

ON THE BEHAVIOR OF PRESSURE IN A LOW MACH NUMBER FLOW

RAFAIL V. ABRAMOV

ABSTRACT. In our recent works, we proposed a theory of turbulence via the mean field effect of an intermolecular potential, which in part relies on an empirically observed “equilibrated” behavior of the pressure variable in a low Mach number flow – that is, while other variables may exhibit considerable variations at low Mach numbers, the pressure is (nearly) constant. At the same time, conventional kinetic theory does not offer a satisfactory explanation for such a behavior of the pressure variable, instead leading to an isentropic flow in the form of the usual compressible Euler equations.

In the current work, we introduce a novel correction term into the pair correlation function of the BBGKY closure for the collision integral, which adjusts the density of incident or recedent pairs of particles depending on the macroscopic compression or expansion rate of the gas. Remarkably, this term does not affect the density and momentum transport equations, and manifests solely in the pressure transport equation. We also find that the effect of the novel term on the pressure dynamics matches the observed behavior – that is, it tends to attenuate the acoustic waves and smooth out the pressure solution. It appears that the missing piece of the low Mach number puzzle has finally been identified.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is known through observations that, at relatively low speeds, the pressure in the atmospheric air flow is mostly equilibrated, whereas the density and temperature may vary considerably. The phenomenon of convection is one of the consequences of such a behavior – indeed, it is known that when a parcel of air warms up, it also expands, while its pressure remains the same. In turn, the expansion leads to a lower density than the ambient air, and thusly reduced gravity force no longer balances the pressure gradient, which leads to a positive buoyancy. In practical applications, such a behavior of the air is used to launch hot air balloons from the surface of the Earth into the troposphere.

Moreover, in our recent works [1–6] we developed a new model of turbulence via an intermolecular potential in a compressible gas, where the pressure variable was either set to a constant [1–5], or its equation was artificially chosen to induce linear damping in the velocity divergence [6]. In all studied cases, turbulent dynamics emerged spontaneously from an initially laminar flow, just as observed in nature and experiments. In summary, the equilibrated behavior of pressure at low speeds is consistent with both the phenomenon of convection and the spontaneous manifestation of turbulent dynamics.

Given all this, there is still a lack of a fundamental understanding of such pressure behavior in the context of kinetic theory. Indeed, the compressible Euler equations [7] fail to describe such an equilibrated behavior of their pressure variable. Instead, they

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO, 851 S. MORGAN ST., CHICAGO, IL 60607

E-mail address: abramov@uic.edu.

preserve the entropy (a quotient of the density and a positive power of the temperature) along their stream lines, which results in a directly opposite thermodynamic behavior – according to the Euler equations, the gas compresses when it heats up, and vice versa. This contradiction, however, only manifests at low speeds. At high speeds, dilute gases behave precisely as the Euler equations predict – they compress when heated and expand when cooled, subsequently producing either discontinuous isentropic effects, such as shock waves and Prandtl–Meyer fans, or smooth compressions–expansions (e.g. the flow in a de Laval nozzle, where the gas compresses while heating up before the critical section, and expands while cooling down thereafter).

Thus, the reality is quite fascinating: without a doubt, the observable macroscopic thermodynamic properties of a real gas depend on the ratio of the speed of the flow to the speed of sound, known as the *Mach number*. Yet, solutions of the Euler equations are always isentropic, and thus are principally incapable of correctly describing the observed thermodynamic properties of the flow at a low Mach number, while at the same time being a valid model of a gas flow at a high Mach number.

Here, one may suggest that, if the Euler pressure equation fails to describe observable thermodynamic properties of a flow in a particular regime, then it should be corrected, in an appropriate fashion, to adhere to the actual behavior of the gas. However, the problem lies much deeper than it seems at a first sight. The matter is that the whole set of the Euler equations (that is, the transport equations for the density, momentum and pressure) is derived directly from the single Boltzmann equation [8, 9] for the velocity distribution function, by computing the transport equations for its velocity moments of appropriate order [7, 10]. Therefore, it is impossible to “correct” the pressure equation separately, as it would disconnect the latter from the Boltzmann equation.

This issue is further exacerbated by the fact that the possibility of “correcting” the Boltzmann equation also seems to be rather distant, because it is, in turn, derived from the Bogoliubov–Born–Green–Kirkwood–Yvon (BBGKY) hierarchy [11–14] of the corresponding Liouville equation for the full multiparticle system. The Liouville equation itself is ironclad; the only mutable part of it is the intermolecular potential. Thus, the whole chain of arguments, starting from the Liouville equation and ending at the Euler equations, is quite rigid and seemingly unassailable. In particular, the inertial [1–5] and weakly compressible [6] pressure regimes, which lead to spontaneously developing turbulent flows in our recent works, were introduced completely empirically, solely by appealing to the natural, observable behavior of real gases. The molecular-kinetic mechanism of the pressure behavior at low Mach numbers remained unknown.

1.1. The new results in the current work. Upon a close examination of the chain of arguments, leading from the Liouville equation to the Euler equations, we concluded that the only “weak spot”, open to an attack, is the closure for the pair correlation function in the BBGKY hierarchy. Therefore, explanations for the observable, yet poorly understood, effects must be hiding in this closure. In the current work, we introduce a novel correction term into the pair correlation function, which adjusts the density of incident and recedent pairs of particles depending on the macroscopic compression or expansion rate of the gas. Remarkably, this term leaves the mass and momentum transport equations invariant, and manifests solely in the pressure transport equation.

Moreover, as we find out, the manner in which this effect manifests in the pressure equation is consistent with the observed behavior of pressure at low Mach numbers; in particular, it may lead to the inertial flow [1–5] or the weakly compressible flow [6], depending on the type of the estimate used.

It appears that we have finally identified the “missing piece” of the puzzle of the low Mach number dynamics – namely, we found what could be the fundamental, molecular-kinetic reason behind the equilibrated behavior of the pressure. Together with the earlier discovered role of the mean field effect of an intermolecular potential in the spontaneous development of turbulent flow [1–6], the new result seems to complete the big picture of the compressible low Mach number dynamics with a molecular-kinetic mechanism for the equilibrated pressure behavior, as observed in nature.

The manuscript is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the detailed, microscopic system of particles interacting via a potential, and formulate the corresponding Liouville equation for it. In Section 3 we derive the equation for the transport of the velocity distribution of a generic particle, and the corresponding transport equations for the density, momentum and pressure variables. In Section 4 we propose a novel term in the pair correlation function of the collision integral, which depends on the angle between the relative coordinate and velocity of the pair of particles. We subsequently show that this novel term leaves the density and momentum equations invariant, and manifests solely in the pressure equation. In Section 5 we propose three different estimates for the scaling coefficient of the novel term, and find that two of them lead to the inertial flow [1–5] and the weakly compressible flow [6], which we previously introduced into our works on turbulence using empirical reasoning. Section 6 summarizes the results.

2. MICROSCOPIC DYNAMICS

Microscopically, we start with a system of K particles, with their coordinates and velocities at a given time t denoted via $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$ and $\mathbf{v}_i(t)$, respectively, with $i = 1, \dots, K$. We assume that the particles in this system interact between each other via a potential $\phi(r)$, with r being the distance between the interacting particles; for simplicity of calculations, particles are not presumed to possess rotational or vibrational degrees of freedom. Such motion is described by the following system of ordinary differential equations:

$$(2.1) \quad \frac{d\mathbf{x}_i}{dt} = \mathbf{v}_i, \quad \frac{d\mathbf{v}_i}{dt} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}_i} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^K \phi(\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|).$$

We assume that the effect of the potential diminishes with increasing distance, that is, $\phi'(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\phi(r)$ is defined up to an additive constant, we can choose $\phi(\infty) = 0$ without loss of generality. We also assume that $\phi(r) > 0$ as $r \rightarrow 0$, that is, the potential is overall repelling.

First, it is trivial to see that (2.1) possesses the Liouville property (i.e. preserves the phase volume); indeed, observe that the divergence of the right-hand side of (2.1) is zero:

$$(2.2) \quad \sum_{i=1}^K \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}_i}{\partial \mathbf{x}_i} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}_i} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^K \phi(\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|) \right) = 0.$$

Second, it is easy to see that the average velocity \mathbf{u} of the system in (2.1), given via

$$(2.3) \quad \mathbf{u} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbf{v}_i(t),$$

is preserved in time irrespectively of what $\phi(r)$ is:

$$(2.4) \quad \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{d\mathbf{v}_i}{dt} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^K \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}_i} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}_j} \right) \phi(\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|) = \mathbf{0}.$$

Third, to show the total energy conservation, it is convenient to denote

$$(2.5) \quad \mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_K), \quad \mathbf{V} = (\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_K), \quad \Phi(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^K \phi(\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|).$$

Then, the system of equations in (2.1) can be expressed via

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{d\mathbf{X}}{dt} = \mathbf{V}, \quad \frac{d\mathbf{V}}{dt} = -\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathbf{X}}.$$

Introducing the total energy

$$(2.7) \quad E(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{V}\|^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{X}),$$

we can calculate

$$(2.8) \quad \frac{d}{dt} E(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{V}(t)) = \frac{\partial E}{\partial \mathbf{X}} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{X}}{dt} + \frac{\partial E}{\partial \mathbf{V}} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{V}}{dt} = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathbf{X}} \cdot \mathbf{V} - \mathbf{V} \cdot \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathbf{X}} = 0.$$

Moreover, E is the Hamiltonian of (2.6), with \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{V} being the canonical variables:

$$(2.9) \quad \frac{d\mathbf{X}}{dt} = \frac{\partial E}{\partial \mathbf{V}}, \quad \frac{d\mathbf{V}}{dt} = -\frac{\partial E}{\partial \mathbf{X}}.$$

2.1. Transition to the Eulerian frame of reference. The dynamics above in (2.6) are formulated in the ‘‘Lagrangian’’ context – that is, all particles in the system are tracked as they progress through the coordinate-velocity states. For what is to follow, it is more convenient to re-formulate the same problem in the ‘‘Eulerian’’ context – that is, to track all the coordinate-velocity states in the system instead, as the particles progress through them. This transition, however, drastically complicates the mathematical description of the dynamics – after all, there are many states which particles will never visit, yet they have to be tracked.

To switch to the Eulerian reference frame, we introduce the density of states $F(t, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V})$ of the system in (2.6). This density satisfies the Liouville equation

$$(2.10) \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} + \mathbf{V} \cdot \frac{\partial F}{\partial \mathbf{X}} = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathbf{X}} \cdot \frac{\partial F}{\partial \mathbf{V}}.$$

The derivation of (2.10) via the infinitesimal generator of (2.6) is given, for instance, in [3]. In what follows, we assume that the domain of a solution F of (2.10) has no boundary effects; for example, it is \mathbb{R}^{3K} for \mathbf{V} , and a periodic cuboid of the same dimension for \mathbf{X} . Now, let us look at some properties of solutions of (2.10).

First, let $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a differentiable function. Then, the integral of $g(F)$ is preserved in time; indeed,

$$(2.11) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int g(F) d\mathbf{X} d\mathbf{V} = \int \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{V}} \cdot \left(g(F) \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathbf{X}} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{X}} \cdot (g(F) \mathbf{V}) \right] d\mathbf{X} d\mathbf{V} = 0.$$

In particular, any L^p -norm of F is preserved in time as a consequence. Moreover, the L^∞ -norm of F is also preserved in time; for that, observe that F remains a constant on a characteristic of (2.10):

$$(2.12) \quad \frac{d}{dt} F(t, \mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{V}(t)) = \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial \mathbf{X}} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{X}}{dt} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial \mathbf{V}} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{V}}{dt} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial \mathbf{X}} \cdot \mathbf{V} - \frac{\partial F}{\partial \mathbf{V}} \cdot \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathbf{X}} = 0.$$

This is the direct consequence of the Liouville property of (2.6).

Next, let us assume that a stationary state F_0 of the Liouville equation in (2.10) is known to us, that is,

$$(2.13) \quad \mathbf{V} \cdot \frac{\partial F_0}{\partial \mathbf{X}} = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathbf{X}} \cdot \frac{\partial F_0}{\partial \mathbf{V}}.$$

Then, a generic solution F of (2.10) preserves the Rényi divergence family [15]:

$$(2.14) \quad D_\alpha(F, F_0) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \int F^\alpha F_0^{1-\alpha} d\mathbf{X} d\mathbf{V}, \quad \alpha > 0.$$

The proof can be found in [1]. The Kullback–Leibler divergence [16] is the special case of (2.14) with $\alpha = 1$.

There are multiple stationary states F_0 of (2.10). One of them, known as the Gibbs canonical state, is given via

$$(2.15) \quad F_G(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}) = \frac{e^{-\Phi(\mathbf{X})/\theta} \prod_{i=1}^K e^{-\|v_i - \mathbf{u}\|^2/2\theta}}{Z_K (2\pi\theta)^{3K/2}}, \quad Z_K = \int e^{-\Phi(\mathbf{X})/\theta} d\mathbf{X},$$

where the parameter θ is the equilibrium temperature of the system of particles,

$$(2.16) \quad \theta = \frac{1}{3} \int \|v_i - \mathbf{u}\|^2 F_G(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}) d\mathbf{X} d\mathbf{V}, \quad \forall i, 1 \leq i \leq K.$$

The Gibbs state F_G maximizes the Shannon entropy [17], given via

$$(2.17) \quad S(F) = - \int F \ln F d\mathbf{X} d\mathbf{V},$$

under the prescribed average velocity and total energy constraints, and is thus regarded as the most “statistically common” equilibrium state encountered in nature. The proof is given in Appendix A.

In what follows, of interest are the formulas for a single-particle density, and a joint two-particle density, given, respectively, via

$$(2.18) \quad f_G(x_i, v_i) = \int F_G(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}) \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^K dx_j dv_j, \quad f_G^{(2)}(x_i, v_i, x_j, v_j) = \int F_G(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}) \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i, j}}^K dx_k dv_k.$$

The explicit formulas for f_G and $f_G^{(2)}$ are given, respectively, via

$$(2.19a) \quad f_G(\mathbf{v}) = \frac{e^{-\|\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u}\|^2/2\theta}}{(2\pi\theta)^{3/2}V},$$

$$(2.19b) \quad f_G^{(2)}(\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = e^{-\frac{\phi(\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|)}{\theta}} Y_K(\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|) f_G(\mathbf{v}) f_G(\mathbf{w}),$$

where V is the volume of the \mathbf{x} -domain, and $Y_K(r)$ is the pair cavity distribution function for K particles [3, 18], given via

$$(2.20) \quad Y_K(\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|) = \frac{V^2}{Z_K} \int \prod_{i=3}^K e^{-(\phi(\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_i\|)+\phi(\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_i\|))/\theta} \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^K e^{-\phi(\|\mathbf{x}_i-\mathbf{x}_j\|)/\theta} \right) d\mathbf{x}_i.$$

3. TRANSPORT EQUATIONS FOR MACROSCOPIC QUANTITIES

Here we proceed in the usual fashion, by deriving the transport equation for the distribution function of a single particle, and then integrating it against appropriate powers of velocity to obtain the equations for the mass density, momentum and pressure.

3.1. The equation for the distribution function of a single particle. Here we follow the standard BBGKY formalism [11–14] to obtain the approximate transport equation for the density of a single generic particle. Let us integrate the Liouville equation in (2.10) over all particles but one:

$$(3.1) \quad \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) f_i(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}} \cdot \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^K \int \frac{\partial \phi(\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|)}{\partial \mathbf{x}} f_{ij}^{(2)}(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w},$$

where the single-particle distribution $f_i(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})$ and the joint two-particle distribution $f_{ij}^{(2)}(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w})$ are given via

$$(3.2) \quad f_i(t, \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{v}_i) = \int F \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^K d\mathbf{x}_j d\mathbf{v}_j, \quad f_{ij}^{(2)}(t, \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{v}_j) = \int F \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i, j}}^K d\mathbf{x}_k d\mathbf{v}_k.$$

Clearly,

$$(3.3) \quad f_i(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = \int f_{ij}^{(2)}(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} = \int f_{ji}^{(2)}(t, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w},$$

for all distinct i and j . Since it is impossible to track statistical properties of individual particles, we replace $f_i \rightarrow f$, $f_{ij}^{(2)} \rightarrow f^{(2)}$, which are the distributions of a “generic” particle and a pair of particles, respectively. The resulting, approximate, equation is given via

$$(3.4) \quad \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) f(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = (K-1) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}} \cdot \int \frac{\partial \phi(\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|)}{\partial \mathbf{x}} f^{(2)}(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w}.$$

The next step is to achieve a *closure*, that is, to express $f^{(2)}$ via f . Here, we propose the following approach. Let us express the joint distribution of two particles $f^{(2)}$ via the product of f , and the corresponding conditional distribution:

$$(3.5) \quad f^{(2)}(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) = f(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f_{\text{cond}}(t, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}),$$

where f_{cond} is the probability that the second particle is at (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) , given that the first particle is at (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) . Now, we are going to make the following assumptions on f_{cond} :

- First, there is no reason for f_{cond} to depend on the absolute coordinate \mathbf{x} and velocity \mathbf{v} ; if anything, only relative coordinate $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}$ and velocity $\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}$ should matter:

$$(3.6) \quad f_{\text{cond}} = f_{\text{cond}}(t, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w} | \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}).$$

- Second, there is no reason for f_{cond} to depend on the absolute directions $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}$; if anything, only the distances $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|$ and $\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\|$, as well as the angle α between them, should matter:

$$(3.7) \quad f_{\text{cond}} = f_{\text{cond}}(t, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w} | \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\|, \cos \alpha), \quad \cos \alpha = \frac{(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w})}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\|}.$$

The reason why we assume that the dependence is on $\cos \alpha$, is that the cosine is invertible in the range between zero and π , which is precisely what is needed.

- Finally, since both particles are generic, the same reasoning applies “backwards”, that is, the following identity is in effect:

$$(3.8) \quad f^{(2)}(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) = f(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f_{\text{cond}}(t, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w} | \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\|, \cos \alpha) \\ = f(t, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) f_{\text{cond}}(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v} | \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\|, \cos \alpha).$$

From the latter identity we infer that the joint distribution has the following structure:

$$(3.9) \quad f^{(2)}(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) = f(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(t, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) g(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\|, \cos \alpha),$$

where $g(r, v, \cos \alpha)$ is a general form of the pair correlation function [18, 19]. The transport equation for f thus becomes

$$(3.10) \quad \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) f(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = (K - 1) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}} \cdot \int \frac{\partial \phi(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|)}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \\ g(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\|, \cos \alpha) f(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(t, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w}.$$

Rescaling $f \rightarrow Km f$ for it to be a mass density, and assuming that K is large enough so that $(K - 1)/K \rightarrow 1$, we arrive at the following transport equation for the single-particle distribution function f :

$$(3.11a) \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}} \cdot \mathcal{C}[f],$$

$$(3.11b) \quad \mathcal{C}[f] = \frac{1}{m} \int \frac{\partial \phi(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|)}{\partial \mathbf{x}} g(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\|, \cos \alpha) f(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(t, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w}.$$

This is a Vlasov-type equation [20], because the collision integral is time-reversible. Due to the time reversibility, this collision integral cannot describe irreversible effects such as

viscosity and heat conductivity. For the purposes of this work, however, these effects are not necessary; in what follows, we will assume that the solutions of interest are Gaussian distributions in \boldsymbol{v} as in (2.19a), and both the stress and heat flux are zero. This assumption does not affect the matter at hand while considerably simplifying calculations, and the viscosity with heat conductivity can be added into the equations *ex post facto*.

3.2. Transport equations for the mass density, momentum and pressure. For a function $\psi(\boldsymbol{v})$, let us define the corresponding velocity moments of f and $\mathcal{C}[f]$ via

$$(3.12) \quad \langle \psi(\boldsymbol{v}) \rangle_f(t, \boldsymbol{x}) = \int \psi(\boldsymbol{v}) f(t, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{v}) d\boldsymbol{v}, \quad \langle \psi(\boldsymbol{v}) \rangle_{\mathcal{C}[f]}(t, \boldsymbol{x}) = \int \psi(\boldsymbol{v}) \mathcal{C}[f](t, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{v}) d\boldsymbol{v}.$$

The transport equation for $\langle \psi \rangle_f$ is computed by integrating (3.11a) against $\psi(\boldsymbol{v})$,

$$(3.13) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \langle \psi \rangle_f + \nabla \cdot \langle \psi \boldsymbol{v} \rangle_f = - \left\langle \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \boldsymbol{v}} \cdot \right\rangle_{\mathcal{C}[f]},$$

where ∇ denotes the spatial gradient, and the \boldsymbol{v} -derivative in the right-hand side was integrated by parts. The dot in the collision moment denotes the scalar multiplication of $\partial \psi / \partial \boldsymbol{v}$ by $\mathcal{C}[f]$, as the latter is a vector. The moment equation above is not closed with respect to $\langle \psi \rangle_f$, as the advection term contains the higher-order moment $\langle \psi \boldsymbol{v} \rangle_f$. Thus, the equations for different moments are coupled to each other, creating a hierarchy.

The low-order velocity moments of f are the density ρ , momentum $\rho \boldsymbol{u}$ and pressure p , given, respectively, via

$$(3.14) \quad \rho = \langle 1 \rangle_f, \quad \rho \boldsymbol{u} = \langle \boldsymbol{v} \rangle_f, \quad p = \frac{1}{3} \langle \|\boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{u}\|^2 \rangle_f.$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{u}(t, \boldsymbol{x})$ denotes the bulk velocity of the flow at the location \boldsymbol{x} , while the local temperature $\theta(t, \boldsymbol{x})$ is given via $\theta = p / \rho$. Denoting the advective derivative via

$$(3.15) \quad \frac{D}{Dt} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla,$$

we obtain, from (3.13), the following equations for ρ , \boldsymbol{u} and p (assuming that the shear stress and heat flux are identically zero):

$$(3.16) \quad \frac{D\rho}{Dt} + \rho \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u} = 0, \quad \rho \frac{D\boldsymbol{u}}{Dt} + \nabla p = - \langle \boldsymbol{I} \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{C}[f]}, \quad \frac{Dp}{Dt} + \frac{5}{3} p \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u} = - \frac{2}{3} \langle (\boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{u}) \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{C}[f]}.$$

The derivation of the transport equations above in (3.16) is given in Appendix B. We note that the usual compressible Euler equations [7] are obtained from (3.16) by setting both collision integrals to zero.

4. A NOVEL EFFECT IN THE PAIR CORRELATION FUNCTION

Above, we have derived the density, momentum and pressure transport equations in (3.16) from the Liouville equation (2.10) for the most general form of the collision integral in (3.11b). In turn, observe that the form of the collision integral in (3.11b) is fixed, and any variation of its properties depends entirely on the pair correlation function $g(r, \boldsymbol{v}, \cos \alpha)$. Therefore, if we are to understand why the pressure variable p of (3.16) behaves differently at different Mach numbers, we have to look into g .

However, before starting to look into the pair correlation function g , we need to understand what we are looking for. We have to keep in mind that there already exist the compressible Euler equations, derived from the Liouville equation under the standard assumptions, which are a good model of the flow at high Mach numbers. Therefore, we need to look for something which is not present at high Mach numbers, and manifests at low Mach numbers instead. What could it be?

We start at the very beginning, that is, the Liouville equation (2.10), which fully describes the evolution of the particle system (2.1). In the classical setting, for a trajectory of (2.6) with an exactly specified initial condition $(\mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{V}_0)$, the solution $F(t, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V})$ of the Liouville equation is a product of Dirac's delta-functions, centered at the corresponding coordinate $\mathbf{X}(t)$ and velocity $\mathbf{V}(t)$ of the complete set of particles:

$$(4.1) \quad F(t, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}) = \delta(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}(t))\delta(\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{V}(t)).$$

Subsequently, the distribution function of a single particle must also be a delta-function:

$$(4.2) \quad f(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}(t))\delta(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}(t)).$$

In a realistic physical system, the Heisenberg uncertainty principle precludes the existence of exact pairs of coordinates and velocities of particles. Therefore, incorporating Heisenberg's principle into (2.10) smoothes out the delta-functions in (4.1) and (4.2). Yet, given that the uncertainty in the coordinate-velocity pairs is provided by the Planck constant, the scale of smoothing is much smaller than the Wigner–Seitz distance between the particles (in a usual dilute gas at normal conditions). Thus, even with Heisenberg's principle, $F(t, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V})$ is effectively a collection of K distinct smooth, yet thin “spikes”. These spikes do not “even out” with time due to the preservation of L^p -norms and the Rényi divergence (2.14).

Strangely enough, when the BBGKY closure is introduced in the process of derivation of the Boltzmann equation (see, for example, [9, 10]), the solution $f(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})$ is treated as a Gaussian density in \mathbf{v} , or something very close to it. Why so? To our knowledge, it is never clearly explained. Here, we offer a plausible explanation as to why such a substitution, despite being rather tacit, is still valid, in the sense that the resulting Boltzmann equation is objectively a good model of real-world processes.

At normal conditions (room temperature, sea level pressure), a particle in a gas moves at the speed of ~ 500 meters per second, and makes $\sim 10^{10}$ collisions with surrounding particles per second, while covering $\sim 10^{-7}$ meters of distance between subsequent collisions (the so called mean free path, or MFP). Assuming that the collisions occur independently, it becomes clear that the sum of the velocity values, indexed between collisions, must approach the isotropic distribution by direction, and the Gaussian distribution by magnitude, due to the Central Limit theorem. In turn, the sum of velocities can be obtained by the time-averaging of the trajectory of a particle. Therefore, we contend that, even though it does not seem to be explicitly stated in any of the major works on this topic, the closure in the Boltzmann equation is introduced not for f itself, but for its suitable time-average instead, such that the Gaussian approximation of the velocity distribution actually applies.

Below, we formalize the foregoing arguments by introducing the running time average of the distribution function, and examining its properties.

4.1. The running time-average. Let us introduce the running time-average $\mathcal{R}_\tau[F]$ of the density F via

$$(4.3) \quad \mathcal{R}_\tau[F] = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{t-\tau}^t F(s) ds.$$

In Appendix C we show that, first, $\mathcal{R}_\tau[F]$ is also a probability density (that is, it is normalized to unity just like F itself), and, second, $\mathcal{R}_\tau[F]$ also solves the Liouville equation (2.10) verbatim:

$$(4.4) \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{R}_\tau[F]}{\partial t} + \mathbf{V} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathcal{R}_\tau[F]}{\partial \mathbf{X}} = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathbf{X}} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathcal{R}_\tau[F]}{\partial \mathbf{V}}.$$

Due to the preservation of the L^∞ -norm, a solution F of (2.10) remains bounded at all times. Therefore, the time derivative of $\mathcal{R}_\tau[F]$ in the left-hand side vanishes as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$:

$$(4.5) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathcal{R}_\tau[F] = \frac{F(t) - F(t - \tau)}{\tau} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \tau \rightarrow \infty.$$

As a result, $\mathcal{R}_\tau[F]$ itself approaches the equilibrium Gibbs state F_G in the same limit:

$$(4.6) \quad \mathcal{R}_\tau[F] \rightarrow F_G \quad \text{as} \quad \tau \rightarrow \infty.$$

Subsequently, applying the BBGKY formalism to (4.4) leads to

$$(4.7) \quad \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \mathcal{R}_\tau[f](t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = (K - 1) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}} \cdot \int \frac{\partial \phi(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|)}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \mathcal{R}_\tau[f^{(2)}](t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w}.$$

Since $\mathcal{R}_\tau[f]$ and $\mathcal{R}_\tau[f^{(2)}]$ are probability densities, the same structure of the joint distribution as in (3.9) applies,

$$(4.8) \quad \mathcal{R}_\tau[f^{(2)}](t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{R}_\tau[f](t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \mathcal{R}_\tau[f](t, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) g_\tau(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\|, \cos \alpha)$$

where, naturally, the pair correlation function $g_\tau(r, v, \cos \alpha)$ must now depend on the averaging window τ .

Henceforth, we will use the notation f to refer to $\mathcal{R}_\tau[f]$, since it is clear at this point that even the conventional BBGKY closure for the Boltzmann equation tacitly uses a running time average of the Liouville solution. Therefore, the transport equation for f remains precisely same as in (3.11a), while the pair correlation function in the collision integral (3.11b) now depends on τ :

$$(4.9) \quad \mathcal{C}[f] = \frac{1}{m} \int \frac{\partial \phi(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|)}{\partial \mathbf{x}} g_\tau(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\|, \cos \alpha) f(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(t, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w}.$$

We have to note, however, that, in the context of the current work, the dependence of g on τ above is completely formal; at no point in what follows we attempt to compute g as a function of τ systematically. Instead, we use this formal τ -dependence that we now know of as a means to justify a novel modification of the pair correlation function, which we propose below. But before that, let us review the properties of the standard approach, which, in the case of the time-reversible potential interactions, leads to the Vlasov equation [20].

4.2. The standard pair correlation function. Normally, g is represented by a radial distribution function [1,3,10,18,19], which accounts for collisional interactions and depends solely on the spatial distance $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|$. In particular, setting g to the pair correlation function for the Gibbs joint state $f_G^{(2)}$ in (2.19b),

$$(4.10) \quad g(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|) = e^{-\frac{\phi(\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}\|)}{\theta}} Y(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|),$$

where $Y(r)$ refers to the pair cavity distribution function for infinitely many particles, leads to Vlasov equation [20], and, subsequently, to the usual hierarchy of the velocity moment equations with the standard transport equations for the density, momentum and pressure [1]. There are no effects which correspond to the equilibrated pressure behavior as observed in nature. Moreover, an assumption that f is a Gaussian distribution (2.19a) with a prescribed density ρ , velocity \mathbf{u} and pressure p , leads directly to the compressible Euler equations, which preserve the entropy along the stream lines, and fail to describe the observed behavior of gases at low Mach numbers.

At the same time, it is clear that, while such closure takes into account collisional interactions at the Gibbs equilibrium, it does not include any effects beyond that; indeed, outside of the “potential well” around the point $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| = 0$, the pair distribution is presumed to be at the equilibrium, just as in the Gibbs pair distribution (2.19b). Thus, we conclude that the standard closure in (4.10) corresponds to a time-averaging window, which, on the one hand, is long enough to equilibrate the microscopic collisional interactions so that f approaches a Gaussian velocity distribution, yet, on the other hand, is not long enough to take into account any macroscopic nonequilibrium effects, which would otherwise accumulate with advection.

4.3. A novel pair correlation function with a nonequilibrium advective effect. Taking into account the foregoing, our new idea is to envision a running time average with a longer window than the one associated with the standard pair correlation function (4.10) and the resulting Euler equations. Observe that the following two effects are associated with a longer time averaging window:

- 1) Averaging out the acoustic waves, and
- 2) Inclusion of longer-scale, advective effects into the pair correlation function.

The first effect is consistent with what we observe in real-world flows at low Mach numbers. Of course, the acoustic waves never vanish in a real gas at any Mach number (which obviously is a complex multiscale system, where we only hope to capture dynamics at the scales of interest, if we are lucky), however they also become effectively uncoupled from the dynamics at low Mach numbers, as if existing “separately” instead. Subsequently, the averaging time window τ in (4.3) must be associated with the statistical decorrelation time of typical acoustic wave solutions of the Euler equations.

The second effect suggests that the novel expression for g will have additional terms beyond (4.10), which are associated with macroscopic advection. Observe that we cannot realistically hope to actually compute g from the true solution of the Liouville equation with the time average directly (as the latter is unsolvable for a system of a realistic size of $\sim 10^{23}$ particles); a practical approach here is to heuristically modify g so that it hopefully includes relevant nonequilibrium effects associated with a longer time average.

In the current work, we propose a novel form of the pair correlation function g , which additionally includes a simple advective effect. Namely, we choose g to be

$$(4.11) \quad g(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, \cos \alpha) = e^{-\frac{\phi(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|)}{\theta}} Y(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|) (1 + \beta \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \cos \alpha),$$

where β is a function of the macroscopic expansion or compression rate of the gas. As we can see, such modification makes g dependent on the angle between the relative coordinate $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}$, and relative velocity $\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}$ of a pair of particles. This means that there is no longer the exact balance between incident and recedent pairs of particles, which is clearly a nonequilibrium, advective effect. For example, if the gas is expanding, the number of the recedent pairs must exceed that of the incident pairs, which suggests that $\beta > 0$ in this situation, since the angle between $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}$ is acute, and thus $\cos \alpha > 0$. Conversely, $\beta < 0$ if the gas is compressing.

The particular form of the correction is chosen as follows:

- 1) We assume that the correction is a ‘‘leading order term’’ of a full nonlinear pair correlation function, and thus has minimal powers of $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|$, $\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\|$ and $\cos \alpha$.
- 2) Since the correction is angle-dependent and must include $\cos \alpha$, the possible ‘‘low-order’’ choices are: $\cos \alpha$, $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \cos \alpha$, $\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\| \cos \alpha$, and $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\| \cos \alpha$.
- 3) Of these four choices, the first and third lead to a singularity in the hydrodynamic limit with the constant particle density, and thus we discard them.
- 4) The remaining two choices, $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \cos \alpha$ and $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\| \cos \alpha$, lead to the same effect in the moment equations (3.16), with the exception that the second choice adds an extra power of $\sqrt{\theta}$, which has to be adjusted via the choice of β anyway so that the physical units are correct. Thus, we choose the simplest correction that works, which is $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \cos \alpha$.

Substituting (4.11) into the collision integral (3.11b), we arrive at

$$(4.12) \quad \mathcal{C}[f] = \frac{1}{m} \int \frac{\partial \phi(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|)}{\partial \mathbf{x}} e^{-\frac{\phi(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|)}{\theta}} Y(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|) (1 + \beta \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \cos \alpha) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w}.$$

Assuming that $\phi(r)$ is a short-range potential, the expression above simplifies to

$$(4.13a) \quad \mathcal{C}[f] = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \bar{\phi}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) + \frac{2\beta \bar{\phi}}{\rho^2} \int \frac{\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}\|} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{w},$$

$$(4.13b) \quad \bar{\phi} = \frac{2\pi\rho p}{3m} \int_0^\infty \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\phi(r)}{\theta}}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r^3 Y(r)\right) dr,$$

where $\bar{\phi}$ is the mean field potential [1–6]. The computation of the novel collision integral in (4.13a) is shown in Appendix D.1. The corresponding velocity moments of $\mathcal{C}[f]$ are given via

$$(4.14) \quad \langle \mathbf{I} \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{C}[f]} = \nabla \bar{\phi}, \quad \langle (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{C}[f]} = -\frac{4\beta \bar{\phi} \sqrt{\theta}}{\sqrt{\pi}},$$

and their computation is shown in Appendix D.2. Substituting the above collision velocity moments into the transport equations for the density, momentum and pressure

in (3.16), we arrive at

$$(4.15) \quad \frac{D\rho}{Dt} + \rho \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad \rho \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt} + \nabla p = -\nabla \bar{\phi}, \quad \frac{Dp}{Dt} + \frac{5}{3} p \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = \frac{8\beta \bar{\phi} \sqrt{\theta}}{3\sqrt{\pi}}.$$

As we can see, the momentum equation contains only the gradient of the mean field potential (which, as we found in our past works [1–6], is the cause of turbulence), and the novel angle-dependent closure effect manifests solely in the pressure equation. To simplify further computation, we assume that $\bar{\phi}$ is that of a hard sphere particle,

$$(4.16) \quad \bar{\phi} = \frac{4\rho p}{\rho_{HS}},$$

where ρ_{HS} is the density of the hard sphere particle. This sets the equations above to

$$(4.17a) \quad \frac{D\rho}{Dt} + \rho \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad \rho \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt} + \nabla \left[p \left(1 + \frac{4\rho}{\rho_{HS}} \right) \right] = \mathbf{0},$$

$$(4.17b) \quad \frac{Dp}{Dt} + \frac{5}{3} p \left(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} - \frac{32\beta}{5\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\rho\sqrt{\theta}}{\rho_{HS}} \right) = 0.$$

Observe that, irrespectively of the exact expression for β , it is already clear that the novel term in the pair correlation function (4.11) generally counteracts the effect of the velocity divergence $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$ – indeed, the signs of β and $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$ are expected to correlate since both are related to the expansion or compression of the gas. In turn, the velocity divergence $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$ is instrumental in producing the acoustic waves in the Euler equations. Thus the novel term should have an attenuation effect on the acoustic waves, which generally corresponds to the observed behavior of gas flows at low Mach numbers.

5. CRUDE ESTIMATES FOR β

Above, β was introduced into the novel pair correlation function (4.11) as a coefficient which specifies the strength and sign of the nonequilibrium angle-dependency effect. Ideally, we should be looking for the exact formula for β , however, at the moment it is unclear how to proceed, and we reserve this problem for the future work.

Instead, here we choose an empirical approach to estimate β . To do this, we recall that β must correlate with the macroscopic expansion or compression rate of the gas, for positive or negative values, respectively. At the same time, it is known that the velocity divergence $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$ is a good measure of an expanding or compressing gas. Therefore, here we choose β to be proportional either directly to $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$, or to a similar quantity, which is also correlated to the expansion or compression rate of the gas. In what follows, we use a “shotgun approach” to this problem, by proposing three different estimates for β , and hoping that one or, perhaps, two of those could turn out to be useful.

5.1. First estimate. Here, we take the straightforward approach of setting β directly proportional to the velocity divergence $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$ of the solution of (4.17), that is

$$(5.1) \quad \beta = \frac{5A\sqrt{\pi}}{32} \frac{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}}{\sqrt{\theta}}.$$

Above, $A > 0$ is an empirical coefficient, and we normalize the bulk velocity of the flow by the square root of the temperature, which corresponds to the average thermal speed of particles. The latter normalization has an additional effect of setting the correct units of the inverse length for β , according to (4.11), which means that A is nondimensional. The resulting pressure equation (4.17b) becomes

$$(5.2) \quad \frac{Dp}{Dt} + \frac{5}{3} \left(1 - A \frac{\rho}{\rho_{HS}} \right) p \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0,$$

where the left-hand side contains the advective derivative of the pressure. Observe that the immediate effect of this correction is the slowdown of the acoustic waves; indeed, the speed of an acoustic wave c is determined via

$$(5.3) \quad c^2 = \left[\frac{5}{3} \left(1 - A \frac{\rho}{\rho_{HS}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{4\rho}{\rho_{HS}} \right) + \frac{4\rho}{\rho_{HS}} \right] \frac{p}{\rho}.$$

For details, see Appendix E. Formally, increasing A to its threshold value of the reciprocal of the packing fraction,

$$(5.4) \quad A_{\max} = \frac{\rho_{HS}}{\rho},$$

we obtain the balanced flow equation, that is,

$$(5.5) \quad \frac{Dp}{Dt} = 0.$$

Further, if $p = p_0$ is a constant throughout the domain, the flow becomes inertial. Thus, from the formal perspective, this estimate for β leads to the type of a turbulent flow we studied previously in [1–5]. We, however, note that the estimate in (5.1) does not explicitly average out acoustic waves as purported by the idea of time-averaging in Section 4.3, although the restriction on their speed can be crudely interpreted as an averaging effect, if the wave speed c in (5.3) is regarded as a group speed of packets of acoustic wave solutions in the usual Euler equations.

Further increase in A results in the expression in the right-hand side of (5.3) becoming negative. As a result, the corresponding acoustic equation becomes elliptic and, therefore, ill-posed in the context of the initial value problem. Besides, it is not clear, from the physics standpoint, how, in the absence of an external source, a positive velocity divergence could possibly result in increasing pressure (or vice versa). Thus, it seems that the maximum physically sensible value of A is given by (5.4), and results in a balanced flow.

We conclude that (5.1) appears to have a rather limited applicability in the context of physics, although the ability to slow down the fastest waves in the system (to the point that the flow can become balanced) may find use in certain applications which model the flow at very large scales, such as numerical weather and climate prediction [21].

5.2. Second estimate. Here, let $\tilde{\rho}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ and \tilde{p} refer to solutions of the usual compressible Euler equations (which are, undoubtedly, valid for shorter time averages). Then, instead of being proportional to $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$, let β be related to the running average of $\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ instead:

$$(5.6) \quad \beta \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta}} \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{t-\tau}^t \nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(s, \mathbf{x}(s)) ds.$$

Here, note that the average is computed along the stream line of the Euler solution, because the interacting pair of particles moves with the flow. To evaluate the time average above, we integrate the Euler equation for the pressure along the stream line backward in time from the current state $p(t, \mathbf{x})$:

$$(5.7) \quad \frac{D\tilde{p}}{Dt} + \frac{5}{3}\tilde{p}\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}} = 0, \quad \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{t-\tau}^t \nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(s, \mathbf{x}(s)) ds = \frac{3}{5\tau} \ln \left[\frac{\tilde{p}(t-\tau, \mathbf{x}(t-\tau))}{p(t, \mathbf{x})} \right].$$

Since the Euler solution $\tilde{p}(t, \mathbf{x}(t))$ along the stream line is inaccessible in the context of (4.17), and the averaging window τ is associated with the decorrelation time of the Euler solution, we approximate the backward state $\tilde{p}(t-\tau, \mathbf{x}(t-\tau))$ above via the background pressure p_0 . The resulting estimate we propose for β is thus

$$(5.8) \quad \beta = \frac{5\sqrt{\pi}}{32} \frac{B}{\tau\sqrt{\theta}} \ln \left(\frac{p_0}{p} \right),$$

where $B > 0$ is a nondimensional coefficient. The pressure equation becomes

$$(5.9) \quad \frac{Dp}{Dt} + \frac{5}{3}p \left[\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} - \frac{B}{\tau} \frac{\rho}{\rho_{HS}} \ln \left(\frac{p_0}{p} \right) \right] = 0,$$

and acquires a damping term which suppresses the acoustic waves, as forethought in Section 4.3. To investigate the behavior of B , let us look at the nondimensional equations. To this end, we follow our work [5]: we introduce the spatial scale of the flow L , the large scale vorticity Ω , the background density ρ_0 , and rescale the variables as

$$(5.10) \quad t \rightarrow \Omega^{-1}t, \quad \mathbf{x} \rightarrow L\mathbf{x}, \quad \rho \rightarrow \rho_0 e^{\zeta}, \quad \mathbf{u} \rightarrow \Omega L\mathbf{u}, \quad p \rightarrow p_0 e^{\zeta}.$$

The transport equations in (4.17), with the pressure equation in (5.9), become

$$(5.11a) \quad \frac{D\zeta}{Dt} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt} + \frac{e^{\zeta-\zeta}}{Ma^2} \nabla \zeta + \frac{4\eta e^{\zeta}}{Ma^2} \nabla(\zeta + \xi) = \mathbf{0},$$

$$(5.11b) \quad \frac{D\xi}{Dt} + \frac{5}{3} \left(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} + \frac{B}{\Omega\tau} \eta e^{\zeta} \xi \right) = 0,$$

where the Mach number Ma and the packing fraction η are given, respectively, via

$$(5.12) \quad Ma = \Omega L \sqrt{\frac{\rho_0}{p_0}}, \quad \eta = \frac{\rho_0}{\rho_{HS}}.$$

Next, we assume that both Ma^2 and η are small parameters, with $Ma^2/\eta \sim 1$. Then, replacing $\xi = Ma^2 \hat{\xi}$, and leaving only the leading order terms, we arrive at

$$(5.13a) \quad \frac{D\zeta}{Dt} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt} + e^{-\zeta} \nabla \hat{\xi} + \frac{4\eta}{Ma^2} \nabla \zeta = \mathbf{0},$$

$$(5.13b) \quad \frac{D\hat{\xi}}{Dt} + \frac{5}{3} \left(\frac{1}{Ma^2} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} + \frac{B}{\Omega\tau} \eta e^{\zeta} \hat{\xi} \right) = 0.$$

From here, we can see that B should scale as

$$(5.14) \quad B \sim \frac{\Omega\tau}{Ma^2\eta}.$$

To compute the effect of this estimate on the momentum equation, observe that, since, in the nondimensional variables, $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} \sim 1$, we have to assume that the linear damping term in (5.13b) is $\sim Ma^{-2}$ (that is, rather strong). Therefore, similarly to the derivation of the Newton law of viscosity, or the Fourier law of heat conduction (see, e.g. Chap. 7–9 of [8]), we can assume that (5.13b) is in a permanent steady state along a characteristic:

$$(5.15) \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = -\frac{Ma^2B\eta}{\Omega\tau}e^{\zeta}\hat{\xi}.$$

Multiplying by $e^{-\zeta}$, computing the gradient, and multiplying once more by $e^{-\zeta}$ yields

$$(5.16) \quad e^{-\zeta}\nabla \left(e^{-\zeta}\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} \right) = -\frac{Ma^2B\eta}{\Omega\tau}e^{-\zeta}\nabla\hat{\xi},$$

which, upon substitution into (5.13a), yields the system for the density and momentum:

$$(5.17) \quad \frac{D\zeta}{Dt} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt} + \frac{4\eta}{Ma^2}\nabla\zeta = \frac{\Omega\tau}{Ma^2B\eta}e^{-\zeta}\nabla \left(e^{-\zeta}\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} \right).$$

In order to understand what the novel term in the momentum equation does, we compute the divergence of the momentum equation above:

$$(5.18) \quad \frac{D(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u})}{Dt} + \nabla \mathbf{u}^T : \nabla \mathbf{u} + \frac{4\eta}{Ma^2}\Delta\zeta = \frac{\Omega\tau}{Ma^2B\eta}\nabla \cdot \left[e^{-\zeta}\nabla \left(e^{-\zeta}\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} \right) \right].$$

Therefore, the estimate manifests as a diffusion term in the equation for $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$.

5.3. Third estimate. We derive the third estimate for β from the usual compressible Euler equation for the momentum, that is,

$$(5.19) \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{u}}}{\partial t} + (\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla)\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = -\frac{\nabla \tilde{p}}{\tilde{\rho}}.$$

Observe that the right-hand side can be treated as an external forcing to the otherwise self-contained advection equation for the velocity, which merely transports the velocity along its own stream lines. In the Euler equations, the right-hand side $\nabla \tilde{p}/\tilde{\rho}$ is, in turn, coupled to the equations for the density and pressure, thus forming an isentropic system which primarily transports rapidly propagating acoustic waves. However, since our variables ρ and p are longer time-averages of the same solution of the Liouville equation, we can regard $\nabla p/\rho$ as a small constant perturbation in the otherwise rapidly oscillating term $\nabla \tilde{p}/\tilde{\rho}$. If so, a crude relation between the constant perturbation component and the time-backward average of the fluctuation $\delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ from the background flow is given by the Green–Kubo relations [22–27], applied backward in time from the current state, which amounts to changing the sign of the perturbation.

Here, we first denote the centered autocorrelation matrix $\mathbf{C}(t)$ of the Euler velocity $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ via the ensemble average

$$(5.20) \quad \mathbf{C}(t) = \langle (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) - \bar{\mathbf{u}})(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(0, \mathbf{x}) - \bar{\mathbf{u}}) \rangle,$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ is the mean state of (5.19). Then, the Green–Kubo formula yields

$$(5.21) \quad \delta\langle\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\rangle = \mathbf{T}\frac{\nabla p}{\rho}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{T} = \int_0^\infty \mathbf{C}(s)\mathbf{C}^{-1}(0)ds.$$

For strongly chaotic and mixing dynamics with a rapid exponential decay of autocorrelation functions, the autocorrelation time matrix \mathbf{T} usually approaches $\tau\mathbf{I}$, where τ is the decorrelation time of the Euler system. This further simplifies the estimate to

$$(5.22) \quad \delta\langle\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\rangle = \frac{\tau}{\rho}\nabla p.$$

Subsequently, the average deviation of the divergence is obtained by applying the divergence operator on both sides, that is,

$$(5.23) \quad \delta\langle\nabla\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\rangle = \nabla\cdot\left(\frac{\tau}{\rho}\nabla p\right).$$

Thus, we set β to

$$(5.24) \quad \beta = \frac{5\sqrt{\pi}}{32}\frac{C}{\sqrt{\theta}}\nabla\cdot\left(\frac{\tau}{\rho}\nabla p\right),$$

with $C > 0$, so that the pressure equation in (4.17b) takes the form

$$(5.25) \quad \frac{Dp}{Dt} + \frac{5}{3}p\left[\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u} - C\frac{\rho}{\rho_{HS}}\nabla\cdot\left(\frac{\tau}{\rho}\nabla p\right)\right] = 0,$$

acquiring a diffusive term, which also suppresses the acoustic waves. To investigate the behavior of C , we rescale the variables as in (5.10)–(5.13), which leads to

$$(5.26a) \quad \frac{D\zeta}{Dt} + \nabla\cdot\mathbf{u} = 0, \quad \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt} + e^{-\zeta}\nabla\hat{\xi} + \frac{4\eta}{Ma^2}\nabla\zeta = \mathbf{0},$$

$$(5.26b) \quad \frac{D\hat{\xi}}{Dt} + \frac{5}{3Ma^2}\left[\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u} - C\Omega\eta e^\zeta\nabla\cdot(\tau e^{-\zeta}\nabla\hat{\xi})\right] = 0.$$

Here it is clear that C should be such that $\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u} \sim Ma^2$. To compute the scaling for C , let us, as above, assume that (5.26b) is permanently at its steady state, that is,

$$(5.27) \quad \frac{e^{-\zeta}}{C\Omega\tau\eta}\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u} = \nabla\cdot(e^{-\zeta}\nabla\hat{\xi}),$$

where we assumed that τ is constant in x . Then, computing the divergence of the momentum equation in (5.26a) yields

$$(5.28) \quad \frac{D(\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u})}{Dt} + \nabla\mathbf{u}^T : \nabla\mathbf{u} + \nabla\cdot(e^{-\zeta}\nabla\hat{\xi}) + \frac{4\eta}{Ma^2}\Delta\zeta = 0.$$

Combining the above two relations, we arrive at

$$(5.29) \quad \frac{D(\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u})}{Dt} + \nabla\mathbf{u}^T : \nabla\mathbf{u} + \frac{4\eta}{Ma^2}\Delta\zeta = -\frac{e^{-\zeta}}{C\Omega\tau\eta}\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u},$$

that is, the effect of this estimate is the linear damping of the velocity divergence along the stream line. Further, assuming that the contribution of the non-divergence terms in

the left-hand side of (5.29) is ~ 1 , it is clear that the damping rate in the right-hand side of (5.29) should be $\sim Ma^{-2}$, which sets the scaling estimate for C at

$$(5.30) \quad C \sim \frac{Ma^2}{\Omega\tau\eta}.$$

Coincidentally, we have already examined this type of dynamics in [6], referring to it as a “weakly compressible” flow. We note, however, that, due to an unknown molecular-kinetic mechanism of the low Mach number pressure behavior at that time, we had to resort to a purely empirical reasoning in [6].

5.4. Practical considerations. Above, we introduced three semi-empirical estimates for the factor β in (4.17b), which set β proportional either directly to the divergence of velocity, or to some proximate quantities, derived from the pressure and momentum equations. Each of these three estimates has its own effect on the pressure equation:

- 1) The first estimate, given via (5.1), slows down the acoustic waves, and ultimately makes the pressure equation balanced (or inertial, if pressure is set to a constant). We have already studied inertial flow in our works [1–5], and found that, while turbulence indeed develops spontaneously in inertial flow and has realistic energy spectra, some other properties of the flow are unrealistic (such as the fluctuations of the density).
- 2) The second estimate, given via (5.8), equips the pressure equation with a linear damping term (for the logarithmic pressure variable). Subsequently, such pressure damping exerts a diffusive effect in the equation for the velocity divergence (which, in turn, happens to be the variable “responsible” for the creation of turbulent dynamics [5]). So far, we have not tested such a model numerically, and thus cannot say how the turbulent dynamics are affected by this estimate.
- 3) The third estimate, given via (5.24), induces a diffusive effect in the pressure equation, which, in turn, confers linear damping to the dynamics of the velocity divergence. Coincidentally, we have already tested this type of dynamics numerically in [6], and found that turbulent flow develops more realistically than what we observed in inertial flow.

A relatively easy next step at this point is an empirical computational testing of these estimates for β in a realistic flow setting. For such computations, a combination of all three estimates in (5.1), (5.8) and (5.24) can be used at once – that is, the pressure equation can be set to

$$(5.31) \quad \frac{Dp}{Dt} + \frac{5}{3} \frac{\rho p}{\rho_{HS}} \left[\left(\frac{\rho_{HS}}{\rho} - A \right) \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} - \frac{B}{\tau} \ln \left(\frac{p_0}{p} \right) - C \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{\tau}{\rho} \nabla p \right) \right] = 0.$$

The pressure equation above has all three effects separately affecting properties of its solution – the term with A slows down the acoustic waves, the term with B induces pressure damping, and the term with C creates pressure diffusion. The balance of the coefficients A , B and C can be chosen heuristically depending on the macroscopic properties of the benchmark flow configuration.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The behavior of pressure in a low Mach number flow is a long-standing mystery. While the traditional molecular-kinetic model, which consists of the Boltzmann equation and the resulting Euler equations, predicts isentropic flow where gas compresses when heated, in reality we observe that, at low Mach numbers, gas expands when heated, while its pressure tends to remain equilibrated. Yet, at a high Mach number, gas behaves as predicted by the Euler equations, that is, it compresses when heated, forming acoustic waves, shock transitions, and other relevant high-speed phenomena. Apparently, the pressure behavior of a real gas is affected by the Mach number of the flow. At the same time, the dynamics of the density and momentum seem to remain unaffected by the Mach number.

In the current work, we propose a molecular-kinetic mechanism which explains such a mysterious pressure behavior. Namely, we modify the pair correlation function of the BBGKY closure of the collision integral, so that it introduces a trivial variation of the pair density depending on the macroscopic compression or expansion rate of the gas. Our argument is simple: if the gas is expanding, then there must be more recedent than incident particle pairs, and vice versa if it is compressing.

Remarkably, we find that our modification of the pair correlation function leaves the density and momentum transport equations invariant, and manifests only in the pressure equation. Moreover, it counteracts the effect of the velocity divergence in the pressure equation, thereby attenuating acoustic waves and similar isentropic phenomena, which is in agreement with the observed behavior of gas flows at low Mach numbers.

Our new modification of the pair correlation function contains a scaling coefficient, which is broadly connected to the macroscopic compression or expansion rate of the gas, and for which we propose three different practical estimates. Coincidentally, two of these estimates lead to the inertial flow [1–5] and the weakly compressible flow [6], which we had to introduce empirically in our past works, for the lack of a fundamental explanation. There is hope that we have finally identified the molecular-kinetic mechanism behind such an intriguing behavior of pressure at low Mach numbers.

Acknowledgment. The work was supported by the Simons Foundation grant #636144.

APPENDIX A. THE MAXIMUM ENTROPY STATE

At the maximum entropy state, the variational principle requires that the variational derivative of the Lagrangian function is zero:

$$(A.1) \quad \frac{\delta S}{\delta F} + \gamma_0 \frac{\delta}{\delta F} \int F d\mathbf{X} d\mathbf{V} + \vec{\gamma}_u \cdot \frac{\delta}{\delta F} \int \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K v_i F d\mathbf{X} d\mathbf{V} + \gamma_E \frac{\delta}{\delta F} \int E(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}) F d\mathbf{X} d\mathbf{V} = 0,$$

where γ_0 , $\vec{\gamma}_u$ and γ_E are the Lagrange multipliers for the normalization, average velocity and total energy constraints, respectively. We now observe that

$$(A.2a) \quad \frac{\delta S}{\delta F} = \ln F + 1, \quad \frac{\delta}{\delta F} \int F d\mathbf{X} d\mathbf{V} = 1, \quad \frac{\delta}{\delta F} \int \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K v_i F d\mathbf{X} d\mathbf{V} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K v_i,$$

$$(A.2b) \quad \frac{\delta}{\delta F} \int E(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}) F d\mathbf{X} d\mathbf{V} = E(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}),$$

which yields

$$(A.3) \quad F_G = \exp \left(-1 - \gamma_0 - \vec{\gamma}_u \cdot \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbf{v}_i - \gamma_E E(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}) \right).$$

We now need to determine the values of γ_0 , $\vec{\gamma}_u$ and γ_E . For that, let us express the argument of the exponent via

$$(A.4) \quad -1 - \gamma_0 - \vec{\gamma}_u \cdot \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbf{v}_i - \gamma_E E(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}) \\ = -1 - \gamma_0 - \frac{\gamma_E}{2} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^K \left\| \mathbf{v}_i + \frac{\vec{\gamma}_u}{\gamma_E K} \right\|^2 + \frac{\|\vec{\gamma}_u\|^2}{2\gamma_E K} - \gamma_E \Phi(\mathbf{X}).$$

From here, it is easy to see that if we set

$$(A.5) \quad \vec{\gamma}_u = -\gamma_E K \mathbf{u}, \quad \gamma_0 = \ln \int e^{-\gamma_E \Phi(\mathbf{X})} d\mathbf{X} + \frac{3K}{2} \ln \left(\frac{2\pi}{\gamma_E} \right) + \frac{\gamma_E K \|\mathbf{u}\|^2}{2} - 1,$$

then F_G acquires the form

$$(A.6) \quad F_G(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}) = \frac{e^{-\gamma_E \Phi(\mathbf{X})}}{\int e^{-\gamma_E \Phi(\mathbf{X})} d\mathbf{X}} \left(\frac{\gamma_E}{2\pi} \right)^{3K/2} \exp \left(-\frac{\gamma_E}{2} \sum_{i=1}^K \|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}\|^2 \right).$$

Observe that, irrespectively of the value of γ_E , F_G is normalized to unity and possesses the prescribed average velocity \mathbf{u} :

$$(A.7) \quad \int F_G d\mathbf{X} d\mathbf{V} = 1, \quad \int \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbf{v}_i F_G d\mathbf{X} d\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{u}.$$

One expects that the remaining Lagrange multiplier γ_E should be chosen so as to match a prescribed mean value of the total energy, but, in practice, it is usually set to satisfy the given value of the kinetic temperature. Namely, we replace γ_E with the kinetic temperature $\theta = \gamma_E^{-1}$, so that

$$(A.8) \quad F_G(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}) = \frac{e^{-\Phi(\mathbf{X})/\theta}}{\int e^{-\Phi(\mathbf{X})/\theta} d\mathbf{X}} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^K e^{-\|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}\|^2/2\theta}}{(2\pi\theta)^{3K/2}}.$$

APPENDIX B. DERIVATION OF THE DENSITY, MOMENTUM AND PRESSURE EQUATIONS

B.1. The density equation. For the zero-order velocity moment, we obtain, from (3.13),

$$(B.1) \quad \frac{\partial \langle 1 \rangle_f}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \langle \mathbf{v} \rangle_f = - \left\langle \frac{\partial 1}{\partial \mathbf{v}} \cdot \right\rangle_{C[f]}.$$

From (3.14) we recall that $\langle 1 \rangle_f = \rho$, $\langle \mathbf{v} \rangle_f = \rho \mathbf{u}$, and, observing that the right-hand side is zero, we arrive at the density transport equation in the form

$$(B.2) \quad \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u}) = 0, \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{D\rho}{Dt} + \rho \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0.$$

B.2. The momentum equation. For the first-order moment, we obtain, from (3.13),

$$(B.3) \quad \frac{\partial \langle \mathbf{v} \rangle_f}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}^2 \rangle_f = - \left\langle \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial \mathbf{v}} \cdot \right\rangle_{C[f]}.$$

Here, we first express

$$(B.4) \quad \langle \mathbf{v}^2 \rangle_f = \langle (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u})^2 \rangle_f + \mathbf{u} \langle \mathbf{v} \rangle_f + \langle \mathbf{v} \rangle_f \mathbf{u} - \langle 1 \rangle_f \mathbf{u}^2 = \langle (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u})^2 \rangle_f + \rho \mathbf{u}^2,$$

and, observing that $\partial \mathbf{v} / \partial \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{I}$, we arrive at

$$(B.5) \quad \frac{\partial (\rho \mathbf{u})}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u}^2) + \nabla \cdot \langle (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u})^2 \rangle_f = - \langle \mathbf{I} \cdot \rangle_{C[f]},$$

or, after subtracting the density equation, multiplied by \mathbf{u} ,

$$(B.6) \quad \rho \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt} + \nabla \cdot \langle (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u})^2 \rangle_f = - \langle \mathbf{I} \cdot \rangle_{C[f]},$$

Under the assumption that the shear stress is zero, $\langle (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u})^2 \rangle_f$ becomes one-third of its own trace, that is,

$$(B.7) \quad \langle (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u})^2 \rangle_f = \frac{1}{3} \langle \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 \rangle_f \mathbf{I} = p \mathbf{I}.$$

This yields the momentum equation in the form

$$(B.8) \quad \rho \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt} + \nabla p = - \langle \mathbf{I} \cdot \rangle_{C[f]}.$$

B.3. The pressure equation. For the second-order moment, we obtain, from (3.13),

$$(B.9) \quad \frac{\partial \langle \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \rangle_f}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \langle \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \mathbf{v} \rangle_f = - \left\langle \frac{\partial \|\mathbf{v}\|^2}{\partial \mathbf{v}} \cdot \right\rangle_{C[f]}.$$

Here, we express, from (B.4),

$$(B.10) \quad \langle \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \rangle_f = \langle \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 \rangle_f + \rho \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 = 3p + \rho \|\mathbf{u}\|^2,$$

$$(B.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \mathbf{v} \rangle_f &= \langle \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \rangle_f + \langle \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \rangle_f \mathbf{u} = \langle (\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 + 2\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} - \|\mathbf{u}\|^2) (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \rangle_f \\ &+ (3p + \rho \|\mathbf{u}\|^2) \mathbf{u} = \langle \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \rangle_f + 2 \langle (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \mathbf{v} \rangle_f \mathbf{u} + (3p + \rho \|\mathbf{u}\|^2) \mathbf{u} \\ &= \langle \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \rangle_f + 2 \langle (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u})^2 \rangle_f \mathbf{u} + (3p + \rho \|\mathbf{u}\|^2) \mathbf{u} = (5p + \rho \|\mathbf{u}\|^2) \mathbf{u}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last identity we used (B.7) and the assumption that the heat flux is zero, that is, $\langle \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}\|^2 (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \rangle_f = \mathbf{0}$. Further observing that $\partial \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 / \partial \mathbf{v} = 2\mathbf{v}$, we arrive at

$$(B.12) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (3p + \rho \|\mathbf{u}\|^2) + \nabla \cdot ((5p + \rho \|\mathbf{u}\|^2) \mathbf{u}) = -2 \langle \mathbf{v} \cdot \rangle_{C[f]}.$$

Next, we express from the density and momentum equations,

$$(B.13) \quad \frac{\partial(\rho\|\mathbf{u}\|^2)}{\partial t} = 2\mathbf{u} \cdot \frac{\partial(\rho\mathbf{u})}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t}\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{u}\|^2\nabla \cdot (\rho\mathbf{u}) - 2\mathbf{u} \cdot \left(\nabla \cdot (\rho\mathbf{u}^2) + \nabla p + \langle \mathbf{I} \cdot \rangle_{C[f]} \right),$$

which yields, upon substitution,

$$(B.14) \quad \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (p\mathbf{u}) + \frac{2}{3}p\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = -\frac{2}{3}\langle (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \rangle_{C[f]},$$

or, with the use of the advective derivative,

$$(B.15) \quad \frac{Dp}{Dt} + \frac{5}{3}p\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = -\frac{2}{3}\langle (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \rangle_{C[f]}.$$

APPENDIX C. PROPERTIES OF THE RUNNING TIME AVERAGE

Let us introduce the running time average of F , with the averaging window $\tau > 0$:

$$(C.1) \quad \mathcal{R}_\tau[F](t, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}) = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{t-\tau}^t F(s, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}) ds.$$

It is easy to see that the time derivative of such running average is the running average of the time derivative of F :

$$(C.2) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathcal{R}_\tau[F](t) = \frac{1}{\tau} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{t-\tau}^t F(s) ds = \frac{F(t) - F(t-\tau)}{\tau} = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{t-\tau}^t \frac{\partial}{\partial s} F(s) ds = \mathcal{R}_\tau \left[\frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right] (t).$$

It is clear that the normalization of $\mathcal{R}_\tau[F]$ is preserved, that is, $\mathcal{R}_\tau[F]$ is also a probability density:

$$(C.3) \quad \int \mathcal{R}_\tau[F] d\mathbf{X} d\mathbf{V} = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{t-\tau}^t ds \int F(s, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V}) d\mathbf{X} d\mathbf{V} = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{t-\tau}^t ds = 1.$$

Together with the linearity of the Liouville equation (2.10), this property allows the Liouville equation to apply to the running time averages verbatim:

$$(C.4) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathcal{R}_\tau[F] + \mathbf{V} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{X}} \mathcal{R}_\tau[F] = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathbf{X}} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{V}} \mathcal{R}_\tau[F].$$

APPENDIX D. COMPUTATION OF THE COLLISION INTEGRAL AND ITS MOMENTS

D.1. Computation of the novel part of the collision integral. For $\beta = 0$, the conventional part of the collision integral in (4.10) leads to the first term in the right-hand side of (4.13a) (for the detailed derivation, see Appendix B.1 of our work [3]). Thus, we will only compute the novel part of the collision integral in (4.11), which involves $\beta \neq 0$, and constitutes the second term in the right-hand side of (4.13a). Assuming that the

intermolecular potential $\phi(r)$ is short-range, we replace $f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) \rightarrow f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$, and, substituting (3.7) for $\cos \alpha$, obtain

$$(D.1) \quad \frac{\beta}{m} \int \frac{\partial \phi(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|)}{\partial \mathbf{x}} e^{-\frac{\phi(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|)}{\theta}} Y(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|) (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot \frac{\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\|} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{w} \\ = \frac{\beta}{m} \int_0^\infty r^3 Y(r) e^{-\frac{\phi(r)}{\theta}} \phi'(r) dr \int \mathbf{n}^2 \cdot \frac{\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\|} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{n} d\mathbf{w},$$

where we substitute $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x} + r\mathbf{n}$, $d\mathbf{y} = r^2 dr d\mathbf{n}$, with \mathbf{n} being the unit vector on a sphere. The integral in $d\mathbf{n}$ is computed as

$$(D.2) \quad \int \mathbf{n}^2 d\mathbf{n} = \frac{4\pi}{3} \mathbf{I}.$$

Substituting $4\pi/3$ into the integral in dr , we obtain

$$(D.3) \quad \frac{4\pi\beta}{3m} \int_0^\infty r^3 Y(r) e^{-\frac{\phi(r)}{\theta}} \phi'(r) dr = \frac{4\pi\beta\theta}{3m} \int_0^\infty r^3 Y(r) \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\phi(r)}{\theta}} \right) dr \\ = -\frac{4\pi\beta\theta}{3m} \int_0^\infty \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\phi(r)}{\theta}} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r^3 Y(r)) dr = -\frac{2\beta\bar{\phi}}{\rho^2},$$

where expression for $\bar{\phi}$ is taken from (4.13b). Substituting the results into (D.1), we have

$$(D.4) \quad \frac{\beta}{m} \int_0^\infty r^3 Y(\theta, r) e^{-\frac{\phi(r)}{\theta}} \phi'(r) dr \int \mathbf{n}^2 \cdot \frac{\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}\|} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{n} d\mathbf{w} \\ = \frac{2\beta\bar{\phi}}{\rho^2} \int \frac{\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}\|} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{w},$$

which is the second term in the right-hand side of (4.13a). Note that we swap \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{w} under the integral above to account for the negative sign in front of $2\beta\bar{\phi}/\rho^2$.

D.2. Computation of the novel collision moments. The collision moment of (4.11) for the momentum equation is

$$(D.5) \quad \langle \mathbf{I} \cdot \rangle_{C[f]} = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \bar{\phi}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \int f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{v} + \frac{2\beta\bar{\phi}}{\rho^2} \int \frac{\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}\|} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{v} d\mathbf{w} = \nabla \bar{\phi},$$

where “ ∇ ” refers to the spatial differentiation. The integral of the β -dependent part is zero, because it is skew-symmetric with respect to the renaming $\mathbf{v} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{w}$. The collision moment of (4.11) for the pressure equation is computed as follows:

$$(D.6) \quad \langle (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \rangle_{C[f]} = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \bar{\phi}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \cdot \int (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{v} + \frac{2\beta\bar{\phi}}{\rho^2} \int (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \frac{\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}\|} \\ f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{v} d\mathbf{w} = \frac{2\beta\bar{\phi}}{\rho^2} \int (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \frac{\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}\|} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{v} d\mathbf{w}.$$

To approximate the remaining integral, we assume that f is the Gaussian density,

$$(D.7) \quad f(\mathbf{v}) = \frac{\rho}{(2\pi\theta)^{3/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}\|^2}{2\theta}\right),$$

with ρ , \mathbf{u} and θ evaluated at the location \mathbf{x} , and make the following change of variables:

$$(D.8a) \quad \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u} = \sqrt{\frac{\theta}{2}}(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{r}), \quad \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u} = \sqrt{\frac{\theta}{2}}(\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{r}),$$

$$(D.8b) \quad \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v} = \sqrt{2\theta}\mathbf{r}, \quad d\mathbf{v}d\mathbf{w} = \theta^3 d\mathbf{p}d\mathbf{r}.$$

With this, the collision moment becomes

$$(D.9) \quad \langle (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \rangle_{C[f]} = \frac{\sqrt{2\theta}\beta\bar{\phi}}{(2\pi)^3} \int (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{r}) \cdot \frac{\mathbf{r}}{\|\mathbf{r}\|} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{p}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{p}d\mathbf{r}.$$

It is clear that the term which is linear in \mathbf{p} integrates out to zero, which further leads to

$$(D.10) \quad \langle (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \rangle_{C[f]} = -\frac{\sqrt{2\theta}\beta\bar{\phi}}{(2\pi)^3} \int \|\mathbf{r}\| \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{p}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{p}d\mathbf{r}.$$

The Poisson integral in $d\mathbf{p}$ alone yields

$$(D.11) \quad \int \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{p}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{p} = (2\pi)^{3/2}.$$

The integral in $d\mathbf{r}$ alone yields, upon switching to the spherical coordinates,

$$(D.12) \quad \int \|\mathbf{r}\| \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{r}\|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{r} = 4\pi \int_0^\infty r e^{-r^2/2} r^2 dr = 8\pi.$$

Substituting the above results into the collision integral, we obtain

$$(D.13) \quad \langle (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \rangle_{C[f]} = -\frac{4\beta\bar{\phi}\sqrt{\theta}}{\sqrt{\pi}}.$$

APPENDIX E. COMPUTATION OF THE ACOUSTIC EQUATION

We consider the system of equations in (4.17a) and (5.2). Let us set $\rho = \rho_0 + \rho'$, $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}'$, $p = p_0 + p'$ (the background state for \mathbf{u} is set to zero). Then we linearize with respect to the background states, arriving at

$$(E.1a) \quad \frac{\partial \rho'}{\partial t} + \rho_0 \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}' = 0, \quad \rho_0 \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}'}{\partial t} + \left(1 + \frac{4\rho_0}{\rho_{HS}}\right) \nabla p' + \frac{4p_0}{\rho_{HS}} \nabla \rho' = 0,$$

$$(E.1b) \quad \frac{\partial p'}{\partial t} + \frac{5}{3} \left(1 - \frac{A\rho_0}{\rho_{HS}}\right) p_0 \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}' = 0.$$

Next, let us add a multiple of the density equation to the pressure equation, that is,

$$(E.2a) \quad \frac{\partial \rho'}{\partial t} + \rho_0 \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}' = 0, \quad \rho_0 \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}'}{\partial t} + \left(1 + \frac{4\rho_0}{\rho_{HS}}\right) \nabla p' + \frac{4p_0}{\rho_{HS}} \nabla \rho' = 0,$$

$$(E.2b) \quad \frac{\partial p'}{\partial t} + \alpha \frac{\partial \rho'}{\partial t} + \left[\frac{5}{3} \left(1 - \frac{A\rho_0}{\rho_{HS}}\right) \frac{p_0}{\rho_0} + \alpha\right] \rho_0 \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}' = 0.$$

Next, let us compute the divergence of the momentum equation, differentiate the pressure equation in t , and equalize the mixed \mathbf{u}' -derivatives:

$$(E.3a) \quad \rho_0 \nabla \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}'}{\partial t} + \left(1 + \frac{4\rho_0}{\rho_{HS}}\right) \Delta p' + \frac{4p_0}{\rho_{HS}} \Delta \rho' = 0,$$

$$(E.3b) \quad \frac{\partial^2 p'}{\partial t^2} + \alpha \frac{\partial^2 \rho'}{\partial t^2} + \left[\frac{5}{3} \left(1 - \frac{A\rho_0}{\rho_{HS}}\right) \frac{p_0}{\rho_0} + \alpha \right] \rho_0 \nabla \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}'}{\partial t} = 0,$$

$$(E.3c) \quad \left[\frac{5}{3} \left(1 - \frac{A\rho_0}{\rho_{HS}}\right) \frac{p_0}{\rho_0} + \alpha \right]^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial^2 p'}{\partial t^2} + \alpha \frac{\partial^2 \rho'}{\partial t^2} \right) = \left(1 + \frac{4\rho_0}{\rho_{HS}}\right) \Delta p' + \frac{4p_0}{\rho_{HS}} \Delta \rho'.$$

It is now obvious that setting α to

$$(E.4) \quad \alpha = \frac{4p_0}{\rho_{HS} + 4\rho_0}$$

leads to the wave equation

$$(E.5a) \quad \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \chi}{\partial t^2} = \Delta \chi, \quad \text{with} \quad \chi = \left(1 + \frac{4\rho_0}{\rho_{HS}}\right) p' + \frac{4p_0}{\rho_{HS}} \rho', \quad \text{and}$$

$$(E.5b) \quad c^2 = \left[\frac{5}{3} \left(1 - \frac{A\rho_0}{\rho_{HS}}\right) \left(1 + \frac{4\rho_0}{\rho_{HS}}\right) + \frac{4\rho_0}{\rho_{HS}} \right] \frac{p_0}{\rho_0}.$$

Observe that setting $\rho_{HS} = \infty$ results in the usual acoustic equation for the pressure variable, with the standard formula for the speed of sound in a monatomic gas.

REFERENCES

- [1] R.V. Abramov. Macroscopic turbulent flow via hard sphere potential. *AIP Adv.*, 11(8):085210, 2021.
- [2] R.V. Abramov. Turbulence in large-scale two-dimensional balanced hard sphere gas flow. *Atmosphere*, 12(11):1520, 2021.
- [3] R.V. Abramov. Creation of turbulence in polyatomic gas flow via an intermolecular potential. *Phys. Rev. Fluids*, 7(5):054605, 2022.
- [4] R.V. Abramov. Turbulence via intermolecular potential: Viscosity and transition range of the Reynolds number. *Fluids*, 8(3):101, 2023.
- [5] R.V. Abramov. Turbulence via intermolecular potential: Uncovering the origin. *Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simulat.*, 130:107727, 2024.
- [6] R.V. Abramov. Turbulence via intermolecular potential: A weakly compressible model of gas flow at low Mach number. *Phys. Fluids*, 34(12):125104, 2022.
- [7] F. Golse. *The Boltzmann Equation and its Hydrodynamic Limits*, volume 2 of *Handbook of Differential Equations: Evolutionary Equations*, chapter 3, pages 159–301. Elsevier, 2005.
- [8] S. Chapman and T.G. Cowling. *The Mathematical Theory of Non-Uniform Gases*. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, 3rd edition, 1991.
- [9] C. Cercignani, R. Illner, and M. Pulvirenti. The mathematical theory of dilute gases. In *Applied Mathematical Sciences*, volume 106. Springer-Verlag, 1994.
- [10] R.V. Abramov. The random gas of hard spheres. *J.*, 2(2):162–205, 2019.
- [11] N.N. Bogoliubov. Kinetic equations. *J. Phys. Acad. Sci. USSR*, 10(3):265–274, 1946.
- [12] M. Born and H.S. Green. A general kinetic theory of liquids I: The molecular distribution functions. *Proc. Roy. Soc. A*, 188:10–18, 1946.

- [13] J.G. Kirkwood. The statistical mechanical theory of transport processes I: General theory. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 14:180–201, 1946.
- [14] J. Yvon. *La Théorie Statistique des Fluides et l'Équation d'État*, volume 203 of *Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles*. Hermann & C^{ie}, Éditeurs, Paris, 1935.
- [15] A. Rényi. On measures of entropy and information. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Contributions to the Theory of Statistics*, pages 547–561, Berkeley, CA, 1961. University of California Press.
- [16] S. Kullback and R. Leibler. On information and sufficiency. *Ann. Math. Stat.*, 22:79–86, 1951.
- [17] C.E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Tech. J.*, 27(3):379–423, 1948.
- [18] T. Boublík. Background correlation functions in the hard sphere systems. *Mol. Phys.*, 59(4):775–793, 1986.
- [19] H. van Beijeren and M.H. Ernst. The modified Enskog equation. *Physica*, 68:437–456, 1973.
- [20] A.A. Vlasov. The vibrational properties of an electron gas. *Sov. Phys. Usp.*, 10:721–733, 1968.
- [21] J.G. Charney. Geostrophic turbulence. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 28(6):1087–1095, 1971.
- [22] M.S. Green. Markoff random processes and the statistical mechanics of time-dependent phenomena. II. Irreversible processes in fluids. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 22:398–413, 1954.
- [23] R. Kubo. Statistical-mechanical theory of irreversible processes. I. General theory and simple applications to magnetic and conduction problems. *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.*, 12(6):570–586, 1957.
- [24] R. Kubo. The fluctuation-dissipation theorem. *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, 29:255–284, 1966.
- [25] U. Dekker and F. Haake. Fluctuation-dissipation theorems for classical processes. *Phys. Rev. A*, 11(6):2043–2056, 1975.
- [26] D. Ruelle. General linear response formula in statistical mechanics, and the fluctuation-dissipation theorem far from equilibrium. *Phys. Lett. A*, 245(3–4):220–224, 1998.
- [27] R.V. Abramov and A.J. Majda. New approximations and tests of linear fluctuation-response for chaotic nonlinear forced-dissipative dynamical systems. *J. Nonlin. Sci.*, 18(3):303–341, 2008.