

The friction factor of two-dimensional rough-boundary turbulent soap film flows

Nicholas Guttenberg and Nigel Goldenfeld

*Department of Physics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign,
1110 West Green Street, Urbana, Illinois, 61801-3080.*

We use momentum transfer arguments to predict the friction factor f in two-dimensional turbulent soap-film flows with rough boundaries (an analogue of three-dimensional pipe flow) as a function of Reynolds number Re and roughness r , considering separately the inverse energy cascade and the forward enstrophy cascade. At intermediate Re , we predict a Blasius-like friction factor scaling of $f \propto Re^{-1/2}$ in flows dominated by the enstrophy cascade, distinct from the energy cascade scaling of $Re^{-1/4}$. For large Re , $f \sim r$ in the enstrophy-dominated case. We use conformal map techniques to perform direct numerical simulations that are in satisfactory agreement with theory, and exhibit data collapse scaling of roughness-induced criticality, previously shown to arise in the 3D pipe data of Nikuradse.

PACS numbers: 47.27.ek, 47.27.nf

Turbulent flows are marked by rich structure over a range of scales—they host fluctuations, vortices, tangles, and other coherent structures that continue to defy a detailed, analytical understanding[1, 2]. When parameterized in terms of the typical flow speed U , characteristic length scale L and kinematic viscosity of the fluid ν , three-dimensional turbulence exhibits universal phenomena as the Reynolds number $Re \equiv UL/\nu \rightarrow \infty$. Most famously, in a theory referred to as K41[3, 4], the dependence of the fluctuation energy spectrum $E(k)$ on wavenumber and mean energy transfer rate $\bar{\epsilon}$ occurs in a way that is independent of ν : $E(k) = \bar{\epsilon}^{2/3} k^{-5/3}$ for values of wavenumber in the so-called inertial range, intermediate between the scales of forcing and the scales where molecular viscosity becomes significant. In this inertial range, turbulent eddies break up into smaller eddies through a mechanism which is to a first approximation Hamiltonian, and results in a cascade of energy to smaller length scales[5].

During the 1930's, Nikuradse undertook a systematic series of measurements of the pressure drop across a turbulent pipe flow as a function of Re [6] and also as a function of r/R , the scale of the roughness of the pipe walls r , normalized by the pipe radius R [7]. The former measurements provided strong support for Prandtl's boundary layer concept[8], and have been replicated and surpassed only recently[9], while the latter measurements, despite recent efforts[10, 11], remain to this day the most complete data set of its kind, spanning three orders of magnitude in Reynolds number and a decade in the dimensionless roughness r . These data reveal that the frictional drag experienced by a turbulent fluid is a non-monotonic and complicated function of Reynolds number, whose form has remained a challenge for theory.

Recently the functional form of the friction factor and its scaling regimes has been analyzed by momentum-transfer arguments [12] and scaling arguments[13], providing an unexpected connection with the spectral function $E(k)$. The different domains of the friction factor

curve each correspond to parameter ranges in which a different lengthscale dominates the flow - the laminar range where the viscous lengthscale is comparable to the lengthscale of the pipe, the Blasius regime where the boundary layer scale dominates, and the Strickler regime where the roughness scale dominates. The structure of these relationships is suggestive of critical phenomena, where the inverse Reynolds number and roughness play similar roles to, for example, the coupling constant and external magnetic field in an Ising model[13]. Remarkably the dependence of the data on Re and r exhibits a scaling law[13] that is sufficiently precise for intermittency corrections to be extracted[14].

The purpose of this Letter is to test the connections between turbulent flow profile, friction and spectral structure in a context where detailed calculations are in principle possible: the case of two-dimensional soap-film turbulence[15, 16]. Here, a soap film is supported between two vertical wires, and the draining flow provides a versatile laboratory for exploring two-dimensional turbulence[16]. The novelty here is that there are two cascades: an energy inverse cascade that runs from small to large scales[17, 18], and a forward cascade[18] in the enstrophy $\Omega \equiv |\nabla \times \mathbf{v}|^2$, where $\mathbf{v}$ is the fluid velocity field. This enstrophy cascade yields an energy spectrum $E(k) = \beta^{2/3} k^{-3}$ where β is the rate of transfer of enstrophy, and so according to the momentum-transfer theory of Gioia and Chakraborty[12], would be expected to yield a friction factor whose dependence on Re and r differs from the 3D prediction. In contrast, the standard boundary-layer theory contains no representation of the nature of the turbulence state and so is unable to differentiate this case from the 3D one. We show that our direct numerical calculations agree well with the momentum-transfer and roughness-induced criticality picture, strongly suggesting that the standard picture of boundary layers is incomplete.

Calculation of the friction factor scaling laws in 2D:- In the momentum-transfer theory of Gioia and

Chakraborty, the friction factor is shown to be proportional to the root-mean-square velocity fluctuation u_s at a scale s determined by the larger of the roughness r or the Kolmogorov scale η_K . Since $E(k)dk$ represents the turbulent kinetic energy in the wavenumber band between k and $k + dk$, it follows that:

$$u_s = \left[\int_{1/s}^{\infty} E(k) dk \right]^{1/2} \quad (1)$$

In two-dimensional turbulent systems, both the energy cascade or the enstrophy cascade may be observed, or they may occur individually[19] depending on the manner of energy injection and the scale at which it occurs. In general, for a conserved quantity with units $[L]^a [T]^b$, the form of the inertial range energy spectrum is: $E(k) = \epsilon_C^{2/(1-b)} k^{2\phi-3}$ where ϵ_C is the flux of the conserved quantity and $\phi \equiv a/(1-b)$.

The scale η at which viscosity becomes relevant is determined by the intersection of viscous forces (parameterized by ν , the kinematic viscosity) and transport of the conserved quantity of the flow ϵ or β . Dimensional analysis gives the result that $\eta \propto \nu^{1/(2-\phi)} \epsilon_C^{1/(a-2(1-b))}$. The fluxes ϵ_C are conserved across the inertial range and as such are determined by factors at the scale of energy injection—the mean flow velocity U and the relevant length-scale of the system R . We can use this to construct a relation between the dimensionless numbers η/R and Re . The results are that $\eta/R \propto Re^{-3/4}$ in the case of the energy cascade and $\eta/R \propto Re^{-1/2}$ in the case of the enstrophy cascade.

The two dimensional inverse cascade friction factor is the same as the case of three dimensional flows, with a Blasius scaling of $f \propto Re^{-1/4}$ and a Strickler scaling of $f \propto r^{1/3}$. The energy spectrum due to the enstrophy cascade leads to a new prediction for the friction factor: a scaling of $f \propto Re^{-1/2}$ in the Blasius regime and $f \propto (r/R)$ in the Strickler regime. These are our central predictions, which we seek to verify by numerical simulation in the next section. In general, the friction factor corresponding to any conserved quantity in the Blasius regime scales as $f \propto Re^{-(1-\phi)/(2-\phi)}$ and as $f \propto r^{1-\phi}$ in the Strickler regime.

Simulations of 2D turbulent rough-pipe flows:- To test the momentum transfer theory's prediction of the friction factor in 2D, we have performed simulations for a range of Reynolds numbers and single-wavelength roughness, both with grid-generated turbulence and turbulence generated by wall roughness. The roughness of the wall breaks translational invariance and means that one cannot simply solve the Navier-Stokes equations using spectral methods. We have overcome this difficulty by using a judiciously-chosen conformal map technique, allowing us to use a spectral method to satisfy incompressibility. The SMART algorithm[20] is used to calculate the advection




FIG. 1: Energy spectra for grid- and roughness-generated turbulence. Grid-generated turbulence exhibits the k^{-3} enstrophy cascade, whereas roughness-generated turbulence exhibits the $k^{-5/3}$ inverse cascade scaling. Inset: simulated wall velocity profile of grid-generated turbulence in a smooth pipe at $Re = 60000$. The profile is consistent with a power law with exponent 0.323 ± 0.005 . We predict an exponent of $1/3$ for enstrophy cascade turbulence.

of the velocity field. The friction factor is measured by computing the pressure drop necessary to maintain the average flow velocity over the periodic domain.

To simulate a rough-walled pipe, we apply a conformal map of the form $w = z + r \exp(ikz)$, where the aspect ratio is held constant ($rk = 3/4$) and the wavenumber k may be varied to produce roughness of different scales. Note that r plays the role of roughness in Nikuradse's experiments, but our aspect ratio is $3/4$ and not unity as in his experiments. This conformal map results in the addition of two body force terms to the Navier-Stokes equation in the transformed (rectangular) domain, in addition to an overall weighting factor deriving from the changed volume of each cell:

$$|g'|^2 \frac{\partial \bar{\mathbf{V}}}{\partial t} + (\bar{\mathbf{V}} \cdot \nabla) \bar{\mathbf{V}} = \nu \nabla^2 \bar{\mathbf{V}} + \frac{|\bar{\mathbf{V}}|^2}{|g'|^2} \mathbf{A} + \frac{2\nu}{|g'|^2} \mathbf{A}^\perp (\nabla \times \bar{\mathbf{V}}) \quad (2)$$

Here $|g'|^2 = x_u^2 + x_v^2 = y_u^2 + y_v^2 = x_u y_v - x_v y_u$, $\bar{\mathbf{V}}$ is the velocity in the transformed coordinates, and the vector $\mathbf{A}$ is defined as:

$$\mathbf{A} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} x_u y_{uv} + x_v x_{uv} \\ x_u x_{uv} - x_v y_{uv} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

We use a simulation domain of 2048×512 to simulate a section of pipe of diameter 1 and length 4. After initializing the velocity field we allow the system to evolve for a sufficient number of pipe transits so that the system is fully turbulent (one pipe transit corresponds to four




FIG. 2: Scaling of the friction factor with respect to Re for inverse cascade and enstrophy cascade dominated flows in 2D. The roughness is $r/R = 0.067$, and the data have been averaged over a time of 5 pipe transits.

units of time as the mean flow velocity is set to 1 in the simulation units). The smaller the roughness, the more transits are needed. This results in roughness-generated turbulence, in which case the observed energy spectrum is dominated by the inverse cascade, as shown in Fig. (1).

In order to attain an enstrophy-dominated flow, we used a technique suggested by the observations reported by Rutgers[19]. We simulated grid-generated turbulence, by placing a series of cylinders at the mouth of the pipe; in each cylinder we set the velocity field to zero every timestep. After one pipe transit the velocity field is fully developed. We then remove the grid and allow the turbulence to decay for a transit before we begin to measure the friction factor and other flow properties. We have observed energy spectra dominated by the enstrophy cascade in this system, as shown in Fig. (1).

Our simulation results at small values of the dimensionless roughness ($r/R = 0.067$) are plotted in Fig. (2). These results were obtained by averaging over 5 full pipe transits, yielding reproducible values for the friction factor, with controlled error bars, as shown. For this flow we observe an approximate power-law scaling of the friction factor with Reynolds number, with an exponent -0.22 ± 0.03 together with an energy spectrum dominated by the inverse-cascade. In the case of grid-generated decaying turbulence, corresponding to an enstrophy-cascade dominated spectrum, we observe an exponent of -0.42 ± 0.05 . These results are within satisfactory agreement with the scalings of $-1/4$ and $-1/2$ respectively, predicted for the 2D Blasius regime on the basis of a momentum transfer argument.

We cannot reach sufficiently high Reynolds numbers to observe a pure Strickler regime, but we can verify




FIG. 3: (Color online). The bottom inset shows the enstrophy cascade data collapse of the friction factor curves for non-dimensional roughness 0.05 ($\circ$), 0.08 ($\square$), 0.1 ($\triangle$), and 0.2 (∇) over a range of Reynolds numbers from 1000 to 80000. The top left inset shows the unscaled friction factor data. The top right inset shows the energy spectrum at $r/R = 0.08$ and $Re = 80000$. The straight lines correspond to $k^{-5/3}$ and k^{-3} .

the Strickler scaling exponent with data collapse. In three dimensions, or in a system dominated by the inverse cascade, we expect data collapse when plotting $f Re^{1/4}$ against $(r/R) Re^{3/4}$ [13]. For the enstrophy cascade, these variables should be $f Re^{1/2}$ and $(r/R) Re^{1/2}$ respectively. We have observed previously that in the presence of roughness, the spectrum is dominated by the inverse cascade. However, we have found that by adding a small amount of random forcing to the velocity field, the enstrophy cascade may be observed even in a rough pipe, though it may be coexistent with an inverse cascade. Using this method we can obtain the roughness dependence of the friction factor in an enstrophy cascade dominated flow. The collapse of the friction factor curves using the enstrophy cascade variables is shown in Fig. (3). The collapse is quite good, despite an apparent shallowness to the Blasius regime in the raw data. This shallowness is likely caused by the presence of a small amount of roughness, modifying the expected $Re^{-1/2}$ scaling at larger Reynolds numbers. We have neglected intermittency, which is negligible in 2D[21].

Relationship of the friction factor to the velocity profile:- Following Prandtl[22], we have calculated the mean velocity profile $u(y)$ as a function of distance from a wall y , and for the enstrophy cascade this yields $u(y) \sim y^\alpha$ with $\alpha = 1/3$, corresponding to the Blasius regime. For a general conserved quantity, $\alpha = (1 - \phi)/(3 - \phi)$. This

relation depends on the zero roughness limit. In [23], it has been shown that roughness modifies the velocity profile so as to increase the apparent scaling exponent. Other work [24, 25] also considers the influence of rough walls on the velocity profile and near-wall scaling.

In our simulations of smooth-pipe enstrophy cascade turbulence, we have measured the velocity profile and found the power-law scaling exponent $\alpha = 0.323 \pm 0.005$ between $0.01R$ and $0.1R$, as shown in the inset of Fig. (1), close to the predicted $\alpha = 1/3$. In the case of our rough-pipe simulations, the velocity profile yielded an exponent of 0.333 ± 0.002 , significantly steeper than the predicted $\alpha = 1/7$ that applies in the smooth, inverse cascade case. Our interpretation is that this is due to spectral contamination from an enstrophy cascade, as in the case of the simulations with random forcing that we presented. The momentum transfer theory integral has an upper limit that is comparable with the Kolmogorov lengthscale at low roughness, and so in that case the small- k part of the energy spectrum controls the friction factor scaling. Because of this, we would expect to see a velocity profile consistent with the enstrophy cascade until the roughness or Reynolds number were high enough to place the crossover between the inverse cascade and contaminant enstrophy cascade below the scale of the roughness.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated that the friction factor in 2D turbulent rough-pipe flows can be calculated using Gioia and Chakraborty's momentum transfer theory, for both inverse and forward cascades. The results are in reasonable agreement with direct numerical simulations, and support the fundamental connection between spectral structure and friction factor scaling, which is manifested in the observed roughness-induced criticality.

We are grateful for valuable discussions with Gustavo Gioia, Pinaki Chakraborty, Carlo Cesar Zuniga Zamalloa, Patricio Jeraldo, Tuan Tran, John Kolinski, Hamid Kellay and Walter Goldburg. Nicholas Guttenberg was partially supported by a University of Illinois Distinguished Fellowship. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. NSF DMR 06-04435.

- [2] K. R. Sreenivasan, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **71**, S383 (1999).
- [3] A. N. Kolmogorov, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR* **30**, 299 (1941), [English translation in *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A* 434 (1991)].
- [4] A. M. Obukhov, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR* **32**, 22 (1941).
- [5] L. Richardson, *Weather Prediction by Numerical Process* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1922).
- [6] J. Nikuradze (1932), *VDI Forschungsheft*, vol. 356 [In English, in NASA TT F-10, 359 (1966)].
- [7] J. Nikuradze, *VDI Forschungsheft* **361** (1933), [English translation available as National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Tech. Memo. 1292 (1950). Online at: <http://hdl.handle.net/2060/19930093938>].
- [8] H. Schlichting and K. Gersten, *Boundary-Layer Theory* (Springer, New York, USA, 2000).
- [9] B. J. McKeon, C. J. Swanson, M. V. Zagarola, R. J. Donnelly, and A. J. Smits, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **511**, 41 (2004).
- [10] M. Shockling, J. Allen, and A. Smits, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **564**, 267 (2006).
- [11] J. J. Allen, M. A. Shockling, G. J. Kunkel, and A. J. Smits, *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. A* **365**, 699 (2007).
- [12] G. Gioia and P. Chakraborty, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **96**, 044502 (2006).
- [13] N. Goldenfeld, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 044503 (2006).
- [14] M. Mehrafarin and N. Pourtolami, *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 055304 (2008).
- [15] R. Kraichnan and D. Montgomery, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **43**, 547 (1980).
- [16] H. Kellay and W. I. Goldburg, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **65**, 845 (2002).
- [17] G. Batchelor, *The Theory of Homogeneous Turbulence* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1982).
- [18] R. H. Kraichnan, *The Physics of Fluids* **10**, 1417 (1967).
- [19] M. A. Rutgers, *Physical Review Letters* **81**, 2244 (1998).
- [20] P. H. Gaskell and A. K. C. Lau, *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids* **8**, 617 (1988).
- [21] J. Paret and P. Tabeling, *Physics of Fluids* **10**, 3126 (1998).
- [22] L. Prandtl, *Ergebn. Aerodyn. Versanst. Göttingen III Lieferung., München-Berlin* (1927) **15**, 1 (1921).
- [23] N. Kotey, D. Bergstrom, and M. Tachie, *Physics of Fluids* **15**, 1396 (2003).
- [24] V. Patel, *Journal of Fluids Engineering* **120**, 434 (1998).
- [25] N. Afzal, A. Seena, and A. Bushra, *Journal of Fluids Engineering* **128**, 548 (2006).

[1] A. J. Chorin, *Vorticity and turbulence* (Springer, New York, 1997).