

Crossover from high to low Reynolds number turbulence

Detlef Lohse

June 15, 2021

The James Franck Institute, The University of Chicago,
5640 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637, USA

The Taylor-Reynolds and Reynolds number (Re_λ and Re) dependence of the dimensionless energy dissipation rate $c_\epsilon = \epsilon L / u_{1,rms}^3$ is derived for statistically stationary isotropic turbulence, employing the results of a variable range mean field theory. Here, ϵ is the energy dissipation rate, L is the (fixed) outer length scale, and $u_{1,rms}$ a rms velocity component. Our fit-parameter free results for $c_\epsilon(Re_\lambda)$ and also for $Re_\lambda(Re)$ are in good agreement with experimental data. Using the Re -dependence of c_ϵ we account for the time dependence of the mean vorticity $\omega(t)$ for decaying isotropic turbulence, which was recently experimentally examined [M. Smith, R. J. Donnelly, N. Goldenfeld, and W. F. Vinen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 2583 (1993)]. The lifetime of decaying turbulence, depending on the initial $Re_{\lambda,0}$, is predicted and found to saturate at $0.18L^2/\nu \propto Re_{\lambda,0}^2$ (ν is the viscosity) for large $Re_{\lambda,0}$.
PACS: 47.27.-i, 47.27.Gs

Dimensional analysis has proven to be a powerful tool in turbulence research, giving a number of key features of turbulent spectra [1, 2]. The main idea is to connect small scale quantities such as the energy dissipation rate ϵ with the large scale quantities such as the outer length scale L and a rms velocity component, $u_{1,rms}$. More precisely, following Richardson's cascade picture of turbulence [3, 2], it is argued that for fully developed turbulence

$$\epsilon = c_\epsilon u_{1,rms}^3 / L \quad (1)$$

holds, where c_ϵ is a dimensionless constant in the range of 1.

However, it is not clear, for what Reynolds number Re the large Re limit (1) is reached. For small Re the dimensionless number c_ϵ clearly depends on Re . E.g., for plane Couette flow with shear $2u_{1,rms}/L$ in one direction we have $c_\epsilon(Re) = 4/Re$. Here and henceforth, following Sreenivasan [4], we defined the Reynolds number Re as

$$Re = Lu_{1,rms}/\nu, \quad (2)$$

where ν is the viscosity. Even for large Re it is not clear whether the Re -dependence of c_ϵ vanishes. Recent experiments on the Taylor Couette flow, which is *bounded*, seem to show that a logarithmic Re -dependence persists up to very high Re [5]. (Here, Re is defined with the velocity of the outer rotating cylinder.) It can be accounted for by employing Prandtl's boundary layer theory [2, 6, 7], yet mathematically only $c_\epsilon < const$ can be proven up to now [8, 7]. For *unbounded* flow experiments favor $c_\epsilon = const$ for high Re , see Sreenivasan's collection of data for grid turbulence [4].

Another way of expressing the physical contents of (1) is to give the Re -dependence of the Taylor-Reynolds number $Re_\lambda = \lambda u_{1,rms} / \nu$, where $\lambda = u_{1,rms} / (\partial_1 u_1)_{rms}$ is the Taylor microscale. With $\epsilon = 15\nu(\partial_1 u_1)_{rms}^2$, valid for isotropic turbulence [2], and eqs. (1), (2) we get

$$Re_\lambda = \sqrt{15Re/c_\epsilon(Re)}. \quad (3)$$

If we have $c_\epsilon = const$ for large Re , we thus also have $Re_\lambda \propto \sqrt{Re}$.

In this Letter we will first derive *explicit* expressions for $c_\epsilon(Re)$ and $c_\epsilon(Re_\lambda)$ for unbounded flow. They only depend on the Kolmogorov constant b , which is *known* from many experiments to be $b = 8.4$ [9]. We do not introduce any free parameter. This is possible as we employ the results from the variable range mean field theory [10], which embodies the Navier-Stokes *dynamics*. We thus offer a way to go far beyond dimensional analysis. In the second part of the paper we apply our results to decaying turbulence, which has very recently been experimentally examined and analyzed by dimensional analysis by Smith, Donnelly, Goldenfeld, and Vinen [11]. Both our results for $c_\epsilon(Re_\lambda)$ and for the time dependence of the mean vorticity $\omega(t)$ in decaying turbulence are in good agreement with experimental data.

We start from the final result of Effinger and Grossmann's variable range mean field theory [10]. For homogeneous, isotropic turbulence a differential equation for the velocity structure function $D(r) = \langle (\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{r}) - \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}))^2 \rangle$ is derived [10], namely

$$\epsilon = \frac{3}{2} \left(\nu + \frac{D^2(r)}{b^3 \epsilon} \right) \frac{1}{r} \frac{d}{dr} D(r). \quad (4)$$

For small r the solution is $D(r) = \epsilon r^2 / (3\nu)$, whereas for large r we get the well known Kolmogorov result $D(r) = b(\epsilon r)^{2/3}$. The Kolmogorov constant b can be calculated within the approach of ref. [10]. But rather than taking the mean field result $b = 6.3$ [10], we will use eq. (4) with the experimental value $b = 8.4$ [9], as this value gives better agreement with the measured structure function $D(r)$, see Fig. 4 of ref. [10]. Eq. (4) is an energy balance equation. The first term in the brackets corresponds to viscous dissipation, the second one can be interpreted as eddy viscosity.

Integrating the differential equation (4) from 0 to the outer length scale L we get

$$D^3(L) + 3b^3 \epsilon \nu D(L) - b^3 \epsilon^2 L^2 = 0. \quad (5)$$

Here we have assumed that (4) holds for all r up to $r = L$, which is definitely not the case for bounded flow and even for unbounded flow slight corrections might be necessary, see below. Anyhow, if L is large enough and the flow is isotropic, it is $D(L) = 2\langle \mathbf{u}^2 \rangle = 6u_{1,rms}^2$. With eqs. (1) and (2) the quadratic (in ϵ) equation (5) can be written in dimensionless form as

$$c_\epsilon^2 - \frac{18}{Re} c_\epsilon - \left(\frac{6}{b} \right)^3 = 0, \quad (6)$$

which is easily solved to give

$$c_\epsilon(Re) = c_{\epsilon,\infty} \left\{ \left(\frac{3b^3}{8} \right)^{1/2} \frac{1}{Re} + \sqrt{1 + \frac{3b^3}{8} \frac{1}{Re^2}} \right\}. \quad (7)$$

The dependence of c_ϵ on the *Taylor-Reynolds* number Re_λ can be obtained from eqs. (6) and (3),

$$c_\epsilon(Re_\lambda) = c_{\epsilon,\infty} \sqrt{1 + \frac{5}{4} \frac{b^3}{Re_\lambda^2}}. \quad (8)$$

In both formulae we have introduced $c_{\epsilon,\infty} = (6/b)^{3/2} = 0.60$ only for *convenience*; the Re - and Re_λ -dependences are purely determined by the Kolmogorov constant b .

For large Re or Re_λ , the function $c_\epsilon(Re_\lambda)$ indeed becomes *constant*, $c_\epsilon(Re_\lambda) = c_{\epsilon,\infty} = (6/b)^{3/2}$, as Sreenivasan finds for grid turbulence with biplane square mesh grids [4]. The experimental value $c_{\epsilon,\infty} \approx 1.0$ is slightly larger than our result $c_{\epsilon,\infty} = 0.60$. The reason for the slight discrepancy is likely due to non universal boundary effects. We have assumed (4) to hold for all r up to $r = L$, thus $D(L) = 6u_{1,rms}^2 =$

$b(\epsilon L)^{2/3}$, which already results in $c_{\epsilon,\infty} = (6/b)^{3/2} = 0.60$. Yet for r around L , $D(r)$ will not scale as $D(r) = b(\epsilon r)^{2/3}$ and we have $D(L) < b(\epsilon L)^{2/3}$. This non universal boundary effect might be treated by introducing an effective, geometry depending $b^{(eff)} < b$ instead of b in eq. (5), defined by $D(L) = b^{(eff)}(\epsilon L)^{2/3}$. (Note that an introduction of $b^{(eff)}$ already in (4) is inappropriate, as boundary effects should not be seen in $D(r)$ for small r .) To get the experimental $c_{\epsilon,\infty} = 1.0$, one should have $b^{(eff)} = 6/c_{\epsilon,\infty}^{2/3} = 6 < b = 8.4$.

The quantity $c_\epsilon(Re_\lambda)/c_{\epsilon,\infty}$, eq. (8), is plotted in Fig. 1, together with Sreenivasan's experimental data for grid turbulence. For $Re_\lambda \approx 50$ the function $c_\epsilon(Re_\lambda)$ saturates at $c_{\epsilon,\infty}$, in good agreement with the data.

For really small Re eq. (7) can – strictly speaking – no longer be applied, as laminar flow is never isotropic, whereas eq. (4) only holds for turbulent, isotropic flow. Note that Fig. 1, starting with $Re_\lambda = 5$, does not include the laminar case (as seen from the inset), since in laminar flow Re_λ loses its meaning. If we perform the small Re limit $Re \ll \sqrt{3b^3/8} = 14.9$, $Re_\lambda \ll \sqrt{5b^3/4} = 27.2$, nevertheless, we can get $c_\epsilon(Re) = 18/Re$, independent of b , as expected, since b characterizes the highly turbulent state. The $\propto Re^{-1}$ -dependence is correct. The prefactor 18 is – again as expected – too large, if compared to the highly anisotropic laminar Couette flow with shear in only *one* direction, see above. In more isotropic laminar flow, e.g., in flow with shear in *three* directions, the agreement for small Re will be better.

Equations (3) and (7) give the function $Re_\lambda(Re)$, see inset of Fig. 1, which strongly resembles latest experimental measurements for grid turbulence by Castaing and Gagne [12, 13]. Also Grossmann and Lohse obtain a very similar curve $Re_\lambda(Re)$ from a reduced wave vector set approximation of the Navier-Stokes equations [14]. Here, for large Re we have $Re_\lambda = \sqrt{15(b/6)^{3/2}}\sqrt{Re} \approx 5\sqrt{Re}$. For small Re it is $Re_\lambda = \sqrt{5/6}Re$. Extrapolating these two limiting cases, the crossover between them takes place at $Re_{CO} = 18(b/6)^{3/2} = 29.8$, corresponding (via eq. (3)) to $Re_{\lambda,CO} = 21.6$, which seems very realistic to us, cf. also [13].

Up to now we applied our theory to statistically *stationary* turbulence. But it also offers an opportunity to analyze *decaying* turbulence. Most experiments on decaying turbulence have been performed in wind tunnels up to now, where the distance from the grid gives the decay time t , if the mean velocity is known [15]. In this kind of experiment the outer length scale L grows with time t , as the wake behind the grid becomes wider with increasing distance. Yet in a very recent new type of experiment performed by Smith, Donnelly, Goldenfeld, and Donnelly [11], L can be kept fixed. In that experiment a towed grid generates homogeneous turbulence in a channel filled with helium II. The decay of the mean vorticity $\omega(t)$ is measured by second sound attenuation [11, 16]. As in [11] we assume that Navier-Stokes dynamics can be applied to this fluid, see the discussion in [11].

In the theoretical analysis of this experiment, for very high $Re_0 = Re(t = 0)$, $Re_{\lambda,0} = Re_\lambda(t = 0)$, the quantity c_ϵ can be considered constant. But the smaller $Re(t)$ or $Re_\lambda(t)$ become with increasing time t , the more important are the cor-

reactions seen in eqs. (7), (8). The total energy (per volume) of the flow is $E = \mathbf{u}_{rms}^2/2 = 3u_{1,rms}^2/2$. The decay of the fully developed turbulence is governed by the differential equation

$$\epsilon = c_\epsilon \frac{u_{1,rms}^3}{L} = c_\epsilon(E(t)) \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{3/2} \frac{E^{3/2}(t)}{L} = -\dot{E}(t). \quad (9)$$

The outer length scale L is fixed, as in the experiment we are referring to [11]. We change variables to $Re(t) = \sqrt{2/3}L\sqrt{E(t)}/\nu$ and obtain

$$\dot{Re} = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{\nu}{L^2} c_\epsilon(Re) Re^2. \quad (10)$$

Integrating eq. (10) with the initial condition $Re(t=0) = Re_0$ gives the time dependence $Re(t)$ of the Reynolds number,

$$\frac{t}{\tau} = \frac{3}{c_{\epsilon,\infty}} \int_{Re_0}^{Re(t)} \frac{-dx}{\gamma x + x\sqrt{x^2 + \gamma^2}}. \quad (11)$$

Here, for simplicity we have introduced the viscous time scale $\tau = L^2/\nu$ and the constant $\gamma = \sqrt{3b^3/8} = 9/c_{\epsilon,\infty} = 14.9$. The integral can be calculated analytically. We define the indefinite integral as

$$F(Re) = \frac{1}{2Re^2} \left\{ -\gamma + \sqrt{\gamma^2 + Re^2} \right\} + \frac{1}{2\gamma} \log \left\{ \frac{\gamma + \sqrt{\gamma^2 + Re^2}}{Re} \right\}. \quad (12)$$

Thus the time dependence of $Re(t)$ is given by the inverse function of

$$t(Re)/\tau = 3(F(Re) - F(Re_0))/c_{\epsilon,\infty}. \quad (13)$$

Note again that there is no free parameter in eq. (13), all quantities on the rhs can be expressed in terms of the Kolmogorov constant b .

Imagine now the limiting case of large Re_0 and also large time, but $Re(t) < Re_0$ still large, i.e., t not too large. For large Re both terms in (12) contribute $(2Re)^{-1}[1 + O(\gamma/Re)]$. Thus $F(Re) = 1/Re$ and from (13) we explicitly get

$$Re(t) = \left(\frac{1}{Re_0} + \frac{c_{\epsilon,\infty}}{3} \frac{t}{\tau} \right)^{-1} \approx \frac{3}{c_{\epsilon,\infty}} \left(\frac{t}{\tau} \right)^{-1}. \quad (14)$$

In Fig. 2 we plotted $Re_\lambda(t)$, calculated from eqs. (13) and (3), for several Re_0 . The scaling law $Re_\lambda(t) \approx 3\sqrt{5}(t/\tau)^{-1}/c_{\epsilon,\infty}$ (corresponding to (14)) only starts to be observable for $Re_0 \approx 10^3$, i.e., $Re_{\lambda,0} \approx 156$.

In the final period of decay, i.e., for very large t (large enough so that $Re(t) \ll \gamma$), we get $Re(t) = 2\gamma\sqrt{e} \exp(-6t/\tau)$ and $E(t) = (9/4)eb^3\nu^2L^{-2} \exp(-12t/\tau)$. An exponential decay for very large t also holds for decaying turbulence with growing outer length scale $L(t)$ [15].

To compare our results with the helium II experiment [11], we have to calculate the mean vorticity $\omega(t)$. Vorticity always causes strain in the flow. It can be shown [2] that $\nu\omega^2 = \epsilon$. Thus

$$\nu\omega^2 = \epsilon = -\dot{E} = -3\nu^2 Re\dot{Re}/L^2. \quad (15)$$

With eq. (10) we get

$$\tau\omega(t) = Re\sqrt{Rec_\epsilon(Re)} = \sqrt{c_{\epsilon,\infty}}Re(t)\sqrt{\gamma + \sqrt{\gamma^2 + Re^2(t)}}, \quad (16)$$

where the universal law on the rhs again only depends on the Kolmogorov constant b and on the time t .

Next, we estimate the lifetime t_l of the decaying turbulence. For this purpose we calculate, how the Kolmogorov length [2]

$$\eta(t) = (\nu^3/\epsilon(t))^{1/4} = \sqrt{\nu/\omega(t)}, \quad (17)$$

depends on time t . Of course, $\eta(t)$ will increase with time, as the turbulence becomes weaker and weaker. The behavior can be obtained from eqs. (16) and (13) for any Re_0 . If Re_0 is large enough, scaling $\eta(t)/L \propto (t/\tau)^{3/4}$ can develop.

How to define the lifetime t_l of the turbulence? As the crossover in the structure function $D(r)$ between the viscous subrange and the inertial subrange happens at $r \approx 10\eta$ [10], we define the lifetime t_l by the condition $10\eta(t_l) = L$. A Reynolds number Re_l is associated with this time t_l via the eqs. (16) and (17). We calculate $Re_l = 20.3$, $Re_{\lambda,l} = 16.0$, which is, as it should be, near to the viscous-turbulent crossover in the curve $Re_\lambda(Re)$, which occurs at $Re_{CO} = 29.8$, $Re_{\lambda,CO} = 21.6$, see inset of Fig. 1. With this definition we obtain the lifetime t_l of the decaying turbulence for any given Re_0 (or, via (3), $Re_{\lambda,0}$) as

$$t_l(Re_0)/\tau = 3(F(Re_l) - F(Re_0))/c_{\epsilon,\infty}. \quad (18)$$

We plotted $t_l(Re_{\lambda,0})$ in the inset of Fig. 2. For small $Re_{\lambda,0}$ the lifetime $t_l(Re_{\lambda,0})$ grows logarithmically with $Re_{\lambda,0}$. For very large $Re_{\lambda,0}$ it saturates at $t_l(Re_{\lambda,0}) = 3\tau F(Re_l)/c_{\epsilon,\infty} = 0.18\tau$, i.e., it becomes independent on Re_0 , if measured in time units of $\tau = L^2/\nu$. The lifetime, if measured in seconds, of course increases $\propto Re_0 \propto Re_{\lambda,0}^2$ in the limiting case.

Finally we compare with the data of the helium II experiment [11]. First we have to embody the boundary effects, as they should be larger in the helium II experiment than in grid turbulence, because the turbulence decays in a tube. Indeed, in ref. [11] $c_{\epsilon,\infty}^{(eff)} = 36.4$ is given (using our definition of c_ϵ , eq. (1)), corresponding to $b^{(eff)} = 6/(c_{\epsilon,\infty}^{(eff)})^{2/3} = 0.55$.

Using this $b^{(eff)}$ instead of b (or $\gamma^{(eff)}$, $c_{\epsilon,\infty}^{(eff)}$, respectively) in eqs. (12) and (16), we plotted $\omega(t)$ in Fig. 3, together with Smith et al.'s experimental data [11]. The two curves show the same features. For small t there is no power law. For medium t

the theory gives $\tau\omega(t) \approx 3^{3/2}(t/\tau)^{-3/2}/c_{\epsilon,\infty}^{(eff)}$. The power law exponent $-3/2$, which is clearly seen in the experimental data, has already been derived by dimensional analysis [11]. But in theory the $-3/2$ -power law for $\omega(t)$ extends much further than observable in experiment, because there experimental noise hinders observation already for $t > 10s$. For further comparison a reduction of the experimental noise is essential. Experiments with dramatically increased sensitivity of the detectors are in progress [17].

The theoretical lifetime t_l of the decaying turbulence (calculated with $b^{(eff)} = 0.55$) is $t_l = 0.013\tau = 140s$, much larger than the $10s$ in which the $\omega(t)$ -signal can be measured. Thus viscous effects, arising from the Re -dependence of c_ϵ for smaller Re , see eq. (7), only become important for a time $t_l \gg 10s$. So the slight decrease in the measured $\omega(t)$ signal for $t \approx 10s$ is not due to them, as one might have thought, but possible due to the uncoupling of the normal and superfluid components of helium II (which was used as the fluid in the experiment [11]), as speculated in [11].

We summarize our main results. We first calculated the functions $c_\epsilon(Re_\lambda)$ and $Re_\lambda(Re)$, eqs. (3), (7), and (8), from a variable range mean field theory [10], which goes far beyond dimensional analysis. We then applied our results to decaying turbulence, highlighted by the expression for the time dependence of $\omega(t)$, eq. (16). All results are in good agreement with experiment. To even improve the agreement, future work has to be done to embody non universal boundary effects in this approach. A way to do so is to introduce $b^{(eff)}$ instead of b in eq. (5). Alternatively, one could get rid of the boundary effects by calculating a high passed filtered velocity field from the experimental data, so that the non universal effects are filtered out.

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to N. Goldenfeld, who encouraged me to start this work. Moreover, I also thank P. Constantin, Ch. Doering, B. Eckhardt, A. Esser, Th. Gebhardt, L. Kadanoff, P. Olla, and in particular S. Grossmann for helpful comments. Michael Smith kindly supplied me with the experimental data of Fig. 3. Support by a NATO grant, attributed by the Deutsche Akademische Austauschdienst (DAAD), and by DOE is kindly acknowledged.

Figures

Figure 1: The Re_λ -dependence of $c_\epsilon/c_{\epsilon,\infty}$ according to eq. (8) with $b = 8.4$. Also shown is Sreenivasan's collection of experimental data [4]. The inset shows $Re_\lambda(Re)$ according to eqs. (3) and (7). The crossover from the laminar scaling $Re_\lambda \propto Re$ to the turbulent range scaling $Re_\lambda \propto \sqrt{Re}$ takes place at $Re_{CO} = 30$, $Re_{\lambda,CO} = 22$.

Figure 2: Time dependence of the Taylor-Reynolds number $Re_\lambda(t)$ for freely decaying turbulence with fixed outer length scale for different $Re_0 = 10^7, 10^6, 10^5, 10^4$ ($Re_{\lambda,0} = 1.58 \cdot 10^4, 4.98 \cdot 10^3, 1.58 \cdot 10^3, 498$), left to right, cf. eqs. (3), (12), and (13) with $b = 8.4$. The dashed line denotes the lifetime t_l i.e., the time, when viscous effects start to dominate, see text. The inset shows the $Re_{\lambda,0}$ -dependence of the lifetime t_l of the turbulence, calculated from eqs. (18), (12), and (3) with $b = 8.4$.

Figure 3: Time dependence of the mean vorticity $\omega(t)$ from Smith, Donnelly, Goldensfeld, and Vinen's experiment [11] for $Re_{\lambda,0} = 634$, solid line. In that experiment $L = 1cm$, $\nu = 8.97 \cdot 10^{-5}cm^2/s$, so that $\tau = L^2/\nu = 1.11 \cdot 10^4s$. The dashed line is our prediction for $\omega(t)$ according to eq. (16) with $b^{(eff)} = 0.55$. The corresponding lifetime $t_l = 0.013\tau = 140s$ is given, too.

References

- [1] A. N. Kolmogorov, CR. Acad. Sci. USSR. **30**, 299 (1941); C. F. von Weizsäcker, Z. Phys. **124**, 614 (1948); W. Heisenberg, Z. Phys. **124**, 628 (1948); L. Onsager, Phys. Rev. **68**, 286 (1945).
- [2] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Fluid Mechanics* (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1987).
- [3] L. F. Richardson, Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A **110**, 709 (1926).
- [4] K. R. Sreenivasan, Phys. Fluids **27**, 1048 (1984).
- [5] D. P. Lathrop, J. Fineberg, and H. S. Swinney, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1515 (1992).
- [6] L. Prandtl, Angew. Math. Mech. **5**, 136 (1925).
- [7] C. Doering and P. Constantin, Variational bounds on energy dissipation in incompressible flows, Phys. Rev. E, submitted (1994).
- [8] C. Doering and P. Constantin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1648 (1992).
- [9] A. S. Monin and A. M. Yaglom, *Statistical Fluid Mechanics* (The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1975).
- [10] H. Effinger and S. Grossmann, Z. Phys. B **66**, 289 (1987).
- [11] M. Smith, R. J. Donnelly, N. Goldenfeld, and W. F. Vinen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2583 (1993).
- [12] B. Castaing, Y. Gagne, and M. Marchand, Physica D (1993).
- [13] B. Castaing, 1993, private communication.
- [14] S. Grossmann and D. Lohse, Universality in fully developed turbulence, Phys. Rev. E, submitted (1993).
- [15] G. K. Batchelor, *The Theory of Homogeneous Turbulence* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1953); J. O. Hinze, *Turbulence* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1975); P. G. Saffman, Phys. Fluids **10**, 1349 (1967).
- [16] R. J. Donnelly, *Quantized Vortices in Helium II* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991).
- [17] N. Goldenfeld, 1993, private communication.