

Diffusion process in a flow

Piotr Garbaczewski

Institute of Theoretical Physics, University of Wrocław, pl. M. Borna 9,
PL-50 204 Wrocław, Poland

November 19, 2018

PACS numbers: 02.50-r, 05.20+j, 03.65-w, 47.27.-i

Abstract

We establish circumstances under which the dispersion of passive contaminants in a forced, deterministic or random, flow can be consistently interpreted as a Markovian diffusion process. In case of conservative forcing the repulsive case only, $\vec{F} = -\vec{\nabla}V$ with $V(\vec{x}, t)$ bounded from below, is unquestionably admitted by the compatibility conditions. A class of diffusion processes is exemplified, such that the attractive forcing is allowed as well, due to an appropriate compensation coming from the "pressure" term. The compressible Euler flows form their subclass, when regarded as stochastic processes.

Whenever one tries to analyze random perturbations that are either superimposed upon or intrinsic to a driving deterministic motion, quite typically a configuration space equation $\dot{\vec{x}} = \vec{v}(\vec{x}, t)$ is invoked, which is next replaced by a formal infinitesimal representation of an Itô diffusion process $d\vec{X}(t) = \vec{b}(\vec{X}(t), t)dt + \sqrt{2D}d\vec{W}(t)$. Here, $\vec{W}(t)$ stands for the normalised Wiener noise, and D for a diffusion constant.

The dynamical meaning of $\vec{b}(\vec{x}, t)$ relies on a specific diffusion input and its possible phase-space (e.g. Langevin) implementation, that entail a detailed functional relationship of $\vec{v}(\vec{x}, t)$ and $\vec{b}(\vec{x}, t)$, and justify such notions like: diffusion in an external force field, diffusion along, against or across the deterministic flow, [1], also with shear effects, [2].

The pertinent mathematical formalism corroborates both the Brownian motion of a single particle and the diffusive transport of neutrally buoyant components in flows of the hydrodynamic type.

Clearly, in random media that are statistically at rest, diffusion of single tracers or dispersion of pollutants are well described by the Fickian outcome of the molecular agitation, also in the presence of external force fields (then in terms of Smoluchowski diffusions). On the other hand, it is of fundamental importance to understand how statistically relevant flows in a random medium (fluid, as example) affect dispersion. In the context of fluids, we might refer to diffusion enhancement due to turbulence, behaviour of Brownian particles in shear flows, but also to general effects of the external forcing (various forms of deterministic or random "stirring" of the random medium) exerted upon gradient or non-gradient, compressible and incompressible flows, and carried by them passive constituents, [2].

Except for suitable continuity and growth restrictions, necessary to guarantee the existence of the process $\vec{X}(t)$ governed by the Itô stochastic differential equation, the choice of the driving velocity field $\vec{v}(\vec{x}, t)$ and hence of the related drift $\vec{b}(\vec{x}, t)$ is normally regarded to be arbitrary.

However, the situation looks otherwise, [2], if we are interested in a diffusion of passive tracers in the a priori given flow whose velocity field is a solution of the nonlinear partial differential equation, be it Euler, Navier-Stokes, Burgers or the like. An implicit assumption, that passively buoyant in a fluid tracers have a negligible effect on the flow, looks acceptable (basically, in case when the concentration of a passive component in a flow is small). Then, one is tempted to view directly the fluid velocity field $\vec{v}(\vec{x}, t)$ as the forward drift $\vec{b}(\vec{x}, t)$ of the process, with the contaminant being diffusively dispersed along the streamlines.

However, in general, the assumed nonlinear evolution rule for $\vec{v}(\vec{x}, t)$ must be checked against the dynamics that is allowed to govern the space-time dependence of the forward drift field $\vec{b}(\vec{x}, t)$, [3], which is *not* at all arbitrary. The latter is ruled by standard consistency conditions that are respected by any Markovian diffusion process, and additionally by the rules of the forward and backward Itô calculus, [1, 3].

This particular issue we have analyzed before in the context of Burgers flows, [4], where the Burgers velocity field was found to be inappropriate to stand for the forward drift of a Markovian diffusion process. Actually, the backward drift was a

correct identification. Then, the forced Burgers dynamics

$$\partial_t \vec{v}_B + (\vec{v}_B \cdot \vec{\nabla}) \vec{v}_B = D \Delta \vec{v}_B + \vec{\nabla} \Omega \quad (1)$$

and the diffusion-convection equation

$$\partial_t c + (\vec{v}_B \cdot \vec{\nabla}) c = D \Delta c \quad (2)$$

for the concentration $c(\vec{x}, t)$ of a passive component in a flow, in case of gradient velocity fields, were proved to be compatible with the Markovian diffusion process input.

According to Ref. [4], in that case the dynamics of concentration results from the stochastic diffusion process whose density $\rho(\vec{x}, t)$ evolves according to

$$\partial_t \rho = -D \Delta \rho - \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\vec{v}_B \rho) , \quad (3)$$

or equivalently:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho &= D \Delta \rho - \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\vec{b} \rho) , \\ \vec{b} &\doteq \vec{v}_B + 2D \vec{\nabla} \ln \rho . \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The previous reasoning can be easily exemplified by considering the standard unforced Brownian motion with the initial (arbitrary, but sufficiently regular) density $\rho_0(\vec{x})$. Its evolution $\rho_0(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \rho(\vec{x}, t)$ is implemented by the conventional heat kernel $p(\vec{y}, s, \vec{x}, t) = [4\pi D(t-s)]^{-1/2} \exp[-\frac{(x-y)^2}{4D(t-s)}]$. The backward drift of the process (a solution of the unforced Burgers equation, originally denoted $\vec{b}_*(\vec{x}, t)$ in Ref. [4]) is defined as follows: $\vec{v}_B(\vec{x}, t) = -2D \vec{\nabla} \ln \rho$. The pertinent concentration dynamics is given by

$$\begin{aligned} c(\vec{x}, t) &= \int p_*(\vec{y}, 0, \vec{x}, t) c_0(\vec{y}) d^3 y \\ p_*(\vec{y}, 0, \vec{x}, t) &\doteq p(\vec{y}, 0, \vec{x}, t) \frac{\rho_0(\vec{y})}{\rho(\vec{x}, t)} . \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The remaining part is to determine the function $c_0(\vec{x}, t)$ i.e. the concentration of a tagged population in a Brownian ensemble. If we arbitrarily decompose the density of the process into $\rho = \rho_1 + \rho_2$ and regard $\rho_1(\vec{x}, t)$ as the density of a tagged population, then an appropriate definition of the concentration comes through:

$$c(\vec{x}, t) = \frac{\rho_1(\vec{x}, t)}{\rho(\vec{x}, t)} . \quad (6)$$

By inspection one can check the validity of the diffusion-convection equation for $c(\vec{x}, t)$ in a Brownian flow with the (backward drift) velocity $\vec{v}_B(\vec{x}, t) = -2D\vec{\nabla}\ln\rho$.

By combining intuitions which underly the self-diffusion description, [5], with those appropriate for probabilistic solutions of the so-called Schrödinger boundary-data and next-interpolation problem, [4, 6, 7], the above argument can be generalized to conservatively forced diffusion processes.

Namely, let us consider again the density $\rho(\vec{x}, t), t \geq 0$ of a stochastic diffusion process, solving the Fokker-Planck equation $\partial_t\rho = D\Delta\rho - \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\vec{b}\rho)$, where $\vec{b}(\vec{x}, t)$ stands for a forward drift. In case of conservative forcing, the drift solves an evolution equation:

$$\partial_t\vec{b} + (\vec{b} \cdot \vec{\nabla})\vec{b} = -D\Delta\vec{b} + \vec{\nabla}\Omega . \quad (7)$$

For drifts that are gradient fields, the potential Ω , *whatever* its functional form is, *must* allow for a representation formula, reminiscent of the probabilistic Cameron-Martin-Girsanov transformation:

$$\Omega(\vec{x}, t) = 2D[\partial_t\Phi + \frac{1}{2}(\frac{\vec{b}^2}{2D} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{b})] , \quad (8)$$

where $\vec{b}(\vec{x}, t) = \vec{\nabla}\Phi(\vec{x}, t)$.

For the existence of the Markovian diffusion process with the forward drift $\vec{b}(\vec{x}, t)$, we must resort to potentials $\Omega(\vec{x}, t)$ that are *not* completely arbitrary functions. Technically, [6], the minimal requirement is that the potential is bounded from below. This restriction will have profound consequences for our further discussion of diffusion in a flow.

If we set $\rho = \rho_1 + \rho_2$ again, and demand that $\rho_1 \neq \rho$ solves the Fokker-Planck equation with the very same drift $\vec{b}(\vec{x}, t)$ as ρ does, then as a necessary consequence of the general formalism, [4, 6], the concentration $c(\vec{x}, t) = \frac{\rho_1(\vec{x}, t)}{\rho(\vec{x}, t)}$ solves an associated diffusion-convection equation $\partial_t c + (\vec{v}_B \cdot \vec{\nabla})c = D\Delta c$. Here, the flow velocity $\vec{v}_B(\vec{x}, t)$ coincides with the backward drift $\vec{b}_* \doteq \vec{v}_B$ of the generic diffusion process with the density $\rho(\vec{x}, t)$ and reads: $\vec{v}_B = \vec{b} - 2D\vec{\nabla}\ln\rho$. Obviously, the forced Burgers equation (1) is identically satisfied.

We should clearly discriminate between forces whose effect is a "stirring" of the random medium and those acting selectively on diffusing particles, with a negligible effect on the medium itself. For example, the traditional Smoluchowski diffusion processes in conservative force fields are considered in random media that are statistically at rest. Following the standard (phase-space, Langevin) methodology, let

us set $\vec{b}(\vec{x}) = \frac{1}{\beta}\vec{K}(\vec{x})$, where β is a (large) friction coefficient and \vec{K} represents an external Newtonian force per unit of mass (e.g. an acceleration) that is of gradient form, $\vec{K} = -\vec{\nabla}U$. Then, the effective potential Ω reads:

$$\Omega = \frac{\vec{K}^2}{2\beta^2} + \frac{D}{\beta}\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{K} \quad (9)$$

and the only distinction between the attractive or repulsive cases can be read out from the term $\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{K}$. For example, the harmonic attraction/repulsion $\vec{K} = \mp\alpha\vec{x}$, $\alpha > 0$ would give rise to a harmonic repulsion, if interpreted in terms of $\vec{\nabla}\Omega$, in view of $\Omega = \frac{\alpha^2}{2\beta^2}\vec{x}^2 \mp 3D\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$. The innocent looking $\mp 3D\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ renormalisation of the quadratic function gives rise to entirely different diffusion processes, with an equilibrium measure arising in case of $U(\vec{x}) = +\frac{\alpha}{2}\vec{x}^2$ only.

The situation would not change under the incompressibility condition (cf. also the probabilistic approaches to the Euler, Navier-Stokes and Boltzmann equations, [8]). Following Townsend' s, [2], early investigation of the diffusion of heat spots in isotropic turbulence we may choose $U(\vec{x}) = \frac{\alpha}{2}x^2 - \frac{\alpha}{4}(y^2 + z^2)$ which implies $\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{K} = 0$. Then, $\Omega(\vec{x}) = \frac{\alpha^2}{2\beta^2}[x^2 + \frac{1}{4}(y^2 + z^2)]$, hence the repulsive Ω is produced again in the equation of motion characterising a stationary diffusion in an incompressible fluid: $div \vec{v} = 0$, $\vec{b} = \vec{b}_* = \vec{v} \rightarrow (\vec{v} \cdot \nabla)\vec{v} = \vec{\nabla}\Omega$.

By formally changing a sign of Ω we would arrive at the attractive variant of the problem, that is however incompatible with the diffusion process scenario in view of the unboundedness of $-\Omega$ from below.

We have thus arrived at the major point of our discussion: we may get in trouble with the Markovian diffusion input in case of general external "stirring" forces. Hence, we must specify an admissible class of perturbations which, while modifying the flow dynamics, would nonetheless generate a consistent diffusion-in-a-flow transport of passive tracers.

Should we a priori exclude the attractive variants of the potential Ω ? Can we save the situation by incorporating, hitherto not considered, "pressure" term effects as suggested by the general form of the compressible Euler (here $\vec{F} = -\vec{\nabla}P$ stands for external volume forces and ρ for the fluid density that itself undergoes a stochastic diffusion process):

$$\partial_t \vec{v}_E + (\vec{v}_E \cdot \vec{\nabla})\vec{v}_E = \vec{F} - \frac{1}{\rho}\vec{\nabla}P \quad (10)$$

or the incompressible, [8], Navier-Stokes equation:

$$\partial_t \vec{v}_{NS} + (\vec{v}_{NS} \cdot \vec{\nabla}) \vec{v}_{NS} = \frac{\nu}{\rho} \Delta \vec{v}_{NS} + \vec{F} - \frac{1}{\rho} \vec{\nabla} P, \quad (11)$$

both to be compared with the equations (1) and (7), that set dynamical constraints for respectively backward and forward drifts of a Markovian diffusion process ?

Notice that the acceleration term \vec{F} in equations (10) and (11) normally is regarded as arbitrary, while the corresponding term $\vec{\nabla}\Omega$ in (1) and (7) involves a bounded from below function $\Omega(\vec{x}, t)$.

Since, in case of gradient velocity fields, the dissipation term in the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation (11) identically vanishes, we should concentrate on analyzing the possible "forward drift of the Markovian process" meaning of the Euler flow with the velocity field \vec{v}_E , (10).

At this point it is useful, at least on the formal grounds, to invoke the standard phase-space argument that is valid for a Markovian diffusion process taking place in a given flow $\vec{v}(\vec{x}, t)$ with as yet unspecified dynamics. We account for an explicit force exerted upon diffusing particles, while not necessarily directly affecting the driving flow itself. Namely, [2, 3], let us set for infinitesimal increments of phase space random variables:

$$\begin{aligned} d\vec{X}(t) &= \vec{V}(t)dt \\ d\vec{V}(t) &= \beta[\vec{v}(\vec{x}, t) - \vec{V}(t)]dt + \vec{K}(\vec{x})dt + \beta\sqrt{2D}d\vec{W}(t). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Following the leading idea of the Smoluchowski approximation, we assume that β is large, and consider the process for times significantly exceeding β^{-1} . Then, an appropriate choice of the velocity field $\vec{v}(\vec{x}, t)$ (boundedness and growth restrictions are involved) may in principle guarantee, [3], the convergence of the spatial part $\vec{X}(t)$ of the process (12) to the Itô diffusion process with infinitesimal increments:

$$d\vec{X}(t) = \vec{v}(\vec{x}, t)dt + \sqrt{2D}d\vec{W}(t). \quad (13)$$

However, one cannot blindly insert in the place of the forward drift $\vec{v}(\vec{x}, t)$ any of the previously considered bulk velocity fields, without going into apparent contradictions. Specifically, the equation (7) with $\vec{v}(\vec{x}, t) \leftrightarrow \vec{b}(\vec{x}, t)$ must be valid.

By resorting to velocity fields $\vec{v}(\vec{x}, t)$ which obey $\Delta \vec{v}(\vec{x}, t) = 0$, we may pass from (7) to an equation of the Euler form, (10), provided (8) holds true and then the right-hand-side of (7) involves a bounded from below effective potential Ω .

An additional requirement is that

$$\vec{F} - \frac{1}{\rho} \vec{\nabla} P \doteq \vec{\nabla} \Omega . \quad (14)$$

Clearly, in case of a constant pressure we are left with the dynamical constraint ($\vec{b} \leftrightarrow \vec{v}_E$):

$$\partial_t \vec{b} + (\vec{b} \cdot \vec{\nabla}) \vec{b} = \vec{F} = \vec{\nabla} \Omega \quad (15)$$

combining simultaneously the Eulerian fluid and the Markov diffusion process inputs, *if and only if* \vec{F} is repulsive, e.g. $-V(\vec{x}, t)$ is bounded from below. Quite analogously, by setting $\vec{F} = \vec{0}$, we would get a constraint on the admissible pressure term, in view of:

$$\partial_t \vec{b} + (\vec{b} \cdot \vec{\nabla}) \vec{b} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \vec{\nabla} P = \vec{\nabla} \Omega . \quad (16)$$

Both, in cases (15), (16) the effective potential Ω must respect the functional dependence (on a forward drift and its potential) prescription (8). In addition, the Fokker-Planck equation (4) with the forward drift $\vec{v}_E(\vec{x}, t) \doteq \vec{b}(\vec{x}, t)$ must be valid for the density $\rho(\vec{x}, t)$.

To our knowledge, in the literature there is known only one specific class of Markovian diffusion processes that would render the right-hand-side of Eq. (10) repulsive but nevertheless account for the troublesome Newtonian accelerations, e.g. those of the form $-\vec{\nabla} V$, with $+V$ bounded from below. Such processes have forward drifts that for each suitable, bounded from below function $V(\vec{x})$ solve the nonlinear partial differential equation:

$$\partial_t \vec{b} + (\vec{b} \cdot \vec{\nabla}) \vec{b} = -D \Delta \vec{b} + \vec{\nabla} (2Q - V) \quad (17)$$

with the compensating pressure term:

$$Q \doteq 2D^2 \frac{\Delta \rho^{1/2}}{\rho^{1/2}} \doteq \frac{1}{2} \vec{u}^2 + D \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{u} \quad (18)$$

$$\vec{u}(\vec{x}, t) = D \vec{\nabla} \ln \rho(\vec{x}, t)$$

Their exhaustive discussion can be found in Refs. [3, 4, 6, 7], together with indications for their possible relevance as a stochastic counterpart of the Schrödinger picture quantum dynamics. Clearly, we have:

$$\vec{F} = -\vec{\nabla} V, \quad \vec{\nabla} 2Q = -\frac{1}{\rho} \vec{\nabla} P \quad (19)$$

where:

$$P(\vec{x}, t) = -2D^2 \rho(\vec{x}, t) \Delta \ln \rho(\vec{x}, t) \quad (20)$$

Effectively, P is here defined up to a time-dependent constant. Another admissible form of the pressure term reads (summation convention is implicit):

$$\frac{1}{\rho} \vec{\nabla}_k [\rho (2D^2 \partial_j \partial_k) \ln \rho] = \vec{\nabla}_j (2Q) \quad (21)$$

If we consider a subclass of processes for which the dissipation term identically vanishes (a number of examples can be found in Refs. [6]):

$$\Delta \vec{b}(\vec{x}, t) = 0 \quad (22)$$

the equation (17) takes a conspicuous Euler form (10), $\vec{v}_E \leftrightarrow \vec{b}$.

Let us notice that (20), (21) provide for a generalisation of the more familiar, thermodynamically motivated and suited for ideal gases and fluids, equation of state $P \sim \rho$. In case of density fields for which $-\Delta \ln \rho \sim const$, the standard relationship between the pressure and the density is reproduced. In case of density fields obeying $-\Delta \ln \rho = 0$, we are left with at most purely time dependent or a constant pressure. Pressure profiles may be highly complex for arbitrarily chosen initial density and/or the flow velocity fields.

To conclude the present discussion let us invoke Refs. [8, 5, 6]. The problem of a diffusion process interpretation of various partial differential equations has been extended beyond the original parabolic equations setting, to nonlinear velocity field equations like the Burgers one, see e.g. [4]. On the other hand, the nonlinear Markov processes associated with the Boltzmann equation, in the hydrodynamic limit, are known to imply either an ordinary differential equation with the velocity field solving the Euler equation, or a diffusion process whose drift is a solution of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation (without the $curl \vec{v} = 0$ restriction), [5, 8]. The case of external forcing has never been satisfactorily solved.

Our reasoning went otherwise. We asked for the admissible space-time dependence of general velocity fields that are to play the rôle of forward drifts of Markovian diffusion processes. Our finding is that solutions of the compressible Euler equation are appropriate for the description of a non-deterministic (e.g. random and Markovian) evolution and belong to a class of Markovian diffusion processes originally introduced by E. Nelson in his quest for a probabilistic counterpart of the quantum

dynamics, [3, 6]. Our solution of the problem involves only the gradient velocity fields. However, a couple of issues concerning the $\text{curl } \vec{b} \neq 0$ velocity fields and their nonconservative forcing have been raised in Refs. [4].

References

- [1] W. Horsthemke, R. Lefever, "Noise-Induced Transitions", Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984; Z. Schuss, "Theory and Applications of Stochastic Differential Equations", Wiley, NY, 1980; H. Risken, "The Fokker-Planck Equation", Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989; N. G. van Kampen, "Stochastic Processes in Physics and Chemistry", North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987
- [2] F. Sagues, W. Horsthemke, Phys. Rev. A 34, (1986), 4136; P. McCarty, W. Horsthemke, Phys. Rev. A 37, (1988), 2112; Y. Katayama, R. Terauti, Eur. J. Phys. 17, (1996), 136; R. T. Foerster, T. G. M. van den Ven, J. Fluid Mech. 96, (1980), 105; A. A. Townsend, Proc. Roy. Soc. A 209, (1951), 418
- [3] A. I. Ilin, R. Z. Khasminski, Theory Prob. Appl., 9, (1964), 466; E. Nelson, "Dynamical Theories of the Brownian Motion", Princeton, University Press, Princeton, 1967; E. Nelson, "Quantum Fluctuations", Princeton University, Princeton, 1985
- [4] P. Garbaczewski, G. Kondrat, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, (1996), 2608; P. Garbaczewski, G. Kondrat, R. Olkiewicz, Phys. Rev. E 55, (1997), 1401
- [5] H. Spohn, "Large Scale Dynamics of Interacting Particles", Springer, Berlin, 1992; J. L. Lebowitz, H. Spohn, J. Stat. Phys. 28, (1982), 539
- [6] Ph. Blanchard, P. Garbaczewski, Phys. Rev. E 49, (1994), 3815; P. Garbaczewski, R. Olkiewicz, J. Math. Phys. 37, (1996), 730; P. Garbaczewski, J. R. Klauder, R. Olkiewicz, Phys. Rev. E 51, (1995), 4114; P. Garbaczewski, pp. 169, in: "Coherent States-Past, Present and Future", eds. D. H. Feng et al, World Scientific, Singapore, 1994
- [7] J. C. Zambrini, J. Math. Phys. 27, (1986), 3207; J. C. Zambrini, pp. 393, in: "Chaos-The Interplay Between Stochastic and Deterministic Behaviour", eds. P. Garbaczewski, M. Wolf, A. Weron, Lecture Notes in Physics vol. 457, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995

- [8] C. Constantini, R. Marra, *J. Stat. Phys.* 67, (1992), 229; C. Beck, G. Roepstorff, *Physica A* 165, (1990), 270; R. Marra, pp. 564 in: "Stochastic Processes, Physics and geometry", eds. S. Albeverio et al, World Scientific, Singapore, 1989; C. Marchioro, M. Pulvirenti, "Vortex Methods in Two-Dimensional Fluid Dynamics", *Lecture Notes in Physics* vol. 203, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984