

Strong Turbulence in d-Dimensions

Victor Yakhot

Department of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering

Boston University, Boston, MA 02215

and

Program in Applied and Computational Mathematics

Princeton University

November 21, 2018

Abstract.

In the limit $d \rightarrow \infty$ the role of pressure gradients and that of the incompressibility constraint decreases, thus blurring the difference between transverse and longitudinal velocity correlation functions. Using Polyakov's expression for the dissipation anomaly the closed equation for the probability density function is obtained. This model for the dissipation terms is the only one satisfying both equations of motion and a set of dynamical constraints. The resulting equations show that when $d \rightarrow \infty$, the predictions of Kolmogorov theory are exact. It is also shown that the $O(1/d)$ pressure effects, producing the regularization of the equations of motion for the PDF are responsible for the distinction between the Navier-Stokes and Burgers dynamics.

The problem of d -dimensional Navier-Stokes turbulence was first considered by Frisch, Fournier and Rose [1] who hoped to develop a renormalized perturbation expansion with $1/d$ as a small parameter. This attempt failed because the $1/d$ -factors appearing in the Wyld diagrammatic expansion due to the angular integrations are cancelled by the $O(d)$ -multipliers, resulting from the summation over the d components of the velocity field. In this paper, using the nonperturbative approach, we will revisit the problem of d -dimensional turbulence

The equations of motion are (density $\rho \equiv 1$):

$$\partial_t v_i + v_j \partial_j v_i = -\partial_i p + \nu \nabla^2 v_i + f_i \quad (1)$$

and

$$\partial_i v_i = 0 \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{f} is a forcing function mimicking the large-scale turbulence production mechanism and in a statistically steady state the mean pumping rate $P = \overline{\mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{v}} = \mathcal{E} = O(1)$ where \mathcal{E} is the mean dissipation rate. In what follows we will also deal with the local dissipation rate

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{x}) = \nu \left(\frac{\partial v_i}{\partial x_j} \right)^2$$

so that $\mathcal{E} = \overline{\mathcal{E}(x)}$. The mean dissipation rate is independent on the space dimensionality d .

Among other results, Kolmogorov theory produced a clear distinction between longitudinal and transverse structure functions: Consider two points \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}' and define $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'$. Assuming that the x -axis is parallel to the displacement vector \mathbf{r} , one can find that in the inertial range [2],[3]:

$$\frac{1}{r^{d+1}} \partial_r r^{d+1} S_3 = -\frac{12}{d} \mathcal{E} \quad (3)$$

giving

$$S_3 = \overline{(\Delta u)^3} \equiv \overline{(u(x') - u(x))^3} \approx -\frac{12}{d(d+2)} r \quad (4)$$

and

$$S_3^t = \overline{(\Delta v)^3} \equiv \overline{(v(x') - v(x))^3} \approx 0 \quad (5)$$

where u and v are the components of velocity field parallel and perpendicular to the x -axis (vector \mathbf{r}). These two relations show that the energy flux in the d -dimensional turbulence is dominated by the longitudinal velocity fluctuations only and that the remaining $d - 1$ transverse components do not directly participate in the energy transfer. It is easy to show that the probability density $P(\Delta u, r) = P(-\Delta u, -r)$, while $P(\Delta v, r) = P(-\Delta v, r)$. Thus, the time-reversal symmetries of transverse and longitudinal velocity fluctuations are very different. This difference is lost in the Fourier-transforms of the relations (4) and (5), both giving $S_3(k) = S_3^t(k) = 0$ for $k \neq 0$. That is why the Wyld expansion, dealing with all components of velocity field on an equal footing, is unable to make a crucial distinction between longitudinal and transverse velocity fluctuations. The relations (4), (5) also show that in the limit $d \rightarrow \infty$ the asymmetry of the probability density function, responsible for non-zero values of the odd-order moments decreases.

We consider the N -point generating function:

$$Z = \langle e^{\lambda_i \cdot \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}_i)} \rangle \quad (6)$$

where the vectors \mathbf{x}_i define the positions of the points denoted $1 \leq i \leq N$. Using the incompressibility condition, the equation for Z can be written:

$$\frac{\partial Z}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial^2 Z}{\partial \lambda_{i,\mu} \partial x_{i,\mu}} = I_f + I_p + D \quad (7)$$

with

$$I_f = \sum_j \langle \lambda_j \cdot \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_j) e^{\lambda_j u(x_j)} \rangle \quad (8)$$

$$I_p = - \sum_j \lambda_j \langle e^{\lambda_j u(x_j)} \frac{\partial p(x_j)}{\partial x_j} \rangle \quad (9)$$

and

$$D = \nu \sum_j \lambda_j \langle e^{\lambda_j u(x_j)} \frac{\partial^2 u(x_j)}{\partial x_j^2} \rangle \quad (10)$$

In what follows we will be mainly interested in the probability density function of the two-point velocity differences which is obtained from (7)-(10), setting $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \mathbf{0}$ (see Refs. [4]-[6]), so that

$$Z = \langle \exp(\lambda \cdot \mathbf{U}) \rangle \quad (11)$$

where

$$\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}') - \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \Delta \mathbf{u} \quad (12)$$

The moments of the two-point velocity differences which in homogeneous and isotropic turbulence can depend only on the absolute values of two vectors (velocity difference $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}') - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x})$ and displacement $\mathbf{r} \equiv \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}$) and the angle θ between them with $\theta = \pi/2$ and $\theta = 0$ corresponding to transverse and longitudinal structure functions, respectively. It is easy to show [2]- [3] that the general form of the second-order structure function in the inertial range is:

$$S_2(r, \theta) = \frac{2 + \xi_2}{2} D_{LL}(r) \left(1 - \frac{\xi_2}{2 + \xi_2} \cos^2(\theta)\right) \quad (13)$$

with $D_{LL}(r) = \langle (u(x) - u(x+r))^2 \rangle$. More involved relation can be written for the fourth-order moment:

$$S_4(r, \theta) = D_{LLLL}(r) \cos^4(\theta) - 3D_{LLNN}(r) \sin^2(2\theta) + D_{NNNN}(r) \sin^2(\theta) \quad (14)$$

where $D_{LLNN} = \langle (v(x) - v(x+r))^2 (u(x) - u(x+r))^2 \rangle$ and v and u are the components of the velocity field perpendicular and parallel to the x -axis, respectively. In general, in the limit $\cos(\theta) \equiv s \rightarrow \pm 1$, corresponding to the moments of the longitudinal velocity differences $S_n(r, s) \rightarrow S_n(r) \cos^n(\theta)$. This means that in this limit $Z(\lambda, r, s) \rightarrow Z(\lambda s, r) \equiv Z(\lambda_x, r)$. The generating function can depend only on three variables:

$$\eta_1 = r; \quad \eta_2 = \frac{\lambda \cdot \mathbf{r}}{r} \equiv \lambda \cos(\theta); \quad \eta_3 = \sqrt{\lambda^2 - \eta_2^2};$$

The equations (7)-(10) become after some manipulations:

$$Z_t + \left[\partial_{\eta_1} \partial_{\eta_2} + \frac{d-1}{r} \partial_{\eta_2} + \frac{\eta_2}{\eta_3} \partial_{\eta_1} \partial_{\eta_3} + \frac{\eta_3}{r} \partial_{\eta_2} \partial_{\eta_3} + \frac{(2-d)\eta_2}{r\eta_3} \partial_{\eta_3} - \frac{\eta_2}{r} \partial_{\eta_3}^2 \right] Z = I_p + D \quad (15)$$

where

$$I_p = \lambda_i \langle (\partial_{2,i} p(2) - \partial_{1,i} p(1)) e^{\lambda \cdot \mathbf{U}} \rangle \quad (16)$$

and

$$D = \lambda_i \nu \langle (\partial_{2,\alpha}^2 v_i(2) - \partial_{1,\alpha}^2 v_i(1)) e^{\lambda \cdot \mathbf{U}} \rangle \quad (17)$$

where, to simplify notation we set $\partial_{i,\alpha} \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial x.\alpha}$ and $v(i) \equiv v(\mathbf{x}_i)$. Interested in the limit $\eta_3 \rightarrow 0$, we will seek a solution in a form:

$$Z = Z_o(\eta_1, \eta_2)K\left(\left(\frac{\eta_3}{\eta_2}\right)^2\right) \quad (18)$$

The equation for the generating function becomes (the subscript o is omitted hereafter):

$$\left[\partial_{\eta_1}\partial_{\eta_2} + \frac{d-1}{r}\partial_{\eta_2} + \frac{2\alpha}{\eta_2}\partial_{\eta_1} + \frac{2\alpha}{\eta_2}\frac{1-d}{r}\right]Z = I_p + D \quad (19)$$

where $\alpha = K'(0)$. When $\eta_3 \rightarrow 0$, one can introduce a more general relation $Z \approx Z_o(\eta_1, \eta_2) + \eta_3^2 Z_1(\eta_1, \eta_2)$ and derive an equation for Z_1 [7]. This, however, does not give any advantage over the expression (18). The turbulence production contributions, which in the case of the large-scale forcing function rapidly varying in time can be written as:

$$I_f = P\eta_2^2\eta_1^2(1 + 2s^2) \approx 3\eta_2^2 P\eta_1^2 Z \quad (20)$$

will be discussed later. The form of Z , introduced above, is only an approximation, valid in the $d \rightarrow \infty$ limit. One can rewrite the dissipation term

$$D = -\frac{3\eta_2^2}{d} \langle (\mathcal{E}(1) + \mathcal{E}(2))e^{\eta_2 U} \rangle + s = -\frac{6\eta_2^2 \mathcal{E}}{d} Z - \frac{3}{d}\eta_2^2 \langle [\delta(1) + \delta(2)]e^{\eta_2 U} \rangle + s \quad (21)$$

where the dissipation fluctuations are defined as $\delta(x) = \mathcal{E}(x) - \mathcal{E}$. The ‘‘surface contribution’’ s :

$$s = \lambda_i \nu \langle \partial_{2,\mu}(\partial_{2,\mu} u_i(2)e^{\lambda \cdot \mathbf{U}}) - \partial_{1,\mu}(\partial_{1,\mu} u_i(1)e^{\lambda \cdot \mathbf{U}}) \rangle \rightarrow 0$$

in the large Reynolds number limit $\nu \rightarrow 0$. Substituting this into (19) gives after Fourier transformation:

$$-\partial_U U \partial_r P - \frac{(d-1)}{r} \partial_U U P + 2\alpha \partial_r P + 2\alpha \frac{1-d}{r} P = \frac{6\mathcal{E}}{d} \partial_U^3 P(U) + \frac{3}{d} \partial_U^3 \kappa(U) P(U) + \partial_U^2 i_p(U) P(U) \quad (22)$$

where

$$\kappa(U) = \langle (\delta_1 + \delta_2) | U \rangle \quad (23)$$

and

$$i_p = \langle \partial_{2,x} p(2) - \partial_{1,x} p(1) | U \rangle \quad (24)$$

are conditional expectation values of $\delta_1 + \delta_2$ and $\partial_{2,x} p(2) - \partial_{1,x} p(1)$ for a fixed value of the longitudinal velocity difference $U \equiv U_x$, respectively. It is clear that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \kappa(U) P(U) dU = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} i_p(U) P(U) dU = \langle \delta_1 + \delta_2 \rangle = \langle i_p \rangle = 0 \quad (25)$$

Multiplying (22) by U^3 gives:

$$\frac{1}{r^{(d-1)a}} \partial_r r^{(d-1)a} S_3 = -\frac{12\mathcal{E}}{d} + i \quad (26)$$

where

$$i = 6 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} i_p(U) U P(U) dU \quad (27)$$

$$a = \frac{1 - 2\alpha/3}{1 + 2\alpha/3} \quad (28)$$

This result differs from exact Kolmogorov relation (3), involving the factors r^{d+1} instead of r^{d-1} derived above. The error stems from the shape of the generating function (18), introduced above. In reality the transverse and longitudinal correlation functions are related by the incompressibility constraint

$$\frac{r}{d-1} \partial_r S_2 + S_2 = S_2^t \quad (29)$$

providing a boundary condition on a mixed derivatives of the Z -function at $\lambda = 0$. This relation is not accounted for in the ansatz (18). One can see that when $d \rightarrow \infty$, the role of the incompressibility constraint and, as a consequence, of the pressure gradients, decreases leading to the longitudinal and transverse correlations functions very close to each other. This is easily understood since a single constraint on the $d \rightarrow \infty$ velocity components

cannot quantitatively change too much. It will become clear below that although, in general, the effect of the pressure contributions is $O(1/d)$, they cannot be neglected since they are responsible for the regularization of the solution, thus producing a major difference between the Navier-Stokes and Burgers dynamics. Comparing (26) with (3) we conclude that when d is large $a = 1$, $i = 0$ and that the the solution in the form (18) is a good approximation. In general we know nothing about the function $\kappa(U)$ which is a part of the dissipation term D . Luckily, it is irrelevant in the above calculation of S_3 . To obtain a closed equation for the generating function, the expression for D is needed. It has been shown by Polyakov [4]

$$D = \lambda_\mu \nu \langle [\nabla_2^2 u_\mu(2) - \nabla_1^2 u_\mu(1)] e^{\lambda_\beta \cdot \Delta \mathbf{u}_\beta} \rangle = -\frac{A}{\eta_2} \partial_{\eta_1} Z \quad (30)$$

where we choose $A = \gamma d + c$ and γ and c are $O(1)$. The relation (30) looks the same as the one appearing in the Polyakov theory of Burgers turbulence. This is not accidental since, barring the pressure contributions, the equation of motion (1) is formally similar to the multidimensional Burgers equation. The expression (30) is a result of an operator product expansion, based on a point-splitting calculation, developed for the one-dimensional problem of Burgers turbulence [3]. It is easy to show that (30) (see Refs. [4],[5]) exactly satisfies the equation of motion (1) (without pressure) and is the only possible model, not violating scaling (see below) and both Galilean invariance and an obvious constraint $\bar{U} = 0$. Substituting this into (22) with $\alpha = 0$, we have after Fourier transformation:

$$\partial_U U \partial_r P + \frac{(d-1)}{r} \partial_U U P = -A \partial_r P - \partial_U^2 i_p(U) P(U) \quad (31)$$

Keeping only the $O(d)$ - contributions gives:

$$-\frac{d}{r} \partial_U U P = \gamma d \partial_r P \quad (32)$$

Multiplying this by U^n and integrating gives:

$$n \frac{d}{r} S_n = \gamma d \partial_r S_n \quad (33)$$

Seeking the solution in a scaling form: $S_n \propto r^{\xi_n}$ gives

$$\xi_n \rightarrow n/3 \quad (34)$$

where $\gamma = 3$ is chosen to satisfy the relation (1). Thus, the predictions of Kolmogorov theory are valid in the limit $d \rightarrow \infty$. One can see that in this case

$$P(U, r) = \frac{1}{r^{\frac{1}{3}}} F\left(\frac{U}{r^{\frac{1}{3}}}\right) \quad (35)$$

which is consistent with the scaling assumption involved in derivation of the expression for the dissipation anomaly (30). This result needs some explanation. The $d \rightarrow \infty$ limit must be understood in a following way: first we fix the moment number n and then drive d to infinity. It is clear from (31) that neglecting the pressure term the exponents

$$\xi_n = \frac{(d-1)n}{A-n} \quad (36)$$

are singular at $n = A$ and violate all possible dynamic constraints. This happens due to the sign of the $O(1)$ contribution to the equation of motion (22). Thus, the role of the pressure terms is in modifying the sign of the ‘‘Burgers- like’’ first contribution to the left side of (22), thus producing the regularization, distinguishing Burgers dynamics from that of the Navier-Stokes. The possibilities of modelling the pressure contributions will be discussed in a future communication. It is interesting, that gradual disappearance of the anomalous scaling was observed in a numerical solution of a set of N coupled one-dimensional ‘‘shell models’’: the deviations from Kolmogorov scaling decreased to close to zero with increase of N [8].

Now, we can show that the pressure terms $I_p = O(1)$ and are small compared to the $O(d)$ contributions. The generating function in the limit $d \rightarrow \infty$ can be written as:

$$Z \approx \sum (-1)^n A_{2n} \frac{(kr^{\frac{1}{3}})^{2n}}{n!} \quad (37)$$

Assuming that at the integral scale $r = L = 1$ the PDF becomes close to the gaussian gives $A_{2n} = 2^n (2n - 1)!!$:

$$Z = \langle e^{\lambda U} \rangle \approx e^{2\lambda^2 r^{\frac{2}{3}}}$$

and

$$\sqrt{\langle e^{2\lambda U} \rangle} \leq Z$$

since $\lambda = ik$ with real k . Using this relation the Schwartz inequality is:

$$I_p \leq \sqrt{(\lambda \cdot \nabla \frac{\nabla_\alpha \nabla_\beta}{\nabla^2} v_\alpha v_\beta)^2} Z \quad (38)$$

The four- order correlation function $\overline{v_\alpha v_\beta v_\gamma v_\delta} \approx \langle v_\alpha v_\gamma \rangle \langle v_\beta v_\delta \rangle + \dots$ where

$$\overline{v_\alpha v_\gamma} \approx v_{rms}^2 (r^2 \delta_{\alpha,\gamma} - \frac{2r_\alpha r_\gamma}{d+1})$$

with $v_{rms}^2 = O(1)$. It means that $\nabla_\alpha \overline{v_\alpha v_\beta} = \nabla_\beta \overline{v_\alpha v_\beta} = 0$. The only source of the $O(d)$ contributions is $\nabla_i r_i = d$ which cannot appear in (38) due to incompressibility. That is why $I_p \leq QZ$, where Q is the operator, involving η_1, η_2 and derivatives, all $O(1)$.

To conclude: Kolmogorov scaling is an exact solution of the Navier- Stokes equations in the limit of large space dimensionality $d \rightarrow \infty$, provided the assumptions leading to a self-consistent conjecture for the dissipation anomaly, similar to the one derived by Polyakov [4] in the theory of Burgers turbulence, are valid. We do not know if this solution is the only possible one. The $O(1/d)$ pressure contributions to the Navier-Stokes equations, though unable to strongly influence the values of the scaling exponents, are crucial providing the regularization of the otherwise singular expression for the scaling exponents. These terms are responsible for a clear distinction between the Navier-Stokes and Burgers dynamics.

The equation (7) can be written for the multidimensional Burgers equation if density fluctuations are taken into account [4],[5]. The fact that in the limit $d \rightarrow \infty$, the pressure terms are unimportant make the Navier-Stokes and Burgers equations formally seem the same. This not so. The steady state solution in the random- force-driven Burgers equation is impossible without accounting for the forcing term (20) which imposes a typical Burgers scaling behaviour $U = O(r)$ [4],[5]. This scaling is not always there: It has been shown in [9]

and [10] that, in principle, the scaling of velocity correlation functions in Burgers turbulence depends on the properties of the forcing function. In the case of the Navier-Stokes dynamics one can drop the forcing term and obtain the inertial range Kolmogorov scaling $U = O(r^{\frac{1}{3}})$. However, as was shown above, neglecting the pressure contributions leads to the singularity of some high-order moments and to the unphysical behaviour. Still, when d is large, due to formal similarity of the equations of motion, one cannot rule out Kolmogorov scaling as a short-time asymptotics of decaying Burgers turbulence.

I am grateful to S. Boldyrev, M. Chertkov, R.H.Kraichnan, A. Polyakov, B. Shraiman and M. Vergassola for their help and most stimulating and interesting discussions.

references

1. U. Frisch, J.-D. Fournier and H. Rose, J.Phys.A, **11** 187 (1978)
2. L.D.Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, Fluid Mechanics, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1987;
3. A.S.Monin and A.M.Yaglom, "Statistical Fluid Mechanics" vol. 1, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA (1971)
4. A.M. Polyakov, Phys.Rev. E **52**, 6183 (1995)
5. S. Boldyrev, Phys.Rev.E **55**, 6907 (1997)
6. V. Yakhot, Phys.Rev. E, (1998)
7. I am grateful to S. Boldyrev for this suggestion.
8. L. Biferale and D. Piorelli, private communication (1998)
9. A. Chekhlov and V. Yakhot, Phys.Rev.E **51**, R2739 (1995);
10. V. Yakhot and A.Chekhlov, Phys.Rev.Lett. **77**, 3118 (1996)