

# Comment on "Indispensable Finite Time Correlations for Fokker-Planck Equations from Time Series Data"

R. Friedrich<sup>1</sup> and Ch. Renner<sup>2</sup>, M. Siefert<sup>2</sup>, and J. Peinke<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster Institut für Theoretische Physik D - 48149 Münster, Germany

<sup>2</sup>Carl-von-Ossietzky-Universität Oldenburg, FB - 8 Physics, D - 21111 Oldenburg, Germany

(Dated: July 21, 2021)

Ragwitz and Kantz [1] propose a correction to a method for the reconstruction of Fokker-Planck equations from time series data. In [2, 3, 4, 5] a method was presented which directly applied the mathematical definitions of the drift  $D^{(1)}$  and diffusion term  $D^{(2)}$  [6] for an estimate from time series. Here different moments of conditional probability densities (pdf) for finite step sizes  $\Delta$  in the limit  $\Delta \rightarrow 0$  have to be estimated. Ragwitz and Kantz state that previous results have not been checked and that indispensable finite time step  $\Delta$  correction have to be employed for reliable estimates of  $D^{(2)}$ . We want to add the following comments.

Ragwitz and Kantz base their investigation on an estimate of the finite time conditional probability in terms of a Gaussian, eq. (7) of their paper. There is, however, no reason that for finite  $\Delta$  the conditional pdf is Gaussian. The exact expressions for the conditional moments up to the order  $\Delta^2$  can be unambiguously derived from the Fokker-Planck equation [7]:

$$\langle x - x_0 | x_0 \rangle = \Delta D^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta^2 [D^{(1)}(D^{(1)})' + D^{(2)}(D^{(1)})''] + \mathcal{O}(\Delta^3) \quad (1)$$

$$\langle (x - x_0)^2 | x_0 \rangle = 2\Delta D^{(2)} + \Delta^2 [(D^{(1)})^2 + 2D^{(2)}(D^{(1)})' + D^{(1)}(D^{(2)})' + D^{(2)}(D^{(2)})''] + \mathcal{O}(\Delta^3), \quad (2)$$

For  $\langle (x - x_0)^2 | x_0 \rangle$  the ansatz (7) of [1] neglects the last two terms which are important for processes involving multiplicative noise. However, intermittency of turbulence is related to a multiplicative process. This remark especially applies to the wind data presented in [1]. The validation of their method based on a Langevin (equation (9)) only works since purely additive noise is considered.

For the investigation of turbulence Ragwitz and Kantz claim to obtain remarkable correction, as shown in their Fig. 6. Our approach in [5] is based on an estimate of the diffusion term using the limit  $\Delta \rightarrow 0$  yielding a dependency which can be approximated by a low order polynomial. In order to improve on this estimate the coefficients of this polynomial have been varied in such a way that the solution of the corresponding Fokker-Planck equation for finite values of  $\Delta$  yields an accurate representation of the measured one. In other words, in a second step, we have performed a parametric estimation of the diffusion term. In Figure 1 we present a case where a large correction to the  $\Delta \rightarrow 0$  estimation of  $D^{(2)}$  had to be introduced (usually corrections are of the order of some




FIG. 1:  $\Delta$  dependence of  $D^{(2)}(u = \sigma_\infty, r = L/2, \Delta)/\sigma_\infty^2$  for different correction terms; squares without correction term, circles with  $((D^{(1)})^2)$ , and crosses with the correction term of [1].  $L$  denotes the integral length,  $\sigma_\infty$  the rms of the velocity increments at large scales. Only for  $\Delta/l_{mar} > 1$  Markovian properties hold, and estimations of  $D^{(2)}$  are sensible. The optimal value of  $D^{(2)}$  based on verifications is indicated by an arrow, further detail see [5].

percentages). For finite values of  $\Delta$  the estimated values of  $D^{(2)}$  clearly differ from the limiting case  $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ . Estimations with different "correction" terms for  $D^{(2)}$  and for finite  $\Delta$  values may fake large corrections values. Taking the limit  $\Delta \rightarrow 0$  these deviations vanish within the error.

The range of  $\Delta$  which can be taken for the estimate of  $D^{(2)}$  must be chosen carefully in order to ensure that the Markovian property holds, see [5]. Since for each estimated value of  $D^{(2)}$  a finite number of data point is used, a statistical error can be estimated for  $D^{(2)}$  (cf. Fig. 1). These errors naturally increase considerably for large values of  $x$  (compare Fig. 6 [1] and Fig 13 [5].) To conclude, a deeper understanding of finite time correlations are of interest. The correct terms of higher orders in  $\Delta$  [7] may be used to improve on the estimation of drift and diffusion terms. Up to now the best way for estimating diffusion coefficients is to combine a nonparametric estimate for  $\Delta \rightarrow 0$  with a functional ansatz, i.e. a suitable polynomial ansatz. Refining the estimates of the coefficients by parametric methods as for instance described by [8] leads to improved results by a comparison of measured and calculated conditional pdfs at finite  $\Delta$ .

- 
- [1] M. Ragwitz and H. Kantz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 254501 (2001).  
 [2] R. Friedrich, J. Peinke, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 863 (1997).

- [3] S. Siegert, R. Friedrich, J. Peinke, Phys. Lett. **A 234**, 275-280 (1998).
- [4] R. Friedrich, *et. al.*, Phys. Lett. **A 271**, 217 (2000).
- [5] Ch. Renner, J. Peinke, R. Friedrich, J. Fluid Mech. **433**, 383 (2001).
- [6] A. N. Kolmogorov, Math. Ann. **140**, 415-458 (1931).
- [7] The Taylor expansion of the conditional expectation of a function  $f(x)$  is simply  $\langle f(x(\Delta))|x \rangle = \sum \frac{\Delta^n}{n!} (L^\dagger)^n f(x)$ , where  $L^\dagger$  is the adjoint Fokker-Planck operator.
- [8] J. Timmer, Chaos, Solitons and Fractals **11**, 2000, 2571-2578