Macroscopic forcing method: a tool for turbulence modeling and analysis of closures
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Abstract

This study presents a numerical procedure, which we call the macroscopic forcing method (MFM), which reveals the differential operators acting upon the mean fields of quantities transported by underlying fluctuating flows. Specifically, MFM can precisely determine the eddy diffusivity operator, or more broadly said, it can reveal differential operators associated with turbulence closure for scalar and momentum transport. We present this methodology by considering canonical problems with increasing complexity. As an example demonstrating the usefulness of the developed methodology, we show that an eddy diffusivity operator, i.e. model form, obtained from an MFM analysis of homogeneous isotropic turbulence leads to significant improvement in RANS prediction of axisymmetric turbulent jets. We show a cost-effective generalization of MFM for analysis of non-homogeneous and wall-bounded flows, where the eddy diffusivity is found to be a convolution acting on the macroscopic gradient of transported quantities. We introduce MFM as an effective tool for quantitative understanding of non-Boussinesq effects and assessment of model forms in turbulence closures, particularly, the effects associated with anisotropy and non-locality of macroscopic mixing.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The kinetic theory of gases has been an invaluable tool for developing continuum models governing transport of mass, momentum, and energy. Without such models, prediction of flows and heat transfer in natural and industrial systems would have required tracking of individual fluid molecules by solving an enormous system of coupled molecular dynamics equations. To date, the largest of such calculations can only span domains of size of order $100\,nm$ which is by far much smaller than many engineering scales. Kinetic theory bridged this gap by analyzing interactions of molecules in a statistical sense. These analyses provide transport coefficients to partial differential equations (PDEs) describing transport phenomena in a macroscopic sense. Unlike the underlying chaotic Brownian dynamics, these scaled-up Eulerian PDEs result in smooth solutions with characteristic length scales multiple orders of magnitude larger than molecular scales. These PDEs therefore offer drastic computational savings by lowering the required number of degrees of freedom in the systems to be solved.

The diffusion equation and the Navier-Stokes equation governing the evolution of mass, heat, and momentum are examples of such transport PDEs. These equations however, do not completely close the gap of length scales all the way to the engineering scales. Most notably, as many engineering applications involve flows at high Reynolds numbers, the Navier-Stokes equation itself admits chaotic solutions spanning a wide spectrum of length scales, rendering the system-level computations prohibitively expensive. Again, as primary quantities of interest involve only the averaged fields, researchers have actively sought approaches for further scale up of the mathematical models over the past decades.

Central in this context is the RANS (Reynolds-Averaged Navier-Stokes) methodology. The goal of RANS models is to predict the average velocity field in a turbulent flow without the need of tracking individual chaotic eddies. In this case, the average is the mean over many ensembles of realizations of the same system under the same boundary conditions. However, as most systems involve statistically time-stationary turbulence, temporal averages are equivalent to ensemble averages. Both averages result in highly smooth mean fields with a much smaller number of degrees of freedom suitable for pursuing scaled-up models.

RANS modeling has, from its inception, been inspired by approaches from kinetic theory. Most notably, the majority of the RANS models are based on the Boussinesq
approximation\cite{12} suggesting closures in terms of diffusion operators with the coefficient referred to as eddy diffusivity. By making an analogy to the kinetic theory, this approximation implies that in the same way that mixing by Brownian motion leads to a scaled-up continuum model involving a diffusion equation with an isotropic coefficient tensor, turbulent mixing should be expressible in terms of diffusion operators when statistically averaged. However, unlike Brownian motion, turbulent fluctuations are often non-isotropic in practice. Aside from this issue, a major criticism of this analogy is that the diffusion approximation requires separation of scales between the scaled-up fields and the underlying microscopic physics. This is the case for molecular-to-continuum modeling since the continuum scale is often orders of magnitude larger than the mean free path of molecules. However, in turbulent flows the underlying chaotic eddies span a wide range of scales; large eddies, which have the highest statistical significance, are often as large as the scale of the mean fields. Therefore, the Boussinesq approximation, while being useful for qualitative analysis and scaling assessments, is not accurate for quantitative predictions.

Despite these shortcomings, the majority of turbulence models in use employ eddy-diffusivity closures based on the Boussinesq approximation\cite{7–11}. Among the models that do not use the Boussinesq approximation, some still retain diffusion-type operators in which the mean momentum flux is expressed as a function of local velocity gradients\cite{13}. Even the models that do not use any closure at the momentum transport level, such as the Reynolds stress closure models\cite{14}, still retain similar approximations in closure of higher moments. Model-form inaccuracies in turbulence models are to some degree compensated by tuning of the model coefficients and tailoring them for specific regimes and applications. As a result, turbulence models are still far from being universal and truly predictive.

In this report we present a method, which we call the macroscopic forcing method (MFM) that allows determination of the “closure operators” that govern the mean-field-mixing by any underlying flow field. MFM acts similar to the way that molecular dynamics simulations reveal transport coefficients for a continuum model, with the exception that in MFM both input and output spaces are continua and that MFM does not make any simplifying assumption such as isotropy or separation of scales between turbulence and mean fields (scaled up fields). MFM precisely reveals the degree of non-locality and anisotropy of the differential operators governing the mean transport.

In the midst of the challenge of determining accurate RANS models, decades ago, super-
computers allowed direct numerical simulation (DNS) of canonical turbulent flows[15] and provided unprecedented access to their detailed underlying transport processes. Despite drastic improvements in computational power, DNS continues to remain inaccessible to industrial applications, and is only viable for canonical and often academic settings. Since its advent, it has been expected that understanding based on DNS will inspire novel RANS models with superior accuracy compared to those developed prior to the DNS era. However, thus far DNS, at best, has been used to provide reference mean fields for the tuning of RANS model coefficients, while the model form has been set a priori. A missed opportunity has been the use of DNS for revealing the model form itself. MFM closes this gap by combining DNS with a novel statistical analysis.

Lastly, the approach, which we shall introduce, unifies the problem of macroscopic modeling between low-Reynolds-number laminar flows and high-Reynolds-number turbulent flows. As a starting point, we consider the problem of dispersion of passive scalars by a laminar parallel flow, first introduced by G. I. Taylor[16]. By recasting this problem in wavenumber space, we show that while MFM correctly reproduces Taylor’s approximation for the low wavenumber limit, it provides a natural framework for extending his solution to all wavenumbers. We then report that the application of MFM to homogeneous turbulence, results in similar operators as those obtained from analysis of parallel flows. The paper then continues to pave the way for the development of MFM for more complex flows, such as those involving interactions with walls and boundary conditions, and ends by providing useful insights about MFM from both physical and mathematical point of views.

A. Problem Statement

The purpose of this section is to introduce the basic terminology and mathematical notation used throughout the paper. While we ultimately develop a general approach that can treat a wide range of transport phenomena, in this section we introduce the problem by considering the passive scalar advection-diffusion equation. Later, we introduce extensions to momentum fields governed by the Navier-Stokes equation. The starting point is the continuum microscopic equation:

$$L_c(x_1, ..., x_n, t) = 0,$$  
(1)
where \( c \) represents the transported field, while \( x_1 \) to \( x_n \) and \( t \) are the independent variables, which correspond to the spatial and temporal coordinates, respectively. \( \mathcal{L} \) is a differential operator representing the transport physics. For example, when the advective flow is incompressible, one can write

\[
\mathcal{L} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + u_j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left( D_M \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \right),
\]

where \( u_j(x_1, ..., x_n, t) \) represents the advecting velocity field, and \( D_M \) represents molecular diffusion. Equation (1) is accompanied by initial and boundary conditions. When (1) is written in discretized form, these conditions can be embedded in the operator \( \mathcal{L} \) and the right hand side of (1).

We refer to Equation (1) as the “microscopic equation” or the “microscopic transport equation,” where \( \mathcal{L} \) is called the microscopic operator acting on the microscopic field \( c \). Next, we define the “macroscopic” or scaled-up field, \( \bar{c} \), which represents the quantity of engineering interest. Mathematically, \( \bar{c} \) is defined as the average of \( c \) over a certain subset of spatiotemporal coordinates. For example, in dispersion of scalars in laminar pipe flows\([16]\), averaging is performed in the pipe cross-section. In RANS modeling, the averaging dimensions are those over which the system is statistically homogeneous. In most cases, the temporal dimension is statistically stationary. In the absence of statistical stationarity, averaging is defined over many ensembles. A more advanced definition of \( \bar{c} \), but outside of the scope of this report, utilizes filters or weighted averages.

The problem is to determine the “macroscopic” operator, \( \mathcal{C} \), with an appropriate set of boundary conditions such that the solution to equation

\[
\mathcal{C} \bar{c} = 0
\]

matches exactly the \( \bar{c} \) obtained from averaging the microscopic solution. Since the macroscopic space, has a lower dimension than the microscopic space, or better said, involves a significantly lower number of degrees of freedom, access to the macroscopic operator allows tremendous savings in computational cost. As we shall see, \( \mathcal{C} \) will depend on the statistics of the microscopic advective field \( u_j \), \( D_M \), the microscopic boundary conditions, and also the definition of averaging that converts \( c \) to \( \bar{c} \).

The immediate difficulty with the above problem statement is that there are numerous macroscopic operators that satisfy the stated requirements. In other words, the answer to the
problem is not unique. In what follows we will utilize additional physics-based constraints such that \( \bar{L} \) will be uniquely determined.

A common method for seeking \( \bar{L} \), referred to as the Reynolds decomposition\[17\], is to apply the averaging operator directly to Equation (1) and analyze the resulting terms. For some terms in \( \mathcal{L} \), averaging commutes with the operator in that term. For example, in Equation (2), ensemble averaging commutes with the time derivative and the diffusion operator, but not with multiplication by \( u_j \) in the advective term. Therefore, after averaging Equation (1), and noting that \( \partial u_j/\partial x_j = 0 \), one can write

\[
\frac{\partial \bar{c}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} (\bar{u}_j \bar{c}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left( D_M \frac{\partial \bar{c}}{\partial x_j} \right) = 0.
\]

If averaging had commuted with multiplication by \( u_j \), for example in the case of a constant \( u_j \), then one could have written the advective term in (4) as \( \partial (\bar{u}_j \bar{c})/\partial x_j \), and therefore the job of finding \( \bar{L} \) would have been complete. However, commutation is rarely permissible when the underlying microscopic flow field is non-uniform. With this line of thinking, the problem of finding the macroscopic operator is then focused on obtaining closures to \( u_j \bar{c} \).

Consistent with this mindset, we sometimes use the notation \( \bar{L}' \) to refer to the portion of \( \bar{L} \) that cannot be closed due to commutation error. In other words, for the case of advection-diffusion problem one can write:

\[
\bar{L} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \bar{u}_j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left( D_M \frac{\partial \bar{c}}{\partial x_j} \right) + \bar{L}' .
\]

Use of this notation might mistakenly imply that \( \bar{L}' \) is solely dependent on the microscopic flow velocity fluctuations, and independent of other processes such as molecular diffusion. We must remember that this is generally not the case; \( \bar{L}' \) depends on all microscopic processes including those involving commuting operators.

When the microscopic advective process is limited to length scales much smaller than the macroscopic field, for example, a spatially periodic velocity profile with effective “mean free path” much smaller than the domain size, the macroscopic operator \( \bar{L}' \) can be approximated by a diffusion operator\[18\]. However, this condition is rarely met in turbulent flows.

Before proceeding to the next section, we introduce some additional terminology. We use \( \Omega \) to refer to the microscopic phase space, and \( \Omega' \) to refer to the macroscopic phase space. With this definition, \( \bar{c} \in \Omega \) and \( \bar{\bar{c}} \in \Omega' \subset \Omega \). The dimension of \( \Omega' \), equal to the number of degrees of freedom of \( \bar{c} \), is much smaller than the dimension of \( \Omega \). Averaging is a projection
operator mapping points (fields) from $\Omega$ to $\overline{\Omega}$. The microscopic operator, $\mathcal{L}$, maps points within $\Omega$, and the macroscopic operator maps points within $\overline{\Omega}$. While we refer to $\mathcal{L}$ as the macroscopic operator, we use “macroscopic closure operator” to refer to $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$. In general, the macroscopic closure operator can be anisotropic, may involve non-constant coefficients, may involve spatial derivatives higher than second order, and may even be non-local.

Next, we review, as a pedagogical example, the problem of dispersion by parallel flows. In Section II.B we present an approximate solution to this problem consistent with the methodology of G. I. Taylor[16]. Then after introducing the macroscopic forcing method (MFM) in Section II, we will revisit this problem and assess the performance of the macroscopic operators obtained using MFM and those obtained from Taylor’s solution.

B. Simple Example: Dispersion by a Parallel Flow

A macroscopic model for dispersion of passive scalars by parallel flows was first introduced by G. I. Taylor[16], where he considered the evolution of a passive scalar by a laminar pipe flow. Consistent with experimental observations, his analysis predicted that the long-term evolution of the cross-sectional averaged scalar field can be predicted by a diffusion equation to the leading order with an effective diffusivity quadratically dependent on the velocity magnitude and inversely proportional to the molecular diffusivity. Since then, this problem has been extensively revisited[19–22] with some studies offering corrections to the leading-order model[21, 23] including extensions to non-parallel flows, such as those in porous media[24–26]. We will show that MFM results are consistent with these corrections, while providing a systematic and robust computational approach for the determination of the macroscopic operators in more general settings including macroscopically inhomogeneous flows.

Without loss of key physical ingredients and lesson points, we consider a simplified parallel flow in a two-dimensional domain as depicted in Figure II.a

$$u_1 = U \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{L_2}x_2\right), \quad u_2 = 0,$$

where $U$ is the velocity amplitude and $L_2$ is the domain length in the $x_2$-direction. We consider a microscopic transport equation given by

$$\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} + u_j \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_j} = D_M \frac{\partial^2 c}{\partial x_1^2} + D_M \frac{\partial^2 c}{\partial x_2^2}.$$
We consider the physical domain $-\infty < x_1 < +\infty$, and $0 \leq x_2 < L_2$ with periodic boundary conditions in the $x_2$ direction. Here, we define the averaging operator

$$\overline{c}(x_1) = \frac{1}{L_2} \int_0^{L_2} c(x_1, x_2) \, dx_2.$$  

(8)

Our task is to determine the macroscopic differential operator acting only in the $x_1$ direction that describes the evolution of $\overline{c}$ without requiring a direct solution to (7).

It is worth starting the analysis with a non-dimensionalization of coordinates. Scaling the spanwise length by $L_2/(2\pi)$, the streamwise length by $UL_2/(4\pi^2 D_M)$, and time by $L_2^2/(4\pi^2 D_M)$, results in the following dimensionless PDE:

$$\frac{\partial \overline{c}}{\partial t} + \cos(x_2) \frac{\partial \overline{c}}{\partial x_1} = \frac{\partial^2 \overline{c}}{\partial x_2^2} + \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial^2 \overline{c}}{\partial x_1^2},$$  

(9)

defined over a domain $-\infty < x_1 < +\infty$, and $0 \leq x_2 < 2\pi$, with periodic boundary conditions in the $x_2$ direction. $\epsilon = 2\pi D_M/(L_2 U)$ is the only dimensionless parameter of the problem.

For the present, we consider the case of $\epsilon = 0$, corresponding to the limit of large Peclet number, which is adequate for capturing the essence of the problem. Figure 1c shows an example solution to this problem. The macroscopic average of this solution, $\overline{c}$, is shown in Figure 1d. The evolution equation for $\overline{c}$ can be derived by applying the averaging operator to Equation (9). In the averaging process, the first term on the right hand side of (9) vanishes due to periodic boundary conditions. Considering $\epsilon = 0$, the averaged equation is

$$\frac{\partial \overline{c}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left( \cos(x_2) \overline{c} \right) = 0.$$  

(10)

The first term in (10) is already closed as seen before, while the second term involves an unclosed product. Next, we derive an approximate closure to this equation following Taylor’s approach. Although Taylor did not examine zero-mean harmonic parallel flows, we still refer to the solutions presented in this section as Taylor’s solution.

In the limit that the concentration field involves features with large streamwise length $l \gg 1$, often associated with long development time, it is possible to derive an approximate solution to Equation (9) via a perturbation approach. In this case, one can conclude that the time scale of mixing in the streamwise direction, $t_1 \sim O(l)$, is much longer than the time scale of mixing in the spanwise ($x_2$) direction via diffusion, $t_2 \sim O(1)$. Therefore, concentration fields can be considered almost well-mixed in the spanwise direction (or more accurately said, “rapidly developed”) while undergoing slower evolution by the streamwise flow. Introducing the decomposition $c(x_1, x_2) = \overline{c}(x_1) + c'(x_1, x_2)$, fast mixing in the spanwise direction...
implies that \( c' \ll \Delta \tau \), where \( \Delta \tau \) represents variation of the averaged concentration in the streamwise direction. More fundamentally, rapid development in the spanwise direction, allows a quasi-steady approximation for the evolution of \( c' \). By subtracting Equation (10) from Equation (9) one can obtain an exact evolution equation for \( c' \):

\[
\frac{\partial^2 c'}{\partial x_2^2} - \cos (x_2) \frac{\partial \bar{c}}{\partial x_1} = \frac{\partial c'}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left[ \cos (x_2) c' \right]',
\]

where the right-most prime (') on the square bracket implies deviation from the mean of the term inside the bracket. Given \( c' \ll \Delta \tau \), \( \partial / \partial x_1 \sim O(1/l) \ll 1 \), and the quasi-steady assumption, the leading-order balance must be between the two terms on the left hand side. This results in a leading order solution for \( c' \) as \( c'_0 = -\cos (x_2) (\partial \bar{c} / \partial x_1) \). Substituting this expression into (10) results in the following macroscopic equation for the evolution of \( \bar{c} \):

\[
\frac{\partial \bar{c}}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \bar{c}}{\partial x_1^2}.
\]

We refer to Equation (12) as Taylor’s solution (or model). Dimensionally, this equation implies that the cross-sectional averaged concentration field experiences a macroscopic diffusivity equal to \( U^2 L_2^2 / (8\pi^2 D_M) \). The most notable outcome of this expression is the unintuitive inverse dependence on the molecular diffusivity, which is well explained in the literature and confirmed experimentally.

Before introducing our work, we briefly note that for the specific problem of parallel flows, improvements to Taylor’s model have been investigated\[21, 23\]. In what is presented above, the only approximation made in the solution to (11) was ignoring the right hand side terms. One may improve this approximation by considering a series expansion for \( c' \) as \( c' = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c^i(x_1, x_2) \) in which \( c^i \sim O(\Delta \tau / l^{i+1}) \), and substitution in (11). Considering \( \partial / \partial x_1 \sim O(1/l) \) and \( \partial / \partial t \sim O(1/l^2) \), as inferred from (12), and equating terms of similar order, one may obtain a recursive relation through which higher order solutions to \( c' \) can be successively obtained by substitution of lower order solutions into the right hand side of (11). Substituting the improved \( c' \) in (10), results in an improved macroscopic model.

For example, the next correction results in the following macroscopic PDE:

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \bar{c} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \bar{c}}{\partial x_1^2} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \bar{c}}{\partial x_1^2} + \frac{1}{32} \frac{\partial^4 \bar{c}}{\partial x_1^4}.
\]

Equation (13) is a perturbative correction to Taylor’s solution. The unfamiliar term, \( \partial^4 \bar{c} / \partial t \partial x_1^4 \) can be simplified as \((1/2) \partial^4 \bar{c} / \partial x_1^4 + O(1/l)^6 \) as suggested by (12). Substituting this
result in (13) leads to a simpler macroscopic PDE, \( \partial \tau / \partial t = (1/2) \partial^2 \tau / \partial x_1^2 - (7/32) \partial^4 \tau / \partial x_1^4 \) with coefficient signs consistent with dissipation mechanism.

By following the necessary algebraic steps one may realize that even in this simple setting, the correction procedure is cumbersome and quickly becomes analytically intractable.

II. THE MACROSCOPIC FORCING METHOD

We now resume the general problem by envisioning an arbitrary transport process described by a microscopic operator, \( \mathcal{L} \), and seek to determine the macroscopic operator, \( \bar{\mathcal{L}} \), such that the solution to Equation (3) results in the same \( \bar{\tau} \) as that obtained from averaging of the microscopic solution. Given the linearity of the microscopic operator, it is straightforward to deduce that the macroscopic operator, \( \bar{\mathcal{L}} \), must also be linear. In discretized space we can therefore write the macroscopic equation as

\[
[\bar{\mathcal{L}}] [\bar{\tau}] = 0,
\]

where brackets denote matrices and vectors. In order to determine \( \bar{\mathcal{L}} \), we examine how the macroscopic system above responds to forcing by setting up the input-output relation

\[
\bar{\mathcal{L}} \bar{\tau}(s) = s, \quad (15)
\]

where \( \bar{\tau}(s) \) denotes the response due to the forcing \( s \). One can reveal columns of the matrix representing \( \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \) by obtaining \( \bar{\tau} \) in response to activation of different elements in \( s \). By combining these columns, it is possible to construct both \( \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \) and \( \bar{\mathcal{L}} \).

Note that operations above are defined in the macroscopic space and thus \( s \in \bar{\Omega} \), meaning that the forcing must be macroscopic (\( s = \bar{s} \)). However, in the absence of \( \bar{\mathcal{L}} \), one can obtain \( \bar{\tau}(s) \) by directly solving the microscopic equation, (1), with the macroscopic forcing added to its right hand side,

\[
\mathcal{L} [c(x_1, \ldots, x_n, t)] = s. \quad (16)
\]

MFM is the procedure of determining \( \bar{\mathcal{L}} \) by obtaining \( \bar{\tau} \) in response to different macroscopic forcing scenarios. With the description given above, however, the immediate concern is the expense of the procedure. Brute force MFM is indeed very expensive, since it often requires many DNS calculations. We will present in sections IV B and IV C methods to substantially reduce the cost of MFM.
In the description above, we skipped discussion of initial condition and boundary conditions. One may naturally incorporate these by extending the discretized system (14) to include both initial and boundary points in $[\bar{c}]$, properly adjust the operator $[\mathcal{L}]$, and the right-hand-side of (14). In doing so, we implicitly assume that both initial condition and boundary conditions are macroscopic, i.e. their description in the macroscopic space is the same as that in the microscopic space. This constraint, however, does not limit the applicability of MFM to turbulence modeling since most practical problems are insensitive to initial conditions, and involve boundary conditions that are indeed macroscopic (e.g., boundary condition remains intact between Navier-Stokes and RANS descriptions). Keeping this in mind, we revisit the problem of dispersion by parallel flows by constraining the initial condition to be macroscopic, $c|_{t=0} = c(x_1)$, as shown in Figure 1b.

A. Revisiting Dispersion by a Parallel Flow

As a pedagogical example, we revisit the problem of dispersion by parallel flows. This time, we apply MFM to reveal the exact macroscopic operator. The equation to be solved is

$$\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} + \cos (x_2) \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_1} = \frac{\partial^2 c}{\partial x_2^2} + s(x_1, t).$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

Note that since the macroscopic space does not involve $x_2$, $s$ is chosen to depend only on $x_1$ and $t$. Given that the problem is homogeneous in $x_1$ and $t$, it makes sense to continue the analysis in Fourier space. Therefore, we consider

$$s(x_1, t) = \exp (i\omega t + ikx_1).$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

After averaging the direct solution to Equation (17), we will find

$$\bar{c} (x_1, t) = \bar{c} \exp (i\omega t + ikx_1).$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

$\mathcal{L}$ then can be expressed in Fourier space as

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{1}{\bar{c}}(\omega, k).$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

With this procedure in mind, we proceed to solve Equation (17) assuming a forcing in the form of (18). We assume a solution of the form

$$c = \tilde{c}(\omega, k, x_2) \exp (i\omega t + ikx_1).$$
Substituting this expression into Equation (17) results in
\[
\left[ i\omega - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_2^2} + i k \cos (x_2) \right] \hat{c}(\omega, k; x_2) = 1.
\] (21)

For a given \( k \) and \( \omega \), one may expand \( \hat{c} \) as
\[
\hat{c}(\omega, k; x_2) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n(\omega, k) \cos(nx_2).
\] (22)

Substituting this expansion into (21) results in a system of linear equations for the \( a_n \)s. We present a solution to this system in Appendix A. The macroscopic operator in Fourier space, \( \hat{L} \), can be determined by substituting \( \hat{c} = a_0 \) from this solution into (20). From (10) we remember that the sole closed term in the full operator is the \( \partial/\partial t \) term, and thus the macroscopic closure operator can be computed as
\[
\hat{L}' = \frac{1}{\hat{c}(\omega, k)} - i\omega
\] (23)

Figures 1.e and 1.f show the solution for \( \hat{L}'(\omega, k) \) obtained from the above procedure. We first note that in the limit of small \( k \) and \( \omega \) the plotted solution matches with Taylor’s solution given in (12), which can be expressed in Fourier space as \( \hat{L}' = 0.5k^2 \) (see Figure 1.e). Further examination indicates that higher-order terms in the Taylor series of this numerical solution also match the correction to the Taylor’s solution given by (13), which is expressed in Fourier space as \( \hat{L}' = 0.5k^2 - 0.5i\omega k^2 - (1/32)k^4 \).

Unlike these perturbative approaches, the present MFM solution discloses the macroscopic closure operator over the entire spectrum of scales. As shown in Figures 1.e, for wavenumbers or frequencies of \( O(1) \) or higher, \( \hat{L}' \) becomes significantly different from the operators from the perturbative models. In fact, even for \( k \) slightly larger than one, the successive perturbative corrections lead to divergence from the true \( \hat{L}' \) (not shown here). This is because perturbative corrections tend to approximate \( \hat{L}'(k, \omega) \) in terms of a polynomial expansion where the order of the dominant term naturally increases as \( k \) increases. In contrast, the true \( \hat{L}' \) transitions from a second-order power-law \( \hat{L}' \sim k^2 \) at small \( k \) to a lower-order power-law, \( \hat{L}' \sim k^1 \), in the large \( k \) limit as shown in the figure.

To demonstrate this point, we compare the performance of macroscopic closure models against a reference solution obtained from averaging of a DNS solution involving high wavenumbers. For the reference solution, we numerically solved the two-dimensional transport problem described by Equation (9). We considered \( c(x_1, x_2, 0) = \exp(-x_1^2/0.025) \)
FIG. 1: Schematic of a parallel flow described by \( u_1 = \cos(x_2) \) (a), and an example initial condition for a scalar field to be dispersed by this flow (b) according to Equation (9) with \( \epsilon = 0 \). Solution field at \( t = 1 \) is shown in (c), and its projection to the macroscopic space is shown in (d). (e) and (f) respectively show the real and imaginary parts of the macroscopic closure operator, \( \hat{L}' \), versus \( k \) for \( \omega = 10^{\{-3,-2,-1,0,1,2,3\}} \). Solid lines show the exact values obtained through the procedure discussed in Appendix A and the dotted symbols show the fitted operator of Equation (24). In (e) the three first frequency cases are almost indistinguishable. The gray dashed line shows \( \hat{L}' = k^2/2 \) representing the diffusion operator derived from Taylor’s solution in (12).

as an initial condition representing a thin zone of contaminant in a 2D space (see Figure 1b). Using a second-order central difference code, and mesh resolutions \( \Delta x_1 = 0.05 \) and \( \Delta x_2 = 0.04\pi \), the temporal evolution of the scalar field is obtained using the forth-order Runge-Kutta method with time step \( \Delta t = 0.002 \). The resulting \( \bar{c}(x_1,t) \) from 2D DNS is shown in Figure 2a. Figure 2b shows the solution obtained from Taylor’s model, (12), for the same setup. It is evident that the early-time dispersion is not captured properly. More remarkably, the perturbative correction to Taylor’s model, (13), predicts a worse behavior
FIG. 2: Space-time evolution of $x_2$-averaged concentration field with an initial condition $c = \exp\left(-x_1^2/0.025\right)$ subject to the advection diffusion equation of (9): (a) DNS result, (b) prediction of Taylor’s model given by (12), (c) prediction of perturbative correction to Taylor’s model given by (13), and (d) prediction of the fitted model obtained from MFM given by (25) as shown in Figure 2c. This lack of convergence has also been noted by others [25], but it is insightful to revisit it here by examining the operators in Fourier space.

It is needless to say that the full macroscopic closure operator, obtained from MFM, predicts a solution matching the mean of the DNS solution. While we have verified this claim numerically, this exercise is of little practical utility unless we can express the macroscopic closure operator in terms of a closed mathematical equation. In the absence of analytical solutions, we attempted to obtain analytical curve fits to the plots shown in Figure 1e and 1f. In doing so, we learned that capturing the true asymptotic behavior of the curves is more crucial than capturing the higher order terms in their Taylor series expansion. By examining the asymptotic behavior of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ in the limits of small and large $\omega$ and $k$, we obtained
the following fitted expression for $\hat{L}$

$$
\hat{L} \simeq \sqrt{(1 + i\omega)^2 + k^2} - (1 + i\omega).
$$

Specifically, Equation (24) is exact in the limits of small and large $k$ and $\omega$ as shown in Figure 1.e and f. Before, developing an intuitive comprehension of this macroscopic closure model, we assess its performance against DNS as done for previous closure operators (see numerical details in Appendix B). Figure 2.d shows the space-time evolution of $\tilde{c}$ obtained from a numerical solution to the macroscopic equation with the closure operator as in (24). It is evident that this MFM-inspired closure operator offers remarkable improvement compared to Taylor’s model and its perturbative correction.

Given that the expression in (24) is not a polynomial expression, one may wonder how the macroscopic operator looks in physical space. Based on Equation (24), the macroscopic PDE in physical space can be obtained by taking the inverse Fourier transform of (24), and adding back the closed $\partial/\partial t$ term:

$$
\left[ \sqrt{\left( I + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right)^2 - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1^2} - I} \right] \tilde{c} (x_1, t) = s (x_1, t),
$$

where $I$ represents the identity operator. Equation (25) represents an MFM-inspired macroscopic model for dispersion of scalars by the considered parallel flow. This mathematical outcome may seem surprising at first, because the resulting operator looks very different from those describing macroscopic dispersion, such as those in Taylor’s solution and its perturbative corrections. This is one aspect of our study that we will continue to highlight repeatedly since the observed difference offers opportunity to improve closure models in use today. However, before moving forward with this mission, we build more intuition about this result by making the following observations:

1- As a sanity check, we note that the resulting model in (24) offers a spatially conservative operator. Given the form of the closure in (10), the macroscopic operator must be divergence of a flux. Here the divergence is implicitly embedded in the expression, and can be verified by checking that the closure operator vanishes in the limit of $k = 0$.

2- The resulting model involves a square root acting on an operator. The most straight-forward interpretation of the square root in physical space is to consider a discretized system for which operators are represented by matrices. The square root simply implies the square
root of the matrix. We will build more physical intuition about the meaning of this square root in Section IV A. Use of fractional-order operators for closure models has been suggested before\cite{27, 28}. However, we here directly obtain the operator from the governing equation, as opposed to inferring it from fitting solutions to experimental data of mean fields. Additionally, the obtained operator differs from common fractional-order closure operators, since the closure term is not solely $\partial^\alpha \sigma / \partial x^\alpha_1$, with $\alpha$ being a non-integer constant. Neither do we obtain such behavior in any asymptotic limit. As we examine more cases and build more intuition, our initial excitement about fractional-order operators fades away and is replaced with a more general concept involving non-locality of operators as discussed in Section IV A.

3- In the limit of small $k$ and $\omega$, Equation (24) reduces to $\hat{\mathcal{L}} = k^2/2$. In other words, the macroscopic model in physical space is $\partial \sigma / \partial t = (1/2) \partial^2 \sigma / \partial x^2_1$. This matches the Taylor’s model, presented in Equation (12), which is appropriate for long-term dispersion of contaminants by parallel flows.

4- The key difference between the MFM-inspired closure operator and those in (12) and (13), is in their character in the high-wavenumber limit, which has close connection to their performance in predicting early-time dispersion of contaminants as shown in Figure 2. The linear propagation of the contaminant front with time, shown in Figure 2.a, is due to the fact that the underlying mechanism of transport is advective. Taylor’s solution, however, results in a diffusion equation, (12), predicting contaminant propagation as $x_1 \sim \sqrt{t}$, which implies an unbounded dispersion speed at early times proportional to $t^{-1/2}$. In contrast, the MFM-based model, (25), honors the physically expected dispersion speeds at both early and long times. This difference in physical space, can be traced in Fourier space by noting the character of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ in the high wavenumber limit. Unlike Taylor’s model, true $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$, and the proposed model in 24 exhibit a high-wavenumber scaling as $\hat{\mathcal{L}} \sim k^1$. Although the considered example is highly simplified, this takeaway message is directly generalizable to more complex flows.

In the next section we build more intuition about these results by focusing on the steady-state limit of this problem. One motivation is that most practical turbulent flows are statistically time-stationary, and thus the RANS operator is a steady operator. Secondly, even in the context of semi-parallel laminar flows, sometimes the steady macroscopic operator is of interest. Though in such cases, instead of an initial value problem, one is interested in a boundary value problem. In some cases, Taylor’s solution is not satisfactory as one is
FIG. 3: Macroscopic closure operator, \( \hat{L} \), versus \( k \) for the steady limit, \( \omega = 0 \), of the microscopic equation (9). The solid line shows the exact operator obtained from the MFM procedure discussed in Appendix A; the dashed line is \( \hat{L} = \sqrt{1 + k^2} - 1 \); the dashed-dotted line shows \( \hat{L} = k^2 / \sqrt{4 + k^2} \). The thin dotted lines show the asymptotic limits of \( 0.5k^2 \), and \( k \), respectively in the small and large wavenumbers. The imaginary part of all solutions is zero.

interested in solutions beyond the small wavenumber limit [29, 30].

**B. Steady Limit of Dispersion by a Parallel Flow**

We examine the steady limit of the same problem discussed in Section II A. Given the homogeneity of this problem in the \( x_1 \) direction, we are not yet examining a boundary value problem. We will consider statistically inhomogeneous problems with boundary conditions in Section IV.

Figure 3 shows the macroscopic closure operator for the steady limit (\( \omega = 0 \)) in wavenumber space. In the small wavenumber limit, where one may assume separation of scales between mean fields and underlying flow scale, the \( k^2 \) scaling is recovered. In the large wavenumber limit, as discussed earlier, a linear \( k^1 \) scaling prevails, even in the steady limit. Converting the problem back to dimensional units, the transition wavenumber scales as \( 4\pi^2 D_M / (U L_2^2) \). The inverse of this scale, \( U L_2^2 / (4\pi^2 D_M) \), can be interpreted as a “mean free path”: it is the product of contaminant’s streamwise characteristic velocity, \( U \), and the
time scale $L_2^2/(4\pi^2D_M)$ for contaminants to diffusively cross a distance of order $L_2$ hence
switching the sign of their streamwise advective motion.

With this interpretation, the analogy with molecular to continuum macroscopic models
becomes more clear. Taylor’s diffusion model, $[12]$, suffices for macroscopic scales much
larger than the “mean free path.” In this case the macroscopic diffusion coefficient is pro-
portional to the product of “mean free path,” $UL_2^2/(4\pi^2D_M)$ and the microscopic velocity
$U$. Conversely, for macroscopic scales smaller than the “mean free path”, the boundedness
of dispersion speed requires the macroscopic operator to change character to a $k^1$ scaling.
However, unlike the advection operator, which also scales as $k^1$, the nature of $\hat{L}$ is dissi-
pative and not advective. In other words, the pre-factor to this proportionality is real and
positive, not imaginary. Therefore, a first derivative operator $\overline{\mathcal{L}} \sim \partial/\partial x_1$ does not capture
the correct trends. This is why we used a square root to capture the expected asymptotic
limit as $\overline{\mathcal{L}} \sim \sqrt{\partial^2/\partial x_1^2}$. However, this should be viewed only as a quick remedy; in Sec-
tion [IVA] we present a generalized operator form after building more intuition about the
problem.

The fitted model presented in Equation $[24]$ reduces to $\hat{\mathcal{L}} = \sqrt{1+k^2} - 1$ in the steady
limit. In this limit, however, we were able to obtain a better fit (see Figure 3 dash-dotted),

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{0.5k^2}{\sqrt{1+0.25k^2}}.$$  (26)

With this model the macroscopic closure operator in physical space can be written as

$$\overline{\mathcal{L}} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left( \frac{0.5}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1^2}}} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1},$$  (27)

which is a divergence of a flux as expected. The flux itself is written as a macroscopic
“diffusivity” times the gradient of the mean field, $D\partial/\partial x_1$, which is also a familiar form.
We emphasize that the macroscopic diffusivity is a non-local operator,

$$D = \frac{0.5}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1^2}}}.$$  (28)

In the low wavenumber limit, the second derivative in the denominator is negligible, and
thus the macroscopic diffusivity is a number $D = 0.5$. Conversely, in the high-wavenumber
limit, macroscopic diffusivity vanishes inversely proportional to $k$. We remind that the eddy
diffusivity operator introduced in $[28]$ is non-singular. The denominator of this operator is
diagonally dominant and invertible.
C. Dispersion of a Solenoidal Passive Vector Field

The MFM methodology described in Section II can be applied to equations for transport of vector fields. For example, the transport equation for a solenoidal passive vector field, $v_i$, can be forced by the macroscopic vector field, $s_i$, in order to reveal the averaged response

$$\frac{\partial v_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial u_j v_i}{\partial x_j} = -\frac{\partial q}{\partial x_i} + \nu \frac{\partial^2 v_i}{\partial x_j \partial x_j} + s_i, \quad (29)$$

$$\frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_j} = 0. \quad (30)$$

Here, $u_j$ is a known transporter velocity field that transports $v_i$, $\nu$ is the molecular (microscopic) diffusivity, and $q$ is the scalar potential to satisfy the divergence-free condition for $v_i$. Passive vector fields have been studied before in the context of the vorticity equation and the scalar gradient transport equation, and also to generate insights about turbulence[31, 32]. Here we examine a different evolution equation (29, 30) for passive vector fields that is more appropriate as a stepping stone for extending MFM to the Navier-Stokes equation, which we will discuss in Section III.

In this section, we apply MFM to parallel flows similar to what we considered earlier for scalar transport. In the simplest form, we consider $u_1 = \cos(x_2)$, $u_2 = 0$, molecular diffusivity only in the $x_2$ direction, and $\omega = 0$ to focus on the steady response. Given that averages are with respect to the $x_2$ direction, we seek a macroscopic operator that describes the behavior of $\overline{v_1}(x_1)$ in response to a macroscopic forcing $s_i$. Due to the continuity constraint, $\partial \overline{v_1} / \partial x_1 = 0$, the solution for $\overline{v_1}$ reduces to a trivial form. Thus it is sufficient to study the response of $\overline{v_2}(x_1)$ to a macroscopic forcing $s_2(x_1)$. The details of the solution methodology are discussed in Appendix C.

Figure 4.d shows the resulting macroscopic operator in wavenumber space, and its asymptotic behavior in the limit of small and large $k$. Interestingly, here the leading-order macroscopic closure operator (limit of $k \simeq 0$) is fourth-order, indicating a macroscopic equation of the form $0.5 \partial^4 \overline{v_2} / \partial x_1^4 = s_2(x_1)$. This is different from the second-order diffusion model of Taylor obtained for dispersion of scalars by the same flow. However, as we shall see, this is an exceptional case due to the specific transporter field, $u_j$. In other cases, the leading-order operator is often second-order.

Another important observation is the behavior of the macroscopic operator in the large wavenumber limit. Similar to the scalar problem we observe that $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \sim k$ in this limit. This is
FIG. 4: An example macroscopic force field $s_2 = \cos(2x_1)$, $s_1 = 0$, corresponding to $k = 2$ plotted in physical space (a), and response of $v_2$ to this force (b) as a steady solution to Equation (29). The solid lines in (b) show the streamlines of the $v$ field, while the transporter velocity $u$ is a parallel flow given by $u_1 = \cos(x_2)$, $u_2 = 0$. Projection of the $v_2$ response to the macroscopic space is obtained after averaging in the $x_2$ direction and is shown in (c). Panel (d) shows the macroscopic closure operator, $\hat{L}' = s_2/v_2$, versus $k$ for the steady limit, $\omega = 0$. The solid line shows the exact operator obtained from the MFM procedure discussed in Appendix C; the dashed line is $\hat{L}' = 0.5k^4$; the dashed-dotted line shows $\hat{L}' = k$.

again a macroscopically non-local behavior. For the scalar problem we justified this behavior intuitively based on the boundedness of the microscopic dispersion speed. For transported solenoidal vector fields, however, the pressure potential allows instant propagation of information. Nevertheless, the $k^1$ scaling of the macroscopic operator persists.

In the next sections we extend MFM by departing from the simplified limit of dispersion by parallel flows which we used here for pedagogy. While we consider more complex flows involving 3D and unsteady velocity fields, we arrive at more general but qualitatively similar
conclusions. In this context we find that the large-eddy size in turbulence plays a role analogous to the mean free path in parallel flows. For macroscopic scales on the order of or smaller than the large eddy, macroscopic operators depict considerable non-local effects, which are missing in the mainstream eddy diffusivity closure models. An additional issue is anisotropy of the macroscopic operators in multi-dimensions which persists even when the macroscopic scale is large. We show how MFM can measure both non-locality and anisotropy of macroscopic operators in a more general setting. Before these extensions, we first formally introduce MFM for the Navier-Stokes equation.

III. MACROSCOPIC FORCING METHOD FOR THE NAVIER-STOKES EQUATION

Extension of MFM to the Navier-Stokes equation (NS) requires discussion of two remaining issues. First is the fact that the microscopic solution is often time dependent, inhomogeneous, and turbulent. This issue can be treated by using ensemble averages. Given that in many practical scenarios, statistical fields are time-stationary, it is sufficient to employ MFM for obtaining the steady macroscopic operator by considering time-independent forcing terms, while averaging is performed over time. The spatial inhomogeneity of such problems results in macroscopic operators that have space-dependent coefficients. Statistical anisotropy would lead to macroscopic operators of tensorial form.

The second issue, which is the more challenging one, is the nonlinearity of the Navier-Stokes equation as a microscopic model. We resolve this issue by introducing a generalized equation as follows.

Consider a velocity field, \( u_i \), which is the solution to the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation

\[
\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial u_j u_i}{\partial x_j} = -\frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i} + \nu \frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial x_j \partial x_j} + r_i, \tag{31}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_j} = 0, \tag{32}
\]

where \( p \) is the pressure field normalized by fluid density, and \( \nu \) is the kinematic viscosity, and \( r_i \) is the known body force, which in most practical cases is either zero, or macroscopic, i.e., \( r_i = \bar{r}_i \). For example, in turbulent channel flows \( r_i \) represents the imposed mean pressure gradient, which is a unity vector field in the streamwise direction when reported in units
of shear velocity and channel half height. \( r_i \) may also represent the known inhomogeneous terms associated with the boundary conditions for discretized problems.

Next, following the previous section, we define the Generalized Momentum Transport (GMT) equation for a given \( u_i \) as

\[
\frac{\partial v_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial u_j v_i}{\partial x_j} = -\frac{\partial q}{\partial x_i} + \nu \frac{\partial^2 v_i}{\partial x_j \partial x_j} + s_i, \tag{33}
\]

where \( q \) is the generalized pressure to ensure incompressibility. The boundary conditions are the same type as those for \( u_i \), but the forcing \( s_i \) is allowed to be different from \( r_i \). Equation (33), subject to constraint (34), describes a linear system for \( v_i \), and thus its macroscopic form can be obtained using MFM. In this case, \( s \) must be selected from \( \Omega \) and thus \( s = \bar{s} \). Let us assume that this reduced form can be written as \( \bar{L}(\bar{v}) = -\nabla \bar{q} + s \) subject to the macroscopic incompressibility constraint, \( \nabla . \bar{v} = 0 \). The question is whether the resulting operator can produce the correct RANS solution. In other words, we should show that

\[
\bar{L}(\bar{u}) = -\nabla \bar{p} + r, \tag{35}
\]

where \( r \) is the same body force as in (31), and subject to the same boundary conditions as those for the Navier-Stokes system. To show this condition, it is sufficient to conclude that when Equation (33) is supplemented with the same body force and boundary conditions as those in the Navier-Stokes, the resulting microscopic solution, \( \bar{v} \) will have the same mean as the mean of Navier-Stokes solution, i.e., \( \bar{v} = \bar{u} \).

It turns out, an even stronger condition holds: when the macroscopic body force of GMT is matched with that of NS, not only will the mean solution of GMT match that of NS, but the instantaneous microscopic solution of GMT also merges (exponentially) to that of NS. This condition may seem unintuitive at first, since NS often admits chaotic solutions whose long term behavior is highly sensitive to the initial condition. How could the solution to such systems merge to identical fields regardless of the initial condition? The answer lies in the linearity of GMT. A quick qualitative proof can be made by introducing the vector field \( \bar{w} = \bar{v} - \bar{u} \). The evolution equation for \( \bar{w} \) can be obtained by subtracting NS from GMT,

\[
\frac{\partial w_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial u_j w_i}{\partial x_j} = -\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_i} + \nu \frac{\partial^2 w_i}{\partial x_j \partial x_j} \tag{36}
\]
FIG. 5: Instantaneous iso-contour of the Q-criterion at $t = 0$ (a) and $t = 5\delta/u_r$ (b) for $w = v - u$ representing the difference between the NS solution to a turbulent channel flow at $Re_r = 180$ and a GMT solution with matching boundary condition and forcing. The initial condition for GMT is $v = 0$. Maximum magnitude of the difference field, $|w|_{\text{max}}$ versus time is shown in (c).

$$\frac{\partial w_j}{\partial x_j} = 0,$$

where the body force is identically zero, given $s = r$. Additionally, since the boundary conditions of NS and GMT match, this equation is subject to homogeneous boundary conditions. Without the presence of any body force or energy injection from the boundaries, the energy in the field $w$ shall decline over time. One may show this formally by deriving an evolution equation for the total kinetic energy of this difference field defined as $K = (1/2) \int \int \int w_i w_i dx_1 dx_2 dx_3$. Contracting (36) with $w$ and integrating in space results in

$$\frac{\partial K}{\partial t} = -\nu \int \int \int \left[ \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_j} \right] dx_1 dx_2 dx_3,$$

where integration by parts in conjunction with the homogeneous boundary conditions for $w$ are used to arrive at the above equation. The only long term solution to this system is $w = 0$. Therefore, the macroscopic operator for the generalized momentum transport equation, obtained through MFM, is a correct RANS operator in the sense that it admits the true RANS solution.

The decay rate of field $w$, indicates an important time scale that needs to be considered in MFM. When performing averaging of the microscopic solutions, one should consider time windows much larger than this decay time as a condition for convergence of statistics and independence to the initial conditions. In practice, $w$ decays exponentially after an early transient. As an example, we performed simulations of a turbulent channel flow at
Re_{\tau} = 180, and examined the solution to the GMT, Equation (33), when it is supplemented with the same macroscopic forcing and boundary conditions as those of the NS solution but using an arbitrary initial condition. Figure 5 shows the computed norm of \( w \) versus time confirming its exponential decay. A fitted line to this plot suggests a decay time scale of about \( \tau_{\text{mix}} = 16.6\delta/u_{\tau} \), where \( \delta \) is the channel half width, and \( u_{\tau} \) is the shear scale velocity. Practically, \( \tau_{\text{mix}} \) is the time scale that denotes slowest mode of mixing and can be used as a mixing index; systems with smaller \( \tau_{\text{mix}} \) are better mixers. Generally, \( \tau_{\text{mix}} \) for mixing of scalars can be different than those for mixing of momentum as suggested by the results shown in [33].

A. A Philosophical Discussion on GMT

The most novel aspect of this work is probably recasting the Navier-Stokes equation in terms of a generalized momentum transport equation, which we called GMT [33]. This generalization formalizes two interpretations of velocity as a vector quantity. The first interpretation is a kinematic interpretation; it represents the time rate of material volume crossing an interface per unit area. The second interpretation of velocity is a dynamic one; it represents momentum per unit mass which is the ability of the material to resist against forces. These two interpretations are not new. They are in fact emphasized often in graduate teaching of momentum analysis in terms of the Reynolds Transport Theorem. In RANS modeling, the goal is often prediction of forces, and thus one thinks of the dynamic interpretation of velocity. The mission of RANS models is therefore determining how the mean momentum is being transported by the underlying turbulent flow. When dealing with the nonlinear advective term, \( \partial/\partial x_j (u_j u_i) \), the first velocity, \( u_j \) is the kinematic velocity; it does not represent momentum, but it is a geometric “transporter” of momentum. The second velocity, \( u_i \), is the quantity of interest; it is the “transportee,” representing momentum per unit mass. The RANS problem can be recast into the following question: how does turbulence mix momentum? MFM plus GMT answers this question precisely by interpreting the turbulence as a transporter of momentum.

In systems governed by the Navier-Stokes equation, the transporter and transportee fields are further constrained to be equal. However, this is only a special case of GMT. By obtaining an operator representing GMT, we also cover the special case of NS.
While MFM uses linear techniques, the final macroscopic RANS equation is indeed a nonlinear equation; it involves an operator acting linearly on the velocity but the operator itself is dependent on the velocity. The caveat is that MFM obtains the macroscopic operator in terms of the independent coordinates for a given flow. An analytical MFM solution would allow expression of the macroscopic operator directly in terms of the statistics of the underlying flow and would resolve the RANS closure problem. Numerical MFM solutions, however, fall short in accomplishing this final goal. Nevertheless, numerical MFM allows substantial advancement towards achieving this goal by determining the RANS operators in terms of independent coordinates and thus quantifying model-form errors in existing RANS models. In other words, numerical MFM acts as an advanced rheometer determining how a given flow mixes momentum. Whether this mixing is describable by local mean gradients or non-local operators, and whether the tensorial coefficients are isotropic or there are substantial non-Boussinesq effects, MFM reveals these details quantitatively. One hope is that much of these missing pieces in current RANS models be universal and thus application of MFM on canonical problems could inform models that will be predictive of practical scenarios.

We show a preliminary example of this practice next. We demonstrate that the application of MFM to homogeneous and isotropic turbulence guides a RANS model correction, leading to significant improvement in RANS prediction of turbulent round jets without the need of applying MFM to the turbulent jet flow itself.

B. MFM Applied to Homogeneous Isotropic Turbulence

Here we briefly include results of a companion study by Shirian and Mani[33] in which the MFM methodology is applied to determine the macroscopic closure operators for transport of passive scalars and momentum in stationary homogeneous isotropic turbulence (HIT). Remarkably, this study also reveals a macroscopic closure operator with similar asymptotic behavior to what was observed for the case of scalar dispersion by a parallel flow. In the case of turbulence, the transition between $\hat{L} \sim k^2$ and $\hat{L} \sim k^1$ occurs when $k$ is on the order of inverse large eddy size, which plays a role analogous to the role of mean free path in previous cases. Using their MFM data, Shirian and Mani[33] obtained fitted macroscopic
closure operators in physical space of the form

\[ \overline{\mathcal{L}} = -\nabla \cdot \left[ \frac{D}{(\mathcal{I} - l^2 \nabla^2)^{1/2}} \right], \tag{39} \]

where for the highest Reynolds number considered, they reported \( D = 0.83u_{\text{rms}}^4/\varepsilon \), \( l = 1.13u_{\text{rms}}^3/\varepsilon \) for the case of scalar transport and \( D = 0.46u_{\text{rms}}^4/\varepsilon \), \( l = 0.67u_{\text{rms}}^3/\varepsilon \) for the case of momentum transport. Here, \( u_{\text{rms}} \) and \( \varepsilon \) are respectively the root mean square of a single component velocity fluctuations and the turbulence dissipation rate. Equation (39) implies that the macroscopic diffusivity, which from now on we refer to as “eddy diffusivity”, is not a constant number. Instead, for HIT it is a non-local but isotropic operator, here expressed as

\[ D = \frac{D}{(\mathcal{I} - l^2 \nabla^2)^{1/2}}. \tag{40} \]

C. Impact on Prediction of Practical Flows

We next show the predictive impact of the obtained RANS operator by applying it to a practical flow and comparing its prediction against available experimental data. For this test case, we consider the self-similar turbulent round jet at a high Reynolds number. We then select an available eddy-diffusivity-based turbulence model, and replace its closure operator with Equation (39). For this purpose, we adopt the Prandtl Mixing Length Model (PMLM)\(^\text{[34]}\) since it provides \( D \) and \( l \) as explicit functions of spatial coordinates. We obtain solutions to both the original and modified RANS models. Figure 6.b shows a remarkable improvement in RANS predictions, almost coinciding with the experimental data\(^\text{[35]}\). More details on this analysis are given in Appendix D.

IV. MFM FOR INHOMOGENEOUS FLOWS

So far we have demonstrated how MFM can be applied to flows with homogeneous directions. In these cases, given the smoothness of \( \overline{\mathcal{L}} \) when transformed to Fourier space, we were able to save on the number of required MFM simulations. For non-homogeneous problems, however, formulation in Fourier space is inappropriate. Nevertheless, the methodology presented in sections II and III is extendable to non-homogeneous problems if one applies MFM in physical space. In what follows, we will first develop intuition about inhomogeneous
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FIG. 6: Schematic of the self similar turbulent round jet (a), and its mean velocity profile (b). Symbols show the LDA measured data of Hussein et al.[35], the dashed line shows RANS prediction using Prandtl mixing length model (PMLM), and the solid line shows RANS prediction using a closure operator of the form shown in Equation (39) with coefficients scaled consistently with the PMLM prescription.

macroscopic operators while ignoring the computational expense of MFM. In the following sections we will remedy the high expense of this brute force MFM, by introducing a more computationally feasible MFM, which focuses on computation of moments of eddy diffusivity kernel.

A. Linear Algebra Interpretation

In order to generate some mathematical insights, it is worth developing an understanding of MFM from a linear algebra point of view. The starting point is the microscopic equation,

\[ \mathcal{L}\ [c] = [s], \]  

(41)

where \(\mathcal{L}\) represents the discretized linear microscopic operator, \([c]\) is a vector representing the microscopic field, and \([s]\) is a vector representing the forcing. Square brackets indicate a matrix or vector involving a discrete set of numbers. We refer to matrix and vector elements by subscripts after the brackets. One may represent the generalized momentum transport equation in a similar fashion by considering the field vector to represent momentum and pressure fields and the operator matrix to represent the discretized form of (33) and (34) where the boundary conditions can be embedded in \(\mathcal{L}\).
Next, we define the averaging operator as

\[ \bar{c} = [P] \bar{c}, \]

(42)

where \([P]\) is the non-square project matrix with number of rows and columns respectively equal to the dimension of \(\Omega\) and \(\bar{\Omega}\). Given that the forcing is macroscopic, we have \(\bar{s} = s\) in continuum space. In discrete space, however, \([\bar{s}]\) and \([s]\) have different dimensions. Therefore, before applying MFM, one needs to extend (or interpolate) \([\bar{s}]\) to the microscopic space

\[ [s] = [E] [\bar{s}], \]

(43)

where \([E]\) is the non-square extension matrix with number of rows and columns respectively equal to the dimension of \(\Omega\) and \(\bar{\Omega}\). \([E]\) and \([P]\) satisfy the relation \([P] [E] = I\).

With these definitions at hand, we can obtain the macroscopic operator in terms of the defined matrices above. Combining equations (41), (42) and (43), one can write

\[ \bar{c} = [P] [L]^{-1} [E] [\bar{s}]. \]

(44)

From the definition of macroscopic operator in (15), we have that \([\bar{c}] = [L]^{-1} [\bar{s}]\). Comparing this with (44) we conclude that

\[ [L] = \left\{ [P] [L]^{-1} [E] \right\}^{-1}. \]

(45)

Equation (45) is a foundational equation in the sense that it represents the macroscopic operator defined directly in terms of the microscopic operator and the definition of average which determines the projection and extension operators. Unlike the brute force approach, introduced in Section II, this linear-algebra-based approach does not explicitly involve the force field \(s\). However, computation of \(\bar{L}\) from this approach can be more expensive due to the cost of direct computation of \([L]^{-1}\). The computational approach introduced in Section II utilizes DNS of the microscopic equations in response to explicit forcing in order to avoid direct computation of \([L]^{-1}\). Nevertheless, both approaches remain highly expensive.

Before remedying the cost issue, we develop more insights about macroscopic operators, by examining inhomogeneous mixing of a passive scalar using the described linear-algebra-based MFM. We consider a 2D domain representing a channel with the left and right walls at \(x_1 = \pm \pi\) with a Dirichlet condition \(c = 0\), and the top and bottom walls at \(x_2 = 0, 2\pi\).
FIG. 7: Flow streamlines in a 2D channel. Velocity field is given by Equation (47).

with a no-flux condition $\partial c/\partial x_2 = 0$. The concentration field $c(x,y)$ is governed by the steady advection diffusion equation

$$u_1 \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_1} + u_2 \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_2} = 0.05 \frac{\partial^2 c}{\partial x_1^2} + \frac{\partial^2 c}{\partial x_2^2}$$

(46)

One may interpret the unequal diffusivities in the two directions to be an outcome of directional nondimensionalization as seen in Section IB, i.e., $\epsilon^2 = 0.05$. For this example, we consider an incompressible flow satisfying the no-penetration conditions on all walls described by (see Figure 7)

$$u_1 = [1 + \cos(x_1)] \cos(x_2), u_2 = \sin(x_1) \sin(x_2).$$

(47)

Discretization of the governing PDE is performed by utilizing the second-order central difference scheme on a uniform staggered mesh using $N_1$ and $N_2$ interior grid points in the $x_1$ and $x_2$ directions, respectively. The advective fluxes on the faces are computed using a second-order interpolation and then multiplication by the analytical normal velocity at the face centers. Fluxes on the left and right boundaries are computed using the interior scheme after extrapolating the concentration field to ghost points half a grid size outside of the domain using a second-order extrapolation scheme that uses knowledge of the concentration field at the boundary and the two adjacent interior cells. To ensure a well-posed system, the number of degrees of freedom associated with the forcing term must be equal to those associated with the concentration field itself. Therefore, the forcing term is also defined at the cell centers corresponding to the same locations as the interior concentration fields.

For this problem we define $\overline{c}$ as the average of the scalar field in the $x_2$ direction. Considering $N_1 = 40$ and $N_2 = 10$, Figure 8a shows the matrix associated with $[L]$ obtained
FIG. 8: (a) $[\mathcal{L}]$ for the example problem described in Section IV A using $N_1 = 40$ and $N_2 = 10$. The color bar is intentionally truncated at $-2$ and $2$. (b) the eddy diffusivity operator, $[\mathcal{D}]$, for the same problem.

from the linear-algebra-based MFM described by Equation (45). One can see qualitative similarity between this matrix and the standard second-order diffusion operator. Quantitatively however, the obtained macroscopic operator involves a non-local eddy diffusivity. To show this, we confirmed computationally that $[\mathcal{L}]$ can be written as the product of three matrices:

$$[\mathcal{L}] = -[\partial/\partial x_1] [\mathcal{D} + D_M I] [\partial/\partial x_1],$$

where $D_M = 0.05$ is the molecular diffusivity in the $x_1$ direction. The right-most $[\partial/\partial x_1]$ is a gradient operator utilizing the aforementioned ghost point scheme, and the left-most $[\partial/\partial x_1]$ is a divergence operator acting on the fluxes defined on the cell faces. The middle operator is the total diffusivity, and $[\mathcal{D}]$ is the eddy-diffusivity matrix whose entries are shown in Figure 8b. The non-locality of this operator is quantified by the off-diagonal entries in Figure 8b. It physically implies that the macroscopic flux at a location is not just dependent on the macroscopic gradients at the same location. Instead, one needs to combine the macroscopic gradients from a neighborhood.

Translating this result back to continuum space, we conclude that eddy diffusivity is described by a convolution kernel acting on the mean gradients,

$$-\overline{w'_1 c}(x_1) = \int_{y_1} \mathcal{D}(x_1, y_1) \frac{\partial \overline{c}}{\partial x_1}|_{y_1} dy_1.$$  

Extending this to multi-dimensions, eddy diffusivity is described by a tensorial kernel,
FIG. 9: (a) Numerically computed kernel at \(x_1 = 0\) associated with \(\mathcal{D}\) obtained from linear-algebra-based MFM for the described inhomogeneous problem. Different plots represent mesh refinement: squares (\(N_1 = 40, N_2 = 10\)), circles (\(N_1 = 80, N_2 = 20\)), solid line (\(N_1 = 160, N_2 = 40\)). (b) eddy diffusivity associated with the homogeneous operator \(\mathcal{D} = 1/\sqrt{1 - \partial^2/\partial x_1^2}\), also plotted in semi-log scales (c) and (d).

\(\mathcal{D}_{ji}(x,y)\), that expresses the macroscopic fluxes in terms of the macroscopic gradients as

\[
- \overline{u_j'c_i(x)} = \int_y \mathcal{D}_{ji}(x,y) \left( \overline{\tau c_i} \right) \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial x_j} |_y dy.
\]  

(50)

We predict that a similar result holds for the case of transported vector fields with the difference that the eddy-diffusivity operator will be described by a kernel involving a fourth-order tensor as

\[
- \overline{u_j'v_i'(x)} = \int_y \mathcal{D}_{jilk}(x,y) \left( \overline{\tau_{ik}} \right) \frac{\partial \tau_{ik}}{\partial x_l} |_y dy.
\]  

(51)

For the numerical example considered above, we show that the implied kernel from our discrete solution, \(\mathcal{D}(x_1, y_1, y_{1,i}) = [\mathcal{D}]_{ij} / \Delta x_1\), converges by mesh refinement (here, the problem is 1D, and subscripts after the bracket imply discrete mesh points). As an example, we show in Figure 9 a the plot of \(\mathcal{D}(x_1 = 0, y_1)\) versus \(y_1\) obtained after successive mesh refinements.
Below we report the major observations, and some speculations regarding their validity for more general settings:

1- For cases with zero normal velocity near a boundary and with boundary conditions that remain invariant under averaging, the eddy-diffusivity kernel vanishes near the boundary (see Figure 8b). Therefore, the macroscopic operator reduces to the molecular diffusivity operator near a boundary. This implies there is no need for additional boundary conditions when scaling up to the macroscopic fields.

2- In the present example, the macroscopic space was 1D and the eddy-diffusivity involved a positive kernel. For multidimensional systems the kernel is tensorial and entries can be positive or negative. It will be interesting to examine however, whether the diagonal entries of the tensor are positive-valued, and whether the tensor is positive definite.

3- In the present example, the computed \( \mathcal{D} \) was symmetric to the machine precision. This implies that if a mean gradient at \( x_{1A} \) result in a mean flux at \( x_{1B} \), the same mean gradient applied to \( x_{1B} \) will result in same mean flux at \( x_{1A} \). In other words, there is reciprocity in eddy diffusivity operator. It will be interesting to investigate under what conditions this reciprocity holds, and whether it is generalizable to cases with mean advection as well as cases with tensorial eddy diffusivity.

4- When the macroscopic dimensions are statistically homogeneous the eddy-diffusivity kernel can be simplified as \( \mathcal{D}(x,y) = \mathcal{D}(x-y) \), and thus convolution in the physical space will result in multiplication in the Fourier space. The specific fitted form for the eddy-diffusivity operator identified as \( \mathcal{D} = D/\sqrt{I-l^2}\partial^2/\partial x_1^2 \) (see Equations 28 and 40) results in a qualitatively similar kernel as that obtained for the inhomogeneous problem (see Figure 9b). Specifically, the kernel is positive for all values of \( y_1 \) and the kernel width is on the order of \( l \), which itself scales with the characteristic eddy size.

5- In the limit that the eddy size (i.e. kernel width) is much smaller than the macroscopic length, the eddy-diffusivity kernel can be safely approximated by a Dirac delta function. In other words, the convolution can be approximated as multiplication by the area under the kernel. This is what Taylor’s model, presented in Section 1B, achieves. Locality of the kernel width is also one of the key conditions necessary for the validity of the Boussinesq approximation. However, even in this limit, the eddy diffusivity is not necessarily an isotropic tensor further challenging the validity of the Boussinesq approximation.

6- In earlier sections we saw universally in all examples that in the limit of large wavenum-
ber, the macroscopic closure operator is proportional to \( k^1 \), implying that \( \hat{D} \sim k^{-1} \). Inverse transforming this relation to physical space implies that the eddy-diffusivity kernel, \( D(x, y) \), must be proportional to \( \log \left( 1/|x - y| \right) \) for small separation distances in macroscopic 1D settings as shown in Figure 9c. Consistently \( D(x, y) \sim 1/|x - y| \) in macroscopic 2D and \( D(x, y) \sim 1/(x - y)^2 \) in macroscopically 3D settings. These are all singular but integrable kernels.

7- In earlier sections we also observed that the eddy-diffusivity operator is a smooth curve in Fourier space. We here assume an infinitely differentiable curve in \( k \)-space. This implies that the kernel associated with the eddy diffusivity, \( D(x, y) \), must vanish exponentially in the limit of large \( |x - y| \) as shown in Figure 9d.

B. Inverse MFM

The insights gained from examination of the full macroscopic operator in Section IV A allows development of a more economical method for approximate determination of the macroscopic operator. To do this, we first introduce the inverse macroscopic forcing method (IMFM). The prior macroscopic forcing method, which should be called forward MFM (FMFM), determines \( \bar{c} \) in response to a specific macroscopic forcing. In contrast, IMFM obtains the macroscopic forcing required for sustaining a pre-specified \( \bar{c} \). For problems in which the microscopic PDE involves a time stepping process, IMFM is straightforward. Given the PDE

\[
\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} = f(c, \nabla c, t, ...) + s,
\]  

one simply can take the average of this equation to arrive at

\[
\frac{\partial \bar{c}}{\partial t} = \bar{f} + s.
\]  

By expanding the time discrete form of the left hand side term, and substituting \( \bar{c} (t + \Delta t) \) with the pre-specified \( \bar{c} \) one obtains an explicit expression for \( s = \bar{s} \) which can be substituted in the equation. For example, for the forward Euler time-stepping method \( s = (\bar{c} (t + \Delta t) - \bar{c} (t)) / \Delta t - \bar{f} (t) \). Substituting this expression in the microscopic PDE constrains \( \bar{c} \) to be the pre-specified value, but the non-macroscopic modes in \( c \) are allowed to evolve.
For problems with a steady microscopic PDE, this treatment can be used in conjunction with artificial time stepping, where the true \( s \) is evaluated in the long term limit. For turbulent flow problems that are statistically time stationary, the microscopic PDE is still time dependent. In such cases, \( s \) is time-independent but is needed instantaneously. One may run multiple ensembles of the simulation and use the ensemble average at each instant. In the limit of infinite ensembles, one will obtain a time stationary \( s \). However, one may run simulations using a finite number of ensembles and use the time average of the computed \( s \) as an improved estimate of the true \( s \). We observed this approach to be satisfactory and converge quickly with number of ensembles in our MFM analysis of turbulent channel flows (not presented here). While running simultaneous ensembles may increase computational cost per time step, it does not affect the total cost since convergence can be achieved over a proportionally lower number of time-steps.

Lastly we note that when performing IMFM, the initial condition and boundary conditions must be adjusted to be consistent with the input \( \bar{c} \). For example, while the left-right boundary conditions in the example discussed in Section IV A remain of Dirichlet type, the specified values of \( c \) at the boundary must be consistent with those of \( \bar{c} \) evaluated at the boundary.

The introduced IMFM methodology can be used as another brute force method to reveal columns of matrices associated with closure operators, or even in Fourier space for homogeneous problems. However, this method can also be used to reveal the low-order moments of the eddy-diffusivity with few DNS simulations as discussed below. We present this method specifically because it can offer a cost-effective MFM.

With the IMFM methodology described above one may use a small number of simulations to determine the low-order moments of the eddy-diffusivity kernel, \( D(x, y) \). For example, for the macroscopically 1D problem discussed in Section IV A by selecting \( \bar{c} = x_1 \) and performing one IMFM DNS, and post-processing the \( \bar{u}_1 \bar{c} \) data, one finds the zeroth moment of the kernel as (see Equation 49),

\[
D^0(x_1) = \int_{y_1} D(x_1, y_1) \, dy_1 = -u_1^0 c^1|_{c=x_1}.
\]  

(54)

As we shall see, \( D^0 \) is the coefficient of the leading-order macroscopic closure operator, which is the usual diffusion operator. In the limit that the “mean free path” or eddy size is much smaller than the macroscopic scale this will be the dominant operator. For multi-
dimensional problems, $D^0$ is replaced by a tensor due to its anisotropy, i.e. the Boussinesq law is not followed.

To quantify the non-local effects, higher order moments must be computed. The first moment of the eddy-diffusivity kernel can be computed by selecting $\bar{c} = x_1^2/2$ and performing IMFM. By combining with the results of the zeroth moment, one can write

$$D^1(x_1) = \int_{y_1} (y_1 - x_1) D(x_1, y_1) dy_1 = -\left( \bar{u}_1 c' \big|_{\bar{c} = x_1^2/2} - x_1 \bar{u}_1 c' \big|_{\bar{c} = x_1} \right),$$

where the last term on the right hand side can be substituted using $D^0$. Likewise, the second moment of $D$ can be computed as

$$D^2(x_1) = \int_{y_1} \frac{1}{2} (y_1 - x_1)^2 D(x_1, y_1) dy_1 = -\left( \bar{u}_1 c' \big|_{\bar{c} = x_1^2/6} - x_1 \bar{u}_1 c' \big|_{\bar{c} = x_1^2/2} + \left( \frac{x_1^2}{2} \right) \bar{u}_1 c' \big|_{\bar{c} = x_1} \right).$$

One may generalize this recursive methodology to compute higher moments of $D$. Determination of the leading-order moments requires few IMFM DNSs, and thus it is much less costly than the brute force MFM.

The additional advantage of IMFM, either in the context of moments or even when used as a brute force method, is that it allows direct probing of the desired unclosed terms in the macroscopic operator. For example, in this case, one may directly determine the operator associated with the unclosed flux $\overline{u_1 c'}$, without requiring first obtaining the full macroscopic operator $\mathcal{L}$ (as done in FMFM). Aside from cost saving, closure of individual fluxes, as opposed to the full unclosed term, has the advantage of guaranteeing conservativeness of the macroscopic model. For more complicated microscopic systems that may involve multiple unclosed terms, IMFM allows probing of different unclosed terms independently, and thus provides more insightful guidelines for modeling and understanding of the underlying dynamics. Note that in IMFM, the forcing field $s$ is not explicitly used when examining the macroscopic operator.

Next, we discuss how the macroscopic operators can be constructed with reasonable accuracy from the knowledge of these moments.

C. Construction of the Macroscopic Operators from Kernel Moments

Having moments of $D$ at hand, the task is to approximate the convolution integrals in (50). We first consider a non-convergent, but conceptually insightful, approximation.
1. Approximation of kernel integral using Taylor series

The integral in Equation (50) can be rewritten by expanding $\partial \bar{c}/\partial x_i$ in terms of its spatial Taylor series around $y = x$. Substitution and utilization of the defined moments leads to representations of $u'_j c'$ in terms of a series involving spatial derivatives of $\bar{c}$ with the computed moments as pre-factors to each term. For example, for the test case considered in Section IV A, the unclosed flux, and thus the macroscopic closure operator, can be modeled as

$$-u'_i c' (x_1) = \left[ D^0 (x_1) + D^1 (x_1) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + D^2 (x_1) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1^2} + \ldots \right] \frac{\partial \bar{c}}{\partial x_1}. \quad (57)$$

The leading term in this expansion, $D^0$, is the local approximation to the eddy-diffusivity operator; it approximates the kernel with a Dirac delta function with matching integral. Higher order terms in (57) are approximations of the non-local effects based on local Taylor series of $\bar{c}$ (!). These terms involve the higher moments of $D$ which can become significant when the macroscopic scale becomes comparable to the kernel’s characteristic width, i.e., eddy size.

One might expect that a truncated expansion based on a few moments beyond $D^0$ could result in considerable model improvement. Such expansion would still lead to a well-posed differential equation, since coefficients (to higher derivatives) vanish near the boundary as the kernel itself vanishes, and thus a model based on this expansion does not impose requirement of additional boundary conditions. However, the expansion presented in Equation (57) is not useful in practice since addition of higher moments does not lead to convergence of the solution. For example, considering the test case discussed in Section IV A, we use DNS of the following microscopic system to assess performance of macroscopic models,

$$u_1 \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_1} + u_2 \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_2} = 0.05 \frac{\partial^2 c}{\partial x_1^2} + \frac{\partial^2 c}{\partial x_2^2} + 1. \quad (58)$$

Figure 10.a shows the 2D DNS results and Figure 10.b shows the macroscopic fields. A macroscopic model that retains only the leading operator, $D^0$, performs a reasonable job in predicting the qualitative features of the mean field, while still lacking quantitatively. When expansion (57) is used, addition of the new terms did not lead to prediction improvement despite relatively smooth mean fields.

This observation is consistent with the issue seen in Section II A when we examined homogeneous parallel flow systems. In fact Taylor’s model represented the zeroth moment
FIG. 10: (a) contour plots representing concentration field computed from 2D DNS of Equation (58). (b) concentration averaged in the $x_2$ direction: solid, DNS; dashed, eddy diffusivity represented by Equation (57) but including only $D^0$; dash-dotted, eddy diffusivity represented by Equation (57) including $D^0$ and $D^1$ terms; circle, eddy diffusivity obtained from the kernel reconstruction method.

of the macroscopic diffusivity kernel for the considered flow while its perturbative correction was indeed an analytical derivation of the higher moments in the expansion of convolution integral (with the exception that in the analytical derivation in Section II A we considered the unsteady problem and thus captured both spatial and temporal moments). As previously shown in Figure 2.c, addition of terms in the moment expansion does not result in improved macroscopic prediction.

It turns out, the expansion in (57) is analogous to the Kramers-Moyal expansion previously formulated for the statistical description of stochastic processes associated with Brownian dynamics. Lack of convergence of this expansion has been previously investigated as described by the Pawula theorem. Likewise, in these applications, while the leading moment promisingly captures a significant portion of the macroscopic behavior, addition of higher moments do not improve quantitative prediction. We are aware of one previous work reporting analogy to the Kramers-Moyal expansion in the continuum context in their analytical study of laminar transport of reacting scalars in porous media.
2. Approximate kernel reconstruction

Although Equation (57) is not a useful expansion in practice, the computed moments from IMFM are still valuable in the sense that one can utilize them to construct converging macroscopic operators. We next show an example of such construction. Our approach has been guided by the fact that all higher-order operators beyond $D^0$ are inherently non-local. We therefore construct approximate convolution kernels that match the moments obtained from MFM. The details of the procedure for the example problem in Figure 10 are as follows.

We first used IMFM to compute the first three moments of $D_i$, i.e., $D^0, D^1, D^2$. We then constructed positively valued kernels that matched the computed moments at each $x_1$. One approach would be to assume known kernel profiles, and tune their parameters to match the low-order moments (see Appendix E). We then used the constructed kernel to setup the macroscopic equation as,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left[ \int_{y_1} D_i(x_1, y_1) \left( \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x_1} \right) |_{y_1} dy_1 + 0.05 \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x_1} \right] + 1 = 0. $$

This macroscopic equation can be solved numerically after discretization. For practical problems involving 3D convolution integrals, one may need to design iterative techniques for fast approximate calculation of the convolution integral. Figure 10.b shows the macroscopic solution obtained through the reconstructed kernel method. Compared to prediction of the model that retains only the leading operator, $D^0$, the solution from the reconstructed kernel, not only shows convergence, but also significant quantitative improvement.

Due to the limited scope of this report, we skip providing examples of the application of IMFM for analysis of inhomogeneous and wall-bounded turbulent flows. However, this is our main intention in developing the presented methodology. Extension to turbulent flows and its advantages are straightforward and clear. Such extensions will help turbulence models in two ways. First, by considering only linear mean momentum profiles in GMT, and performing IMFM, one can measure the full tensorial form of the leading-order eddy diffusivity

$$D^0_{ijkl}(x) = -\overline{u'_i v'_j | v_m = x_n \delta_{il} \delta_{mk}}. \quad (59)$$

In other words, with only nine DNS simulations, the local (leading) term in the eddy-diffusivity operator can be measured precisely. One can then use this knowledge to quantitatively assess the anisotropy in momentum mixing by the underlying turbulent flow. To
this end, IMFM acts as a non-intrusive rheometer determining the macroscopic “material properties” of the underlying turbulence.

Second, by computing the higher moments of $D$ one can quantitatively assess the level of non-locality involved in turbulent mixing. Quantitative and independent assessments of anisotropy and non-locality provide invaluable insights in determining the missing pieces in today’s RANS models.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We presented a systematic numerical procedure, which we call MFM, for determination of scaled up operators describing the macroscopic influence of microscopic transport processes. MFM is applicable to both laminar and turbulent flows, homogeneous and inhomogeneous flows, and can be used to examine transport of scalar fields as well as vector fields such as those describing momentum as a transported quantity.

For a given setting, MFM can obtain the exact macroscopic differential operator governing the evolution of mean fields. However, MFM does not solve the closure problem in turbulence modeling. This is because MFM obtains the operator coefficients explicitly in terms of the independent coordinates for each specific setup. Tackling the turbulence closure question requires expressing these coefficients in terms of the mean field quantities themselves resulting in nonlinear operators. The advantage of MFM is therefore in quantification of the model-form error and identification of improved model forms. Whether the RANS model should involve an anisotropic but local eddy diffusivity or a non-local operator, the presented methodology can provide this information quantitatively.

Additionally, MFM provides a robust framework for RANS model verification. In today’s practice, RANS model forms are postulated based on physical intuition, and their coefficients are tuned using reference data from configurations similar to those in real applications. Therefore, when a model generates accurate mean velocity profiles, it is unclear to what degree the good performance is due to cancellation of model-form error with coefficient error. Performing MFM on specific geometries, and direct comparison with RANS operators allows a more rigorous verification of RANS models.

We point out that MFM is an expensive procedure (either forward or inverse), involving at least multiple DNS solutions. Therefore, we expect this method to be mostly used to
investigate canonical problems. The hope is that an understanding of closure operators in canonical flows will reveal some universality, and that this understanding can be extendable to flows with more complex geometries. As an example, we showed how application of MFM in homogeneous and isotropic turbulence can inform new RANS operators which then led to significant improvements in prediction of axisymmetric jet flows without requiring an MFM analysis of jets.

Examination of the macroscopic operators for homogeneous flows in Fourier space revealed a smooth curve with $k^2$ scaling in the low-wavenumber limit and $k^1$ scaling in the high-wavenumber limit. The $k^1$ scaling was universally observed in a wide range of conditions for both laminar and turbulent problems and for both scalar and momentum transport. While the $k^1$ scaling is consistent with the intuitive expectation of bounded dispersion speed, the pre-factor to this scaling is real and positive, and thus cannot be captured by an advective operator. Instead, we showed that this scaling is indicative of a non-local, but dissipative mechanism of transport, as suggested by the fitted operator, $\nabla \left[ D / \sqrt{1 - l^2 \nabla^2} \right] \nabla$.

Due to presence of two asymptotic scalings in the small and large $k$ limits, the non-locality does not conform to a simple fractional-order differential operator expressed as a Laplacian to a non-integer power. Extending our observations to inhomogeneous cases, we conclude that fractional order PDEs are likely limited in scope for describing macroscopic transport. Instead one needs to consider non-locality in a broader sense, as described by the introduced kernel $D(x,y)$ that expresses mean fluxes in terms of a weighted superposition of the surrounding mean field gradients.

We point out that MFM can also enrich LES modeling in the long term. One fundamental approach is to recast the LES modeling problem in the MFM context by modifying the definition of averages that are used here. A more immediately accessible approach is to utilize knowledge derived from MFM in the RANS context. For example, the reported $k^1$ scaling of macroscopic operator for the high-wavenumber limit is also expected in the case of LES, implying the LES eddy diffusivity should vanish in the high-wavenumber limit. Additionally, the required anisotropy treatments in wall-modeled LES can be informed from anisotropy of $D$ to be understood in the RANS context.

While in this report we considered scalar and momentum transport in the context of incompressible flows, it is possible to envision extension of MFM for broader applications including reacting scalars, compressible systems, shock-turbulence interactions, and buoy-
ancy driven flows. These are examples where anisotropy and/or coupling with other physics is known to impose challenge in modeling. MFM is a valuable tool that can shed light into effects of multiphysics coupling on closure operators in a quantitative manner.

MFM can be viewed as a numerical rheometer, similar to the way that molecular dynamics simulations predict continuum-level transport coefficients. Experimental rheometers measure momentum diffusivity due to the underlying chaotic Browning dynamics. When using them, the key fundamental assumption is that placing of the material under the rheometer does not affect the chaotic Browning dynamics responsible for transport of momentum. Experimental rheometry of turbulence is not possible due to violation of this condition. In this sense, a novel aspect of our work is recasting the Navier-Stokes equation in a more general form by separating the roles of velocity as a transporter and transportee. Rigorous rheometry must be non-intrusive to the transporter mechanism but it can be intrusive to the transportee field. Given emerging supercomputing power, MFM provides a fresh opportunity to study turbulence by measuring its “material properties”.
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Appendix A: Solution to Equation (21)

Substitution of Equation (22) into (21) results in a series involving \( \cos (nx_2) \). The product \( \cos (nx_2) \cos (x_2) \) can be expanded as \( (1/2) \cos [(n + 1)x_2] + (1/2) \cos [(n - 1)x_2] \). Using this expansion and balancing the left-hand side and right-hand side of the equation for each term
results in

\[ i\omega a_0 + \frac{ik}{2} a_1 = 1, \quad (A1) \]
\[ ik a_0 + (i\omega + 1) a_1 + \frac{ik}{2} a_2 = 0, \quad (A2) \]
\[ \frac{ik}{2} a_{n-1} + (i\omega + n^2) a_n + \frac{ik}{2} a_{n+1} = 0, \quad (A3) \]

where the last equation applies for \( n \geq 2 \). The recursive relation in \( (A3) \) needs two initial conditions, i.e., \( a_1 \) and \( a_2 \). Depending on the ratio of \( a_1 \) and \( a_2 \), it admits two modes of solutions, one increasing in magnitude exponentially, and one decreasing in magnitude exponentially. To obtain a physical solution, we impose the condition that the exponentially increasing mode must be zero. This condition sets a unique value for the ratio \( a_1/a_2 \). We investigated this condition by rewriting \( (A3) \) in terms of \( r_n = a_n/a_{n-1} \) and re-arranging as

\[ r_{n+1} = \frac{2(-n^2 - i\omega)}{ik} - \frac{1}{r_n}. \]

The question is to determine the value of \( r_2 \) such that this recursive relation leads to \( |r_{n\to\infty}| \) smaller than unity. A randomly selected \( r_2 \) leads to unbounded \( |r_{n\to\infty}| \). This can be understood better when thinking in terms of Equation \( (A3) \). A random combination of \( a_1 \) and \( a_2 \) will have both exponentially increasing and decreasing modes present. Even with a small pre-factor, the exponentially increasing mode eventually prevails for sufficiently large \( n \). Only when the ratio of \( a_1 \) and \( a_2 \) are set to precisely remove the increasing mode, one will obtain the physically correct solution. Our numerical trick is to use the recursive relation backward in \( n \). By choosing a random finite number for \( r_N \) where \( N \) is a sufficiently large number, we solve the above recursive relation backward in \( n \) to find a value for \( r_2 \). Moving backward in \( n \) suppresses the relative contribution of the exponentially increasing mode. Starting from sufficiently large \( N \), on the order of \( O(100) \), we find the physical value of \( r_2 \) to be converged within many significant digits. Once the ratio \( a_2/a_1 \) is at hand, one can solve Equations \( (A1) \) and \( (A2) \) to obtain \( a_0 \).

**Appendix B: Numerical Solution of Equation (24)**

Even though in other sections we have solved macroscopic equations directly in physical space using techniques of linear algebra, for the specific problem discussed in Section \( \text{II A} \), it was easier to solve the problem in the Fourier space for both spatial and temporal dimensions.
To do this, we represent the initial condition as a source term that is activated at time $t = 0$ via a Dirac delta function,

$$s(x_1, t) = \exp\left(-x_1^2/0.025\right) \delta(t).$$

The above expression is Fourier transformed in space and time using a physical mesh with $\Delta x_1 = 0.05$ and $\Delta t = 0.025$ and a truncated domain $-5 \leq x_1 \leq 5$. $\mathcal{S}(k, \omega)$ is then divided by $\mathcal{L}(k, \omega) = \sqrt{(1 + i\omega)^2 + k^2 - 1}$ and then inverse transformed to obtain $c(x_1, t)$ in the physical space.

Next, we discuss the treatment of mode $k = \omega = 0$. Given that the temporal domain is not infinite, this procedure results in a time-periodic solution corresponding to repeated spontaneous injections of scalar in the domain. To eliminate the artifacts associated with this periodicity, we applied the following remedies. First, the temporal domain is taken to be substantially large ($0 \leq t \leq 40$). This time is longer than the diffusion time over the entire spatial domain, and ensures that for each period the effects of previous cycles have vanished except for their spatial mean. The second remedy is to correct the spatial mean of $\mathcal{C}$ to avoid a linear growth due to the periodic cycles. To this end, the mode $k = 0$ is solved analytically in the physical space using the trivial differential equation $\partial/\partial t = 0$.

To verify our method, we repeat this procedure using the exact $\mathcal{L}$, obtained through MFM discussed in Appendix A and confirm that the obtained $c(x_1, t)$ matches that of the two-dimensional DNS solved in the physical space under resolution refinement.

Appendix C: Macroscopic Operator for a Solenoidal Passive Vector Field Subject to a Parallel Flow

As discussed in Section II C, we consider the simple limit of zero streamwise microscopic diffusivity ($\epsilon = 0$), and steady limit of the microscopic equations. By considering $s_2 = \exp(i k x_1)$, $v_i = \hat{v}_i(x_2) \exp(i k x_1)$ and $q = \hat{q}(x_2) \exp(i k x_1)$, we seek the solution in Fourier space. Substituting these expressions in (29) and (30) and simplification results in

$$ik \cos (x_2) \hat{v}_1 = \frac{d^2 \hat{v}_1}{dx_2^2} - ik \hat{q}, \quad (C1)$$

$$ik \cos (x_2) \hat{v}_2 = \frac{d^2 \hat{v}_2}{dx_2^2} - \hat{q}' + 1, \quad (C2)$$
\[ ik \hat{v}_1 + \frac{d\hat{v}_2}{dx_2} = 0. \quad (C3) \]

One may eliminate variables by combining these equations and obtain a single equation for the unknown \( \hat{v}_2 \).

\[ ik \cos (x_2) \hat{v}_2 + \frac{1}{k^2} \frac{d^4 \hat{v}_2}{dx_4^4} + \frac{1}{ik} \frac{d}{dx_2} \left[ \cos (x_2) \frac{d\hat{v}_2}{dx_2} \right] - \frac{d^2 \hat{v}_2}{dx_2^2} = 1. \quad (C4) \]

Next, we consider the following series solution for \( \hat{v}_2 \)

\[ \hat{v}_2 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \cos (n x_2). \quad (C5) \]

Substitution in \( (C4) \) and rearranging leads to

\[ ika_1 = 2 \quad (C6) \]

\[ 2ik^3 a_0 + 2 \left( k^2 + 1 \right) a_1 + ik \left( k^2 + 2 \right) a_2 = 0 \quad (C7) \]

\[ ik \left( k^2 + n (n - 1) \right) a_{n-1} + 2 \left( n^2 k^2 + n^4 \right) a_n + ik \left( k^2 + n (n + 1) \right) a_{n+1} = 0, n \geq 2. \quad (C8) \]

The solution methodology is similar to what we discussed in Appendix A since the system of equations are similar to those obtained for the scalar field. Once this solution at hand, one can obtain the macroscopic closure operator as \( \hat{L}'(k) = \hat{s}_2/\hat{v}_2 = 1/a_0(k) \).

**Appendix D: Details of RANS Solutions for the Axisymmetric Jet**

For this problem we follow the solution of Tollmien by seeking a similarity solution of the form

\[ \bar{u}(x, r) = \frac{1}{x} f(\eta) = \frac{1}{x} f \left( \frac{r}{x} \right), \quad (D1) \]

where \( u \) is the axial velocity and \( x \) and \( r \) are the axial and radial coordinates respectively. Following approximations for semi-parallel flows, the RANS equation can be written as:

\[ \frac{\bar{u}}{\bar{u}} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} + \bar{v} \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial r} = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( -r \bar{u} \bar{v}' \right), \quad (D2) \]

where \( \bar{v} = (1/x) g(\eta) \) is the mean radial velocity and can be computed from \( f \) via integral of the continuity equation as

\[ \eta_0 g(\eta_0) = \int_0^{\eta_0} \eta \frac{d}{d\eta} \left[ \eta f(\eta) \right] d\eta. \quad (D3) \]
In Prandtl Mixing Length Model (PMLM), the following closure model is used

\[ -\overline{uv'} = D \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial r}, \]  

(D4)

where the eddy diffusivity, \( D \), is approximated as the product of a mixing length and a velocity scale, \( D = l_p u_p \). The Prandtl mixing length, \( l_p \), is assumed to scale with the jet half width

\[ l_p = \alpha_1 r_{50} = \alpha_1 x \eta_{50}, \]

where \( \eta_{50} \) is defined such that \( f(\eta_{50}) = f(0)/2 \), and \( \alpha_1 \) is an order unity constant to be determined. The Prandtl velocity scale, \( u_p \), is assumed to scale with the product of the mixing length and mean velocity gradient as

\[ u_p = \alpha_2 l_p |\partial \bar{u}/\partial r|. \]

With this description, the closure model becomes

\[ -\overline{uv'} = \alpha_2 \alpha_1^2 r_{50}^2 \left[ \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial r} \right] \left[ \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial r} \right]. \]

Substitution of this model in (D2) results in the following similarity ODE

\[ -f \frac{d}{d\eta} (\eta f) + g \frac{d f}{d\eta} = 1 \frac{d}{\eta} \frac{d f}{d\eta} \left[ \alpha_2 \alpha_1^2 \eta_{50} \right] \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial \eta} \right| \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial \eta} \right|. \]  

(D5)

In PMLM, it is only necessary to prescribe the combined constant \( \alpha_2 \alpha_1^2 \); the model remains ambiguous about the independent values of \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \).

In the MFM-inspired closure model, we replace the eddy diffusivity in (D4) with an operator similar to that in Equation (40). Following simplifications for semi-parallel flows, this leads to the following closure model

\[ -\overline{uv'} = \left\{ I - l_p^2 \left[ \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right) - \frac{1}{r^2} \right] \right\}^{-\frac{1}{2}} D \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial r}. \]  

(D6)

Given both \( l_p \) in PMLM and \( l \) in MFM-based operators scale with large eddy size (also quantified as \( \text{urms}^3/\varepsilon \)), and given \( \alpha_1 \) is still a free parameter, we can simplify the analysis by defining \( l_p = l \). Substituting this model into (D2) and rearranging terms results in the following similarity ODE

\[ -f \frac{d}{d\eta} (\eta f) + g \frac{d f}{d\eta} = \left( \eta \left\{ I - \alpha_2^2 \eta_{50}^2 \left[ \frac{1}{\eta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \left( \eta \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \right) - \frac{1}{r^2} \right] \right\}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left[ \alpha_2 \alpha_1^2 \eta_{50} \right] \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial \eta} \right| \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial \eta} \right) \right). \]  

(D7)
We solved both equations (D5) and (D7) each coupled with (D3), to respectively represents solutions of the original and MFM-inspired RANS models. The numerical procedure used a second-order central difference scheme. The square root and inverse operators in (D7) were computed using MATLAB’s commands after casting the operators in matrix format. The computational domain was \( 0 \leq \eta \leq 0.9 \). At \( \eta = 0 \) a normalization condition \( f = 1 \) was used, while \( \eta = 0.9 \) was assumed to be sufficiently outside of the jet profile such that use of a dirichlet condition \( f = 0 \) would be justifiable. An iterative procedure was designed to converge to the steady solution.

The remaining task is determination of coefficients \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \). In PMLM the combined coefficient \( \alpha_2 \alpha_1^2 \) is the only coefficient that must be determined, but this coefficient is tuned rather than being derived. In our analysis of this model we selected \( \alpha_2 \alpha_1^2 = 0.05 \) so that the computed \( \eta_{50} = 0.0925 \) matches that inferred from the experimental plot in Figure 6b. In the MFM-based closure model, however, two independent parameters must be determined. In order to allow a genuine assessment of this model we must avoid additional tuning to minimize the possibility of coincidental matching of model solution with the experimental data. We used the following physics-based reasoning to select the parameter \( \alpha_1 \) (instead of tuning).

Given the MFM analysis of HIT, presented in Section III B and reported in more detail in [33], \( l_p \) must be

\[
l_p = L = C u_{rms}^3 / \varepsilon,
\]

where \( C \) is a constant and we seek its value in the limit of high Re. Shirian and Mani reported \( C \) to be 0.69 for \( Re_\lambda = 26 \) and 0.67 for \( Re_\lambda = 40 \) (see their Table II). We anticipate \( C \) to be a bit smaller than 0.67 in the much higher Re limit, but given all uncertainties, we continue our analysis by assuming \( C = 0.6 \).

Next, we substitute for \( u_{rms} \) and \( \varepsilon \) in (D8) using reported experimental measurements of the jet centerline. A recent high-quality data is provided by Darisse et al. [38]. While this study reports a mean centerline velocity profile consistent to that of Hussein [35], which we used in Figure 6, they provide more accuracy in reporting of kinetic energy and dissipation rates. From this study we estimate \( u_{rms} = 0.22 \) (see Figure 5 in [38]), and \( \varepsilon = 0.017 \) (see Figure 13 in [38]), both in units of centerline velocity and \( r_{50} \). Substituting these results in (D8) yields, \( l_p = 0.38 r_{50} \). Hence, \( \alpha_1 = 0.38 \) or equivalently \( \alpha_1 \eta_{50} = 0.035 \), which is the value we implemented in Equation (D7).
Likewise to PMLM approach, we selected $\alpha_2 \alpha_1^2$ such that the computed $\eta_{50} = 0.0925$ matches the experimental result ($\alpha_2 \alpha_1^2 = 0.065$). Figure 6b shows significant improvement in prediction of the mean velocity profile owing to modification of the RANS operator. The slight remaining mismatch near the axis of symmetry is attributed to the inaccuracy of PMLM coefficients as opposed to the model form; PMLM incorrectly prescribes a vanishingly small $D$ near the axis of symmetry.

Appendix E: Kernel Reconstruction from Moments

For the problem considered in Section IV C 2, we considered an approximate kernel described by

\[
D(x_1, y_1) = \begin{cases} 
    h(x_1) \exp\left(\frac{x_1 - y_1}{l_1(x_1)}\right), & x_1 < y_1; \\
    h(x_1) \exp\left(\frac{y_1 - x_1}{l_2(x_1)}\right), & x_1 \geq y_1.
\end{cases}
\] (E1)

For each $x_1$-position, the moments of the above kernel form can be computed analytically in terms of $h$, $l_1$ and $l_2$. By matching these moments to those obtained from IMFM, we obtained profiles of $h$, $l_1$ and $l_2$ versus $x_1$. Aside from kernel shape approximation and discretization errors, we commit two additional errors when matching the moments. First, the analytical computation of the moments in terms of $h$, $l_1$ and $l_2$ does not consider domain truncation by walls. In other words, we assume that $l_1$, $l_2$, and $h$ become sufficiently small near the wall to allow neglecting of this error. Second, in rare points where the matched value of $l_1$ or $l_2$ becomes negative, we replace its value with zero. By utilizing such kernels we show in Figure 10 significant improvements in prediction of mean concentration field in comparison to that obtained from the local eddy diffusivity. This kernel reconstruction method also resolves the convergence issue observed when corrections to the leading operator was incorporated using expansions based on Taylor series and moments.

For the specific problem considered here, we avoided using the canonical homogeneous kernel, $D = D/\sqrt{I - l^2 \partial^2 / \partial x_1^2}$ because this kernel is symmetric in space, while the actual kernel involves spatial asymmetry near the boundaries. However, we here briefly note that
in a homogeneous system the moments of this kernel are $D^0 = D$, $D^1 = 0$, and $D^2 = Dl^2/2$.


