Resolved energy budget of superstructures in Rayleigh-Bénard convection
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Turbulent flows in nature often exhibit large-scale flow structures despite the presence of small-scale fluctuations. These so-called turbulent superstructures play a crucial role in many geo- and astrophysical flows. In turbulent Rayleigh-Bénard convection, for example, horizontally extended coherent large-scale convection rolls emerge. Currently, a detailed understanding of the interplay of small-scale turbulent fluctuations and large-scale coherent structures is missing. Here, we investigate the resolved energy and thermal variance budgets by applying a filtering approach to direct numerical simulations of Rayleigh-Bénard convection at high aspect ratio. In particular, we focus on the energy transfer rate between large-scale flow structures and small-scale fluctuations. We show that the small scales primarily act as a dissipation for the superstructures. However, we find that the height-dependent energy transfer rate has a complex structure with distinct bulk and boundary layer features. Additionally, we observe that the heat transfer rate is restricted to the thermal boundary layer. Our results clarify the interplay of superstructures and turbulent fluctuations and may help to guide the development of an effective description of large-scale flow features in terms of reduced-order models.

1. Introduction

Turbulent flows in nature are a ubiquitous phenomenon and often show a surprising large-scale order, even though turbulence is associated with small-scale fluctuations and chaotic, irregular motion. Prominent examples are cloud streets in the atmosphere (Atkinson & Zhang 1996) or solar granulation (Nordlund et al. 2009). Many physical systems, such as the atmosphere or the interior of stars and planets are driven by thermal gradients leading to convection. Currently little is known about the interplay of small-scale fluctuations and large-scale order, but a detailed understanding is of importance for the development of reduced-order models in climate science, as well as in geo- and astrophysical settings. Therefore, the goal of this work is to better understand the coexistence of this large-scale order and turbulence in convective flows.

Rayleigh-Bénard convection (RBC) is an idealized system to study convection and has been successfully employed to understand various phenomena such as pattern formation,
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spatiotemporal chaos \cite{Bodenschatz2000, Getling1998} and turbulence \cite{Lohse2010, Chillà2012}. In this paper, we investigate this idealized flow to clarify the energetics of the large-scale convection rolls and the impact of small-scale fluctuations.

RBC is a confined flow between a heated bottom plate and a cooled top plate. It is governed by three nondimensional control parameters, the Rayleigh number $Ra$, characterizing the strength of the thermal driving, the Prandtl number $Pr$, which is the ratio between kinematic viscosity and thermal diffusivity and the aspect ratio $\Gamma$ of system length to height. Above the onset of convection, at which the heat transfer changes from conduction to convection, a rich dynamics can be observed \cite[see, e.g.,][]{Bodenschatz2000}. Close to onset, the flow organizes into regular convection rolls. As the Rayleigh number is increased, the flow becomes increasingly complex. For example, at moderate Rayleigh numbers in high aspect ratio RBC, the dynamics of the convection rolls becomes chaotic, exhibiting spiral defect chaos (SDC), see e.g. \cite{Morris1993} for an early study, or \cite{Bodenschatz2000} and references therein for an overview. At much higher Rayleigh numbers, the flow becomes turbulent and features prominent smaller-scale flow structures such as thermal plumes \cite{Siggia1994, Grossmann2004, Lohse2010, Schumacher2018}.

As visualized in figure [1], even in the turbulent regime, horizontally extended large-scale convection rolls, so-called turbulent superstructures, have been observed in direct numerical simulations of large aspect ratio systems \cite{Hartlep2003, Parodi2004, Shishkina2006, vonHardenberg2008, Emran2015, Pandey2018, Stevens2018}. Their large-scale structure and dynamics can be revealed, for example, by time averaging \cite{Emran2015, Pandey2018}, and they are composed of clustered plumes \cite{Parodi2004}. Turbulent superstructures vary on time scales much larger than the characteristic free-fall time \cite{Pandey2018}, and their length scale increases with $Ra$ \cite{Hartlep2003, 2005, Shishkina2006, Pandey2018}. However, recent findings suggest that in the high Rayleigh number regime between $2 \times 10^7$ and $10^9$, their length scale is independent of $Ra$ \cite{Stevens2018}. They also appear to have a close connection to the boundary layer (BL) dynamics \cite{Pandey2018, Stevens2018}, e.g. the local maxima and minima of the temperature in the midplane coincide with the position of hot and cold plume ridges. Additionally, the presence of the large-scale flow has important consequences for the temperature statistics in RBC \cite{Lülf2011, 2015} and affects its standard deviation and kurtosis \cite{Stevens2018} as well as the heat transport \cite{Stevens2018, Fonda2019}. For moderate Rayleigh numbers, their dynamics is reminiscent of SDC in the weakly nonlinear regime \cite{Emran2015}. This points at the possibility of establishing connections to flows at much lower Rayleigh number, which are theoretically tractable by methods such as linear stability analysis and order parameter equations \cite{Bodenschatz2000, Manneville1990}. This is of considerable interest because so far only a few attempts to theoretically understand these turbulent large-scale patterns exist. \cite{Elperin2002, 2006a} found large-scale instabilities based on a mean field theory with advanced closures. \cite{Ibbeken2019} studied the effect of small-scale fluctuations on large-scale patterns in a generalized Swift-Hohenberg model, and have shown that the fluctuations lead to an increased wavelength of the large-scale patterns. Still, the principal mechanism of the formation of the large-scale pattern and the selection of their length scale is not fully understood in turbulent RBC, and the emergence of large-scale rolls in the turbulent regime leaves many open questions. For example, the interplay between superstructures and small-scale turbulence
is currently largely unexplored. Thus, the main aim of this article is to clarify the impact of turbulence on the large-scale patterns.

To analyze the interplay between the different scales, we here focus on the energy and thermal variance budgets of the superstructures and the corresponding transfer rates between large-scale flow structures and small-scale fluctuations. We investigate RBC by means of direct numerical simulations (DNS) in large aspect ratio systems from the weakly nonlinear regime close to onset at $Ra = 10^4$ up to the moderately turbulent regime at $Ra = 10^7$ for $Pr = 1$. We then apply a filtering approach (Germano 1992) to isolate the superstructure dynamics. The scale-resolved energy and thermal variance budgets of convective flows have previously been studied by Kimmel & Domaradzki (2000); Togni et al. (2017, 2019) with respect to large eddy simulation models for small scales and by Togni et al. (2015) using velocity and temperature increment statistics. These studies revealed an inverse energy transfer from smaller to larger scales close to the wall, which is closely connected to the enlargement of plumes during impinging. This is also consistent with findings in other wall-bounded turbulent flows, which appear to show pronounced inverse energy transfer, see e.g. Domaradzki et al. (1994); Marati et al. (2004); Cimarelli & De Angelis (2011, 2012); Cimarelli et al. (2015).

In this work, we characterize the energy balance for a wide range of scales with a focus on the scale of the large-scale patterns. We study the energy budget of superstructures and in particular the role of turbulent fluctuations. We first introduce the theoretical and numerical background for the subsequent analysis in section 2 before the results are presented and discussed in section 3. At the scale of the superstructures, we find that the global, i.e. time- and volume-averaged, energy input into the large scales is

Figure 1: Temperature fields in the midplane for two different Rayleigh numbers with $Pr = 1$ and aspect ratio 24. Red indicates hot rising fluid and blue cold descending fluid. Close to onset in the weakly nonlinear regime, regular patterns with wavelength $\lambda_s$ emerge. Connected large-scale structures are present in the turbulent regime as well, and their length scale $\lambda_s$ is increased compared to onset. The small-scale fluctuations can be removed with a filter width $l_s$, which preserves the large-scale rolls. For similar visualizations of turbulent superstructures see also Stevens et al. (2018); Pandey et al. (2018).
primarily balanced by the energy transfer rate to small scales. The large-scale viscous
dissipation is comparably weak at (sufficiently) high $Ra \geq 10^7$. To understand the role
of the boundary layers, we supplement the volume-averaged analysis with a study of the
horizontally (and time-) averaged height profiles of the energy budget. We find that these
profiles exhibit a complex near-wall structure. In a layer close to the wall, we identify a
region of inverse energy transfer in which energy is transferred from the small scales to
the large scales. In comparison to that, we observe that the energy transfer in the bulk is
exclusively dissipative. We additionally complement the analysis of the resolved energy
budget with that of the resolved thermal variance budget. We show that the resolved
thermal dissipation and heat transfer rates at sufficiently high Rayleigh number attain
a constant value at large scales. Our findings on the height dependence reveal that the
substantial part of the heat transfer rate between scales is strongly restricted to the
boundary layers.

2. Theoretical and numerical background

To begin with, we introduce the underlying equations and methods. We present in
detail the filtering approach as well as the resolved energy and thermal variance budgets
used to study the transfer rates between scales. We then describe the numerical data to
which the analysis is applied.

2.1. Governing equations

RBC is governed by the Oberbeck-Boussinesq equations (OBEs), which describe the
evolution of the velocity $u$ and the temperature fluctuation $\theta$, i.e. the deviation from
the mean temperature. In this setup it is assumed that the density varies with temper-
ature, but the variations are small, such that the fluid can still be considered as being
incompressible (Chillà & Schumacher 2012). Explicitly, the non-dimensionalized, three-
dimensional equations are

$$\nabla \cdot u = 0 \quad (2.1a)$$
$$\partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u = -\nabla p^* + \sqrt{Pr \frac{Ra}{Ra}} \nabla^2 u + \theta \hat{z} \quad (2.1b)$$
$$\partial_t \theta + u \cdot \nabla \theta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{Pr Ra}} \nabla^2 \theta, \quad (2.1c)$$

in which $p^*$ is the kinematic pressure including gravity, which points in the negative
$z$-direction. Here $\hat{z}$ is the unit vector in the vertical direction. The equations are non-
dimensionalized with the free-fall time $t_f = \sqrt{H/(\alpha g \Delta)}$ and velocity $u_f = H/t_f$, where
$\Delta$ is the temperature difference between top and bottom, and $H$ is the height of the
system. The system is subject to two control parameters, the Prandtl number $Pr = \nu/\kappa$,
which is the ratio of kinematic viscosity to thermal diffusivity and the Rayleigh number
$Ra = g \alpha \Delta H^3/(\nu \kappa)$, the ratio between the strength of the thermal driving and damping
by dissipation. Here $g$ is the acceleration due to gravity and $\alpha$ the thermal expansion
coefficient. These equations are supplemented with Dirichlet boundary conditions for the
temperature as well as no-slip boundary conditions for the velocity at the top and bottom
wall, and periodic boundary conditions at the side walls. This system of coupled partial
differential equations leads to a turbulent convective flow for strong thermal driving,
i.e. for sufficiently large $Ra$ far above the onset of convection.

In a statistically stationary state, exact relations between forcing and dissipation can be
derived from the kinetic energy and thermal variance budgets (Shraiman & Siggia)
The averaged energy input $\langle u_z \theta \rangle$ is balanced by the averaged dissipation $\langle \varepsilon \rangle$, and the dimensionless heat transport $Nu = \sqrt{RaPr} \langle u_z \theta \rangle + 1$ is balanced by the thermal dissipation $\langle \chi \rangle$:

$$\langle \varepsilon \rangle = \langle u_z \theta \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{RaPr}} (Nu - 1) \quad (2.2)$$

$$\langle \chi \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{RaPr}} Nu, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{Pr}{Ra}} (\nabla \mathbf{u} + (\nabla \mathbf{u})^T)^2$ \quad (2.4)

and $\chi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{RaPr}} (\nabla \theta)^2$. \quad (2.5)

Here $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes an average over time and volume, which we also denote as global average. For more details see also [Siggia (1994); Chillà & Schumacher (2012); Ching (2014)]. These statements for the averaged relation between forcing and dissipation are generalized to scale-dependent budgets in the following section.

### 2.2. Filtering

In order to separate small-scale fluctuations and large-scale structures, we use low-pass filtering. In this study, we only filter horizontally to extract the horizontally extended superstructures [Hartlep et al. 2003; Stevens et al. 2018; Pandey et al. 2018]. This approach avoids artifacts due to the impenetrable top and bottom boundary conditions; for a three-dimensional filter additional assumptions for the velocity and temperature field outside the simulation domain have to be made. The filtering operator is a locally weighted average given by a convolution with a filter kernel $G_l$:

$$\mathbf{u}_l(x) = G_l * \mathbf{u} = \frac{1}{l^2} \int_{x-l/2}^{x+l/2} \int_{y-l/2}^{y+l/2} \mathbf{u}(x',y',z) \, dx' \, dy'. \quad (2.6)$$

For our study we choose $G_l$ as a standard two-dimensional box-filter. The large-scale velocity $\mathbf{u}_l$ encodes the velocity fluctuations on scales larger than the scale $l$ in the horizontal directions. The temperature fluctuation $\theta_l$ is defined analogously. In the following, we refer to scales below the filter width as unresolved and scales above it as resolved or large-scale. The evolution of the resolved scales is given by filtering (2.1)

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_l = 0 \quad (2.7a)$$

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u}_l + \mathbf{u}_l \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_l = -\nabla p_l^* + \sqrt{\frac{Pr}{Ra}} \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}_l + \nabla \mathbf{z} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{\tau}_l \quad (2.7b)$$

$$\partial_t \theta_l + \mathbf{u}_l \cdot \nabla \theta_l = \frac{1}{\sqrt{PrRa}} \nabla^2 \theta_l - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{\gamma}_l, \quad (2.7c)$$

in which

$$\mathbf{\tau}_l = \langle uu \rangle_l - \mathbf{u}_l \mathbf{u}_l \quad (2.8)$$

$$\mathbf{\gamma}_l = \langle u\theta \rangle_l - \mathbf{u}_l \theta_l. \quad (2.9)$$

Here additional terms, $\mathbf{\tau}_l$ and $\mathbf{\gamma}_l$, appear due to the nonlinearity of the OBEs: the turbulent or unresolved stress tensor and turbulent or unresolved heat flux, respectively, which effectively describe the impact of the unresolved scales on the resolved ones.
A few words on the limiting cases $l \to 0$ and $l \to \infty$ are in order. For any field $q$
\[ \lim_{l \to 0} G_l \ast q = q, \quad (2.10) \]
see e.g. Sagaut [2006]. On the other hand, for $l \to \infty$ the filtering is essentially a horizontal average, which we shall denote by $\langle \cdot \rangle_A$, i.e.
\[ \lim_{l \to \infty} G_l \ast q = \langle q \rangle_A. \quad (2.11) \]
That means, the filtering procedure applied in this work smoothly interpolates between the fully resolved and the height-dependent horizontally averaged fields. Using the above definitions, we can derive the resolved energy budget in the next step. In particular, we will focus on the resolved budget at the scale of the turbulent superstructures.

### 2.3. Resolved energy budget

To derive the resolved energy budget, (2.7b) is multiplied with $u_l$, similar to the procedure for the Navier-Stokes equations (Sagaut 2006; Eyink 1995, 2007; Eyink & Aluie 2009; Aluie & Eyink 2009). After collecting terms, we obtain
\[ \partial_t e_l + \nabla \cdot J_l = -\varepsilon_l + Q_l - \Pi_l \quad (2.12) \]
and the individual terms are explicitly given by
\[ Q_l = \overline{\partial_t u_l \cdot \hat{z}} \quad (2.13) \]
\[ \Pi_l = -\nabla u_l : \tau_l \quad (2.14) \]
\[ \varepsilon_l = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{Pr}{Ra}} (\nabla u_l + (\nabla u_l)^T)^2 \quad (2.15) \]
\[ J_l = (e_l + p^*_l) u_l - \sqrt{\frac{Pr}{Ra}} \nabla e_l + \tau_l \cdot u_l - \sqrt{\frac{Pr}{Ra}} u_l \cdot \nabla u_l. \quad (2.16) \]
Here $e_l = \overline{u_l^2}/2$ is the resolved kinetic energy and $Q_l$ a source term, i.e. the energy input rate into the resolved scales named thermal or buoyant driving. The evolution equation contains a large-scale spatial flux term $J_l$, which redistributes energy in space and a large-scale dissipation term $\varepsilon_l$. Compared to the unfiltered energy budget, an additional contribution $\Pi_l$ appears. It originates from the nonlinear term in the momentum equation and captures the transfer rate of kinetic energy between scales. In the following, we refer to $\Pi_l$ as the energy transfer. In addition, the large-scale spatial flux also contains a contribution related to the turbulent stress tensor.

In a nutshell, (2.12) describes, that the change of the resolved energy $e_l$ is balanced by spatial redistribution, direct dissipation, large-scale buoyant driving and transfer between scales. The latter can act, depending on its sign, as a sink or source for the resolved scales. Complementary to spectral analysis techniques (see e.g. Domaradzki et al. (1994); Lohse & Xia (2010); Verma et al. (2017); Verma (2018)), this approach allows the spatially resolved study of the energy transfer (Meneveau & Katz 2000) between superstructures and small-scale fluctuations. In the following spatial and temporal averages of the resolved energy balance are considered.

#### 2.3.1. Averaged resolved energy budget

To derive a scale-resolved generalization of equation (2.2), we begin with the study of the volume and time average of (2.12). In a statistically stationary state $\langle \partial_t e_l \rangle$ vanishes. The averaged flux $\langle \nabla \cdot J_l \rangle$ vanishes as well because of the boundary conditions. This
leaves us with

$$\langle Q_l \rangle = \langle \varepsilon_l \rangle + \langle \Pi_l \rangle. \tag{2.17}$$

At each scale, the energy input $Q_l$ is balanced by the direct dissipation and the energy transfer between scales.\footnote{Note that the latter is not present in the unfiltered energy balance (2.2). The energy dissipation primarily occurs at the smallest scales in three-dimensional turbulence (Pope 2000). For a statistically stationary state to exist in a forced system, the introduced energy has to be transferred to the dissipative scales. Since RBC is forced on all scales by buoyancy, including the largest scales, the volume-averaged energy transfer above the dissipative range is $a$-priori expected to be down-scale. This is similar to three-dimensional homogeneous isotropic turbulence (Pope 2000). Accordingly, the energy transfer has to act as a sink for the resolved energy.}

To understand the scale dependence of the different contributions, we first determine the two limits $l \to 0$ and $l \to \infty$, for which we make use of (2.10) and (2.11). For $l \to 0$ $\Pi_l$ vanishes and

$$\lim_{l \to 0} (\langle Q_l \rangle - \langle \varepsilon_l \rangle - \langle \Pi_l \rangle) = \langle Q \rangle - \langle \varepsilon \rangle = 0, \tag{2.18}$$
i.e. the unfiltered balance is recovered with $Q = u_z \theta$. In the limit $l \to \infty$ the filtering is equivalent to a horizontal average. In an infinitely extended domain $\langle u \rangle_A = 0$, and therefore, all terms in the budget vanish individually

$$\lim_{l \to \infty} \langle Q_l \rangle = \lim_{l \to \infty} \langle \varepsilon_l \rangle = \lim_{l \to \infty} \langle \Pi_l \rangle = 0. \tag{2.19}$$

The detailed scale dependence and the balance between the different terms at the length scale corresponding to superstructures are investigated numerically and presented in subsequent sections.

To complete this section, we present the horizontally and time-averaged resolved kinetic energy budget

$$\langle \nabla \cdot J_l \rangle_A = - \langle \varepsilon_l \rangle_A - \langle \Pi_l \rangle_A + \langle Q_l \rangle_A, \tag{2.20}$$
in which $\langle \cdot \rangle_A$ from now on describes a horizontal average and over time. This will be used to determine the role of the boundary layers and to refine the global picture. Compared to the global resolved energy budget, the spatial flux term $\nabla \cdot J_l$ does not vanish. The limiting behavior of these terms is very similar to that of the global balance. As $l \to 0$ the energy transfer vanishes, whereas the other terms recover the unfiltered balance

$$\langle \nabla \cdot J \rangle_A = - \langle \varepsilon \rangle_A + \langle Q \rangle_A, \tag{2.21}$$
where $J = (e + p^*) u - \sqrt{Pr} Ra \nabla e - \sqrt{Pr} Ra u \cdot \nabla u. \tag{2.22}$

As $l \to \infty$ all terms vanish individually for the same reason as above.

In the work of Petschel \textit{et al.} (2015), the unfiltered budget (2.21) has been studied. It was shown, that most of the energy is typically dissipated near the wall and energy input occurs in the bulk, from where it is transported to the wall. The scale-dependent generalizations of local and averaged energy budgets presented above allow us to refine this picture scale-resolved and identify relevant scales, on which this primarily happens.

\footnote{An alternative representation in terms of the Nusselt number is presented in Appendix C.}
2.4. Resolved temperature variance

To complete the theoretical background, we consider the governing equations and averages of the resolved thermal variance $e^\theta_l = \bar{\theta}_l^2/2$

$$\partial_t e^\theta_l + \nabla \cdot J^\theta_l = -\chi_l - \Pi^\theta_l,$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.23)

where the individual terms are given as

$$\chi_l = \frac{1}{\sqrt{Ra Pr}} (\nabla \bar{\theta}_l)^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.24)

$$J^\theta_l = \bar{u}_l e^\theta_l - \frac{1}{\sqrt{Ra Pr}} \nabla e^\theta_l + \gamma_l \bar{\theta}_l$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.25)

$$\Pi^\theta_l = -\gamma_l \cdot \nabla \bar{\theta}_l.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.26)

Equation (2.24) describes the direct thermal dissipation of the resolved scales, (2.25) the spatial redistribution of thermal variance, and (2.26) the transfer rate between resolved and unresolved scales. We will refer to the latter as the heat transfer in the following. As before, we will consider the time- and volume-averaged budget

$$\langle \chi_l \rangle + \langle \Pi^\theta_l \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{Ra Pr}} Nu = \langle \chi \rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.27)

see Appendix B for the derivation. This budget shows that the total heat transport is balanced by the direct thermal dissipation and the heat transfer between scales. Because $\langle \chi_l \rangle \ll \langle \chi \rangle$, the averaged heat transfer between scales is down-scale, i.e. $\langle \Pi^\theta_l \rangle > 0$. This is consistent with classical theories, in which a temperature variance cascade is proposed [Lohse & Xia 2010]. The horizontally averaged budget is given by

$$\langle \nabla \cdot J^\theta_l \rangle_A = -\langle \chi_l \rangle_A - \langle \Pi^\theta_l \rangle_A,$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.28)

which shows that the spatial redistribution of heat is balanced by the direct thermal dissipation and the heat transfer between scales.

In this section we derived scale-resolved generalizations of the kinetic energy budget and the thermal variance budget. In order to investigate the interplay of superstructures and turbulence and their scale dependence, we present results from direct numerical simulations in the following.

2.5. Numerical simulations

The OBEs (2.1) are solved numerically with a finite-difference approximation, using a compact sixth-order scheme in space and a fourth-order Runge-Kutta scheme for time stepping [Lomax et al. 2001]. The grid is non-uniform in the vertical direction for $Ra \geq 5 \times 10^4$, with monotonically decreasing grid spacing towards the wall. The pressure equation is solved with a factorization of the Fourier transform to satisfy the solenoidal constraint [Mellado & Ansorge 2012]. The filter is implemented using a trapezoidal rule.

We study the Rayleigh number regime from $Ra = 10^4$ up to $Ra = 10^7$ in a large aspect ratio of $\Gamma \approx 24$ for $Pr = 1$. The full simulation details are provided in table 1. The Nusselt numbers shown are calculated based on the buoyant driving $Nu_V = \sqrt{Ra Pr \langle u_z \theta \rangle} + 1$, the viscous dissipation $Nu_\varepsilon = \sqrt{Ra Pr \langle \varepsilon \rangle} + 1$ and the thermal dissipation $Nu_\chi = \sqrt{Ra Pr \langle \chi \rangle}$. Their consistency with one another serves as a resolution check of the simulations [Verzicco & Camussi 2003]. Here the numbers agree to 99% or better. Furthermore, the resolution requirements have been estimated a priori as proposed in [Shishkina et al. 2010], and the relevant scale, i.e. the Kolmogorov scale $\eta$ for $Pr = 1$, has been compared
Table 1: Input and reference output parameters of the simulations with $Pr = 1$. The number of grid points in the vertical direction is $N_z$ and in horizontal directions $N_x$ and $N_y$. $Nu_V$, $Nu_\chi$ and $Nu_\varepsilon$ are Nusselt numbers calculated based on the buoyant driving, thermal and viscous dissipation, respectively. Here the Reynolds number $Re = \sqrt{\langle u^2 \rangle Ra/Pr}$ is based on the root-mean-square velocity. Additionally $\lambda_s$ characterizes the wavelength of the turbulent superstructures and $l_s$ the filter width to separate the superstructures from turbulent fluctuations. Lastly, $T_t$ is the total runtime, $\tau$ the time window over which the averages are taken and $t_s$ the characteristic time scale of the evolution of the superstructures as defined in Pandey et al. (2018).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$Ra$</th>
<th>$N_xN_yN_z$</th>
<th>$Nu_V$</th>
<th>$Nu_\chi$</th>
<th>$Nu_\varepsilon$</th>
<th>$Re$</th>
<th>$\lambda_s$</th>
<th>$l_s$</th>
<th>$T_t$</th>
<th>$\tau$</th>
<th>$t_s$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.03 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$448^2 \times 64$</td>
<td>2.259</td>
<td>2.262</td>
<td>2.259</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5.01 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$768^2 \times 96$</td>
<td>3.557</td>
<td>3.560</td>
<td>3.557</td>
<td>47.28</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.02 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>$1280^2 \times 140$</td>
<td>4.364</td>
<td>4.366</td>
<td>4.364</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.03 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>$2560^2 \times 208$</td>
<td>8.374</td>
<td>8.380</td>
<td>8.375</td>
<td>222.58</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.07 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>$3200^2 \times 256$</td>
<td>16.040</td>
<td>16.055</td>
<td>16.037</td>
<td>685.86</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all cases we find that the maximum grid step $h$ is smaller than the Kolmogorov scale $\eta$ and that the vertical grid spacing $\Delta y$ is smaller than the height-dependent Kolmogorov scale based on $\langle \varepsilon \rangle_A$ at the corresponding height. Together with the consistency of the Nusselt number, this shows that our simulations are sufficiently resolved.

3. Results

In the following, we present numerical results to examine the scale dependence of the global resolved energy budget (2.17) and the different contributions in (2.20), as well as the temperature variance budget (2.27) and (2.28). We focus on the scale of the superstructures, for which we first have to characterize their scale.

### 3.1. Determining the superstructure scale

In order to extract the length scale of the superstructures, we compute azimuthally and time-averaged spectra in the horizontal planes (Hartlep et al. 2003; Pandey et al. 2018; Stevens et al. 2018). Specifically, we choose the cross spectrum of the vertical velocity and the temperature in the midplane for the definition of the superstructure scale (Hartlep et al. 2003)

$$E_{\theta u_z}(k) = \left\langle \int_0^{2\pi} Re \left( \hat{\theta}^* \hat{u}_z \right) k \, d\varphi \big|_{z=0.5} \right\rangle_\tau. \quad (3.1)$$

Here $\hat{\cdot}$ denotes a horizontal Fourier transform, $\langle \cdot \rangle_\tau$ an average over time, and $E_{\theta u_z}(k)$ is normalized in such a way that $\int E_{\theta u_z}(k) \, dk = \langle Q \rangle_A \big|_{z=0.5}$. A representative example is shown in figure 2. The peak of the spectrum characterizes the wavelength of the superstructures $\lambda_s = 2\pi/k_{\lambda_s}$. The corresponding length scale $\lambda_s$ is listed in table 1 for all simulations. The wavelength increases compared to the theoretical expectation for onset $\lambda_0 = 2.016$ (Getling 1998) and is largest for the highest Rayleigh number.
The observed length scales are comparable with the ones obtained in previous studies on superstructures (Hartlep et al. 2003; von Hardenberg et al. 2008; Stevens et al. 2018; Pandey et al. 2018). Since a superstructure consists of pairs of a warm updraft and a cold downdraft, we take the associated filter width $l_s$ for the definition of the superstructure scale to be slightly smaller than $\lambda_s/2$. The exact values are given in table [1]. Small variations do not affect the outcome significantly. With this choice the individual large-scale up- and downdrafts are preserved and the small-scale fluctuations are removed. We can then use (2.12) and (2.23) to characterize the energetics of the large-scale convection rolls and the associated superstructures and filter out the smaller-scale fluctuations.

### 3.2. Mean resolved energy budget

In this section we study the volume-averaged resolved energy budget. We first consider a wide range of filter widths before focusing on the specific scale of the superstructures. We begin our discussion with the scale dependence of the stationary global resolved energy budget (2.17). The different contributions are shown in figure 3a as a function of the filter width for $Ra = 1.07 \times 10^7$. The average energy input into the resolved scales $\langle Q_l \rangle$ and the direct dissipation $\langle \varepsilon_l \rangle$, decrease monotonically with increasing $l$, but the dissipation decays faster. In contrast to that, the average energy transfer $\langle \Pi_l \rangle$ has a maximum at intermediate scales. For all shown filter widths $\langle \Pi_l \rangle > 0$, i.e. the energy transfer acts on average as an energy sink as expected for three-dimensional turbulence (see discussion in section 2.3.1). In other words, there is a net energy transfer from the larger to the smaller scales.

How can we understand the functional form of $\langle \Pi_l \rangle$? At large scales, dissipation is comparably small and the energy transfer primarily balances the thermal driving $\langle Q_l \rangle$. With decreasing filter scale the power input through thermal driving accumulates, which is why it is increasing with decreasing filter width. It is mostly balanced by the energy transfer which increases accordingly. When the considered scale reaches the dissipative regime the direct dissipation $\langle \varepsilon_l \rangle$ begins to dominate and the energy transfer starts to decay and finally vanishes at $l = 0$. The structure at small filter width is comparable to three-dimensional turbulence, see e.g. Ballouz & Ouellette (2018); Buzzicotti et al. (2018). Furthermore, this behavior is of course consistent with the analytical limits for
Figure 3: (a) Contributions to the volume-averaged resolved energy budget for a range of filter scales for $Ra = 1.07 \times 10^7$. (b) Different contributions to the budget (2.17) at the superstructure scale $l_s$ as a function of $Ra$. (c,d,e) Comparison of $\langle \Pi_l \rangle$, $\langle \varepsilon_l \rangle$ and $\langle Q_l \rangle$ for different $Ra$. (f) Scale $l_{II}$ of the maximum of $\langle \Pi_l \rangle$ compared to the Kolmogorov scale $\eta$ as a function of $Ra$. 
small and large $l$ derived above. Notably, at the superstructure scale $l_s$ only a small fraction, roughly 10\%, of the total energy input $\langle Q \rangle$ is injected in the resolved scales. Out of that roughly 75\% is transferred to unresolved scales, and only 25\% is directly dissipated.

In figure 3b we compare $\langle \Pi_l \rangle$, $\langle Q_l \rangle$ and $\langle \varepsilon_l \rangle$ at the scale of the superstructure $l_s$ for different Rayleigh numbers. Here, it is clear that the energy transfer increases, whereas the resolved dissipation and the resolved power input decrease with increasing $Ra$. The energy transfer becomes increasingly important compared to the dissipation at larger Rayleigh numbers. At $Ra = 1.07 \times 10^7$ it is of the same order as the power input, hence being crucially important for the energy balance of the turbulent superstructures. Here one can see a crossover between $\langle \Pi_l \rangle$ and $\langle \varepsilon_l \rangle$ as a function of $Ra$. The transition from $\langle \varepsilon_l \rangle > \langle \Pi_l \rangle$ to $\langle \varepsilon_l \rangle < \langle \Pi_l \rangle$ falls in the range $Ra = 10^5 - 10^6$. We associate the relative increase of the energy transfer to an increase in turbulence for higher $Ra$. As $Ra$ increases, the nonlinear terms in the OBEs are gaining importance and the Reynolds number $Re$ increases, see table 1. This is consistent with expectations from scaling theories for RBC \cite{Ahlers2009}. In this regime enhanced small-scale fluctuations are present and the bandwidth of the dynamically active scales is increased. Here the scale separation between the scale of the superstructure and the dissipative regime is increased. A footprint of this can be seen in figure 3c, which shows the energy transfer between scales for different Rayleigh numbers. We observe a shift of the small-scale fluctuations with the highest energy transfer rate to smaller scales for higher $Ra$. At the same time the scale of the superstructure is increasing, see table 1, hence the scale separation between these scales increases. The maximum of the energy transfer grows with increasing $Ra$ and decays slower with increasing $l$ at large $l$. The peak down-scale energy transfer is also becoming more localized with increasing $Ra$. In general the energy transfer between scales increases with $Ra$, see figure 3d whereas the direct dissipation and resolved power input decrease, see figure 3d and 3e for all considered scales.

The scale $l_{\Pi}$ at which $\langle \Pi_l \rangle$ is maximal decreases with $Ra$, as shown in figure 3f. We expect this to be related to the shift of the dissipative range to smaller scales with increasing $Ra$, since the energy transfer decays when the considered scale reaches the dissipative regime. The Kolmogorov scale $\eta$ characterizes the dissipative scale. Hence, $l_{\Pi}$ follows a similar trend as $\eta$, shown in figure 3f.

In summary, we find that the energy transfer between superstructures and small-scale fluctuations is on average a sink. At large $Ra$ the energy transfer becomes increasingly important, which is caused by the increasing amount of turbulence, and the large-scale dissipation is significantly smaller at the scale of the superstructures for $Ra \geq 10^7$. In the next step the global picture is refined and the height-resolved balance is investigated.

### 3.3. Horizontally averaged resolved energy budget

In RBC the flow in the boundary layers and the bulk region is qualitatively different, as long as the boundary layers are not fully turbulent \cite{Ahlers2009, Lohse2010, Chillà2012}. To analyze the difference between these distinct regions in the resolved energy budget, we present results for the horizontally averaged energy budget (2.20). This helps to understand the role of the boundary layers for the different contributions of the resolved energy budget in more detail. Compared to the global budget, there is an additional spatial flux term $\langle \nabla \cdot J_l \rangle_A$, which vertically redistributes energy. It is calculated from the right-hand side of (2.20). The profiles of all the height-dependent contributions of (2.20) are presented in figure 4 for a simulation with $Ra = 1.07 \times 10^7$ as an example from the turbulent regime. They are compared to the unfiltered profiles in 4b. The energy input into the resolved scales takes place mainly in the bulk.
The energy transfer is positive in a layer in the bulk, i.e. it acts as a sink. Therefore it effectively increases the dissipation, as it does for the global balance. However, there is an inverse energy transfer from the unresolved to the resolved scales near the wall in agreement with the results on RBC (Togni et al. 2015, 2017, 2019) and other wall-bounded flows (Domaradzki et al. 1994; Marati et al. 2004; Cimarelli & De Angelis 2011, 2012; Cimarelli et al. 2015). This shows that the boundary layers are important for the dynamics of the superstructures since additional energy from the unresolved scales is provided there. The close connection of superstructures to the boundary layers is also discussed in Parodi et al. (2004); von Hardenberg et al. (2008); Pandey et al. (2018); Stevens et al. (2018).

A comparison of the energy transfer profile for different Rayleigh numbers (see figure 4c) shows that its form depends strongly on $Ra$. The energy transfer peaks always in the bulk and is exclusively a sink, i.e. it acts as an additional dissipation. Thus the bulk determines the global behavior of the energy transfer. Moreover, in the midplane the mean energy transfer in units of the mean dissipation is approximately the same for all considered $Ra$. For $Ra = 10^4$ there is a small plateau of strong down-scale transfer around the midplane. This splits into two peaks for $Ra = 10^5$ and relaxes to an extended plateau and decays towards the wall. In contrast, the direct dissipation primarily occurs near the wall and decays towards the bulk.

Figure 4: (a) Different contributions to the horizontally averaged resolved energy budget at the superstructure scale $l_s$ and (b) unfiltered energy budget for $Ra = 1.07 \times 10^7$ normalized by the total dissipation. (c) Energy transfer term at $l_s$ for different $Ra$ normalized by the corresponding total dissipation. (d) Comparison of the distance from the wall to the first minimum $z_m$ and zero crossing $z_0$ of $\langle \Pi_l \rangle_A$ with the boundary layer thicknesses of the temperature and the velocity fields as a function of $Ra$. 
for $Ra = 10^7$. Thus with increasing $Ra$ the relative importance of $\Pi_l$ increases as the width of the plateau in the bulk increases, which underpins the volume-averaged results presented above. For $Ra < 10^7$ the energy transfer close to the wall is characterized by a negative minimum, which means that there is a near-wall layer driving the resolved scales. With increasing $Ra$ the driving in this layer becomes weaker, the layer itself shrinks and shifts closer to the wall. At $Ra = 10^7$ the layer’s structure becomes more complicated with the emergence of a thin dissipative layer even closer to the wall. These findings complement the results from Togni et al. (2017, 2019) by considering superstructures and their energetic interaction with turbulent fluctuations.

We shall make the first attempt to link the scale-resolved layer structure revealed in figure 4c with the boundary layer structure of RBC. Figure 4d shows the thickness of the thermal dissipation layer $\lambda_\theta$ and viscous dissipation layer $\lambda_u$ as a function of $Ra$. The layers are defined as the distance to the wall at which the horizontally averaged thermal, respectively viscous, dissipation equals its volume average (Petschel et al. 2013). The thicknesses are indicated in figure 4a and 4b to present their relative position compared to the profiles. In addition, figure 4d characterizes the width of the layer with upscale energy transfer for the resolved scales. There the distance from its minimum to the wall $z_m$ and its edge $z_0$ are presented as a function of $Ra$. (They are also highlighted for clarity in figure 4c for $Ra = 1.02 \times 10^5$.) All scales decrease with increasing $Ra$ and follow a similar trend. Interestingly, $z_m$ appears to be bounded by the thermal layer. This means that the inverse energy transfer mostly happens inside the thermal boundary layer, as well as that the decrease of its extent can be associated with the well-known decrease of the boundary layers (Ahlers et al. 2009). Once more this underlines the importance of the boundary layers for the superstructures because there the transfer term changes from an energy sink to a source.

We noted that for increasing $Ra$ the average energy transfer in the midplane is approximately the same in absolute terms, i.e. when compared to the global mean dissipation, as shown in figure 4c: In figure 5 instead, we show it in units of the local (midplane-averaged) power input for varying $Ra$, along with the identically scaled direct dissipation $\langle \varepsilon_l \rangle_A$. The comparison shows that the local relative importance of the energy transfer in the midplane increases with increasing $Ra$. This is in agreement with

† See Appendix A for a note on the scale dependence of the $\Pi_l$ profile.
the global picture presented above. However, the energy transfer surpasses the direct dissipation at lower $Ra$ already for $Ra = 5 \times 10^4$ compared to $Ra = 10^6$ for the volume averages. At large $Ra$ it is comparable in magnitude to the energy input into the resolved scales $\langle \Pi_l \rangle_A |_{z=0.5} \approx 0.6 \langle Q_l \rangle_A |_{z=0.5}$. Hence it is a crucial part of the dissipation of the superstructures in the midplane.

To summarize, through the study of the height profiles we identified the distinct impact of the bulk and boundary layers on the resolved scales. The boundary layers strongly influence the resolved-scale dynamics and show an increasingly complex structure which depends on $Ra$ with a layer close to the wall which predominantly drives the resolved scales.

3.3.1. Implications for reduced models

Emran & Schumacher (2015); Pandey et al. (2018) have pointed out similarities between the turbulent superstructures and patterns close to the onset of convection. In future work, one could attempt to develop effective large-scale equations for RBC at high $Ra$ with equations similar to the OBEs at low $Ra$. In this regime analytical techniques are feasible (Bodenschatz et al. 2000). To discuss these similarities, we draw comparisons between the resolved profiles at large $Ra$ to the unfiltered profiles for a small $Ra$ from the weakly nonlinear regime. As we have seen in the previous section, the energy transfer primarily contributes to the resolved energy budget as a sink term, with the result of adding additional dissipation. For the following comparison we therefore rewrite it in terms of an effective resolved dissipation $\tilde{\varepsilon}_l = \varepsilon_l + \Pi_l$. This follows the approach of Emran & Schumacher (2015), who performed a Boussinesq closure to determine turbulent viscosities and diffusivities to characterize the superstructures. In figure 6a the resolved profiles of the superstructures are shown and in figure 6b the unfiltered profiles from the weakly nonlinear regime. Close to the wall, the renormalized dissipation $\tilde{\varepsilon}_l$ and the redistribution differ from the corresponding profiles close to onset, due to the inverse energy transfer present in the transfer between scales. Parodi et al. (2004); Pandey et al. (2018); Stevens et al. (2018) observed a close connection between the boundary
layers and the large-scale structures in the midplane. This is present in the discussed profiles as well since energy is transferred up-scale to the superstructures close to the wall. In the midplane there are qualitative similarities between the height-dependent forms of the resolved budget and the original budget. Quantitatively, we find differences i.e. the renormalized dissipation in the midplane and close to the wall for the turbulent superstructure is larger in magnitude than the dissipation close to onset. The energy input is comparable in magnitude and the vertical redistribution of kinetic energy is smaller for the turbulent large-scale structure than close to onset. This shows that an effective dissipation may capture the superstructures in the bulk, but does not include the more complex near-wall behavior of the superstructures at high $Ra$.

In figure 5 the averaged effective dissipation in the midplane is shown as a function of $Ra$ normalized by the resolved power input in the midplane. It increases with $Ra$, since the increase in the energy transfer between scales is larger than the decrease of the direct dissipation.

Another interesting observation from Hartlep et al. (2003); Pandey et al. (2018); Stevens et al. (2018) is that the length scale of the turbulent large-scale pattern is increased compared to onset and that the pattern itself shows dynamics comparable to spiral defect chaos. Therefore, the superstructures cannot be effectively described by a simple, increased dissipation, respectively a reduced Rayleigh number, which would lead to a smaller wavelength. This has to be accounted for in an effective description.

In this subsection, we further developed the similarities between turbulent superstructures and patterns at onset of convection. These observations give important cues for the development of effective large-scale equations in future work. In this context, a phenomenological model for large-scale patterns in presence of small-scale fluctuations in the midplane of RBC has been introduced in Ibbeken et al. (2019). In the last step we will make use of the particular strength of the filtering approach and consider the spatially resolved energy transfer.

### 3.3.2. Energy transfer rate and plume dynamics

In RBC plumes are prominent structures, which play a crucial role for the dynamics and are essential parts of the superstructures. To gain insight into their role in the energy transfer, we discuss the local energy budget. The advantage of the filtering approach to study the energy transfer between scales is that we can compare instantaneous snapshots of different spatially resolved quantities to connect flow structures and characteristics of the contributions to the energy budget. In figure 7 a comparison of a vertical cut through the system for $\Pi_t$ and the temperature field is shown for different $Ra$. We observe a close connection between plume impinging and detaching and the direction of the energy transfer, especially prominent in the weakly nonlinear regime. At plume detachment, energy is transferred to the unresolved scales and at plume impinging there is an inverse energy transfer from the small scales to the large scales. Similar connections have been made in Togni et al. (2015), where a peak in the inverse transfer from scales above the layer height $H$ to smaller scales is found close to the distance at which plumes impinge. Due to the increasingly complex and three-dimensional motions at larger $Ra$ in the turbulent regime, see figure 7b and 7c, this close connection is weakening. This is due to the fact, that fewer plumes extend throughout the entire cell and are more likely to be deflected on their way from the top to the bottom plate or vice versa. Hence, they do not experience the sharp temperature gradient at the BL and instead release their temperature in the bulk. This prevents strong plume enlargements and the corresponding transfer to the largest scales. It is also consistent with the increase of energy transfer $\Pi_t$ in the bulk at larger $Ra$, cf. figure 4a.
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Figure 7: Comparison of an instantaneous snapshot of the temperature field and the energy transfer between scales for (a) \( Ra = 1.03 \times 10^4 \), (b) \( Ra = 1.02 \times 10^5 \), and (c) \( Ra = 1.07 \times 10^7 \) at the superstructure scale \( l_s \). Close to onset in the weakly nonlinear regime a direct connection between the plume dynamics, i.e. impinging and detachment, with the direction of the energy transfer is present. On impinging the plume heads enlarge, which is accompanied by an inverse energy transfer. During detachment the plumes shrink and there is a direct energy transfer.

Since we observe a layer of inverse energy transfer close to the wall, see figure 4a, we conclude that the inverse transfer caused by plume impinging has to exceed the direct transfer caused by plume detaching, at least in the weakly nonlinear regime. How can the above considerations be related to the findings for the global energy budget? At small Rayleigh numbers the direct transfer in the bulk and the inverse transfer close to the wall almost balance, resulting on average in a small direct transfer. At larger \( Ra \) the inverse transfer caused by impinging is reduced because only a fraction of the released plumes reaches the upper BL. Here the width of the inverse transfer layer is reduced. Additionally the size of the boundary layers and accordingly the width of the plumes decreases, which enhances the small-scale fluctuations in the bulk. The direct transfer is increased, e.g. due to the decay of the large-scale convection rolls to smaller vortices [Lohse & Xia 2010], see figure 7. This is accompanied by an increase of the width of the bulk layer and the direct transfer layer. Consequently, on average the direct transfer increases with \( Ra \).

Here we have seen that there is a close connection between the direction of the energy transfer with the impinging and detaching of plumes. Overall close to the wall the inverse transfer exceeds the direct transfer. The large scales therefore have to transfer energy by other mechanisms down-scale as well, e.g. by the decay into smaller vortices, resulting on average in a direct transfer.
3.4. Resolved temperature variance budget

The importance of the temperature field for the kinetic energy transfer was noted in the previous section. For completeness, we here complement this with the consideration of the budget of the resolved temperature variance.

3.4.1. Mean resolved temperature variance

The global balance (2.27) shows that the total thermal dissipation is split into two contributions. The resolved dissipation $\langle \chi_l \rangle$ and the heat transfer $\langle \Pi_{l_s}^\theta \rangle$. As illustrated in figure 8a, the resolved thermal dissipation exceeds the heat transfer at all scales, including the scale of the superstructure for the highest considered Rayleigh number. This is qualitatively different from the behavior observed for the contributions to the kinetic energy balance. The heat transfer and direct dissipation both approach a constant value after an initial increase for small filter width. At these scales they are roughly scale-independent and the transfer of temperature variance is down-scale. This is important for the phenomenology of RBC. In fact, both the Obukhov-Corrsin theory as well as the Bolgiano-Obukhov theory rest on a cascade picture for the temperature variance, consistent with our observations. A more detailed treatment of these considerations is beyond the scope of our work, and we refer the reader to Lohse & Xia (2010);
3.4.2. Horizontally averaged resolved temperature variance

The profiles of all the contributions to the horizontally averaged resolved thermal variance budget are shown in figure 9a for $Ra = 1.07 \times 10^7$ and compared to the unfiltered profiles in 9b as an example from the turbulent regime. The resolved thermal dissipation follows a very similar form as the original thermal dissipation. It almost vanishes in the bulk and strongly increases towards the wall in the BLs. The heat transfer is positive for almost all heights and also vanishes in the bulk. A notable exception is at small $Ra$, where it is slightly negative, i.e. up-scale, close to the midplane. It has a strong peak close to the wall and acts (almost) exclusively as a thermal dissipation. This is similar for different $Ra$ as shown in figure 9c. The peak increases in magnitude with increasing $Ra$ and its distance to the wall $z_m^\theta$ decreases. The peak almost coincides with the height of the thermal boundary layer $\lambda_{Nu} = 1/(2Nu)$, see figure 9d. The top and bottom BL give the largest resistance for the heat flux through the cell \cite{Ahlers2009}. In this
region the thermal variance deposited by the resolved heat flux is partly transferred to smaller scales and mainly dissipated.

Comparing the resolved energy with the resolved thermal variance budget, there are qualitatively similar scale dependencies. The transfers between scales increase with increasing $Ra$ and act on average as a dissipation. However, the heat transfer is roughly constant after an initial increase at small scales, whereas the energy transfer decays after a maximum at small scales. Additionally, the profiles at the superstructure scale show qualitative differences, i.e. the heat transfer is almost exclusively down-scale for all heights while the energy transfer shows a layer of up-scale energy transfer as well.

4. Summary

We investigated the scale-resolved energy budget of RBC at moderate Rayleigh numbers in the range $1.03 \times 10^4 \leq Ra \leq 1.07 \times 10^7$ for a fixed $Pr = 1$ and a high aspect ratio ($\Gamma \approx 24$) with a focus on the interplay of turbulent superstructures and turbulent fluctuations. As a starting point, we generalized the volume-averaged kinetic and thermal variance budgets to scale-dependent budgets of the resolved fields. For the kinetic energy budget, this results in a balance between the resolved energy input, the direct large-scale dissipation and an energy transfer to the unresolved scales. It shows that the small-scale fluctuations play an important role for the energy balance of the large scales. For our simulations at the highest Rayleigh numbers under consideration, we find that the energy transfer to the smaller scales is of comparable magnitude to the resolved energy input at the superstructure scale. This means that the generation of small-scale turbulence acts as a dissipation channel for the large scales, which qualitatively confirms the classic picture that small-scale turbulence introduces an effective dissipation.

When resolving the energy transfer with respect to height, a more complex picture emerges, which in particular reveals the role of the boundary layers in the near-wall regions. The height-dependent balance of the distinct terms is summarized in figure [10], which shows that most of the energy input due to thermal driving takes place in the bulk. Here, energy is transferred to smaller scales and transported towards the wall. While the direct large-scale dissipation is comparably small in the bulk, its main contribution stems from regions close to the wall. Close to the wall, we additionally find an inverse energy transfer from the small to the large scales, which shows that the boundary layers play a distinct role for the energy budget of the superstructures. In summary that means, even though the energy transfer acts as a dissipation on average, it shows a pronounced height-dependence with an inverse transfer layer close to the wall.

Consistent with previous studies [Emran & Schumacher 2015; Pandey et al. 2018], we find qualitative similarities between turbulent superstructures and patterns in the weakly nonlinear regime. The resolved energy budget of the superstructures and the standard energy budget at the onset of convection shows qualitative similarities in the midplane when the energy transfer to smaller scales is interpreted as an effective dissipation. This may open possibilities for modeling the large-scale structure of turbulent convection at high Rayleigh numbers.

In order to gain insight into the origin of the inverse energy transfer, we studied the spatially resolved energy transfer. At small $Ra$ there is a direct correspondence between plume impinging and plume detaching and the direction of the energy transfer. The enlargement of the plume head during impinging is accompanied by an energy transfer to the large scales. Conversely, the small scales are fed during plume detachment. A stronger inverse transfer caused by plume impinging could therefore result in the layer
of inverse transfer observed close to the wall. However, this correspondence is reduced in the turbulent regime, due to an increase in lateral plume motion.

We complemented the investigations of the resolved energy budget with the study of the resolved thermal variance budget. We found, that the heat transfer between scales is roughly scale-independent at large scales in the turbulent regime. Furthermore, it acts as a thermal dissipation at all heights for large Rayleigh numbers and is strongly peaked close to the BLs.

Our investigations reveal the impact of turbulent fluctuations on the large-scale convection rolls in turbulent Rayleigh-Bénard convection. In future investigations, it will be interesting to see whether the impact of turbulence reaches an asymptotic state at sufficiently high Reynolds numbers. This could open the possibility for universal effective large-scale models for Rayleigh-Bénard convection at high Rayleigh numbers.
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Appendix A. Horizontal profiles for small filter width

The profiles of the energy transfer term $\Pi_l$ are strongly scale-dependent, as can be expected. In figure 11, the horizontally averaged energy transfer is shown for different filter widths for $Ra = 1.02 \times 10^5$ as an illustrative example for the moderately turbulent regime. The dissipation layer $\lambda_u$ and the thermal dissipation layer $\lambda_\theta$ are indicated by the dashed and dotted lines, respectively. Energy input regions are highlighted in green, direct dissipation and down-scale energy transfer in red, and spatial redistribution in orange.

Figure 10: Sketch of the resolved energy balance, highlighting the distinct structure of the bulk and boundary layer. Here, the profiles are obtained from a simulation at $Ra = 1.02 \times 10^5$ as an illustrative example for the moderately turbulent regime. The dissipation layer $\lambda_u$ and the thermal dissipation layer $\lambda_\theta$ are indicated by the dashed and dotted lines, respectively. Energy input regions are highlighted in green, direct dissipation and down-scale energy transfer in red, and spatial redistribution in orange.

The profiles of the energy transfer term $\Pi_l$ are strongly scale-dependent, as can be expected. In figure 11, the horizontally averaged energy transfer is shown for different filter widths for $Ra = 1.07 \times 10^7$. The inverse energy transfer close to the wall only occurs for large filter widths. For small filter widths the profiles are consistent with the ones reported by Togni et al. (2017, 2019) for a similar Rayleigh number. In Togni et al. (2017, 2019), the height-dependent budgets have been considered for small filter width ($i < 0.25$).
and smaller aspect ratio 8 with a spectral cutoff filter in the horizontal directions. There it is found that the energy transfer acts as a dissipation for all heights throughout the layer, consistent with our findings at small filter width. This can be regarded as an indication for the robustness of the results with respect to the exact choice of the filter. Additionally, the inverse transfer found here for large scales highlights the prominent role of the superstructures and the need for different subgrid scale models for the large and the intermediate scales.

Appendix B. Mean resolved temperature variance budget

Here we describe the derivation of the global resolved thermal variance budget (2.27). We take the volume average of (2.23)

\[ \langle \nabla \cdot J_l^\theta \rangle = -\langle \chi_l \rangle - \langle \Pi_l^\theta \rangle, \]  

(B1)

in which the temporal derivative vanishes in the statistically stationary state. The first term can be evaluated and does not vanish in contrast to the flux term in the kinetic energy budget. We have

\[ \langle \nabla \cdot J_l^\theta \rangle = \langle \nabla \cdot (\bar{u} e_l^\theta - \frac{1}{\sqrt{RaPr}} \nabla e_l^\theta + \gamma_l \bar{\theta}_l) \rangle = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{RaPr}} \langle \nabla^2 e_l^\theta \rangle, \]  

(B2)

since the first and last contribution vanish because of the boundary conditions. We will have a close look at the volume average

\[ \frac{1}{V} \int_V \nabla^2 e_l^\theta \, dV = \frac{1}{V} \int_V \nabla \cdot (\bar{\theta}_l \nabla \bar{\theta}_l) \, dV = \frac{1}{V} \int_{\partial V} (\bar{\theta}_l \nabla \bar{\theta}_l) \cdot \hat{n} \, dA. \]  

(B3)

In the last integral the contributions from the sidewalls vanish because of the periodic boundary conditions. Therefore only the integration over the top and bottom wall remains, at which the temperature is constant, i.e. \( \bar{\theta}_l \vert_{z=0,1} = \pm 1/2 \). This gives

\[ \frac{1}{V} \int_{\partial V} (\bar{\theta}_l \nabla \bar{\theta}_l) \cdot \hat{n} \, dA = -\frac{1}{2} \left( \partial_z \int_{z=0} \theta \, dA + \partial_z \int_{z=1} \theta \, dA \right) \]  

(B4)
where we used the fact that $\theta$ is constant at the top and bottom wall, and therefore $\bar{\theta}_l|_{z=0,1} = \bar{\theta}|_{z=0,1}$. The Nusselt number is defined as

$$Nu = \sqrt{Ra Pr} \langle u_z \theta \rangle_A - \partial_z \langle \theta \rangle_A,$$

which is independent of $z$, see e.g. Scheel & Schumacher (2014). At the top and bottom wall $u = 0$ and $Nu|_{z=0,1} = -\partial_z \langle \theta \rangle_A$, and we find

$$\langle \nabla^2 e^l \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} (\partial_z \langle \theta \rangle_A |_{z=0} + \partial_z \langle \theta \rangle_A |_{z=1}) = Nu.$$

Substituting this back into (B 1) results in the global balance (2.27).

**Appendix C. Connection between mean resolved energy budget and original budget**

Under the assumptions that the filtered fields obey the same boundary conditions as the unfiltered ones, and that the filter preserves volume averages, the statistically stationary energy and thermal variance budgets can be related to the Nusselt number

$$\langle \varepsilon_l \rangle + \langle \Pi_l \rangle + \langle \gamma_l \cdot \hat{z} \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{Ra Pr}} (Nu - 1) = \langle \varepsilon \rangle,$$

$$\langle \chi_l \rangle + \langle \Pi_l^\theta \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{Ra Pr}} Nu = \langle \chi \rangle.$$

The total kinetic energy dissipation is split into energy transfer between scales $\Pi_l$, direct dissipation of the resolved scales $\varepsilon_l$ and the thermal driving of the unresolved scales $\gamma_l$. Similarly, the total thermal dissipation is split into the direct thermal dissipation of the resolved scales $\chi_l$ and a thermal energy transfer between scales $\Pi_l^\theta$. Alternatively, we can write equation (C 1) as

$$\langle Q_l \rangle + \langle \gamma_l \cdot \hat{z} \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{Ra Pr}} (Nu - 1) = \langle Q \rangle,$$

in which the total energy input is split into the resolved energy input and the turbulent heat flux. If we introduce the resolved Nusselt number $Nu_l = \sqrt{Ra Pr} \langle Q_l \rangle + 1$, this relation can be written as

$$Nu_l + \sqrt{Ra Pr} \langle \gamma_l \cdot \hat{z} \rangle = Nu,$$

which shows that $Nu$ is split into $Nu_l$ and the heat flux into the unresolved scales $\sqrt{Ra Pr} \langle \gamma_l \cdot \hat{z} \rangle$.
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