Global stability of fluid flows despite transient growth of energy
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Verifying nonlinear stability of a laminar fluid flow against all perturbations is a central challenge in fluid dynamics. Past results rely on monotonic decrease of a perturbation energy or a similar quadratic generalized energy. None show stability for the many flows that seem to be stable despite these energies growing transiently. Here a broadly applicable method to verify global stability of such flows is presented. It uses polynomial optimization computations to construct non-quadratic Lyapunov functions that decrease monotonically. The method is used to verify global stability of 2D plane Couette flow at Reynolds numbers above the energy stability threshold found by Orr in 1907. This is the first global stability result for any flow that surpasses the generalized energy method.

A central approach to understanding fluid dynamics has been to study a handful of canonical systems in detail. Despite many discoveries over the last century, one of the simplest-seeming questions remains open for some of the most-studied systems: at given parameter values, will the flow return to its simplest (laminar) state no matter how it is perturbed? Laboratory experiments and simulations of the Navier–Stokes equations are unable to give a complete answer for all perturbations. Theoretical methods are needed to guarantee global stability.

For a steady laminar velocity field \( \mathbf{U}(x) \) solving the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations, the velocity, \( \mathbf{u}(x, t) \), and pressure, \( p(x, t) \), of perturbations around the laminar state evolve according to

\[
\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} = -\nabla p + \frac{1}{\Re} \Delta \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{u}), \tag{1}
\]

\[
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \tag{2}
\]

where \( \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{u}) = -\mathbf{U} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{U} \). Quantities in (1)–(2) are dimensionless, having been scaled using a length scale \( h \), velocity scale \( U \), and kinematic viscosity \( \nu \). Choices of \( h \) and \( U \) depend on the particular system. The dimensionless Reynolds number is \( \Re = \frac{U h}{\nu} \).

There is a critical threshold \( \Re_G > 0 \) such that the laminar state \( \mathbf{U} \) is globally asymptotically stable (meaning all perturbations \( \mathbf{u} \) eventually converge to zero) if and only if \( \Re < \Re_G \) [1]. Loss of global stability is not sufficient for turbulence, but it is necessary, and often it is more informative than linear stability. Linear stability of the laminar state does not preclude turbulence whose onset is subcritical [2–6], nor does it ensure that the laminar state is physically realizable because the basin of attraction can be minuscule [7–9]. The value of \( \Re_G \), however, can be very hard to determine.

An upper bound on \( \Re_G \) is provided by any \( \Re \) at which a sustained non-laminar flow is found. A lower bound on \( \Re_G \) requires finding a \( \Re \) threshold below which the laminar state is globally stable. Historically, the only method applicable to all systems governed by (1)–(2) has been the energy method pioneered by Reynolds and Orr [10, 11], wherein one finds the threshold \( \Re_E \) such that the kinetic energy, \( \dot{E} = \frac{1}{2} \int |\mathbf{u}|^2 \, dx \), of every nonzero perturbation decreases monotonically toward zero if and only if \( \Re < \Re_E \). Often the lower bound on \( \Re_G \) provided by \( \Re_E \) is very conservative. In systems where turbulence is driven by parallel shear, such as pressure-driven flow in a pipe or boundary-driven flow in a layer, the energy stability thresholds \( \Re_E \) [12–15] are much smaller than the minimum \( \Re \) at which sustained non-laminar states have been found [4, 16–18]. In other words, there is a large gap between these lower and upper bounds on \( \Re_G \).

Global stability at \( \Re \) values larger than \( \Re_E \) has been shown only in special cases. Each such result has relied on showing monotonic decrease of a quadratic integral that is an inviscid invariant—i.e., the nonlinear term in (1) does not contribute to the expression for the integral’s evolution. In symmetric systems where individual components of \( E \) are conserved, for instance, one can consider various linear combinations of them. This is called the generalized energy method [15, 19–21]. Lacking an artificial symmetry on \( \mathbf{u} \), however, \( E \) is the only nonnegative quadratic integral that can be shown to decrease globally, so the generalized energy method may add local stability results but still gives \( \Re_E \) as a lower bound on \( \Re_G \). No method for verifying global stability at larger \( \Re \) values has been reported, aside from the one presented here.

The standard way to show that a solution of a dynamical system is globally asymptotically stable is to construct a Lyapunov function. This is a functional \( V \) that maps each spatial function \( \mathbf{u}(\cdot, t) \) to a real number and satisfies \( V(\mathbf{0}) = 0 \). Let \( \mathcal{L}V \) denote the Lie derivative of \( V \) along PDE solutions of (1)–(2), meaning \( \mathcal{L}V \) is the functional such that \( \mathcal{L}V(\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)) = \frac{d}{dt} V(\mathbf{u}(\cdot, t)) \) for all \( \mathbf{u}(x, t) \) solving (1)–(2). The \( \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0} \) state is globally attracting if \( V(\mathbf{u}) > 0 \) and \( \mathcal{L}V(\mathbf{u}) < 0 \) for all nonzero \( \mathbf{u} \) admitted by the boundary conditions [22]. The energy method uses \( V = E \), and in symmetric cases the generalized energy method uses other quadratic \( V \).

Our method constructs Lyapunov functionals \( V \) with polynomial dependence on \( \mathbf{u} \), in particular with

\[
V(\mathbf{u}) = V(\mathbf{a}, q) = E^d + P(\mathbf{a}, q), \tag{3}
\]
Reynolds number is 1 planes. Some authors use half these differences, so their $u$, $U$ the laminar flow sustained non-laminar states [23–25], and the laminar stability has been verified using each set of modes, along with 8, 12, and 13. Figure 1 shows Re values at which stabilizing explicitly on the projections $Re > 0$ and $L E < 0$ for all admissible perturbations. In systems where $u$ is periodic and/or vanishes at all boundaries,

$$L E = \int \left( -\frac{1}{Re} |\nabla u|^2 - u \cdot D \cdot u \right) dx, \quad (4)$$

where $D = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla U + \nabla^T U)$ is the laminar strain-rate tensor [1]. Variational arguments imply that $L E < 0$ for all divergence-free nonzero $u$ if and only if all eigenvalues $\lambda$ are negative for the energy eigenproblem [15, 27, 28]

$$\left( \frac{1}{Re} \Delta - D \right) w - \nabla \zeta = \lambda w, \quad \nabla \cdot w = 0, \quad (5)$$

where $\zeta$ is the Lagrange multiplier enforcing incompressibility of $w$. This defines an energy stability threshold $Re_E$, where for $Re < Re_E$ the energy is a valid Lyapunov functional, so the laminar state is globally stable. It is only because $L V$ is quadratic that its negativity can be verified by solving a linear Euler–Lagrange equation (5). Going beyond quadratic $V$ requires other ways to enforce $V > 0$ and $L V < 0$.

To construct new non-quadratic $V$, we follow the ideas of constructing $V$ using the method explained below, so computations were limited to 13 modes.

Over the full range of periods $L$ for which computations were performed, results surpass the energy method. For instance, at the most energy-unstable period $L_E$ where the energy method gives stability up to $Re_E \approx 177.2$, our best $V$ verified stability at $Re = 252.4$. Beyond their implications for Couette flow, the greater significance of these results is the proof of concept for a broadly applicable new method—the first generalization of the energy method that is applicable to any 2D or 3D flow.

To recall the workings of the energy method, note that positivity of $E$ is clear, so implementing the energy method amounts to determining the Re at which $L E < 0$ for all admissible perturbations. In systems where $u$ is periodic and/or vanishes at all boundaries,

$$L E = \int \left( -\frac{1}{Re} |\nabla u|^2 - u \cdot D \cdot u \right) dx, \quad (4)$$

where $D = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla U + \nabla^T U)$ is the laminar strain-rate tensor [1]. Variational arguments imply that $L E < 0$ for all divergence-free nonzero $u$ if and only if all eigenvalues $\lambda$ are negative for the energy eigenproblem [15, 27, 28]
in [29] and consider a partial Galerkin expansion of $u$,

$$u(x, t) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i(t) u_i(x) + v(x, t), \quad (6)$$

where the $u_i$ are selected modes of the energy eigenproblem (5), and $a_i = \int u \cdot u_i \, dx$ is the orthogonal projection of $u$ onto $u_i$. Let $q = (\int |v|^2 \, dx)^{1/2}$, so the perturbation energy is $E = \frac{1}{2} (|a|^2 + q^2)$. Lyapunov functions $V$ will be functions of the $m + 1$ scalars $(a, q)$, each of which is a functional of $u$.

To derive the functional $\mathcal{L}V$ that coincides with $\frac{d}{dt} V$ along solutions of (1)–(2), we let only even powers of $q$ appear in $V$, in which case $\frac{d}{dt} V = \frac{\partial V}{\partial a} \cdot f(a) + 2 \frac{\partial V}{\partial q} \Gamma(v)$.

The resulting expression for $\mathcal{L}V$ is [30]

$$\mathcal{L}V(a, q, v) = G(a, q, v) + M(a, q) \cdot \Theta(a, v),$$

where

$$G(a, q, v) = \frac{\partial V}{\partial a} \cdot f(a) + 2 \frac{\partial V}{\partial q} \Gamma(v),$$

$$M(a, q) = \frac{\partial V}{\partial a} - 2 \frac{\partial V}{\partial q} \cdot a,$$

$$\Theta(a, v) = \Theta_{AB}(a, v) + \Theta_C(v),$$

$$f_i(a) = L_{ij} a_j + N_{ijk} a_j a_k,$$

$$L_{ij} = \frac{1}{\rho c} \langle u_i, \Delta u_j \rangle + \langle u_i, A(u_j) \rangle,$$

$$N_{ijk} = -\langle u_i, u_j, \nabla u_k \rangle,$$

$$\Theta_{AB}(a, v) = \langle \partial V/\partial a, v \rangle + \langle v, h_0 \rangle a_j,$$

$$h_0 = \frac{1}{\rho c} \Delta u_i - U \cdot \nabla u_i - u_i \cdot \nabla^T U,$$

$$\Theta_C(v) = \langle v, v, \nabla u_i \rangle,$$

$$\Gamma(v) = \frac{1}{\rho c} \langle v, \Delta v \rangle - \langle v, Dv \rangle,$$

and $(u, v) = \int u \cdot v \, dx$.

Positivity of $V$ is enforced by regarding $V(a, q)$ as a polynomial on $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$, rather than a functional of $u$. Requiring positivity of this polynomial away from the origin constrains $P$. Negativity of $\mathcal{L}V$ is enforced in a similar way, but since $\mathcal{L}V$ depends on the full tail $v$, it first must be bounded above by a polynomial depending only on $(a, q)$. The reason we choose the $u_i$ to be modes of the energy eigenproblem is so that $\Gamma(v) \leq \kappa q^2$ [29], where $\kappa$ is the largest eigenvalue from (5) not associated to any of the $m$ modes in the sum of (6). Enough modes are included so that $\kappa < 0$, and we impose $\frac{\partial V}{\partial q} \geq 0$ so that

$$G(a, q, v) \leq \tilde{G}(a, q) = \frac{\partial V}{\partial a} \cdot f(a) + 2 \frac{\partial V}{\partial q} \kappa q^2.$$

A more complicated procedure described in the Supplement introduces a polynomial $\Xi(a, q)$ with auxiliary constraints that ensure

$$M(a, q) \cdot \Theta(a, v) \leq \Xi(a, q). \quad (9)$$

By (7)–(9), if $\tilde{G} + \Xi < 0$ for all $(a, q)$, then $\mathcal{L}V < 0$ for all $u$. Therefore, if polynomials $P(a, q)$ and $\Xi(a, q)$ are found such that $V > 0$, $\tilde{G} + \Xi < 0$, and $\frac{\partial V}{\partial q} \geq 0$ for all nonzero $(a, q)$, and such that the inequalities in the Supplement guaranteeing (9) hold, then $V$ is a valid Lyapunov functional. Each of these constraints amounts to nonnegativity of a polynomial expression.

Verifying that a polynomial is nonnegative is computationally intractable (NP-hard) in general [31]. A tractable sufficient condition is that the polynomial can be written as a sum of squares of other polynomials. Computational techniques for enforcing sum-of-squares (SOS) constraints, introduced two decades ago [32–34], let us search for $P$ and $\Xi$ in a chosen bounded-degree set of polynomials subject to SOS constraints that imply all of the inequalities described above. If such $P$ and $\Xi$ are found, then $V$ defined by (3) is a valid Lyapunov functional. The tunable coefficients of $P$ and $\Xi$ appear linearly in the expressions that must be SOS, and the problem of choosing these coefficients subject to the SOS constraints can be reformulated [35, 36] as a semidefinite program—a type of conic optimization problem that can be solved numerically using specialized software. These numerics are subject to rounding error (unless one incorporates interval arithmetic as in [37]), so they provide numerical approximations to stability thresholds.

The approach to fluid stability described above was proposed but not implemented in [29]. As a preliminary test, the idea was applied in [30] to an example contrived to have simple energy eigenmodes. Quartic and sextic Lyapunov functionals were successfully computed in [30], but they had no chance to improve upon the generalized energy method, which already gives Re$_G$ exactly for that flow. The present work adds three contributions. First, we show that the approach of [29] can surpass quadratic Lyapunov functionals in practice. Second, we do this in a realistic context where the energy eigenproblem (5) must be solved computationally. Third, we make a crucial technical change to the way $\Xi$ is defined and constrained in [29], as described in the Supplement, which improves our results dramatically.

The ansatz (3) for $V$ is not an arbitrary polynomial since some structure can be deduced a priori. Both $V$ and $\mathcal{L}V$ must be sign-definite, so their highest-degree terms must be of even degree. This is possible only if the nonlinearity in (1) does not contribute to the evolution of the highest-degree term in $V$, in which case both expressions can have the same maximum degree. This is why the leading term in (3) takes the form $E^d$. Further, $P$ can have no terms of degree less than two since $V$ must have a unique minimum when $u = 0$. When $d = 1$ these constraints require $V$ to be the energy $E$ in general, re-
fecting the lack of freedom in the quadratic case. When \( d \geq 2 \) there is significant freedom in the choice of \( P \).

Constructing a polynomial \( \Xi \) that is guaranteed to satisfy (9) requires computing all tensors in (7). First one must compute energy eigenmodes of (5) for the chosen values of \((\text{Re}, L)\), then select a set of modes \( \{\mathbf{u}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_m\} \) on which \( V \) will depend. It is necessary to include all modes with positive eigenvalues at the given \((\text{Re},L)\), so that \( \kappa < 0 \) in (8), and to include enough stable modes that trajectories of the truncated system \( \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} = \mathbf{f} \) are bounded. Beyond this, there is freedom in the number and choice of modes. For a fixed number of modes, experimentation may need to determine which mode set gives the strongest stability results.

To implement the method presented here for 2D plane Couette flow, we first solve the energy eigenproblem and choose a subset of modes on which \( V \) is verified to (9) requires computing all tensors in (7). First one must have a nontrivial kernel, and this kernel can be reflected the lack of freedom in the quadratic case. When \( d \geq 2 \) there is significant freedom in the choice of \( P \).

Constructing a polynomial \( \Xi \) that is guaranteed to satisfy (9) requires computing all tensors in (7). First one must compute energy eigenmodes of (5) for the chosen values of \((\text{Re}, L)\), then select a set of modes \( \{\mathbf{u}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_m\} \) on which \( V \) will depend. It is necessary to include all modes with positive eigenvalues at the given \((\text{Re},L)\), so that \( \kappa < 0 \) in (8), and to include enough stable modes that trajectories of the truncated system \( \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} = \mathbf{f} \) are bounded. Beyond this, there is freedom in the number and choice of modes. For a fixed number of modes, experimentation may need to determine which mode set gives the strongest stability results.

To implement the method presented here for 2D plane Couette flow, we first solve the energy eigenproblem and choose a subset of modes on which \( V \) will depend. With the stream function \( \psi \) defined by \( \mathbf{u} = \left( \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y}, -\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} \right) \), the eigenproblem (5), subject to no-slip boundary conditions \( \nabla \psi(x, \pm \frac{1}{2}) = \mathbf{0} \), becomes

\[
\lambda \Delta \psi = \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x \partial y} + \frac{1}{\text{Re}} \Delta^2 \psi. \tag{10}
\]

Fourier decomposition in \( x \) gives an equation for \( \hat{\psi}(\alpha, y) \), where the streamwise wavenumber \( \alpha \) is an integer multiple of \( \frac{2\pi}{L} \). The solution is \( \hat{\psi}(\alpha, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{4} c_j e^{i\beta_j y} \), where the \( \beta_j \) are roots of the characteristic polynomial

\[
p(\lambda, \text{Re}, \alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{\text{Re}} (\alpha^2 + \beta^2)^2 + \lambda (\alpha^2 + \beta^2) - \alpha \beta. \tag{11}
\]

The boundary conditions on \( \hat{\psi} \) give a constraint of the form \( \mathbf{Bc} = \mathbf{0} \), where \( \mathbf{B} \) is a matrix (given in the Supplement) and \( \mathbf{c} = [c_1 \ c_2 \ c_3 \ c_4]^T \). For given \( \text{Re} \) and \( \alpha \), eigenvalues \( \lambda \) of (10) can be found from the fact that \( \mathbf{B} \) must have a nontrivial kernel, and this kernel can be used to construct the corresponding energy eigenmodes. The eigenmodes can be translated arbitrarily in \( x \), so when \( \alpha \neq 0 \), we choose two modes shifted by a quarter-period to span the corresponding eigenspace and ensure orthogonality. As an example, Fig. 2 shows eigenvalues and corresponding eigenmodes for \((\text{Re}, L) = (240, 2)\), a point in the parameter regime where energy can grow transiently yet our computations verify stability.

The four nested sets of eigenmodes that were used to compute the stability results of Fig. 1 are defined in the caption of Fig. 2. For each \((\text{Re}, L)\) and set of modes, all tensors in (7) were computed numerically. We then formulated the SOS computations described above, searching for polynomials \( P \) and \( \Xi \) such that \( V \) was verified to be a Lyapunov functional. The parser YALMIP [38, 39] was used to reformulate all SOS constraints as semidefinite programs, which were then solved using the interior-point algorithm of MOSEK [40]. The resulting \( P \) and \( \Xi \) have many terms, so we do not report them here.

For each \( L \) and set of modes, the symbol plotted in Fig. 1 is the largest \( \text{Re} \) for which our SOS computations found a valid quartic \( V \). The \( V \) we constructed at each \((\text{Re}, L)\) need not be a valid Lyapunov function at smaller \( \text{Re} \) values. However, for the many \( \text{Re} \) values smaller than those indicated in Fig. 1 at which we have carried out SOS computations, we never failed to find a different \( V \) verifying stability.

We expect the stability thresholds in Fig. 1 will continue to improve with an increase to the number of eigenmodes (\( m \)) on which \( V \) explicitly depends in (3). However, our computations for 13 modes are already expensive. This prevents us from considering very large \( L \) since the number of modes that would be needed grows at least linearly with \( L \). Thus the present version of our method cannot apply to arbitrary-\( L \) perturbations in very long
domains, although it surpasses the energy method for perturbations up to whatever period is computationally tractable. Aside from adding modes, stability thresholds can be improved by raising the polynomial degree \((2d)\) of \(V\). We used only quartic \(V\) because sextic \(V\) demand much larger computational cost and memory footprint.

In summary, we have presented a general method for constructing polynomial Lyapunov functionals to show global stability of fluid flows. It can be used to surpass the many conservative results derived using energy or the other quadratic functionals to which past studies of fluid stability have been confined. The method is more technical than the classic energy method but can be implemented using modern computational tools of polynomial optimization. We have verified stability for 2D plane Couette in a regime where energy can grow transiently. This improves on a century-old stability criterion of Orr, at least for perturbations whose streamwise periods are not too large. As far as we know, this is the first global stability result for any flow that is stronger than what can be shown using the energy method or its generalizations to other quadratic integrals. The natural next step is to apply the same approach to 3D perturbations of plane Couette flow or another 3D flow where the energy method is overly conservative, such as pipe flow. The procedure will be the same as in the present 2D example, only with greater technicality and computational cost. Beyond the topic of stability, our results suggest that new computational tools such as polynomial optimization have the potential to make progress on fluid dynamical questions that have withstood progress for many years.
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Lyapunov stability theorem

To show that the energy of the velocity perturbations $u(x,t)$ satisfying (1)–(2) tends to zero as $t \to \infty$, we use the Lyapunov stability theorem given as Proposition 3.2 in [22]. Results in that work apply to the present infinite-dimensional dynamics, whereas most Lyapunov stability theorems are stated for ordinary differential equations. Let $X$ be the class of differentiable spatial functions satisfying the no-slip and periodic boundary conditions imposed by the fluid domain. Consider $X$ as a normed linear space with the spatial $L^2$ norm, $\|u\|^2 = \int |u|^2 \, dx$. A Lyapunov stability result in this setting applies to every solution of (1)–(2) that remains in the class $X$ for $t \geq 0$. If a Lyapunov functional $V$ is continuous and satisfies

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} V(u(t)) = 0,$$

for every admissible initial condition $u(0) \in X$. In other words, the laminar state $u = 0$ would be globally asymptotically stable.

The conditions in Proposition 3.2 of [22] require that $V$ is continuous and satisfies

$$\xi_L(\|u\|) \leq V(u) \leq \xi_U(\|u\|),$$

$$\xi_L \leq V(0) \leq \xi_U,$$

(S1)

where $\xi_L$, $\xi_U$ and $\xi_D$ are continuous strictly increasing functions from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to $\mathbb{R}_+$ that vanish at 0, and where $\xi_L$ and $\xi_U$ are unbounded. The functional $\mathcal{L}V : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is the Lie derivative of $V$ along solutions of (1)–(2). It has no explicit time-dependence but is defined such that $\mathcal{L}V(u(\cdot),0) = \frac{d}{dt} V(u(\cdot),t)|_{t=0}$ for the solution $u(x,t)$ of the Navier–Stokes equations (1)–(2) with initial condition $u(\cdot,0) \in X$.

Condition (S1) implies that $V(0) = 0$, and the fact that the laminar flow $u = 0$ is an equilibrium point implies $\mathcal{L}V(0) = 0$. Conditions (S1) and (S2) require that

$$\xi_L \leq V(u) \leq \xi_U,$$

for all nonzero $u$, and that $V$ approaches infinity as $\|u\|$ does (i.e., $V$ is radially unbounded). In the present work we impose constraints which ensure $V(u) \geq \varepsilon E(u) = \varepsilon \frac{1}{2} \|u\|^2 = \xi_L(\|u\|)$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $V$ is a polynomial of the form (3), this implies $V \leq c_\varepsilon E + c_\varepsilon E^2 = \xi_U$ for some positive constants $c_\varepsilon$ and $c_\varepsilon$, so condition (S1) holds. Our constraints also ensure that there exists a function $Q(a,q)$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}V(u) \leq Q(a,q) \leq -\varepsilon \frac{1}{2} \|u\|^2$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$, so condition (S2) holds with $\xi_D = \varepsilon E$. Thus, Proposition 3.2 of [22] can be applied.

Constraints on $\Xi$

The function $Q(a,q)$ that must bound $\mathcal{L}V$ above takes the form $Q = G + \Xi$, where $G$ is defined by (8) and $\Xi$ satisfies (9). Note that $Q(0,0) = 0$, which implies $\Xi(0,0) = 0$ since $G(0,0) = 0$. The constraint (9) on $\Xi$ is

$$M(a,q) \cdot \Theta(a,v) \leq \Xi(a,q),$$

where $M$ and $\Theta$ are defined by (7). Constructing such $\Xi$ requires additional estimates on $M \cdot \Theta$ because $\Theta$ depends on the infinite-dimensional tail $v$ of the velocity’s Galerkin expansion (6), whereas $\Xi$ can depend on $v$ only through its norm, $q = \|v\|$.

In previous efforts [29, 30], the $M \cdot \Theta$ term was estimated by

$$M \cdot \Theta \leq |M||\Theta| \leq |M|(|\Theta_{AB}| + |\Theta_C|) \leq |M|\sqrt{2(|\Theta_{AB}|^2 + |\Theta_C|^2)},$$

(S3)

where $|\Theta_{AB}|^2 + |\Theta_C|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m (\Theta_{AB}^2 + \Theta_C^2)$. Individual terms in the latter sum were then estimated by [29, 30]

$$|\Theta_{AB}| \leq \sqrt{a^T G_i a}, \quad (G_i)|_{j,k} = (\hat{h}_{ij}, \hat{h}_{jk}),$$

$$|\Theta_C| \leq C_i q^2, \quad C_i = \|\rho(D_i)|_{\infty} = \sup_{x} \rho(D_i(x)),

(S4)

with $\hat{a} = [1 \ a_1 \cdots a_m]^T$, $G_i$ is the $L^2$ Gram matrix of the vector fields $\{\hat{h}_{ij}\}_{j=0}^m$. $D_i = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla u_i + \nabla^T u_i)$ is the strain-rate tensor of the energy eigenmode $u_i$, and $\rho(D_i(x))$ is the spectral radius of $D_i(x)$. Here, $\hat{h}_{ij}$ is the solenoidal projection of $h_{ij}$ orthogonal to all the eigenmodes $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^m$, meaning $\langle \hat{h}_{ij}, u_k \rangle = 0, \nabla \cdot \hat{h}_{ij} = 0$, and $\hat{h}_{ij} \cdot n = 0$ at no-slip boundaries (where $n$ is the outward normal vector). These bounds result in an estimate $M \cdot \Theta \leq |M|\sqrt{p_\Theta}$ with $p_\Theta = 2 \sum_{i=1}^m (\hat{a}^T G_i \hat{a}^2 + C_i q^4)$ being a polynomial. The upper bound $|M|\sqrt{p_\Theta}$ depends only on $(a,q)$ as desired, but it is not a polynomial because of the absolute value and the square root. Additional manipulations are needed to formulate purely polynomial inequalities that imply $Q < 0$ (cf. [29]), which at last can be relaxed to sum-of-squares (SOS) constraints. The resulting formulation is very computationally expensive. For 2D Couette flow we have implemented it with $a \in \mathbb{R}^6$. Relative to the new approach described below, the computations were more expensive and the stability results were significantly weaker.

In the present work we derive an estimate $M \cdot \Theta \leq \Xi$, where $\Xi$ is a polynomial in $(a,q)$. In contrast to (S3), where the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality was used immediately on $M$ and $\Theta$, we estimate

$$M \cdot \Theta = \sum_{i=1}^m M_i \Theta_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^m |M_i||(\Theta_{AB}^2) + |\Theta_C^2|).$$

(S5)
In general this estimate is sharper than (S3), and we still can apply the estimates (S4) derived in [29, 30]. In particular, if we can find polynomials $r_i(a, q)$ and $s_i(a, q)$ such that
\begin{align}
|M_i||\Theta_{AB}| &\leq |M_i|\sqrt{\tilde{a}^T G_i \tilde{a}q^2} \leq r_i, \quad (S6) \\
|M_i||\Theta_{Ci}| &\leq s_i C_i q^2, \quad (S7)
\end{align}
then $M \cdot \Theta$ is bounded above by the polynomial
\begin{equation}
\Xi(a, q) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} (r_i + s_i C_i q^2). \quad (S8)
\end{equation}
The $M_i$ defined in (7) depend on the Lyapunov functional $V$, so the conditions (S6)–(S7) do also. The construction of $r_i$ and $s_i$ satisfying (S6)–(S7) must be done simultaneously with the construction of a $V$ that satisfies all other constraints. For these constructions to be carried out computationally, the constraints (S6)–(S7) must be transformed into polynomial inequalities.

Condition (S6) on each $r_i$ is equivalent to the $2 \times 2$ positive semidefinite matrix constraint
\begin{equation}
\begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{a}^T G_i \tilde{a} q^2 r_i & \tilde{a}^T G_i \tilde{a} q^2 M_i \\
\tilde{a}^T G_i \tilde{a} q^2 M_i & r_i
\end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \quad (S9)
\end{equation}
holding for all $(a, q) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$. Multiplying this matrix on the left and right by a dummy variable $w \in \mathbb{R}^2$ gives a polynomial inequality that also is equivalent to (S6):
\begin{equation}
w_i^2 \tilde{a}^T G_i \tilde{a} q^2 r_i + 2 w_1 w_2 \tilde{a}^T G_i \tilde{a} q^2 M_i + w_2^2 r_i \geq 0 \quad (S10)
\end{equation}
for all $(a, q, w) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+3}$. The $r_i$ cannot have any constant or linear terms because $\Xi(0, 0) = 0$, and their degree cannot exceed that of $V$.

The condition (S7) on each $s_i$ holds if $|M_i| \leq s_i$, as follows from the bound on $|\Theta_{Ci}|$ in (S4). This can be enforced by the polynomial inequalities
\begin{equation}
-s_i \leq M_i, \quad M_i \leq s_i. \quad (S11)
\end{equation}
The requirement that $\Xi(0, 0) = 0$ does not restrict the lower-degree terms of the $s_i$ because $C_i q^2$ vanishes at the origin. The maximum degree of each $s_i$ can be no larger than that of $M_i$, which is two less than the degree of $V$ when using the ansatz (3).

**Final sum-of-squares conditions**

The polynomial inequalities that suffice for $V$ to be a valid Lyapunov functional, which are derived above and in the main document, can be summarized as
\begin{align*}
E(a, q)^d + P(a, q) - \varepsilon E(a, q) &\geq 0, \\
-\left(\tilde{G}(a, q) + \Xi(a, q) + \varepsilon E(a, q)\right) &\geq 0, \quad \frac{\partial V}{\partial q} \geq 0, \\
w_i^2 \tilde{a}^T G_i \tilde{a} q^2 r_i(a, q) + w_2^2 r_i(a, q) + 2 w_1 w_2 \tilde{a}^T G_i \tilde{a} q^2 M_i(a, q) &\geq 0, \quad (S12)
\end{align*}
for $i = 1, \ldots, m$. In the expressions above, $V = E^d + P$, $E = \frac{1}{2}(|a|^2 + q^2)$, $P$ is a polynomial of degree no more than $2d - 1$ with no constant or linear terms, $G_i$ and $C_i$ are constants in the estimates of (S4), the $M_i$ are defined in (7), $\tilde{G}$ is defined by (8), $\Xi$ is defined by (S8), and $\varepsilon > 0$ is fixed. The $r_i$ are polynomials of degree at most $2d$ with no constant or linear terms, while the $s_i$ are polynomials of degree at most $2d - 2$. In all polynomials, only even powers of $q$ are present. All stability computations reported here used $d = 2$, corresponding to quartic Lyapunov functionals $V$, cubic $P$, quartic $r_i$, and quadratic $s_i$. In all cases we fixed $\varepsilon = 2 \cdot 10^{-5}$.

As noted in the main document, verifying the nonnegativity conditions in (S12) is computationally intractable (NP-hard [31]). Therefore, we strengthen them to more tractable SOS conditions. To search for a Lyapunov functional $V$, the tunable variables in (S12) are the coefficients of the polynomials $P$, $r_i$, and $s_i$. Every expression that must be SOS is linear in these polynomials, which is essential. Polynomial optimization problems subject to SOS constraints can be converted into semidefinite programs only if the SOS expressions are linear in the tunable parameters. Indeed, there are many possible ways of deriving an upper bound $M \cdot \Theta \leq \Xi$, but only certain estimates lead to a formulation in which the tunable parameters appear linearly. The estimates used here have this property, as do the ones derived in [29]. Thus, having replaced each inequality in (S12) with an SOS condition, we used the software YALMIP [38, 39] to formulate an equivalent semidefinite program and the software MOSEK v8.0.0.80 [40] to solve it numerically.

To decrease computational cost and improve numerical conditioning, symmetries of the governing dynamics (7) can be used to anticipate symmetries of the polynomials $P$, $r_i$, and $s_i$, whose ansätze then can be chosen to impose these symmetries. The symmetries of the truncated system $\frac{df}{dt} = f$ depend on the choice of eigenmodes. With the 6-mode set defined in the main document, for instance, the system is invariant under the rotation $(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6) \rightarrow (a_1, a_2, a_4, -a_3, a_6, -a_5)$. Thus, our ansätze for $P$, $r_i$, and $s_i$ omitted all monomials that are not invariant under the transformations generated by this rotation. To ease the detection of symmetries and increase sparsity of the tensors in (7), our
computations for 2D plane Couette flow used the spatial domain \((0, L) \times (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})\), rather than \((0, L) \times (0, 1)\).

**Numerical solution of the energy eigenproblem**

The energy eigenproblem for 2D plane Couette was solved numerically using the stream function formulation (10). Expansion of \(\psi\) as a Fourier series in \(x\) yields the Fourier components \(\hat{\psi}(\alpha, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{4} c_{j} e^{i\beta y}\), where \(\alpha\) is an integer multiple of \(\frac{2\pi}{L}\), and the \(\beta_{j}\) are roots of the characteristic polynomial (11). The no-slip boundary conditions at \(y = \pm \frac{1}{2}\) imply a constraint \(Bc = 0\), where \(c = [c_{1} \ c_{2} \ c_{3} \ c_{4}]^{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{4}\) and

\[
B = \begin{bmatrix}
\cos(\frac{1}{2}\beta_{1}) & \cdots & \cos(\frac{1}{2}\beta_{4}) \\
\sin(\frac{1}{2}\beta_{1}) & \cdots & \sin(\frac{1}{2}\beta_{4}) \\
\beta_{1} \cos(\frac{1}{2}\beta_{1}) & \cdots & \beta_{1} \cos(\frac{1}{2}\beta_{4}) \\
\beta_{1} \sin(\frac{1}{2}\beta_{1}) & \cdots & \beta_{1} \sin(\frac{1}{2}\beta_{4})
\end{bmatrix}.
\] (S13)

The matrix \(B\) depends on \((\lambda, \text{Re}, \alpha)\) through the roots \(\beta_{j}\) of the characteristic polynomial (11). The ansatz for \(\psi\) slightly changes when there are repeated roots, but this occurs only on a parameter set of measure zero. The constraint \(Bc = 0\) has a nonzero solution \(c\) only at those \((\lambda, \text{Re}, \alpha)\) where \(B\) has a nontrivial kernel. In such cases, \(\lambda\) is an eigenvalue of the energy eigenproblem (10) at the corresponding \((\text{Re}, \alpha)\) values, and the null vector \(c\) can be used to construct \(\hat{\psi}(\alpha, y)\). The velocity field of the eigenmode is \(u = (\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y}, -\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x})\), where \(\psi(x, y) = 2\text{Re}(\hat{\psi}(\alpha, y)e^{i\alpha x})\). Each nonzero-\(\alpha\) eigenmode represented by \(c\) is \(L^{2}\)-orthogonal to the quarter-phase shifted eigenmode represented by \(e^{i\alpha/2}c = ic\). We take both of these modes to span the \(\lambda\)-eigenspace. All eigenmodes \(u\) are normalized by their \(L^{2}\) norms, so the resulting set of modes \(\{u_{1}, \ldots, u_{m}\}\) is \(L^{2}\)-orthonormal.

At each fixed \((\text{Re}, \alpha)\), we used a nonlinear root solver to find \(\lambda\) at which \(B\) is singular, corresponding to \(\lambda\) that are eigenvalues of (10). Our implementation searched for \(\lambda\) that locally minimized the smallest singular value of \(B\), as computed by a singular value decomposition. This numerical approach was more robust than searching for zeros of \(\det(B)\) or tracking individual eigenvalues of \(B\). Only a certain number branches were tracked at each multiple of \(\frac{\pi}{\text{Re}}\). In the special case \(\alpha = 0\), the streamwise-independent eigenfunctions can be found analytically starting from (5). The eigenvalues are \(\lambda = -\frac{1}{\text{Re}}(k\pi)^{2}\) for \(k \in \mathbb{N}\), with eigenfunctions \(u = \frac{f}{2}(\cos(k\pi y), 0)\) when \(k\) is odd and \(u = \frac{f}{2}(\sin(k\pi y), 0)\) when \(k\) is even.

Once a set of eigenmodes \(\{u_{1}, \ldots, u_{m}\}\) was selected, \(f\) and the \(h_{ij}\) were computed according to the formulas in (7). The largest eigenvalue not associated to these modes gives the value of the constant \(\kappa\). Because we use the estimate (S4) to bound \(M \cdot \Theta\), the \(G_{i}\) and \(C_{i}\) appearing in (S4) had to be computed as well.

To compute the matrices \(G_{i}\), we first need the \(\tilde{h}_{ij}\), which are the solenoidal projections of the \(h_{ij}\) onto the orthogonal complement of the selected eigenmodes. First, the solenoidal projection \(h_{ij}^{\text{div}}\) was calculated by solving a Poisson problem of the form \(\Delta \phi = \nabla \cdot h_{ij}\) with boundary conditions \(\nabla \phi \cdot n = h_{ij} \cdot n\), in which case \(h_{ij}^{\text{div}} = h_{ij} - \nabla \phi\) with \(\nabla \phi = 0\) whenever \(u\) has no-slip boundary conditions. This computation was done in Fourier space by exploiting the Fourier decomposition of the initial \(h_{ij}\). Then, the projections of \(h_{ij}^{\text{div}}\) onto \(u_{1}, \ldots, u_{m}\) were subtracted from \(h_{ij}^{\text{div}}\) to produce the \(\tilde{h}_{ij}\).

Lastly, the \(G_{i}\) were the \(L^{2}\) Gram matrices associated to \(\{h_{ij}\}_{j=1}^{m}\), as defined in (S4).

The eigenvalues of \(D_{i}(x)\) appearing in the estimates (S4) were computed explicitly. Incompressibility of the flow implies \(\text{tr}(D_{i}(x)) = 0\) for all \(x\), and in the two-dimensional case this means that \(D_{i}(x)\) has two opposite eigenvalues whose magnitude is the spectral radius. Hence the spectral radius is

\[
\rho(D_{i}(x)) = \sqrt{(\frac{\partial^{2} \psi_{i}}{\partial x \partial y})^{2} + (\frac{1}{4}(\Delta \psi_{i}))^{2}},
\] (S14)

where \(\psi_{i}\) is the stream function of the energy eigenmode \(u_{i}\). The maxima of the \(\rho(D_{i}(x))\) over all \(x\) in the domain were found numerically using constrained optimization methods, giving the values \(C_{i} = \|\rho(D_{i})\|_{\infty}\).