

THE GODBILLON-VEY INVARIANT AS TOPOLOGICAL VORTICITY COMPRESSION AND OBSTRUCTION TO STEADY FLOW IN IDEAL FLUIDS

THOMAS MACHON

H.H. Wills Physics Laboratory, Tyndall Avenue, Bristol BS8 1TL, UK

ABSTRACT. If the vorticity field of an ideal fluid is tangent to a foliation, additional conservation laws arise. For a class of zero-helicity vorticity fields the Godbillon-Vey (GV) invariant of foliations is defined and is shown to be an invariant purely of the vorticity, becoming a higher-order helicity-type invariant of the flow. $GV \neq 0$ gives both a global topological obstruction to steady flow and, in a particular form, a local obstruction. GV is interpreted as helical compression and stretching of vortex lines. Examples are given where the value of GV is determined by a set of distinguished closed vortex lines.

1. INTRODUCTION

In an ideal fluid the evolution of vorticity is given by

$$(1) \quad \partial_t \omega + \mathcal{L}_U \omega = 0,$$

where U is the fluid velocity, ω the vorticity and \mathcal{L} the Lie derivative. In a domain Ω , the fluid velocity is a vector field satisfying the conditions

$$(2) \quad \nabla \times U = \omega, \quad \nabla \cdot U = 0, \quad U \parallel \partial\Omega,$$

which determine U up to the addition of a harmonic vector field. (1) implies that vortex lines flow along U , they are ‘frozen’ in the field. Indeed, if Φ^t is the diffeomorphism of Ω generated by the fluid after a time t , then the vorticity satisfies

$$(3) \quad \omega_t = d\Phi^t(\omega_0).$$

This transport of vorticity leads to a number of conservation laws, in particular, as first observed by Woltjer [1] and Moreau [2], the helicity of the vorticity field

$$(4) \quad \mathcal{H} = \int_{\Omega} U \cdot \omega \, dV,$$

is conserved by the fluid. This can be seen explicitly,

$$(5) \quad \frac{d\mathcal{H}}{dt} = \int_{\Omega} (\partial_t + U \cdot \nabla)(U \cdot \omega) dV = \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (F\omega) dV,$$

where $F = U^2/2 - P$, and P is pressure. Stokes’ theorem then gives a boundary term which vanishes as long as $\omega \parallel \partial\Omega$, a condition we impose henceforth. \mathcal{H} is a topological quantity invariant not only under the flow of U but any divergence-free vector field. First understood by Moffatt [3], formalised by Arnold [4], this

topological aspect of helicity manifests in its relation to the average linking of vortex lines, a fact revealed by writing U in terms of the Biot-Savart operator.

For curves in three dimensions, linking is perhaps the most elementary topological property and integral invariants that measure other topological aspects of ω have long been sought¹, with qualified success. For vorticity fields supported on handlebodies, one can define invariants that measure higher-order topological invariants (such as triple-linking numbers) [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13], typically mirroring their development by Milnor through the use of Massey products [14], however these invariants have not been extended to general vorticity fields. Notably it has been shown by Enciso, Peralta-Salas, and Torres de Lizaur [15], building on the work of Kudryavtseva [16, 17], that any such invariant defined by a functional whose derivative can be written as an integral operator with a continuous kernel is a function of helicity. A manifestation of this result can be seen in the attempts to define asymptotic invariants other than helicity [18, 19, 20], which become functions of helicity.

As noted [15], this constraint can be evaded by considering invariants which are not continuous functionals on the space of volume-preserving vector fields, as in the case of the triple-linking invariants. Here we consider vorticity fields whose integral curves lie tangent to a (singular) codimension-1 foliation \mathcal{F} of Ω . This property is preserved under volume-preserving diffeomorphisms so that diffeomorphism invariants of \mathcal{F} become invariants of the vorticity field. In particular we study vorticity fields admitting a vector potential A satisfying $A \cdot \omega = 0$. By Frobenius' integrability theorem, this implies that A defines a codimension-1 foliation of the fluid domain. It also implies that helicity vanishes, when it is defined. In such cases we may define a higher order integral invariant, GV , related to the Godbillon-Vey invariant of foliations.

In this paper we discuss GV for ideal fluid flows. We show, under assumptions on the singularities in \mathcal{F} , that it is defined purely in terms of the vorticity field, so is an integral invariant (conserved quantity) of the vorticity under general volume-preserving diffeomorphisms and hence the fluid flow. If Ω is closed and the foliation \mathcal{F} is non-singular, then GV is equal to the Godbillon-Vey invariant of \mathcal{F} . In general, GV may be defined for fluids on manifolds with boundary with $\omega \parallel \partial\Omega$, where the Godbillon-Vey invariant cannot be defined.

As we will discuss, GV is a topological invariant measuring the helical compression of the vortex lines. Inasmuch as it is a combination of twisting and squeezing of vorticity, we are tempted to refer to it as the 'wring' of a vorticity field, as in 'wringing a towel'. While a local geometric meaning for GV can be given fairly easily, the global topological interpretation is subtle [21]. Here we show, for a class of vorticity fields with $GV \neq 0$, that GV is determined by the local structure of a distinguished set of closed vortex lines, associated to the Kupka phenomenon of integrable 1-forms [22, 23, 24]. These distinguished closed lines can be given local self-linking terms and GV measures, in part, the failure of these self-linking terms to balance the linking terms from the other lines.

Helicity gives a lower bound for the enstrophy [5], and the goal has often been to give further bounds for the energy for higher-order helicities. GV is dimensionless, and so cannot bound a dimensionful quantity such as the energy alone. We show, however, that GV has a very natural relationship to Euler dynamics. In particular

¹Arnold and Khesin's "dream" [5].

$GV \neq 0$ implies that the flow is not steady and

$$(6) \quad GV^2 \leq C \int_{\Omega} (\partial_t \omega)^2 dV,$$

where C is a positive function depending on ω and the metric of Ω for which we give an explicit form. As GV is invariant under volume-preserving diffeomorphisms, this gives a global topological obstruction to the existence of a metric making ω a steady solution of the Euler equations. We show further that in a particular metric-dependent form the density for GV gives a local obstruction to $\partial_t \omega$ vanishing. In this form (6) can be further approximated, giving the relation

$$(7) \quad |GV| \lesssim \frac{L^7}{4E^2} \int_{\Omega} (\partial_t \omega)^2 dV,$$

where L is a characteristic lengthscale of the system as E is the total kinetic energy (of U). In this way, GV can be seen to measure the ratio between the rate of change of vorticity to the kinetic energy of the flow. As discussed above, GV has a geometric interpretation, measuring the average helical vortex compression (‘wring’) of the flow. Vorticity compression is the core nonlinearity of the Euler equations, given this as well as (6) we speculate that flows with $GV \neq 0$ will prove particularly interesting from a dynamical perspective.

The relevance of GV in hydrodynamics has been noted previously [5, 25, 28]. In particular, Tur and Yanovsky [26], establish the local conservation of GV , where it arises in the case of a hydrodynamic system described by a 1-form S , evolving as $(\partial_t + L_U)S = 0$. In Webb et al. [27] the potential application of GV to ideal fluids is discussed. In general, the vector potential A for ω satisfying $A \cdot \omega = 0$ may be written as $A = U + V$, where U is the fluid velocity and V is curl-free. Webb et al. discuss the special case $V = 0$, however, as we discuss below, GV can be defined in more generality. Because GV is invariant under all volume-preserving diffeomorphisms, it appears as a Casimir-type invariant in the Hamiltonian formulation of ideal fluids [29], which we discuss in another paper [30].

2. THE GODBILLON-VEY INVARIANT OF A VORTICITY FIELD

We consider a vorticity field ω defined on a 3-manifold Ω with volume-form μ . We take all vector fields and differential forms to be smooth throughout. We impose $\omega \parallel \partial\Omega$ and

$$(8) \quad \text{div}(\omega) = \mathcal{L}_{\omega}\mu = 0,$$

hence (by Cartan’s magic formula) $\iota_{\omega}\mu$ is closed, assumed exact so $\iota_{\omega}\mu = d\theta$. Then the helicity

$$(9) \quad \mathcal{H} = \int_{\Omega} \theta \wedge d\theta,$$

is an invariant of volume-preserving diffeomorphisms. Helicity is invariant under a gauge transformation, $\theta \rightarrow \theta + df$, for any function f and is invariant for *any* choice of θ only if it satisfies the fluxless condition [31] (see Appendix I). This condition is equivalent to the statement that

$$(10) \quad \int_S d\theta = 0,$$

for any surface $S \subset \Omega$, with $\partial S \subset \partial\Omega$. The fluxless condition is always satisfied if each component of $\partial\Omega$ is simply connected.

Here we will consider the special case where θ can be chosen such that

$$(11) \quad \theta \wedge d\theta = 0.$$

i.e. the helicity density vanishes. In the fluxless case this implies, but is stronger than, $\mathcal{H} = 0$. For example, any simply-connected three-dimensional submanifold $S \subset \Omega$ with $\omega \parallel \partial S$ has a gauge-invariant helicity (S must also transform under any diffeomorphism of Ω). Then it is quite possible to have $\Omega = S_1 \cup S_2$, $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 + \mathcal{H}_2 = 0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1 \neq 0$ in which case (11) cannot be satisfied. We also note that if the integral curves of ω are closed then (11) does not imply that the pairwise linking numbers of the vortex lines vanish, for example consider a vorticity field supported on a set of N solid tori, γ_i each carrying flux Φ_i , with the vortex lines within each torus having zero mutual linking (zero self-linking term [32]). In such a configuration there are N independent gauge invariant measurements of helicity corresponding to integrals of $U \cdot \omega$ over a tubular neighbourhood of each filament. Let \mathcal{H}_i be the helicity corresponding to γ_i , then (11) is equivalent to the requirement that all the \mathcal{H}_i vanish.

$$(12) \quad \mathcal{H}_i = \Phi_i \sum_j \Phi_j \text{Lk}(i, j) = 0,$$

which does not imply $\text{Lk}(i, j) = 0$ (as an example take all fluxes equal with the tori forming link 8_3^4 in the Rolfsen table [33]).

The case we consider is of an integrable vorticity field, (11) implies the kernel of θ defines a (singular) foliation \mathcal{F} of Ω with ω tangent to the leaves. If θ is unique, \mathcal{F} is defined purely in terms of the vorticity field. In Ref. [15] the integrable case is discussed and diffeomorphisms that act by transforming the pair (\mathcal{F}, ω) are held distinct from those that act by transforming just the vorticity field. Because \mathcal{F} is defined in terms of the vorticity, this issue is avoided.

For now we will assume that $\theta \neq 0$ and that θ is the unique 1-form satisfying $d\theta = \omega$ and $\theta \wedge \omega = 0$, then there is a 1-form η satisfying,

$$(13) \quad d\theta = \theta \wedge \eta.$$

Consider the integral

$$(14) \quad GV = \int_{\Omega} \eta \wedge d\eta.$$

The 1-form η is defined up to addition of $f\theta$, f a function. Under such a transformation we have

$$(15) \quad GV = \int_{\Omega} \eta \wedge d\eta + \int_{\Omega} df \wedge d\theta,$$

the second term gives a boundary contribution which vanishes, ω is tangent to $\partial\Omega$ so $d\theta|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ and GV does not depend on the choice of η . By construction GV is invariant under any volume-preserving diffeomorphism and hence the fluid flow.

GV is essentially the Godbillon-Vey invariant [34, 35] of the foliation defined by θ . In particular, if Ω is closed, then GV is exactly the Godbillon-Vey invariant. If Ω has a boundary then GV is defined for the pair (θ, ω) whereas the Godbillon-Vey invariant may not be. For a foliation, one requires invariance under the transformation $\theta \rightarrow h\theta$ for a non-zero function h . This leads to a gauge transformation

$\eta \rightarrow \eta - d \log h$, and hence to a boundary term

$$(16) \quad \int_{\partial\Omega} -\log h \, d\eta,$$

which vanishes in general only if $\partial\Omega$ is a leaf of the foliation (it is easily verified that $\theta \wedge d\eta = 0$), and for an arbitrary integrable vorticity field this is not the case.

2.1. Non-uniqueness of θ . So far we have assumed that there is a unique θ satisfying (11). θ is a potential 1-form for the vorticity and all gauge transformations of θ are physically equivalent. It follows that if θ satisfying (11) is non-unique, then we would like GV to not depend on the choice, so that GV is a well-defined invariant of vorticity. The goal of this section is to show that, restricting to non-zero choices of θ , non-uniqueness imposes sufficient structure on ω to force $GV = 0$.

Suppose the choice of θ satisfying (11) is not unique. Then the difference between any two choices is a closed 1-form β satisfying $\beta \wedge d\theta = 0$, and there is a 1-parameter family of 1-forms, $\theta + c\beta$, c constant, satisfying (11). If $\theta \neq 0$ throughout the domain, then there is an open set $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$, $a < 0 < b$, such that $\theta + c\beta \neq 0$ for $c \in (a, b)$, this allows us to only consider non-zero θ . Zeros in θ can be accommodated for, and we will deal with them in part below, but for simplicity we will exclude the possibility for now.

The 1-form β satisfies

$$(17) \quad \theta \wedge \beta = g d\theta.$$

If the right-hand side of (17) vanishes identically, then $h\theta = \beta$ for some function h . h is a first integral of ω , so that $dh \wedge d\theta = 0$ and we may take $\eta = d \log h$ on the complement of the zero set of h , which we take to be open and dense on Ω . Then let $T_\epsilon = \{x \in \Omega : |h(x)| > \epsilon\}$. Then consider the integral

$$(18) \quad GV_\epsilon = \int_{T_\epsilon} \eta \wedge d\eta = 0,$$

and as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, $GV_\epsilon \rightarrow GV$ and we find $GV = 0$.

Now we consider the case where the right-hand side of (17) does not vanish identically. The function g is defined only on the complement of the zero set of vorticity, which we denote $Z_\omega = \{x \in \Omega : \omega = 0\}$, and we take the complement Z_ω^c open and dense. We also define Z_g to be the zero set of G , which we also take to have open and dense complement. Now consider the 1-forms β/g , and $\theta' = f\theta$ on $Z_\omega^c \cap Z_g^c$, f an arbitrary function. These satisfy

$$(19) \quad \frac{\beta}{g} \wedge d\theta' = df \wedge d\theta,$$

f is arbitrary and the right-hand side is smooth on all of Ω . In particular, we may choose f so that at some point $p \in Z_\omega \cup Z_g$, $d\theta'$ is an arbitrary 2-form satisfying $\theta \wedge d\theta' = 0$. This implies that $\beta/g = \xi + k\theta$ where ξ is smooth on Ω and k is potentially singular (on the zero sets of both g and ω).

We choose $\eta = \xi$, then $\eta \wedge d\eta$ is smooth on the entire domain, but on $Z_\omega^c \cap Z_g^c$ we may write $\eta \wedge d\eta = dk \wedge d\theta$, which must then extend smoothly on to Ω . Now let k_ϵ be a smooth approximation to k . We can integrate $dk_\epsilon \wedge d\theta$ over Ω to give $GV_\epsilon = 0$. As $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, $GV_\epsilon \rightarrow GV$, so we conclude $GV = 0$.

Finally one could consider the mixed case, where the zeros of $gd\theta$ have some interior, S . If S is sufficiently well-behaved, then ω must be tangent to the boundary

of S and one can treat the two regions, S and S^c , separately using the above methods.

As a consequence of this, we find that the value of GV depends purely on the vorticity field, rather than the 1-form θ , if θ is not unique then $GV = 0$. Finally, note that this result also forces $GV = 0$ if ω has a first integral.

3. GV AND DYNAMICS

3.1. Global Obstruction to Steady Flow. GV has natural relation to the dynamics of the flow. First suppose the flow is steady, and that there is a choice of non-zero θ satisfying (11), then following Arnold [5], the flow must be one of three types:

- (1) $U \times \omega = X$, where X is curl-free.
- (2) Non-constant Beltrami field, $\omega = \alpha U$, with α a non-constant function.
- (3) Constant Beltrami field, $\omega = \lambda U$ with λ constant.

In the first two cases θ is not unique, the dual to X is a closed 1-form β satisfying $\beta \wedge d\theta = 0$, and the function α is a first integral of ω , so $\alpha \wedge d\theta = 0$. In both these cases, $GV = 0$ by arguments in the previous section. In the third case, helicity is non-zero if $\lambda \neq 0$, so GV cannot be defined. If $\lambda = 0$, then the flow is irrotational, and $GV = 0$ trivially.

Invariant under volume-preserving diffeomorphisms, $GV \neq 0$ is then a global obstruction to the existence of a metric making ω a steady solution of the Euler equations, under the assumptions given. This can be compared with results on the topology of the vorticity scalar in two dimensions obstructing steady flow [36]; results on the ‘Eulerisability’ of velocity fields [37, 38], where it is shown that such velocity fields cannot contain Reeb components; as well as results making use of contact topology, showing that a vector field without a closed orbit cannot be a solution to the Euler equations (for analytic vector fields on S^3) [39].

3.2. Local Obstruction to Steady Flow. We now give an alternate version of the connection between GV and dynamics. For simplicity we assume that Ω is a subset of \mathbb{R}^3 with the standard metric and total volume V . Then let the vector field H be dual to η (in coordinates $H^i g_{ij} = \eta_j$, for g the metric), giving

$$(20) \quad GV = \int_{\Omega} H \cdot \nabla \times H \, dV.$$

For h we make the choice

$$(21) \quad H = \frac{1}{U \cdot A} \omega \times U,$$

where A is the vector field dual to θ (in coordinates $A^i g_{ij} = \theta_j$) and note that it is well-defined as per Section 2, provided $U \cdot A \neq 0$, if $U \cdot A = 0$, one can modify H in the neighbourhood of such a zero. Assuming $U \cdot A \neq 0$ throughout and noting that the vorticity equation gives $\partial_t \omega = -\nabla \times (\omega \times U)$ we find

$$(22) \quad H \cdot \nabla \times H = -\frac{1}{(U \cdot A)^2} (\omega \times U) \cdot \partial_t \omega.$$

With this choice of H , $\partial_t \omega$ is non-zero wherever $H \cdot \nabla \times H$ does not vanish, the density of GV gives a local obstruction to the flow being steady and implies the global result. This perspective also translates to arbitrary vector fields V transporting the vorticity. One can replace U in (21) with any volume preserving vector

field V , whereupon the density of GV is related to the time derivative of ω under the flow of V .

3.3. Bounds on Vorticity Rate-of-Change. Helicity is a dimensionful quantity, if U has dimensions $[X]$, then helicity has dimensions $[X]^2[\text{Length}]^2$. Under a rescaling $\omega \rightarrow c\omega$, helicity transforms as $H \rightarrow c^2H$ (along with orientation reversal, this is sufficient to establish a bijection between the sets of vector fields with fixed non-zero helicity) and it is well-known that helicity bounds the enstrophy $\int_{\Omega} \omega^2 dV$ [4]. Conversely, GV is dimensionless (note that η always has dimensions of Length^{-1}) so can only bound ratios of physical quantities. First note that

$$(23) \quad \int_{\Omega} U \cdot A dV = \int_{\Omega} U^2 dV = 2E,$$

where E is the kinetic energy of the flow, so we can write $U \cdot A = 2E/V + \delta$, expanding we find

$$(24) \quad GV = \frac{V^2}{4E^2} \int_{\Omega} dV (\omega \times U) \cdot (\partial_t \omega) \left(1 - \delta \frac{V}{E} + O(\delta^2) \right).$$

Neglecting terms of order δ and above (constant energy density) we find

$$(25) \quad GV \approx \frac{V^2}{4E^2} \int_{\Omega} (\omega \times U) \cdot (\partial_t \omega) dV.$$

Then using Cauchy-Schwarz and the Poincaré inequality we find

$$(26) \quad |GV| \lesssim \frac{L^7}{4E^2} \int_{\Omega} (\partial_t \omega)^2 dV,$$

where $L^7 = V^2/\sqrt{\lambda}$ and λ is the minimal Laplacian eigenvalue, so that GV is related to the ratio of the rate of change of the vorticity to the (squared) kinetic energy.

4. ZEROS OF θ

So far we have required $\theta \neq 0$. Zeros in θ can be accommodated, and we will discuss some aspects here. Suppose θ has zero set \mathcal{Z} , so that θ defines a singular foliation of Ω . We will deal with two particular types of zeros. The first, Morse-type, are isolated zeros of vorticity where $\theta = fdg$, and dg has a critical point. The second type correspond to particular closed orbits of vorticity, around which θ has the form given in (28), and one can think of as local vortex filament structures within the flow.

While zeros in general can be dealt with through the use of Haefliger structures [40], we will deal with the differential forms directly. Structurally stable, zeros of integrable 1-forms have a rich structure [23, 24]. For example, the 1-form

$$(27) \quad \theta = \alpha yzdx + \beta xzdy + \gamma xydz,$$

with $\alpha \neq \beta \neq \gamma$ is homogeneous of degree 2, satisfies $\theta \wedge d\theta = 0$ and has a C^2 -stable zero at the origin. A related example has also been used to demonstrate the local non-existence of a Clebsch representation for velocity fields in the vicinity of vorticity zeros [41]. In general, in the smooth category, there are structurally stable examples such as (27) of arbitrarily high degree. Here we restrict our discussion to zeros of θ that are C^1 structurally stable, and note that an extension to higher-order zeros should be possible. C^1 structurally stable zeros come in two varieties [22].

The first are points where θ has the local form fdg , with $f \neq 0$ and g having a Morse critical point. In a neighbourhood of such a point, one can write $\eta = -d \log f$ which is non-singular, so that η can be defined.

The second type of zero has $\theta = 0$ and $d\theta \neq 0$, in this case the Kupka phenomenon occurs [22, 23, 24], and in a neighbourhood of such a zero there is a local system of coordinates such that

$$(28) \quad \theta = a(x, y)dx + b(x, y)dy,$$

where a and b have a simple zero at $x = y = 0$. In this case the zero becomes a line L . ω is tangent to L , which therefore cannot intersect $\partial\Omega$ transversely, making L a distinguished closed orbit. On such a Kupka line η cannot be defined, but GV can still be computed. From (28) we can define a neighbourhood, N_L , such that $d\theta|_{\partial N_L} = 0$. The torus ∂N_L separates the domain into two regions, as the vorticity is tangent to ∂N_L both the exterior and interior (containing the Kupka line) have a well-defined GV , so we may write $GV = GV_e + GV_i$, for exterior and interior respectively. It is then simply a matter of checking (which can be done by a simple calculation), that η may be defined on the interior of ∂N_L such that $\eta \wedge d\eta$ is identically zero on the complement of L , and so we may identify $GV_i = 0$.

It is important to note that if we allow more complex zeros in θ , then the analysis becomes more delicate. For example, suppose we allow (27). Then η cannot be defined on the zero. In this case GV , as defined above, is invariant under $\eta \rightarrow \eta + f\theta$ only if $f \sim 1/\|x\|^a$, as $x \rightarrow 0$, where $a < 3$.

5. LOCAL STRUCTURE

5.1. Local Conservation Law. Like helicity, GV is a global property of the fluid and cannot be measured locally. For example, in a neighbourhood of any point where $\omega \neq 0$ we have a Clebsch representation [41],

$$(29) \quad U = f\nabla g + \nabla\phi.$$

Consequently, one may choose a vector potential for ω as well as a particular η such that both the helicity density and the Godbillon-Vey density vanish on the neighbourhood. Despite this, there are several local analyses that are informative. First we will derive a local conservation law for GV , which obtains validity by making a global choice for η .

Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with the Euclidean metric. Then in a neighbourhood about any point with $\omega \neq 0$, we may use (29) and write $\theta = fdg$. Note that in the Clebsch representation the functions f and g are both transported by the flow [42] so that

$$(30) \quad (\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_U)f = (\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_U)g = 0$$

then by properties of the Lie derivative we find

$$(31) \quad (\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_U)\theta = ((\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_U)f)dg + fd((\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_U)g) = 0$$

since the point around which we used the Clebsch expansion was arbitrary, we find that θ is transported by the flow. We note that this can also follow as θ is defined as a vector potential satisfying $\theta \wedge d\theta = 0$. Since $d\theta$ is transported by the flow via the vorticity equation $((\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_U)d\theta = 0)$, we must have (locally) $(\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_U)\theta = dc$, for some function c . But θ is defined by the requirement that $\theta \wedge d\theta = 0$ which must be constant in time, hence $dc = 0$, so that (31) holds.

The vorticity equation reads $(\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_U)d\theta = 0$, using $d\theta = \theta \wedge \eta$ and the result that $(\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_U)\theta = 0$ we have

$$(32) \quad (\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_U)\eta = k\theta$$

for some function k . It follows that

$$(33) \quad (\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_U)\eta \wedge d\eta = d(kd\theta).$$

In vector calculus notation we have

$$(34) \quad (\partial_t + U \cdot \nabla)(H \cdot \nabla \times H) = \nabla \cdot (k\omega)$$

which gives an explicit local conservation law, and we find that GV is carried by vorticity. One must choose H to determine k . For example, taking H as in (21) gives the result

$$(35) \quad k = H^2 + \frac{1}{U \cdot A} H \cdot \nabla(P + U^2/2),$$

or

$$(36) \quad k = \frac{1}{(U \cdot A)^2} (\omega^2 U^2 - (\omega \cdot U)^2 + (\omega \times U) \cdot \nabla(P + U^2/2)),$$

where P is the pressure. The analysis by Tur and Yanovsky [26] yields an alternate form for k when the choice $H \cdot A = 0$ is made.

5.2. Interpretation as Helical Compression. Due to the form of GV it is tempting to attempt to interpret it as the linking of the integral curves of the vector field X associated to the 2-form $d\eta$ as $d\eta = \iota_X \mu$. This is not natural for two reasons. Firstly, $d\eta$ is not necessarily parallel to $\partial\Omega$, so integral curves of X may end. Secondly, $d\eta$ is not invariant under the transformation $\eta \rightarrow \eta + f\theta$, so that the integral curves of X change, and may reconnect locally. Instead, there is a local geometric interpretation of GV as helical compression of vorticity. Vorticity compression is the core nonlinearity of the Euler equations, and given the strong relationship between GV and dynamics, we speculate that flows with $GV \neq 0$ will be particularly interesting from a dynamical perspective. The helical compression interpretation, essentially Thurston's 'helical wobble' for foliations [27, 43], can be seen as follows. Suppose \mathcal{F} is the foliation induced by ω , and N is a unit vector normal to it. Then the vector field $h_N = (N \cdot \nabla)N$ is a choice of h for $\nabla \times N$, and is hence equal to a choice of h for ω up to a gauge transformation.

h_N measures the local compression of the leaves of \mathcal{F} , as shown in Figure 1(left), its magnitude is the curvature of the integral curves of the normal vectors to \mathcal{F} , and it points along the direction of local expansion. Twisting of h_N as one moves transverse to the leaves of \mathcal{F} (Figure 1(right)) corresponds to helical compression of the vortex lines and also $h_N \cdot \nabla \times h_N \neq 0$. Following Reinhardt and Wood [44], one can give a local pointwise expression for $h_N \cdot \nabla \times h_N$ as $\kappa^2(\tau - B \cdot \nabla N \cdot Z)$, where κ and τ are the curvature and torsion of the integral curves of N and B and Z are the binormal and normal fields for the integral curves of N in the Frenet-Serret frame. Because it can be interpreted as a combination of twisting and compression, we are tempted to refer to GV as the 'wring' of the vorticity.




FIGURE 1. Local geometric interpretation of GV as helical vortex compression. Left: N (red) is the normalised field to the foliation \mathcal{F} to which the vorticity (blue) is tangent. The vector h_N points in the direction of local compression of the surfaces of \mathcal{F} . Right: helical compression of \mathcal{F} . In this case the vector h_N rotates about the vertical as one moves upwards, hence $h_N \cdot \nabla \times h_N \neq 0$.

6. GLOBAL STRUCTURE

For $GV \neq 0$ one must construct a vorticity field with global properties, much like the helicity requires the global linking of vortex lines. All known examples of vorticity fields with $GV \neq 0$ have a certain degree of complexity, and do not permit a simple expression. Here we will adapt Thurston's construction [43] to give an example of a vorticity field where GV is determined by certain Kupka lines – closed orbits of ω .

First consider the link, L , in S^3 with N components each denoted L_i , $i \in [1, N]$, shown in Figure 2 for $N = 3$. Thurston's construction uses as its base the horocycle foliation of the unit tangent bundle of the hyperbolic plane² and creates a foliation on the complement of this link, defined by a 1-form θ . The leaves of the foliation are transverse to the boundary and induce a slope s_i on each link component (measured relative to the oriented longitudes as in Figure 2). In Thurston's construction, the boundary components are spun [35] onto tori and filled with Reeb components. Equivalently, in our case, we can simply allow them to become zeros of θ , where they become Kupka lines. Since the neighbourhood of each Kupka line has a well defined value of $GV = 0$, the value of GV for the total vorticity field must be equal to the Godbillon-Vey invariant of the foliation, and is given by

$$(37) \quad GV = 4\pi^2 \left(N - 2 - \left(\frac{1}{s_1} + \sum_{i=2}^N s_i \right) \right).$$

To understand the meaning of (37), we construct a $GV = 0$ vorticity field with the same set of closed vortex lines. First we define a closed 1-form A on $S^3 \setminus L$. As $H^1(S^3 \setminus L; \mathbb{R}) \cong \mathbb{R}^N$, this form is defined by a set of N fluxes ϕ_i , and leads to a

²In the Poincaré disk model, this is defined by the 1-form $\alpha = 2(y - \sin \theta)dx + 2(\cos \theta - x)dy + (x^2 + y^2 - 1)d\theta$; where θ is the fiber coordinate. The leaves of the foliation are helicoids with axis on the boundary.




FIGURE 2. The link L with 3 components in S^3 . In the example given, each component of L is a closed orbit of ω . The local structure of θ in a neighbourhood of L defines a slope for each component. The value of GV is determined by the deviation of these slopes from the value they would have in the case when ω is singular, with each L a flux line.

measured (singular) foliation of $S^3 \setminus L$. We can then multiply A by a function f , zero on L , so that A can be extended to a 1-form on S^3 . The resulting singular foliation of S^3 has $GV = 0$ and N Kupka lines, with slopes $s_1 = -\phi_1 / \sum_{i \neq 1} \phi_i$ on L_1 and $s_i = -\phi_i / \phi_1$ on L_i , $i \neq 1$. Then note that $\sum_{i=2}^N s_i + 1/s_1 = 0$. Comparing to (37), we see that GV measures, in part, the failure of the Kupka line slopes to ‘commute’ in the manner expected for singular vorticity field with flux lines on L .

The construction has at its core a foliation that is transverse to the fibers of a circle bundle, in which case $\eta \wedge d\eta$ can be integrated over the fibers [45]. Using similar techniques [46] it should be possible to a range of examples similar examples to the one above where the Kupka lines form any link L whose complement is an S^1 bundle over S^2 . These have been classified [47], which in principle allows for such a construction to be made.

It is a pleasure to thank J.H. Hannay for many stimulating conversations, as well as D. Peralta-Salas for his hospitality and insight. I would also like to acknowledge useful discussions with P.J. Morrisson, G.P. Alexander, D. Barkley, M.V. Berry and H.K. Moffatt.

REFERENCES

- [1] Woltjer L. 1958 A theorem on force-free magnetic fields, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **44**, 489-491. (doi:10.1073/pnas.44.6.489)
- [2] Moreau JJ. 1961 Constantes d’un îlot tourbillonnaire en fluid parfait barotrope, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris **252**, 2810-2812.
- [3] Moffatt HK. 1969 The degree of knottedness of tangled vortex lines, J. Fluid. Mech. **35**, 117-129. (doi:10.1017/S0022112069000991)
- [4] Arnold VI. 1986 The asymptotic Hopf invariant and its applications, Selecta Math. Soviet. **5**, 327-345. (doi:10.1007/978-3-642-31031-7_32)
- [5] Arnold VI, Khesin B. 1999 *Topological methods in hydrodynamics*. New York: Springer.
- [6] Berger MA. 1990 Third-order link integrals. J. Phys. A **23**, 2787-2793. (doi:10.1088/0305-4470/23/13/017)

- [7] Komendarczyk R. 2009 The third order helicity of magnetic fields via link maps. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **292** 431-456. (doi:10.1007/s00220-009-0896-z)
- [8] Komendarczyk R. 2010 The third order helicity of magnetic fields via link maps. II, *J. Math. Phys.* **51**, 122702. (doi:10.1063/1.3516611)
- [9] Akhmetiev P. 2005 On a new integral formula for an invariant of 3-component oriented links. *J. Geom. Phys.* **53**, 180-196. (doi:10.1016/j.geomphys.2004.06.002)
- [10] Akhmetiev PM, Kunakovskaya OV. 2009 Integral formula for a generalized Sato-Levine invariant in magnetic hydrodynamics, *Math. Notes*, **85**, 503-514. (doi:10.1134/S0001434609030225)
- [11] DeTurck D, Gluck H, Komendarczyk R, Melvin P, Shonkwiler C, Vela-Vick DS. 2013, Generalized Gauss maps and integrals for three-component links: Toward higher helicities for magnetic fields and fluid flows, *J. Math. Phys.* **54**, 013515. (doi:10.1063/1.4774172).
- [12] DeTurck D, Gluck H, Komendarczyk R, Melvin P, Nuchi H, Shonkwiler C, Vela-Vick DS. 2013 Generalized Gauss maps and integrals for three-component links: Toward higher helicities for magnetic fields and fluid flows, part II, *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* **13** 2897-2923. (doi:10.2140/agt.2013.13.2897)
- [13] Laurence P, Stredulinsky E. 2000 Asymptotic Massey products, induced currents and Borromean torus links, *J. Math. Phys.* **41**, 3170. (doi:10.1063/1.533299)
- [14] Milnor J. 1965 Link groups, *Ann. Math.* **59**, 177-195. (doi:10.2307/1969685)
- [15] Enciso A, Peralta-Salas D, Torres de Lizaola F. 2016 Helicity is the only integral invariant of volume-preserving transformations, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **113**, 2035-2040. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1516213113)
- [16] Kudryavtseva EA. 2014 Conjugation invariants on the group of area-preserving diffeomorphisms of the disk. *Math. Notes* **95**, 877-880. (doi:10.1134/S0001434614050332)
- [17] Kudryavtseva EA. 2016 Helicity is the only invariant of incompressible flows whose derivative is continuous in C^1 -topology. *Math. Notes* **99**, 626-630. (doi:10.1134/S0001434616030366)
- [18] Gambaudo JM, Ghys É. 2001 Signature asymptotique d'un champ de vecteurs en dimension 3. *Duke Math. J.* **106**, 41-79. (doi:10.1215/S0012-7094-01-10613-3)
- [19] Baader S, Marché J. 2012 Asymptotic Vassiliev invariants for vector fields. *Bull. Soc. Math. Fr.* **140**, 569-582. (doi:10.24033/bsmf.2637)
- [20] Komendarczyk R, Volic I. 2014 On volume-preserving vector fields and finite-type invariants of knots. *Ergod. Theory Dyn. Syst.* **36**, 832-859. (doi:10.1017/etds.2014.83)
- [21] Hurder S. 2002 Dynamics and the Godbillon-Vey Class: A History and Survey. In *Foliations: Geometry and Dynamics* (eds. Walczak P, Conlon L, Langevin R) pp. 26-60, World Scientific. (doi:10.1142/9789812778246_0003)
- [22] Kupka I. 1964 The singularities of integrable structurally stable Pfaffian forms, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **52**, 1431-1432. (doi:10.1073/pnas.52.6.1431)
- [23] Camacho C. 1978 Structural stability theorems for integrable differential forms on 3-manifolds. *Topology* **17**, 143-155. (doi:10.1016/S0040-9383(78)90019-8)
- [24] Camacho C, Lins Neto A. 1982 The topology of integrable differential forms near a singularity. *Publ. Math. IHÉS* **55**, 5-35. (doi:10.1007/BF02698693)
- [25] Webb GM, Dasgupta B, McKenzie JF, Hu Q, Zank GP. 2014 Local and nonlocal advected invariants and helicities in magnetohydrodynamics and gas dynamics I: Lie dragging approach, *J. Phys. A* **47**, 095501. (doi:10.1088/1751-8113/47/9/095501)
- [26] Tur AV, Yanovsky VV. 1993 Invariants in dissipationless hydrodynamic media, *J. Fluid Mech.* **248**, 67-106. (doi:10.1017/S0022112093000692)
- [27] Webb GM, Prasad A, Anco SC, Hu Q. 2019 Godbillon-Vey helicity and magnetic helicity in magnetohydrodynamics. *J. Plasma Phys.* **85**, 775850502. (doi:10.1017/S0022377819000679)
- [28] Tabachnikov, S.L. (1990) Two remarks on the asymptotic Hopf invariant. *Funct. Anal. Appl.* **24**, 74-75. (doi:10.1007/BF01077928)
- [29] Morrison PJ. 1998 Hamiltonian description of the ideal fluid, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **70** 467-521. (doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.70.467)
- [30] Machon T. 2020 The Godbillon-Vey Invariant as a Restricted Casimir of Three-dimensional Ideal Fluids, arXiv:2001.01305 [math-ph].
- [31] Cantarella J, Parsley J. 2010 A new cohomological formula for helicity in \mathbb{R}^{2k+1} reveals the effect of a diffeomorphism on helicity, *J. Geom. Phys.* **60**, 1127-1155. (doi:10.1016/j.geomphys.2010.04.001)
- [32] Moffatt HK, Ricca RL. 1992 Helicity and the Călugăreanu invariant, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **439**, 411-429. (doi:10.1098/rspa.1992.0159)

- [33] Rolfsen D. 2003 *Knots and Links* Providence, Rhode Island: AMS Chelsea.
- [34] Godbillon C, Vey J. 1971 Un invariant des feuilletages de codimension 1, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Série A **273**, 92-95.
- [35] Candel A, Conlon L. 1999 *Foliations I* Providence, Rhode Island: AMS.
- [36] Ginzburg VL, Khesin B. 1994, Steady fluid flows and symplectic geometry, J. Geom. Phys. **14**, 195-210. (doi:10.1016/0393-0440(94)90006-X)
- [37] Peralta-Salas D, Rechtman A, Torres de Lizaur F. 2019, arXiv:1904.00960 [math.DG].
- [38] Cieliebak K, Volkov E. 2017 A note on the stationary Euler equations of hydrodynamics. Ergod. Theory Dyn. Syst. **37**, 454-480. (doi:10.1017/etds.2015.50)
- [39] Etnyre J, Ghrist R. 2000 Contact topology and hydrodynamics: I. Beltrami fields and the Seifert conjecture, Nonlinearity **13**, 441. (doi:10.1088/0951-7715/13/2/306)
- [40] Ghys É 1989. L'invariant de Godbillon-Vey. In *Séminaire Bourbaki: volume 1988/89, exposés 700-714, Astérisque, no. 177-178*, Talk no. 706, pp. 155-181.
- [41] Graham CR, Henyey FS. 2000 Clebsch representation near points where the vorticity vanishes, Phys. Fluids **12**, 744. (doi:10.1063/1.870331)
- [42] Zakharov VE, Kuznetsov EA 1997, Hamiltonian formalism for nonlinear waves Phys.-Usp. **40**, 1087 - 1116. (doi:10.1070/PU1997v040n11ABEH000304)
- [43] Thurston WT. 1972 Noncobordant foliations of S^3 , Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., **78**, 511-514. (doi:10.1090/S0002-9904-1972-12975-6)
- [44] Reinhart BL, Wood JW. 1973 A metric formula for the Godbillon-Vey invariant for foliations, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **38**, 427-430. (doi:10.2307/2039304)
- [45] Bott R. 1978. On the characteristic classes of group-actions. In *Differential Topology, Foliations, and Gelfand-Fuks Cohomology*, Springer Lecture Notes **652**, pp. 25-61, appendix by Brooks R. (doi:10.1007/BFb0063501)
- [46] Brooks R. 1979 Volumes and characteristic classes of foliations, Topology **18**, 295-304. (doi:10.1016/0040-9383(79)90020-X)
- [47] Burde G, Murasugi K. 1970 Links and Seifert fiber spaces, Duke Math. J. **37**, 89-93. (doi:10.1215/S0012-7094-70-03713-0)

7. APPENDIX I

We consider the invariance of helicity

$$(38) \quad H = \int_{\Omega} \theta \wedge d\theta,$$

under an arbitrary transformation, $\theta \rightarrow \theta + \beta$, where β is a closed 1-form. Then the helicity integral gives a boundary term

$$(39) \quad H \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} \theta \wedge d\theta + \int_{\partial\Omega} \theta \wedge \beta,$$

which in general does not vanish. By construction, $d\theta|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, hence $\theta|_{\partial\Omega}$ is a closed 1-form on $\partial\Omega$ and defines a de Rahm cohomology class $[\theta] \in H^1(\partial\Omega; \mathbb{R})$. Restriction to the boundary defines a map $r : H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^1(\partial\Omega; \mathbb{R})$. $d\theta$ is fluxless if $[\theta] = 0 \in H^1(\partial\Omega; \mathbb{R})/\text{Im}(r)$. This condition is equivalent to the statement that

$$(40) \quad \int_S d\theta = 0,$$

for any surface $S \subset \Omega$, with $\partial S \subset \partial\Omega$.

8. APPENDIX II

We start with the definition

$$(41) \quad H = \frac{1}{U \cdot A} \omega \times U = \beta \omega \times U.$$

Then we assert that

$$(42) \quad (\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_U)H = fA,$$

where f is to be determined. Using coordinate notation (recall we are in Euclidean space, so that we do not distinguish covariant and contravariant indices), we have

$$(43) \quad fA_i = \partial_t H_i + U_j \partial_j H_i + U_j \partial_i H_j.$$

Now by construction we have $U_i H_i = 0$, so this is rewritten as

$$(44) \quad fA_i = \partial_t H_i + U_j \partial_j H_i - H_j \partial_i U_j,$$

or

$$(45) \quad fA = \partial_t H - U \times \nabla \times H.$$

Expanding we find

$$(46) \quad fA = (\partial_t \beta) \omega \times U + \beta (\partial_t \omega) \times U + \beta \omega \times (\partial_t U) - U \times (\nabla \beta \times (\omega \times U)) + \beta U \times (\partial_t \omega),$$

(recall $\beta = (U \cdot A)^{-1}$) which becomes

$$(47) \quad fA = ((\partial_t + U \cdot \nabla) \beta) \omega \times U + \beta \omega \times (\partial_t U).$$

Now, using the fact that

$$(48) \quad (\partial_t + U \cdot \nabla)A + (\nabla A) \cdot U = 0,$$

we find

$$(49) \quad ((\partial_t + U \cdot \nabla) \beta) = \beta (H \cdot A + \beta A \cdot \nabla (P + U^2/2)).$$

So we get

$$(50) \quad fA = ((h \cdot A) + \beta A \cdot \nabla (P + U^2/2)) H - \beta \omega \times \nabla (P + U^2/2) - \beta \omega \times (\omega \times U).$$

Then we find

$$(51) \quad fA = (H^2 + \beta H \cdot \nabla (P + U^2/2)) A,$$

so we may identify

$$(52) \quad f = H^2 + \beta H \cdot \nabla (P + U^2/2).$$