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Time-delayed feedback control, attributed to Pyragas (1992 Physics Letters 170(6) 421-428), is a method known to stabilise periodic orbits in low dimensional chaotic dynamical systems. A system of the form \( \dot{x}(t) = f(x) \) has an additional term \( G(x(t) - x(t - T)) \) introduced where \( G \) is some ‘gain matrix’ and \( T \) a time delay. The form of the delay term is such that it will vanish for any orbit of period \( T \), therefore making it also an orbit of the uncontrolled system. This non-invasive feature makes the method attractive for stabilising exact coherent structures in fluid turbulence. Here we begin by validating the method for the basic flow in Kolmogorov flow; a two-dimensional incompressible Navier-Stokes flow with a sinusoidal body force. The linear predictions for stabilisation are well captured by direct numerical simulation. By applying an adaptive method to adjust the streamwise translation of the delay, a known travelling wave solution is able to be stabilised up to relatively high Reynolds number. Finally an adaptive method to converge the period \( T \) is also presented to enable periodic orbits to be stabilised in a proof of concept study at low Reynolds numbers, near the onset of chaos. These results provide great motivation for devising more sophisticated applications of the method which may allow unstable exact coherent structures to be found by simply time-stepping a modified set of equations, thus circumventing the usual convergence algorithms.

1. Introduction

Borrowing mathematical theory from dynamical systems and applying it to the Navier-Stokes equations has seen the computational discovery of unstable exact coherent solutions (ECSs) which serve as organising centres of a turbulent flow. These unstable solutions can take the form of steady equilibria, travelling waves or time periodic orbits. The idea is that chaotic trajectories flit in phase space between the neighbourhoods of these solutions directed via their stable and unstable manifolds (Kawahara & Kida 2001; Gibson et al. 2008; van Veen & Kawahara 2011; Kawahara et al. 2012). This approach has elucidated the transition to turbulence when the laminar state remains stable and a boundary in phase space exists between states which excite turbulence and those which decay (Schneider et al. 2007; Pringle et al. 2012). It has also begun to unravel the processes sustaining turbulence (Hamilton et al. 1995; Kawahara et al. 2012; Lucas & Kerswell 2017) and, importantly, is beginning to show its utility as a predictive tool (Chandler & Kerswell 2013; Cvitanović 2013).

Despite these successes the computational methods used so far have some important shortcomings. The current state-of-the-art for converging unstable periodic orbits form what have become known as the “recurrent flow analysis”, pioneered by Kawahara & Kida 2001; Viswanath 2007; Cvitanović & Gibson 2010;
Chandler & Kerswell (2013). This requires near recurrent episodes to be located in numerical simulations which form guesses for a high dimensional Newton solver. The algorithms circumvent the formation of the Jacobian matrix by way of a GMRES solution (or other Krylov method) and maintain the Newton step-size within a trust region of its linearisation by a hookstep (Viswanath 2007). We refer to this solution algorithm as Newton-GMRES-hookstep or Newton-GMRES. Such algorithms, as with any Newton method, require an initial guess sufficiently close to the solution for convergence. This becomes increasingly difficult to determine for more severe turbulence where instability is increased and close approaches to a target solution are more fleeting. By far the biggest computational inefficiency with this method is the resource spent attempting convergences which fail or result in a known ECS. For example at \( Re = 40 \) in Kolmogorov flow Chandler & Kerswell (2013) report from one DNS attempting 1223 guesses with 540 convergences, with 49 unique ECSs reported. The situation deteriorates as \( Re \) increases at \( Re = 60 \) Chandler & Kerswell (2013) finds 163 guesses with only 7 converged states. With longer DNS, by leveraging GPU acceleration, Lucas & Kerswell (2015) were able to generate orders of magnitude more guesses and examine the convergence rate. The conclusion of this work was that the success rate of Newton-GMRES was around 10% and does not vary significantly for starting residuals in the range \( 0.1 < R < 0.3 \) (when accounting for sample sizes). There is clearly significant room for improvement and several subsequent studies have been working on refinements, including using dynamic-mode-decomposition (Page & Kerswell 2020), variational methods (Lan & Cvitanović 2004; Azimi et al. 2020) and preconditioning guesses (Tuckerman et al. 2018).

The method presented here is that of time-delayed feedback control (TDF). For small systems of nonlinear ordinary differential equations a method attributed to Pyragas (Pyragas 1992) (and so is also known as Pyragas control in the literature) has seen considerable success at stabilising periodic orbits from chaotic systems. The key idea is to include into an evolution equation of the form \( \dot{x} = f(x) \), an additional term;

\[
\dot{x} = f(x) + G(t) (x(t - T) - x(t)).
\]

It can be shown that for a given period \( T \) and gain matrix \( G \) this additional delay term can stabilise periodic orbits. Notice that the delay term has the property that for a periodic solution with period \( T \) it vanishes identically, meaning that a periodic solution of period \( T \) of the delayed system is also a solution of the original system. The method is therefore termed ‘noninvasive’. The method is particularly appealing because of its simplicity (any direct numerical simulation code can be easily adapted to include the extra terms) and it does not require \( a \text{'}priori \) knowledge of the controlled solution (Pausch & Eckhardt 2011; Smaoui & Zribi 2017; Linkmann et al. 2020).

This method, and its variants have seen success in a variety of systems, for example semiconductor lasers (Ushakov et al. 2004; Schikora et al. 2006), neuroscience (Popovych et al. 2005; Schöll et al. 2009), microscopy (Yamasue & Hikihara 2006) and chemical turbulence (Kim et al. 2001). Also delayed feedback has been used to stabilise standing waves in complex Ginzburg-Landau equations (Stich et al. 2013), and an experimental study controlling Taylor-Couette flow (Luthje et al. 2001). To the best of the author’s knowledge the only application of the method for the Navier-Stokes equations is reported by Kawahara (2005). This paper briefly reports the result of stabilising the gentle periodic orbit of Kawahara & Kida (2001) using Pyragas control, however little detail is provided of the implementation or the generality of the result. For example it appears necessary to have prior knowledge of this particular orbit in order for the stabilisation to be applied. Also this orbit represents the ‘edge state’ in this configuration and therefore
One sticking point of TDF is that it is argued that orbits with odd numbers of unstable Floquet multipliers are unable to be stabilised by this method (Just et al. 1999; Nakajima & Ueda 1998). The analysis examines the effect of applying the control near a Hopf bifurcation and bringing the complex conjugate pair of eigenvalues back across the imaginary axis. For example, for pitchfork bifurcations, where the unstable direction does not oscillate, the time-delayed feedback control is not generally thought to work. Several studies have subsequently offered resolutions to this issue, including forcing oscillation of the unstable manifold through $G$ (Schuster & Stemmler 1997; Flunkert & Schöll 2011) and even shown counter examples (Fiedler et al. 2011; Sieber 2016). Here we demonstrate that we can use some of the symmetries of the fluid problem to also circumvent this issue when stabilising the basic flow.

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 describes the system under consideration and the methods used. Section 3 shows a linear stability analysis for the basic flow and validates the numerical application of TDF by stabilising the laminar in direct numerical simulation (DNS). Section 4 demonstrates the stabilisation of travelling waves by the application of an adaptive method to fix the phase speed. We then show in section 5 how one can also adaptively iterate estimates of the period to stabilise an unstable periodic orbit (UPO) at low Reynolds number, at the onset of chaos. Finally in section 6 we summarise and discuss the results before considering possible avenues of further work.

2. Formulation

In this paper we will present the application of time-delayed feedback control to so-called Kolmogorov flow; the sinusoidally body forced incompressible Navier-Stokes equations. This flow is widely studied for both transition to turbulence and for the recurrent flow analysis mentioned in the introduction (Chandler & Kerswell 2013; Lucas & Kerswell 2015). We consider a vorticity formulation for which the equations in non-dimensional form are

$$\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \omega = \frac{1}{Re} \Delta \omega - n \cos(ny) + f, \quad (2.1)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0 \quad (2.2)$$

with vorticity $\omega = \nabla \times \mathbf{u}$, velocity $\mathbf{u}$, $Re$ the Reynolds number and $f$ is a second forcing term. We will consider the periodic torus $[0, 2\pi] \times [0, 2\pi]$ and a forcing wavenumber $n = 4$ and solve the equations with a standard pseudospectral method with two-thirds dealiasing, fourth order Runge-Kutta time-stepping on the nonlinear and forcing terms and Crank-Nicolson on the viscous term. For $Re \leq 40$ a resolution of $128^2$ is used and $200 \geq Re > 40 256^2$. The code is implemented in CUDA to run on GPUs and available at https://bitbucket.org/dan_lucas/PSGPU with a Python version in Jupyter notebooks available in supplementary material.

The system is invariant under the symmetries

$$\mathcal{S} : [u, v](x, y) \rightarrow [-u, v] \left( -x, y + \frac{\pi}{n} \right), \quad (2.3)$$

$$\mathcal{R} : [u, v](x, y) \rightarrow [-u, -v] \left( -x, -y \right), \quad (2.4)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_l : [u, v](x, y) \rightarrow [u, v](x + l, y) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq l \leq \frac{2\pi}{\alpha}, \quad (2.5)$$
where $S$ represents the discrete shift-&-reflect symmetry, $R$ rotation through $\pi$ and $T_t$ is the continuous group of translations in $x$.

2.1. Flow measures

In order to discuss various features of the flows considered we define here some diagnostic quantities. Total energy, energy dissipation rate and energy input rate are defined in the standard way as

$$E(t) := \frac{1}{2}\langle \|\nabla u\|^2 \rangle_V, \quad D(t) := \frac{1}{Re}\langle \|\nabla u\|^2 \rangle_V, \quad I(t) := \langle u \sin(ny) \rangle_V$$

where the volume average is defined as $\langle \quad \rangle_V := \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} dx dy$. The base state or laminar profile and its energy and dissipation are

$$u_{lam} := Re_n^2 \sin(ny) \hat{x}, \quad E_{lam} := \frac{Re^2}{4n^4}, \quad D_{lam} := \frac{Re}{2n^2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.7)

2.2. Time-delayed feedback

Time-delayed feedback is included by setting

$$f = G(\psi(x,t) - \psi(x + s\hat{x}, t - T)) \hspace{1cm} (2.8)$$

where the streamfunction, $\psi$, is defined as $u = (\psi_y, -\psi_x)$, such that $\omega = -\nabla^2 \psi$, and $G(t)$ is a scalar gain function. $s$ is a shift accounting for the translational symmetry in $x$ and $T$ is a time lag or period. Note we could have included symmetry operations for the discrete shift and reflect, and rotational symmetries but we only consider the continuous symmetry for now. It should be noted that, in principle, we have a great deal of freedom in choosing $G$. It could be a function of space as well as time, or even be an operator. In fact the choice above is equivalent to $f = -\hat{G}(\omega(x,t) - \omega(x + s\hat{x}, t - T))$ with $\hat{G} = G(t)\nabla^{-2}$. This choice was made to improve the performance of the method, it is stronger on large scales, and is mainly motivated by the linear analysis in the next section.

3. Linear stability analysis of the basic flow

In order to give some theoretical motivation and validation of the TDF method we first apply it to the basic flow. For Kolmogorov flow the basic flow, which is the global attractor at small Reynolds number $Re$, is given by the precise balance between forcing and dissipation

$$u_{lam} = \frac{Re}{n^2} \sin(ny) \hat{x}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.1)

This laminar state has a well-known long-wavelength instability [Meshalkin & Sinai 1961] at a critical Reynolds number, $Re_c$. For $n = 4$ this is $Re_c \approx 9.97$. The linear analysis can be extended to approximately include the time-delayed term. Equation 2.1 rewritten for streamfunction which is expanded $\psi = \psi_{lam} + \psi'$ and linearising the governing equation yields

$$\frac{\partial \nabla^2 \psi'}{\partial t} + Re \sin(ny) \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \nabla^2 \psi'_x - \psi'_x \right) = \frac{1}{Re} \nabla^4 \psi' + G(\psi'(x,t) - \psi'(x + s\hat{x}, t - T))$$

\hspace{1cm} (3.2)

using the usual ansatz $\psi' = \hat{\psi}(y)e^{i\alpha x + \sigma t}$ the modified Orr-Sommerfeld equation now reads
\[
\sigma \left( \frac{d^2}{dy^2} - \alpha^2 \right) \hat{\psi} = -i\alpha Re \sin(ny) \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \left( \frac{d^2}{dy^2} - \alpha^2 \right) \hat{\psi} + \hat{\psi} \right) \\
+ \frac{1}{Re} \left( \frac{d^2}{dy^2} - \alpha^2 \right)^2 \hat{\psi} + G \left( 1 - e^{i\alpha s - \sigma T} \right) \hat{\psi}
\] (3.3)

The eigenvalue \( \sigma \) now appears in an exponential coming from the delay term. If we assume \( T \) is small but finite (reasonable since we are attempting to stabilise the laminar equilibrium and not a UPO, \( T \) tending to zero should recover the original stability boundary), and are only interested in \( \sigma \approx 0 \), (again reasonable if we are tracing stability boundaries and not interested in growth rates in general) then we may expand the exponential to linear terms in \( \sigma \), i.e. \( e^{-\sigma T} \approx 1 - \sigma T \) resulting in

\[
\sigma \left( \frac{d^2}{dy^2} - \alpha^2 - GTe^{i\alpha s} \right) \hat{\psi} = -i\alpha Re \sin(ny) \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \left( \frac{d^2}{dy^2} - \alpha^2 \right) \hat{\psi} + \hat{\psi} \right) \\
+ \frac{1}{Re} \left( \frac{d^2}{dy^2} - \alpha^2 \right)^2 \hat{\psi} + G \left( 1 - e^{i\alpha s} \right) \hat{\psi}.
\] (3.4)

We solve the eigenvalue problem numerically using a Fourier series expansion for \( \hat{\psi}(y) \). The implementation is in Python and using the numpy eigenvalue solver (Virtanen et al. 2020; Strang 1988). Inspecting equation (3.4), in particular the new terms involving \( G \) from the time delay, it is now clear why the shift \( s \) is retained despite the laminar solution being \( x \) invariant. Without the shift operator the right hand side of (3.4) has no dependence on \( G \) (equivalently with \( s = 0 \)). Therefore the \( G \) term on the left hand side, while it can rescale the eigenvalue spectrum, bringing unstable eigenvalues closer to the imaginary axis, it cannot change their sign. On the other hand, with the translation \( s \) in place the feedback term on the right hand side can shift the spectrum and force eigenvalues to cross the imaginary axis by acting like a drag term. Figure 1 (left panel) shows the relevant part of the eigenvalue spectrum at \( Re = 40 \) and \( \alpha = 1 \) without any feedback, \( G = 0 \). There are five unstable modes with positive real part (one purely real and 2 complex conjugate pairs). Setting \( G = 50 \), \( T = 0.01 \) but no shift \( s = 0 \) shows the rescaling of the spectrum, with the unstable modes remaining positive, but with \( G = 50 \), \( T = 0.01 \) and \( s = 1 \) we see the whole spectrum shift and the unstable modes cross the axis. To get a broader picture of how this stabilisation depends on \( G \), \( s \), and \( Re \), figure 2 (right panel) shows neutral curves on the \( G - s \) plane for various \( Re \). The stable region is to the right of the contour, i.e. large \( G \). This shows that there is an interval of \( s \) which can stabilise the base flow which reduces in size as \( Re \) increases, but can be increased on increasing \( G \). There are two branches, one approximately centered at \( s = 1 \) and one \( s = 2.5 \) with a gap of instability around \( s = 2 \) regardless of \( Re \) or \( G \). We may understand the structure by considering the final term in equation (3.4) when \( \alpha s = 2\pi \) this term vanishes and the primary effect of the shift operator on the spectrum is lost. Up to \( Re = 200 \) only \( \alpha = 1, 2 \) and \( 3 \) are unstable, therefore \( s \approx \pi \) & \( \frac{2\pi}{3} \) will fail to stabilise the laminar solution. Likewise the optimal \( s \) is centered on \( \frac{2\pi}{6} \) which maximises the effect of this term across the unstable \( \alpha \).

These predictions can be verified by applying the method in the full nonlinear equations. This is achieved using a Crank-Nicolson-type timestepping (average of forward and backward Euler) for stability (note delay differential equation methods are required for other method of lines types of time stepping). Where \( T \) is not a multiple of timesteps, the timestep is adjusted accordingly, such that the rounded number of timesteps to traverse
is maintained (e.g., \( dt = T/N_T \)). We need to integrate the equations for at least \( T \) time units before the feedback can be applied. Also if feedback is introduced discontinuously, i.e. immediately from \( G = 0 \) to 100 in one timestep, for example, then a discontinuity will propagate through the solution (a well known issue in delay differential equations [Bellen et al. 2003]). To mitigate this we introduce \( G(t) \) gradually by the following

\[
G(t) = \min(G_{\text{max}}, \kappa(t - T_{\text{start}}))
\]

where \( \kappa \) is some rate and \( T_{\text{start}} \) the time at which we introduce TDF with \( G_{\text{max}} \) the final maximum.

We demonstrate the stabilisation at \( Re = 40 \) and \( Re = 200 \) in figure 2 using \( T_{\text{start}} = 50 \) to allow ‘spin-up’ of the uncontrolled system (from the usual uniform amplitude, randomised phase intitial condition in Fourier space) and \( T = 0.01 \) to be a small delay to give good agreement with the linear theory. To quantify the size of the delay term and approach to the laminar state we introduce the following distance and error measures

\[
Q(t) = \left( \frac{\langle (\omega - \omega(x - s, y, t - T))^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\langle \omega^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} V} \right), \quad \text{and} \quad E_I(t) = \left| 1 - \frac{I_{\text{Dlam}}}{I} \right|.
\]

Figure 1 indicates at \( Re = 40 \) and \( G = 20 \) a neutral curve is found at \( s = 1.5 \). To demonstrate the precision of the neutral curve estimate we perform numerical solutions at \( s = 1.49 \) and \( 1.51 \), and also \( s = 1 \) and \( 2 \) to show behaviour well within the stable and unstable regions. We use \( \kappa = 100 \) as for stabilisation of the laminar it was found that large \( \kappa \) could be accommodated. Figure 1 shows that \( s = 1.49 \) gives asymptotic stability of the laminar flow while \( s = 1.51 \) initially is attracted towards \( u_{\text{lam}} \) but then picks up the unstable manifold and moves away. In contrast far from the neutral curve \( s = 2 \) does not exhibit a close approach to the laminar but settles onto a different attractor in the controlled system. Also of interest is that the curve at \( s = 1 \) lies on top of \( s = 1.49 \) indicating that the decay rate is not sensitive to the specific choice of stable \( s \).

The rightmost panel of figure 2 shows the result of the same calculation but at \( Re = 200 \) and \( G = 100 \) with \( s = 1.2 \) and \( 2 \), chosen to lie in the middle of the stable and unstable regions. As predicted \( s = 1.2 \) shows stabilisation and \( s = 2 \) does not.

Figure 3 shows snapshots of the vorticity field at the end of these simulations, showing the laminar at \( Re = 40 \), the flow for \( Re = 40, G = 20, s = 1.51 \) and \( Re = 200, G = 100, s = 2 \). We note that in these later two cases which do not stabilise we see a clear streamwise mode 3 pattern. This is in keeping with the analysis that this instability region is due to \( \alpha = 3 \); the other wavelengths are stabilised and mode 3 persists in the controlled dynamics, even at high \( Re \) and large amplitude.

4. Travelling waves: adaptive phase speed

The goal of this work is not to merely control turbulence; there is a vast literature on this topic and potentially more effective or applicable methods than TDF. Rather we seek to use this method as an efficient means to discover unstable nonlinear solutions embedded in the turbulent attractor. In this case it is impossible to perform any linear stability analysis \textit{a’priori} and predict what parameter values TDF will or will not work for. We will also need to guess the value of the period for UPOs, or phase speed of travelling waves, or indeed translations for relative UPOs. Moreover even if a solution is stabilised there is no guarantee that it will be the unique attractor and that our intial
**Figure 1.** (Left) Eigenvalue spectra for the modified Orr-Sommerfeld operator with $\alpha = 1$, $R = 40$. Blue circles show the result for $G = 0$, i.e. the uncontrolled Kolmogorov flow case. Orange diamonds show the rescaling of the spectrum for $G = 20$ and $s = 0$. Green stars show the shifting of the spectrum for $G = 20$ and $s = 1$ demonstrating the crossing of the imaginary axis of the eigenvalues with largest real part. (Right) Neutral curves for various Reynolds numbers in the $(s, G)$ plane with stable region lying to the right of the curves. Of note are the regions about $s = \pi \& \frac{2\pi}{3}$ where instability is always found regardless of the size of $G$. The situation is mirrored for $\pi < s < 2\pi$ with instability at $s = 2 \pi \& \frac{2\pi}{3}$.

**Figure 2.** Results of TDF applied to Kolmogorov flow. Left panel shows the relative size of the feedback term $Q$ and middle the relative error of the energy input rate relative to the laminar $E_I$ for $Re = 40$ and $G = 20$ with various choices for $s$ demonstrating stabilisation only within the boundaries shown in figure 1. Right panel shows $Q$ and $E_I$ now at $Re = 200$, $G = 100$ with $s = 1.2$ showing stabilisation and $s = 2$ not, again in agreement with the linear analysis.

**Figure 3.** Snapshots of the vorticity fields $\omega$ at the end of the simulations shown in figure 2. Left shows the stabilised laminar solution at $Re = 40$, note the laminar looks exactly the same at $Re = 200$ only with larger amplitude. Middle shows the unstable case near the neutral curve $Re = 40$, $G = 20$ and $s = 1.51$, the state is close to the laminar with a streamwise mode three disturbance in agreement with the linear theory. Right shows the unstable case at $Re = 200$, $G = 100$ and $s = 2$, the flow field is turbulent but again retains the mode three signature expected when applying TDF for $s \approx \frac{2\pi}{3}$ in this system.
condition will be in its basin of attraction. In general we will require some adaptive approaches to seek appropriate gain $G$, period $T$ and shifts $s$ to stabilise target ECSs.

As a first attempt of this approach we demonstrate the case of stabilising the travelling wave $T_1$ as reported in [Chandler & Kerswell 2013]. This solution is found as it is particularly amenable to the method due to being relatively weakly unstable (compared to other solutions) and has an unstable spectrum with entirely non-zero imaginary parts (see figure 6 later). In general travelling waves, including $T_1$, will have all symmetries broken and therefore we require that the specific combination for the phase speed of the solution $c = \frac{s}{T}$ to be respected in order for the TDF terms to vanish. While phase speeds for certain travelling waves are reported in the literature, we treat it as an unknown to be computed.

Our approach to find $c$ is to implement an adaptive method to vary $s(t)$ via descent using a simple ordinary differential equation

$$\dot{s} = \gamma \delta s \quad (4.1)$$

where $\gamma$ is some parameter varying the speed of the descent and $\delta s$ is an estimate of the mean shift remaining between $\omega(x+s,y,t-T)$ and $\omega(x,y,t)$. In other words $s+\delta s$ should minimise the delay term over translations at a given time, $t$, and delay, $T$. This mean shift is computed by averaging the phase shifts across the individual Fourier amplitudes, i.e.

$$s_k = \frac{1}{ik_x} \log \left( \frac{\hat{\omega}_k(t)}{\hat{\omega}_k(t-T)} \right),$$

where $\omega = \sum_k \hat{\omega}_k e^{ik \cdot x}$ is the Fourier expansion of $\omega$. This requires some care with the branches of the complex logarithm (or arctan); the full code is provided in the supplementary material. The ODE is solved alongside the DNS using Adams-Bashforth time-stepping.

The results of stabilising $T_1$ are shown in figure 4 at $Re = 40$ & $100$ using $G_{max} = 100$, $\gamma = 0.05$, $s(0) = 0$, $\kappa = 1$, and $T = 0.1$. These values were arrived at after a very short amount of trial and error, in fact this travelling wave is stabilised over a large range of parameters at these $Re$. At $Re = 40$ we demonstrate the effect of removing the adaptive shift by setting $\gamma = 0$, this also indicates the lack of stabilisation of the laminar in agreement with the results of the previous section. We notice that the dynamics are steady with the energy input rate $I$ settling onto a value close to that of $T_1$ (the same is true for $D$ and $E$, not shown for brevity) and the size of $Q$ tends to a small non-zero value. Our interpretation here is that $T_1$ is indeed stabilised but $Q$ cannot tend to zero as $s$ is incorrect. By setting $\gamma = 0.05$ $s$ adaptively adjusts to the value $s = 0.00198$ which is in agreement with the value of $c$ reported in [Chandler & Kerswell 2013], at the same time $Q$ drops to machine precision.

The result is repeatable at $Re = 100$ with the rest of the parameters held fixed, only now the convergence rate is decreased. At $Re = 200$ the increased complexity throws up something more of a challenge and stabilisation is not found, even on increasing to $G_{max} = 5000$. To understand the issue here we converge the $T_1$ solution at $Re = 100$ using Newton-GMRES-hookstep (using the code from Chandler & Kerswell (2013) and Lucas & Kerswell (2013)) and perform arc-length continuation in $Re$. At $Re = 100$ and $Re = 200$ we then conduct a stability analysis of the solution via Arnoldi iteration, the unstable part of the spectrum is shown in figure 6 along with the continuation curve. The important feature to note is that the unstable travelling wave has gained two further unstable directions at $Re = 200$ with purely real eigenvalues, thus violating the so-called ‘odd-number limitation’ (even though there are an even number of unstable eigenvalues).
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Figure 4. Time series of $E/E_{lam}$, $Q$ and $s$ (left to right) when applying TDF at $Re = 40$, $100$ $G = 100$ and $Re = 200$, $G = 5000$. For $Re = 40$ and 100 the T1 travelling wave is stabilised completely provided $\gamma \neq 0$. The right panel shows the convergence of the phase speed $c$ using the descent method of equation (4.1). When $Re = 200$ the travelling wave is no longer stabilised.

Figure 5. Vorticity, $\omega$, for (left to right) the T1 travelling wave solution at $Re = 100$, $Re = 200$, the new travelling wave at $Re = 200$ converged from the final state of the $G = 5000$ TDF simulation shown in the right most panel.

Figure 6. Left panels show the result of arclength continuation in $Re$ of the travelling wave solutions shown in figure 5. Right shows the unstable part of the eigenvalue spectrum for the T1 travelling wave at $Re = 100$ and 200. Note at $Re = 200$ the two smallest eigenvalues sitting on the real axis.

This is why the stabilisation has been unsuccessful here. Unlike the laminar solution we do not have the same freedom to manipulate this spectrum by varying the shift, however future work may find a more sophisticated application of TDF to work around this issue [Sieber 2016; Pyragas & Pyragas 2014; Lehnert et al. 2011; Flunkert & Schöll 2011].

While the case at $Re = 200$ has failed to completely stabilise a travelling wave, $Q$ has fallen to around $10^{-4}$. We therefore attempt a Newton-GMRES convergence with this state and find a new travelling wave. Continuation of this new state in $Re$ (figure
shows that there is a turning in a saddle node at \( Re \approx 166 \) indicating that this is a high Reynolds number exact coherent structure which is likely not present at the lower \( Re \) of previous work \((\text{Chandler & Kerswell 2013; Lucas & Kerswell 2015})\). We also perform Arnoldi iteration on this state and find that it also has some purely real unstable eigenvalues (not shown).

This result is encouraging on two fronts. First we find a high Reynolds number ECS with relative ease. Second it shows that, even when the ‘target’ solution is not completely stabilised by TDF, it is still possible to ‘precondition’ a guess for Newton-GMRES using the method.

5. Unstable Periodic Orbits: proof of concept

Now it has been shown that Pyragas control can stabilise travelling waves, the next challenge is to determine if it can stabilise periodic orbits for this flow. Given the known short-comings of the method for purely real unstable Floquet exponents, and to prove the concept in a simple setting, we apply the method at low Reynolds number. Kolmogorov flow exhibits a classical Ruelle-Takens transition to chaos \((\text{Ruelle & Takens 1971})\), in particular at \( Re \approx 31 \) a periodic orbit undergoes a subcritical Hopf bifurcation leading to chaos. The typical solutions in the \( D - I \) and \( D - t \) planes are shown in figure 7 for \( Re = 30 \) (stable periodic orbit) and \( Re = 31 \) (weak chaos). The periodic orbit is converged at \( Re = 31 \) with period \( T \approx 36.48 \) and translation \( s \approx -0.45 \). Arnoldi iterations confirm unstable exponents \( \lambda_{\pm} = 7.7 \times 10^{-4} \pm 0.074i \). The orbit is actually ‘preperiodic’ to half the period but with the addition of an \( RS^5 \) symmetry; we deal with the double period version for simplicity of the implementation of Newton-GMRES and TDF.

Our first goal is to apply TDF at \( Re = 31 \) with the period and shift input from the Newton-GMRES convergence. This should be the least demanding test of the method possible, however even with the relatively weakly unstable Floquet exponent it is a challenge to stabilise the UPO. This is primarily due to the starting history and the application of the gain \( G \). If the gain is strongly applied very abruptly, the dynamics settle onto a periodic solution in the controlled system where \( Q \not\to 0 \), i.e. the period/symmetries of the control do not match the orbit. If \( G \) is too weakly applied, control is not achieved
at all. Figures 8 and 9 (case A in table 1) show the effect of applying a gain function

$$G(t) = \min(G_{\text{max}}, \kappa(t-T_{\text{start}})^2)$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.1)$$

with $G_{\text{max}} = 25$ and $\kappa = \frac{G_{\text{max}}}{40000}$, meaning $G_{\text{max}}$ is reached after 200 time units, and set $T_{\text{start}}$ to be the first time when $Q < 0.2$, essentially denoting a close recurrence. As can be seen, the orbit is not stabilised, the residual decreases but then begins to grow and plotting in a $(D,I)$ plane shows significant deviations from the Newton-GMRES converged trajectory. This picture remains qualitatively the same for a variety of parameters, including $G_{\text{max}}$.

Even though we initiate the control after a near recurrence, this example is still for one particular initial condition, and therefore initial history $T_{\text{start}} - T < t < T_{\text{start}}$. It is reasonable to consider the effect of different starting points on the control. We are not guaranteed that, even if the UPO is stabilised by the feedback, it is the unique attractor in the controlled system and we begin within its basin of attraction. To tackle this issue we may periodically, here every 250 time units, turn off the feedback term by setting $G = 0$ for $1.2T$ time units and a new $T_{\text{start}} = T_{\text{start}} + 250 + 1.2T$ is set to re-establish the control. Through such experimentation it was discovered that this re-initialising of the history with uncontrolled dynamics can nudge the system successively closer to the orbit of the uncontrolled system, such that $Q$ remains small over a period, even when $G = 0$. This is shown in figure 8 (left panel, case B in table 1) using the same $G_{\text{max}} = 25$ and first $T_{\text{start}} = 500$. The orbit is now stabilised with $Q$ dropping off and staying at around $10^{-4}$ even when $G = 0$ (the upper edge of the orange band corresponds to times when $G = 0$), and in the $(D,I)$ plane (figure 9) the orbit is effectively coincident with the Newton-GMRES converged UPO. Despite the observed stabilisation the method does not show $Q$ asymptoting to zero; it saturates at a value well above the typical tolerance of Newton-GMRES ($\sim 10^{-12}$). We will show that this arises due to error in the values of $T$ and $s$ only. The convergence criterion used for Newton-GMRES is a residual of the state vector which does not include $T$ or $s$ explicitly. In other words while $T$ and $s$ are sufficiently accurate to integrate around the orbit to the tolerance, it does not guarantee that the values of $T$ and $s$ themselves are to within this tolerance of their exact values. This will be critical for TDF if there is to be any hope of $Q$ vanishing. Moreover the ultimate goal is to be able to discover new orbits with only a guess for the period and shift, therefore initially making a large error in their values. We therefore require some methods for adaptively converging $T$ and $s$.

As outlined in the previous section we have devised a method to adaptively adjust $s$ in equation (4.1). We can also adapt the period by iteratively adjusting $T$ each reset cycle (when $G = 0$, i.e. $t = T_{\text{start}} + 250 + T$) by seeking a new $T$ which minimises a distance measure from the current time. To do this with the full state vector, as we do for $Q$, requires excessive storage and computations; while we store the history over $T$, in general we will require more history to allow $T$ to increase if necessary. Instead we store three degrees of freedom $e_1 = \dot{\omega}_{(0,1)}$, $e_2 = \dot{\omega}_{(0,2)}$ and $e_3 = \dot{\omega}_{(0,3)}$ and define

$$q(t, T) = \sqrt{(e_1(t) - e_1(t-T))^2 + (e_2(t) - e_2(t-T))^2 + (e_3(t) - e_3(t-T))^2}.$$  

These variables are chosen as, having $k_s = 0$, they are directly unaffected by the shift and therefore are less sensitive to the adaptive adjustments made to $s$. We compute the updated $T$ which minimises $q$ by first locating the timestep, $k$, in the history for which $q$ is smallest. We then use the Lagrange quadratic interpolant about this point,
differentiating to find the minimum gives the correction to the timestep to update $T$;

$$dt_{new} = \frac{T_{new}}{N_T} = \frac{(k + k_c)}{N_T} dt_{old}, \quad k_c = \frac{q_{k+1} - q_{k-1}}{2(q_{k+1} - 2q_k + q_{k-1})},$$

(5.2)

where $N_T$ is the number of timesteps around the orbit, $dt_{old}$ is the previous timestep used and $k_c$ is the correction given by the interpolating quadratic. Keeping the number of timesteps around the orbit fixed eases the implementation of the history and period adjustment; provided the timestepping is well converged ($N_T$ is large enough) the small adjustments will not cause significant errors. To control this we only seek minima of $q$ within 1% of the current/input period. This also makes sure that the method does not stray far from the target period. The calculations are found to be more sensitive to changes of $s$ than $T$, so it was necessary to allow the stabilisation to settle near to the

**Figure 8.** Relative size of feedback term, or residual, $Q$ for the runs outlined in table 1. Left figure shows those cases without any adaptivity to improve $T$ and $s$, right shows the two cases where $T$ and $s$ are adjusted to accelerate the stabilisation. Note for cases $B$ to $E$ the delay terms are turned off every 250 time units before being restarted after $1.2T$, this means the top edge of the coloured bands represents the value of residual $Q$ in the absence of time-delayed feedback control.

**Figure 9.** Energetics for some of the cases outlined in table 1. Right shows the shows the final 36.5 time units from the cases $A$ (original $T$, $s$ and no resetting of $G$), $B$ (original $T$, $s$ but resetting $G$), projected onto the ($D/D_{lam}, I/D_{lam}$) plane. Note there is also black curve for the converged UPO which is almost completely obscured by the curve for $B$. Middle shows the time series for the normalised dissipation rate $D/D_{lam}$ for the unsuccessful case $A$ and the stabilised case $B$. Right figure shows again the ($D/D_{lam}, I/D_{lam}$) plane for case $E$ (improved $T$, $s$ and resetting $G$), now coloured for time. Note that the other stabilised cases ($C$, $D$) would appear virtually identical to $B$ and $E$ in these plots.
orbit before starting to vary them. In the first instance the the period is iterated upon from $t = 1000$ and the shift from $t = 2000$.

Figure 10 shows the convergence of $s$ (using $\gamma = 100$) and $T$ (case C in table 1) and the associated decreasing of $Q$, (right panel of figure 8) even when using a more speculative guess for the period and shift, i.e. starting with $T = 36.5$ and $s = -0.5$. This gives a fairer reflection of the method had one not had a Newton-GMRES convergence to hand. The ‘residual’, i.e. the value of $Q$ when $G = 0$ for a period, can become as low as $\sim 10^{-6}$, so has shown some improvement over the Newton-GMRES values.

Despite having converged toward the expected values from these starting ‘guesses’ there is clearly still significant variability (error) in $s$ and $T$, which is contributing to the still relatively large, and also varying, values of $Q$. To verify that the main impediment to $Q$ vanishing is the precision to which $s$ and $T$ are known, we take our current best estimate for them and start another run, using the same initial conditions. In order to improve the convergence of $s$ we set $\gamma = 10^5Q$, i.e. now time dependent, the idea being to slow the descent of $s$ when $Q$ is small. Having started with a good estimate for $T$ and $s$ we set $T_{\text{start}} = 10000$ to allow the dynamics to converge to the orbit before starting the adaptive adjustment. We might have reduced this waiting time by taking an initial condition from the previous stabilisation run and a smaller $T_{\text{start}}$, however it is important to demonstrate that the starting point is not critical for overall stabilisation using this approach.

We are now able to converge an even closer estimate of $s$ and consequently $T$ as evidenced in figures 8 and 10 and the values in table 1, case D. The residual of $Q$ without control is of the order $10^{-8}$. We also perform a final calculation (case E) using these converged values without any adaptivity to show that it is enough to have accurate $T$ and $s$ and the adaptivity does not play any other significant role in stabilising the orbit. We also change the initial condition, but keep the $Q < 0.2 \ T_{\text{start}}$, and find essentially the same result.

Finally as a check of our findings against the original Newton-GMRES converged UPO, we use our stabilised state, period and translation as a start for a new Newton-GMRES convergence. The starting residual being $2 \times 10^{-8}$ only one iteration is required to drop this to $10^{-13}$, notably the period being $T = 36.4869618$ and shift $s = -0.4510612$ which are very slightly different from the values input. These value differ from the original arclength continued UPO by approximately $10^{-4}$ in relative terms.

Figure 10. Figures showing the result of iteratively improving the estimate of period $T$, left, and translation shift $s$, right, for cases $C$ and $D$ from table 1. $C$ shows the relatively rapid convergence to the correct value from a deliberately poor guess. Insets show the slower but more precise convergence of case $D$, associated with the much lower values of $Q$ in figure 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reset</th>
<th>$G$</th>
<th>initial $T$</th>
<th>initial $s$</th>
<th>improved $T$</th>
<th>improved $s$</th>
<th>$Q$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0 36.481544</td>
<td>-0.451272</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$\sim 10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0 36.481544</td>
<td>-0.451272</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$8.8 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100 36.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>36.4869508</td>
<td>-0.4510425</td>
<td>$6.2 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$10^2Q$</td>
<td>36.4869508</td>
<td>-0.4510425</td>
<td>36.4869616</td>
<td>$4.4 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0 36.4869616</td>
<td>-0.4510612</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$1.9 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.** Table for the various UPO stabilisation tests conducted, all run over 50000 time units and shown in figures 8-10. The final column shows the lowest residual $Q$ with $G = 0$, i.e. the closeness of recurrence in the uncontrolled dynamics. $A$ and $B$ are started with the Newton-GMRES converged period and translation which is shown in the fourth and fifth columns. $D$ is started with the optimal period and translation of run $C$.

### 6. Discussion

This study has shown several useful results using time-delayed feedback control in two-dimensional turbulence. First is stabilisation of the laminar solution up to high Reynolds numbers. Despite the laminar state violating the so-called ‘odd-number’ limitation, we have taken advantage of the continuous symmetry of the solution to manipulate the linear operator and find stabilisation for certain choices of shift $s$ and gain $G$. The DNS shows good agreement with the linear analysis. We have also shown that by applying TDF in conjunction with an adaptive method for the shift $s$, we are able to completely stabilise the T1 travelling wave solution. This breaks down at high $Re$ where the solution gains purely real unstable eigenvalues, however the method creates an excellent guess for a newly discovered travelling wave at high Reynolds number. This is particularly encouraging as it has taken very little effort to find this solution despite the increased complexity which comes along with higher $Re$. The new travelling wave has the unimodal signature similar to the states discovered by bifurcation analysis by [Kim & Okamoto 2010; Kim et al. 2017] and indicative of the vorticity condensate of 2D turbulence. This opens up the possibility of making use of high Reynolds number ECSs to investigate the turbulent cascades of energy and enstrophy.

For UPOs the situation is complicated by the need to converge accurate estimates of $T$ and $s$ simultaneously. It is clear that errors in these variables feed into not only into delay terms, but also each other; we may expect longer/shorter translations when over/under-estimating the period. While periodicity is found with imprecise $T$ and $s$, non-vanishing $Q$ makes the UPO’s presence in the uncontrolled system difficult to ascertain. We have shown that it is possible to improve these estimates adaptively during a stabilisation simulation, however a number of ad-hoc choices have been made in designing these methods and improvements should be possible. The key result is the realisation that the main difficulty for these methods is the accuracy of period and translation, and that if one is able to obtain good estimates, stabilisation can be possible.

The method used for the UPO here has been attempted at higher Reynolds number ($Re = 40$), however a suitable target UPO, e.g. R19 from [Chandler & Kerswell 2013], has yet to be stabilised. This is likely because of the increased dimension of the chaotic attractor, meaning that ‘nudging’ via resetting the history requires longer to settle onto the orbit, or alternatively the correct $G_{max}$ has yet to be found.

One very appealing feature of this work is the simplicity of the method and the ease with which it may be implemented. Any DNS code can be quite easily adapted to include the feedback term; the memory overhead associated with storing the history
is not significant and is only slightly more onerous than required for the recurrent flow analysis. The nature of the method also makes it attractive as a way to ‘target’ particular types of orbit, particularly orbits of a certain length which may be missed by recurrent flow analysis. This may lead to improved periodic orbit theory predictions when using the UPOs as a basis to recreate turbulent statistics (Chandler & Kerswell 2013; Cvitanovic 2013).

Care has been taken to conduct very long calculations to ensure the robustness of the methods. In practise, once we are satisfied with the behaviour of the adaptive techniques to converge the period and translation, it would be hoped that shorter time integrations would suffice. The new travelling wave solution at $Re = 200$ also suggests that, even when TDF does not fully stabilise a particular ECS, small gains could perturb the dynamics to lie close enough to an underlying unstable state to make a Newton-GMRES convergence trivial.

Literature in low dimensional systems and our results in this simple 2D flow show that the bifurcation scenario is important for stabilisation and the method used to stabilise. It therefore remains to be seen how TDF will perform in other flow configurations. One of our next steps will be to implement these methods in a wall-bounded shear flow, like the plane Couette case of Kawahara (2005), and determine how well travelling waves and UPOs can be stabilised in a more physically realistic configuration.

The main challenge for future improvements of time-delayed feedback control in fluids is the application of an systematic adaptive approach to setting the gain, symmetries and period. We have established that without precise values of these parameters we are unlikely to succeed in stabilisation. For the method to really compete with the recurrent flow analysis we need to develop a more automatic way to find accurate $s$ and $T$, or at least reduce the number of parameters, $\kappa, \gamma, T_{\text{start}}, G_{\text{max}}$, currently used. We will also need to address the so-called ‘odd-number’ limitation; looking at the stability properties of the collection of UPOs converged at $Re = 60$ in Lucas & Kerswell (2015) suggests that it is very likely for high dimensional orbits to have unstable eigenvalues on or near the imaginary axis. More sophisticated methods reported in the literature (Schuster & Stemmmer 1997; Pyragas 2006; Flunkert & Schöll 2011; Lehnert et al. 2011; Pyragas & Pyragas 2014) are therefore likely to be required to stabilise UPOs in the Navier-Stokes equations.
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