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Abstract

We consider the question of fundamental limitations on the performance of eddy-viscosity closure models for turbulent flows, focusing on the Leith model for 2D Large-Eddy Simulation. Optimal eddy viscosities depending on the magnitude of the vorticity gradient are determined subject to minimum assumptions by solving PDE-constrained optimization problems defined such that the corresponding optimal Large-Eddy Simulation best matches the Direct Numerical Simulation. The main finding is that with a fixed cutoff wavenumber $k_c$, the performance of the Large-Eddy Simulation systematically improves as the regularization in the solution of the optimization problem is reduced and this is achieved with the optimal eddy viscosities exhibiting increasingly irregular behavior with rapid oscillations. Since the optimal eddy viscosities do not converge to a well-defined limit as the regularization vanishes, we conclude that the problem of finding an optimal eddy viscosity is not in fact well posed.

1 Introduction

The closure problem is arguably one of the most important outstanding problems in turbulence research. It touches upon some of the key basic questions concerning turbulent flows and at the same time has far-reaching consequences for many applications, most importantly, for how we simulate turbulent flows in different settings. Given the extreme spatio-temporal complexity of turbulent flows, accurate numerical solutions of the Navier-Stokes system even at modest
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Reynolds numbers requires resolutions exceeding the capability of commonly accessible computational resources. To get around this difficulty, one usually relies on various simplified versions of the Navier-Stokes system obtained through different forms of averaging and/or filtering, such as the Reynolds-Averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) system and the Large-Eddy Simulation (LES). However, such formulations are not closed, because these systems involve nonlinear terms representing the effect of unresolved subgrid stresses on the resolved variables. The “closure problem” thus consists in expressing these quantities in terms of resolved variables such that the RANS or LES system is closed.

Most closure models are formulated based on some ad-hoc, albeit well-justified, physical assumptions. There exists a vast body of literature concerning the design, calibration and performance of such models in various settings. Since it is impossible to offer an even cursory survey of these studies here, we refer the reader to the well-known monographs (Pope, 2000; Davidson, 2015) for an overview of the subject. Recently, there has been a lot of activity centered on learning empirical closure models from data using methods of machine learning (Jimenez, 2018; Duraisamy et al., 2019). It is however fair to say that the field of turbulence modelling has been largely dominated by empiricism and there is a consensus that the potential and limitations of even the most common models are still not well understood. Our study tackles this basic question, more specifically, how well a certain common closure model can in principle perform if it is calibrated in a mathematically optimal way.

We will focus on the Leith model (Leith, 1968, 1971, 1996) for two-dimensional (2D) LES which belongs to the family of Smagorinsky-type eddy-viscosity models (Smagorinsky, 1963). Like all eddy-viscosity closure models, the Leith model depends on one key parameter which is the eddy viscosity typically taken to be a function of some flow variable. Needless to say, performance of such models critically depends on the form of this function. The specific question we are interested in is how accurately the LES equipped with such an eddy-viscosity closure model can at best reproduce solutions of the Navier-Stokes system obtained via Direct Numerical Simulation (DNS). We will address this question by formulating it as an optimization problem for a system of partial differential equations (PDEs) where we will seek an optimal functional dependence of the eddy viscosity on the state variable such that the corresponding LES will match the DNS as well as possible over a time window of several eddy turnover times. By framing this question in terms of an optimization problem we will be able to find the best (in a mathematically precise sense) eddy viscosity, and this will in turn allow us to characterize performance limitations for this class of closure models. We emphasize that the novelty of our approach is that by finding an optimal functional form of the eddy viscosity we identify, subject to minimum assumptions, an optimal structure of the nonlinearity in the closure model, which is fundamentally different, and arguably more involved, than calibrating one or more constants in a selected ansatz for the eddy viscosity.

The structure of the paper is as follows: in the next section we formulate our LES model and state the optimization problem for the optimal eddy viscosity; in §3 we introduce an adjoint-based approach to the solution of the optimization problem and in §4 discuss computational details; our results are presented in §5 whereas final conclusions are deferred to §6.
2 Large-Eddy Simulation and Optimal Eddy Viscosity

We consider 2D flows of viscous incompressible fluids on a periodic domain $\Omega := [0, 2\pi]^2$ over the time interval $[0, T]$ for some $T > 0$ ("=" means “equal to by definition”). Assuming the fluid is of uniform unit density $\rho = 1$, its motion is governed by the Navier-Stokes system written here in the vorticity form

$$\partial_t w + \nabla^\perp \psi \cdot \nabla w = \nu_N \Delta w - \alpha w + f_\omega \quad \text{in} \quad (0, T) \times \Omega, \quad (1a)$$

$$\Delta \psi = -w \quad \text{in} \quad (0, T) \times \Omega, \quad (1b)$$

$$w(t = 0) = w_0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \quad (1c)$$

where $w = -\nabla^\perp \cdot u$, with $\nabla^\perp = [\partial_{x_2}, -\partial_{x_1}]^T$ and $u$ the velocity field, is the vorticity component perpendicular to the plane of motion, $\psi$ is the streamfunction, $\nu_N$ is the coefficient of the kinematic viscosity (for simplicity, we reserve the symbol $\nu$ for the eddy viscosity), and $w_0$ is the initial condition. System (1) is subject to two forcing mechanisms: a time-independent forcing $f_\omega$ which ensures that the flow remains in a statistical equilibrium and the Ekman friction $-\alpha w$ describing large-scale dissipation due to, for example, interactions with boundary layers arising in geophysical fluid phenomena. The forcing term is defined to act on Fourier components of the solution with wavenumbers in the range $[k_a, k_b]$ for some $0 < k_a < k_b < \infty$, i.e.,

$$[\hat{f}_\omega]_k := \begin{cases} F, & k_a \leq |k| \leq k_b, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $[\hat{f}_\omega]_k$ is the Fourier component of $f_\omega$ with the wavevector $k$ (hereafter hats “\(\hat{}\)” will denote Fourier coefficients) and $F > 0$ is a constant parameter.

The phenomenology of 2D forced turbulence is described by the Kraichnan-Batchelor-Leith theory (Kraichnan, 1967; Batchelor, 1969; Leith, 1968) which makes predictions about various physical characteristics of such flows. Their prominent feature, distinct from turbulent flows in three dimensions (3D), is the presence of a forward enstrophy cascade and an inverse energy cascade (Bracco & McWilliams, 2010; Vallgren & Lindborg, 2011; Boffetta & Ecke, 2012). Here we will chose $k_a$ and $k_b$ such that the forcing term (2) will act on a narrow band of Fourier coefficients to produce a well-developed enstrophy cascade towards large wavenumbers and a rudimentary energy cascade towards small wavenumbers. The parameters $\nu_N$, $\alpha$ and $F$ will be adjusted to yield a statistically steady state with enstrophy $\mathcal{E}(t) := \int_\Omega w^2(t, x) \, d\Omega$ fluctuating around a well-defined mean value $\mathcal{E}_0$. The initial condition $\omega_0$ in (1c) will be chosen such that the evolution begins already in this statistically steady state at time $t = 0$.

2.1 The Leith Closure Model

The LES is obtained by applying a suitable low-pass filter $G_\delta$, where $\delta > 0$ is its width, to the Navier-Stokes system (1) and defining the filtered variables $\tilde{w} = G_\delta \ast w$ and $\tilde{\psi} = G_\delta \ast \psi$ (“\(\ast\)” denotes the convolution operation and hereafter we will use tilde “\(\tilde{}\)” to represent filtered
variables). For simplicity, we will employ a sharp low-pass spectral filter defined in terms of its Fourier-space representation as

$$\hat{G}_\delta(k) := \begin{cases} 1, & |k| \leq k_c \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

(3)

where $k_c$ is the largest resolved wavenumber such that the filter width is $\delta = 2\pi/k_c$. Since we normally have $k_b < k_c$, it follows that $\tilde{f}_\omega = f_\omega$. Application of filter (3) to the vorticity equation (1a) yields

$$\partial_t \tilde{\omega} + \nabla \cdot \nabla \psi \cdot \nabla \tilde{\omega} = \nu_N \Delta \tilde{\omega} - \alpha \tilde{\omega} + M$$

where the term $M := \nabla \cdot \nabla \psi \cdot \nabla \tilde{\omega} - \nabla \cdot \nabla \omega \cdot \nabla \tilde{\omega}$ represents the effect of unresolved subgrid quantities. Since this expression depends on the original unfiltered variables $\omega$ and $\psi$, to close the filtered system the term $M$ must be modelled in terms of an expression involving the filtered variables only. We will do this using the Leith model (Leith, 1968, 1971, 1996), which has a similar structure to the Smagorinsky model (Smagorinsky, 1963) widely used as a closure for 3D flows, but is derived considering the forward enstrophy cascade as the dominant mechanism in 2D turbulent flows. There is evidence for good performance of the Leith model in such flows (Graham & Ringler, 2013; Maulik & San, 2017). Its preferred form is

$$M \approx \tilde{M} = \nabla \cdot (\tilde{\nu} \nabla \tilde{\omega})$$

(4)

where $\tilde{\omega}$ is the solution to the LES system, cf. (6), and the eddy viscosity is assumed to be a function of the magnitude of the vorticity gradient

$$\nu = \nu(\nabla \tilde{\omega} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\omega}) = \nu(s), \quad \text{with} \quad s := \nabla \tilde{\omega} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\omega} \in \mathcal{I} := [0, s_{\text{max}}],$$

(5)

where $s_{\text{max}} > 0$ is sufficiently large and $\mathcal{I}$ will be referred to as the “state space domain”.

While in the original formulation of the Leith model the eddy viscosity was usually taken to be a linear function of $|\nabla \tilde{\omega}|$ (Graham & Ringler, 2013; Maulik & San, 2017), here we consider a very general dependence of the eddy viscosity on $|\nabla \tilde{\omega}|$ subject only to some minimum assumptions to be specified below. Making $\nu$ a function of $|\nabla \tilde{\omega}|^2$, rather than of $|\nabla \tilde{\omega}|$, in (5) will simplify subsequent calculations. With the Leith model (4)–(5), the LES version of the 2D Navier-Stokes system (1) takes the form

$$\partial_t \tilde{\omega} + \nabla \cdot \nabla \psi = \nabla \cdot (\left[\nu_N + \nu(s)\right] \nabla \tilde{\omega}) - \alpha \tilde{\omega} + f_\omega$$

in $(0, T] \times \Omega$, \hspace{1cm} (6a)

$$\Delta \tilde{\psi} = -\tilde{\omega}$$

in $(0, T] \times \Omega$, \hspace{1cm} (6b)

$$\tilde{\omega}(t = 0) = \tilde{\omega}_0 = \tilde{\omega}_0$$

in $\Omega$, \hspace{1cm} (6c)

where the initial condition is given by the filtered initial condition from the DNS system.

An equivalent form of equation (6a) can be obtained noting that with the form of the filter given in (3), the decomposition of the subgrid stresses reduces to $M = \nabla \cdot \nabla \psi - \nabla \cdot \nabla \omega$. As a result, the advection term in (6a) can be replaced with $\nabla \cdot \nabla \omega$. While our numerical solution will be based on (6a), this second form will facilitate the derivations.
presented in §3. We will assume that for all times \( t \in [0, T] \) the filtered vorticity field \( \tilde{\omega} \) is in the Sobolev space \( H^2_0(\Omega) \) of zero-mean functions with square-integrable second derivatives (Adams & Fournier, 2003). We stress the distinction between the fields \( w, \bar{w}, \tilde{\omega} \) which represent, respectively, the solution of the DNS system (1), its filtered version and the solution of the LES system (6).

### 2.2 Optimization Formulation for Eddy Viscosity

The optimal eddy viscosity will be found as a minimizer of an error functional representing the mean-square error between observations of the DNS, i.e., of the solution \( w(t, x) \) of the Navier-Stokes system (1), and of the corresponding prediction \( \tilde{\omega}(t, x; \nu) \) of the LES model (6) with eddy viscosity \( \nu \). These observations are acquired at points \( x_i, i = 1, \ldots, M^2 \), forming a uniform \( M \times M \) grid in \( \Omega \) with operators \( H_i : H^2(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) defined as

\[
(H_i \tilde{\omega}) (t) := \int_{\Omega} \delta(x - x_i) \tilde{\omega}(t, x) \, d\Omega = \tilde{\omega}(t, x_i), \quad i = 1, \ldots, M^2, \tag{7}
\]

where \( \delta(\cdot) \) is the Dirac delta distribution and observations \((H_i \tilde{\omega}(\nu)) (t)\) of the LES solution are defined analogously (an integral representation of the observation operators will be convenient for the derivation of the solution approach for the optimization problem presented in §3). The number of the observations points \( M^2 \) will be chosen such that \( M \gtrsim k_c \), i.e., the observations will resolve all flow features with wavenumbers slightly higher than the cutoff wavenumber \( k_c \) in (3). The error functional then takes the form

\[
\mathcal{J}(\nu) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \sum_{i=1}^{M^2} \left[ (H_i w) (t) - (H_i \tilde{\omega}(\nu)) (t) \right]^2 \, dt \tag{8}
\]

and is understood as depending on the functional form of the eddy viscosity \( \nu = \nu(s) \).

The form of equation (6a) suggests that \( \nu = \nu(s) \) must be at least a piecewise \( C^1 \) function on \( I \). However, as will become evident in §3, our solution approach imposes some additional regularity requirements, namely, \( \nu = \nu(s) \) needs to be piecewise \( C^2 \) on \( I \) with the first and third derivatives vanishing at \( s = 0, s_{\text{max}} \). Since gradient-based solution approaches to PDE-constrained optimization problems are preferably formulated in Hilbert spaces (Protas et al., 2004), we shall look for an optimal eddy viscosity as an element of the the following linear space which is a subspace of the Sobolev space \( H^2(I) \)

\[
\mathcal{S} := \left\{ \nu \in C^3(I) : \frac{d}{ds} \nu(s) = \frac{d^3}{ds^3} \nu(s) = 0 \text{ at } s = 0, s_{\text{max}} \right\}. \tag{9}
\]

Then, the problem of finding an optimal eddy viscosity becomes

\[
\tilde{\nu} := \arg \min_{\nu \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{J}(\nu). \tag{10}
\]

Our approach to solving this problem is outlined in the next section.
3 Adjoint-based Optimization

We formulate our approach in the continuous (“optimize-then-discretize”) setting (Gunzburger, 2003) and adopt the strategy developed and validated by Matharu & Protas (2020). Here we only summarize its key steps and refer the reader to that study for further details. A local solution of problem (8)–(10) can be found using an iterative gradient-based minimization approach as $\tilde{\nu} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \nu^{(n)}$, where

\[\begin{align*}
\nu^{(n+1)} &= \nu^{(n)} - \tau^{(n)} \nabla_{\nu} J(\nu^{(n)}), & n = 0, 1, \ldots, \\
\nu^{(0)} &= \nu_0,
\end{align*}\] (11)

in which $\nu^{(n)}$ is the approximation of the optimal eddy viscosity at the $n$th iteration, $\nabla_{\nu} J(\nu)$ is the gradient of the error functional (8) with respect to the eddy viscosity $\nu$, $\tau^{(n)}$ is the step length along the descent direction and $\nu_0$ is the initial guess for the eddy viscosity.

A central element of algorithm (11) is the gradient $\nabla_{\nu} J(\nu)$. In many problems of PDE-constrained optimization it can be conveniently expressed using solutions of suitably-defined adjoint equations (Gunzburger, 2003). However, the present optimization problem (8)–(10) has a nonstandard structure because the control variable $\nu(s)$ is a function of the dependent variable $s = |\nabla \tilde{\omega}|^2$ in system (6). On the other hand, in its standard formulation adjoint analysis allows one to obtain expressions for gradients depending on the independent variables in the problem (here, $t$ and $x$). This difficulty was overcome by Bukshtynov et al. (2011); Bukshtynov & Protas (2013) who generalized adjoint analysis of PDE systems to problems of the type (8)–(10) by introducing a suitable change of variables.

To obtain an expression for the gradient $\nabla_{\nu} J$ we consider the Gâteaux differential of functional (8) defined as $J'(\nu; \nu') := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \epsilon^{-1} [J(\nu + \epsilon \nu') - J(\nu)]$, where $\nu' \in S$ is an arbitrary perturbation of the eddy viscosity $\nu$. Noting that it is a bounded linear functional acting on $\nu'$, we invoke the Riesz representation theorem (Berger, 1977) to obtain

\[J'(\nu; \nu') = \left\langle \nabla_{\nu}^{H^2} J, \nu' \right\rangle_{H^2(I)} = \left\langle \nabla_{\nu}^{L^2} J, \nu' \right\rangle_{L^2(I)},\] (12)

where the inner product in the space $H^2(I)$ is defined as

\[\left\langle p_1, p_2 \right\rangle_{H^2(I)} = \int_0^{s_{\text{max}}} p_1 p_2 + \ell_1^2 \frac{dp_1}{ds} \frac{dp_2}{ds} + \ell_2^4 \frac{d^2 p_1}{ds^2} \frac{d^2 p_2}{ds^2} \, ds,\] (13)

in which $\ell_1$ and $\ell_2$ are length-scale parameters. While for all values of $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in (0, \infty)$ the inner products (13) are equivalent (in the sense of norm equivalence), these two parameters play a very important role in regularization of solutions to the optimization problem (8)–(10). In (11) we require the gradient in the space $H^2(I)$, i.e., $\nabla_{\nu} J = \nabla_{\nu}^{H^2} J$, but it is convenient to first derive the gradient with respect to the $L^2$ topology.
Introducing adjoint fields \( \tilde{\omega}^* \) and \( \tilde{\psi}^* \) defined to satisfy the following adjoint system

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{\omega}^* \\
\tilde{\psi}^*
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
-\partial_t \tilde{\omega}^* - \nabla^2 \tilde{\psi} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\omega}^* + \alpha \tilde{\omega}^* + \tilde{\psi}^* \\
-\nabla \cdot (2 \frac{dW}{ds} (\nabla \tilde{\omega} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\omega}) \nabla \tilde{\omega}) + (\nu_N + \nu) \nabla \tilde{\omega} \\
\Delta \tilde{\psi}^* - \nabla^2 (\tilde{\omega}^* \nabla \tilde{\omega})
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
W \\
0
\end{bmatrix},
\tag{14a}
\]

\( \tilde{\omega}^* (t = T, x) = 0, \tag{14b} \)

with the source term \( W(t, x) := \sum_{i=1}^{M^2} H_i^* [(H_i \tilde{\omega}(\nu)) (t) - (H_i w)(t)] \), where \( H_i^* : \mathbb{R} \to H^{-2}(\Omega) \), are the adjoints of the observation operators \( H_i \), cf. (7), defined as \( (H_i^* \xi) := \delta(x - x_i) \xi, \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}, i = 1, \ldots, M^2 \). Using the Riesz identity (12), we can then deduce an expression for the gradient defined with respect to the \( L^2 \) topology as

\[
\nabla_{L^2}^\nu J(s) = - \int_0^T \int_\Omega \delta (\nabla \tilde{\omega} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\omega} - s) \nabla \tilde{\omega} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\omega}^* d\Omega dt.
\tag{15}
\]

The \( L^2 \) gradient given in (15) may in principle be discontinuous as a function of \( s \) and hence will not ensure the regularity required of the optimal eddy viscosity, cf. §2.2. To circumvent this problem, we define a Sobolev gradient using the Riesz relations (12) to identify the \( H^2 \) inner product (13) with an expression for the Gâteaux differential. Integrating by parts with respect to \( s \) and noting that the perturbation \( \nu' \in S \) is arbitrary, we obtain the Sobolev gradient \( \nabla_{H^2} J \) as a solution of the elliptic boundary-value problem

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Id - \ell_1^2 \frac{d^2}{ds^2} + \ell_2^4 \frac{d^4}{ds^4}
\end{bmatrix} \nabla_{H^2} J(s) = \nabla_{L^2}^\nu J(s), \quad s \in \mathcal{I},
\tag{16a}
\]

\[
\frac{d^{(1)} (\nabla_{H^2} J)}{ds^{(1)}} \bigg|_{s=0, s_{\text{max}}} = \frac{d^{(3)} (\nabla_{H^2} J)}{ds^{(3)}} \bigg|_{s=0, s_{\text{max}}} = 0.
\tag{16b}
\]

The choice of the boundary conditions in (16b) ensures the vanishing of all the boundary terms resulting from the integration by parts. There is in fact some freedom in how to cancel these terms and the choice in (16b) is arguably the least restrictive (in particular, the corresponding Sobolev gradient need not vanish at \( s = 0 \) and can therefore modify the value of \( \nu(0) \), which turns out to be important in practice). The boundary conditions (16b) are the reason for the presence of additional constraints in the definition of space \( S \) in (9).

Determination of the Sobolev gradient \( \nabla_{H^2} J \) based on the \( L^2 \) gradient \( \nabla_{L^2} J \) by solving system (16) can be viewed as low-pass filtering of the latter gradient using a non-sharp filter (as discussed by Protas et al. (2004), this can be seen representing the operator \([\Id - \ell_1^2 (d^2/ds^2) + \ell_2^4 (d^4/ds^4)]^{-1}\) in the Fourier space). The parameters \( \ell_1 \) and \( \ell_2 \) serve as cut-off length scales representing the wavelengths of the finest features retained in the gradient \( \nabla_{H^2} J \) such that increasing \( \ell_1 \) and \( \ell_2 \) has the effect of making the Sobolev gradient “smoother” and vice versa. Thus, \( \ell_1 \) and \( \ell_2 \) are “knobs” which can be tuned to control the regularity of the optimal eddy viscosities obtained as solutions of the problem (8)–(10). Since by construction \( \nabla_{H^2} J \in S \), choosing the initial guess in (11) such that \( \nu_0 \in S \) will ensure that \( \nu^{(0)}, \nu^{(1)}, \ldots, \nu \in S \).
4 Computational Approach

The evaluation of the Sobolev gradient $\nabla_H^{H^2} J$ requires the numerical solutions of the LES system (6) and the adjoint system (14) followed by the solution of problem (16). For the first two systems we use a standard Fourier pseudo-spectral method in combination with a CN/RKW3 time-stepping technique introduced by Le & Moin (1991) which give spectrally accurate results in space and a globally second-order accuracy in time. The spatial domain is discretized using $N_x = 256$ equispaced grid points in each direction. Since the eddy viscosity $\nu = \nu(s)$ is state-dependent, we also need to discretize the state domain $\mathcal{I}$, cf. (5), which is done using $N_s$ Chebyshev points (values of $N_s$ are provided in table 1). We use Chebyshev differentiation matrices to perform differentiation with respect to $s$ and the eddy viscosity $\nu(s)$ and its derivatives are interpolated from state space $\mathcal{I}$ to the spatial domain $\Omega$ using the barycentric formulas (Trefethen, 2013). The boundary-value problem (16) is solved using a method based on ultraspherical polynomials available in the chebop feature of Chebfun (Driscoll et al., 2014). Solution of the 2D Navier-Stokes system (1) is dealiased using Gaussian filtering based on the 3/2 rule (Hou, 2009), however, this is unnecessary for the LES system (6) due to the aggressive filtering applied. To ensure that aliasing errors resulting from the presence of state-dependent viscosity are eliminated, the adjoint system (14) is solved using twice as many grid points $2N_x$ in each direction. In practice, the Polak-Ribière variant of the conjugate-gradient method (Nocedal & Wright, 2006) is used to accelerate convergence in (11) with the step size found by solving the line-minimization problem $\tau^{(n)} = \arg \min_{\tau > 0} J(\nu^{(n)} - \tau \nabla_\nu J(\nu^{(n)}))$.

5 Results

Our computations are based on a flow problem defined by the following parameters $\nu_N = 1 \times 10^{-2}$, $\alpha = 1 \times 10^{-3}$, $F = 5$, and $k_a = k_b = 4$. In the optimization problem (8)–(10) we fix $M = 32$, which is slightly larger than the largest cutoff wavenumber $k_c$ we consider (cf. table 1) and therefore ensures that the optimal eddy viscosity is determined based on all available flow information, and $T = 20 \approx 30t_e$, where $t_e := [\int_0^T \mathcal{E}(t) \, dt/(8\pi^2T)]^{-1/2}$ is the eddy turnover time (Bracco & McWilliams, 2010). We emphasize that the key insights provided by our computations do not depend on the particular choice of $T$, as long as it remains of comparable magnitude to the value given above.

Our first set of results addresses the effect of the cutoff wavenumber $k_c$. They are obtained by solving problem (8)–(10) for decreasing values of $k_c = 30, 25, 20$ while retaining fixed values of the regularization parameters $\ell_1, \ell_2$ and a fixed resolution $N_s$ in the state space $\mathcal{I}$, cf. cases A, B and C in table 1. In each case the optimization problem is solved using the initial guess $\nu_0(s) = 0$ corresponding to no closure model at all. The dependence of the error functional $J(\nu^{(n)})$ on iterations $n$ in the three cases is shown in figure 1a, where we see that while the mean-square errors between the DNS and the optimal LES increase as the cutoff wavenumber $k_c$ decreases, the largest relative reduction of the error is achieved in case C with the smallest $k_c$. The corresponding optimal eddy viscosities $\nu = \nu(s)$ are shown in figure 1b. Since small values of $s$ are attained more frequently in the flow, cf. the probability
density function (PDF) of $\sqrt{s}$ embedded in the figure, the horizontal axis is scaled as $\sqrt{s}$ which magnifies the region of small values of $s$. We see that for the largest cutoff wavenumber $k_c = 30$ the optimal eddy viscosity is close to zero over the entire range of $s$. However, for decreasing $k_c$ the optimal eddy viscosity exhibits oscillations of increasing magnitude. We note that values of $s \lesssim 50$ occur very rarely in the flow and hence the gradient (15) provides little sensitivity information for $s$ in this range. Thus, the behavior of $\nu(s)$ for $s \lesssim 50$ is an artifact of the regularization procedure defined in (16) and is not physically relevant.

In order to provide additional insights about the properties of the optimal eddy viscosity, our second set of results is obtained as solutions of problem (8)–(10) with a fixed $k_c = 20$ and progressively reduced regularization achieved by decreasing the parameters $\ell_1, \ell_2$ while simultaneously refining the resolution $N_s$ in the state space $I$, cf. cases C, D and E in table 1. Optimization problems with weaker regularization are solved using the optimal eddy viscosity obtained with stronger regularization as the initial guess. From the normalized error functionals shown as functions of iterations in figure 2a, we see that as regularization is reduced, the mean-square errors between the optimal LES and the DNS become smaller and approach a certain nonzero limit, cf. table 1. As is evident from figure 2b, this is achieved with the corresponding optimal eddy viscosities developing oscillations with an ever increasing frequency. More precisely, each time the regularization parameters $\ell_1, \ell_2$ are reduced and the resolution $N_s$ is refined, a new oscillation with a higher frequency appears in the optimal eddy viscosity $\nu(s)$ (in fact, in each case, this is the highest-frequency oscillation which can be represented on a grid with $N_s$ points).

In order to assess how well the solutions of the LES system (6) with the optimal eddy viscosities $\nu$ shown in figures 1b and 2b approximate the solution of the Navier-Stokes system (1), in figures 3a and 3b we show the time evolution of the quantity $\log_{10}|1 - C(t)|$ where

$$C(t) := \frac{1}{||\tilde{w}(t)||_{L^2(\Omega)}||\tilde{\omega}(t)||_{L^2(\Omega)}} \int_{\Omega} \tilde{w}(t, x) \tilde{\omega}(t, x) \, d\Omega$$

is the normalized correlation between the two flows. For a more comprehensive assessment, these results are shown for $t \in [0, 2T]$, i.e., for times up to twice longer than the “training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>$k_c$</th>
<th>$N_s$</th>
<th>$\ell_1$</th>
<th>$\ell_2$</th>
<th>$\nu_0$</th>
<th>$\mathcal{J}(\nu_0)$</th>
<th>$\mathcal{J}(\nu^{(\infty)})$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10^4</td>
<td>10^3</td>
<td>No Closure</td>
<td>$6.087 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>$3.238 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>$9.215 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10^4</td>
<td>10^3</td>
<td>No Closure</td>
<td>$2.088 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>$3.829 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>$1.586 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10^4</td>
<td>10^3</td>
<td>No Closure</td>
<td>$3.736 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>$7.483 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>$4.636 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>10^3</td>
<td>10^2</td>
<td>Case C</td>
<td>$7.483 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>$3.226 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>$1.433 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>10^1</td>
<td>10^0</td>
<td>Case D</td>
<td>$3.226 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>$2.449 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>$9.806 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Summary information about the different cases considered.
Figure 1: (a) Dependence of the functional $\mathcal{J}(\nu^{(n)})$ on the iteration $n$ and (b) dependence of the optimal eddy viscosity $\tilde{\nu}$ on $\sqrt{s}$ for cases A, B and C, cf. table 1. Panel (b) also shows the PDF of $\sqrt{s}$ in case C.

Figure 2: (a) Dependence of the normalized functional $\mathcal{J}(\nu^{(n)})/\mathcal{J}(\nu_0)$, with $\mathcal{J}(\nu_0)$ from case C, on the iteration $n$ and (b) dependence of the optimal eddy viscosity $\tilde{\nu}$ on $\sqrt{s}$ for cases C, D and E, cf. table 1. The inset in panel (b) shows magnification of the region $\sqrt{s} \in [0, 25]$. Panel (b) also shows the Leith model with $k_c = 20$ and the eddy viscosity $\nu(s) = (0.02)^3 \sqrt{s}$.

window” $[0, T]$ used in the optimization problem (8)–(10). In figure 3b we also present the results obtained for $k_c = 20$ with an optimal closure model based on the linear stochastic estimator introduced by Langford & Moser (1999). Since at early times correlation $\mathcal{C}(t)$ reveals exponential decay corresponding to the exponential divergence of the LES flow from the DNS, this effect can be quantified by approximating the correlation as $\mathcal{C}(t) \approx \mathcal{C}_0 e^{-rt}$, where $\mathcal{C}_0 = 1$ follows the fact that $\tilde{\omega}_0 \equiv \tilde{w}_0$, whereas the decay rate $r$ is obtained from a least-squares fit over the time window $[0, T]$. The decay rates $r$ obtained in this way are collected in table 1. Finally, the time evolution of the vorticity field in the DNS, LES with no closure model and LES with the optimal eddy viscosity (case E) are available together with an animated version of figure 3b as a movie on-line.
Figure 3: Adjusted normalized correlations (17) for the LES with (a) no closure and the optimal eddy viscosity in cases A, B and C, and (b) no closure and the optimal eddy viscosity in cases C, D and E. The correlation is also shown for the Leith model with $k_c = 20$ and the eddy viscosity $\nu(s) = (0.02)^3 \sqrt{s}$ in (a) and for an optimal closure model based on the stochastic estimator (Langford & Moser, 1999) in (b). Thick and thin lines correspond to, respectively, time in the “training window” ($t \in [0, T]$) and beyond this window ($t \in (T, 2T]$).

6 Discussion and Conclusions

In this study we have considered the question of fundamental limitations on the performance of eddy-viscosity closure models for turbulent flows. We focused on the Leith model for 2D LES for which we sought optimal eddy viscosities that subject to minimum assumptions would result in the least mean-square error between the corresponding LES and the DNS. Such eddy viscosities were found as minimizers of a PDE-constrained optimization problem with a nonstandard structure which was solved using a suitably adapted adjoint-based gradient approach (Matharu & Protas, 2020). A key element of this approach was a regularization strategy involving the length-scale parameters $\ell_1$ and $\ell_2$ in the Sobolev gradients, cf. (16).

Our main finding is that with a fixed cutoff wavenumber $k_c$ the LES with an optimal eddy viscosity $\tilde{\nu}$ matches the DNS increasingly well as the regularization in the solution of the optimization problem is reduced, cf. figure 2a. This is quantified by a reduction of the rate of exponential decay of the correlation between the corresponding LES and the DNS, cf. figure 3b and table 1. This optimal performance of the closure model is achieved with eddy viscosities $\tilde{\nu}(s)$ rapidly oscillating with a frequency increasing as the regularization parameters are reduced. From this we conclude that in the limit of vanishing regularization parameters and an infinite numerical resolution the optimal eddy viscosity would be undefined as it would exhibit oscillations with an unbounded frequency. Thus, in the absence of regularization the problem of finding an optimal eddy viscosity is ill-posed!

The optimal performance of the LES is realized by a rapid variation of the eddy viscosity $\tilde{\nu}(s)$ which alternates between injection and dissipation of the enstrophy in narrow bands of $s$, cf. figure 2b. In addition, the optimal eddy viscosities have the property that $\tilde{\nu}(0) > 0$, in contrast to what is typically assumed in the Leith model where $\nu(0) = 0$ (Maulik & San, 2017). As is evident from figure 3b, the performance of the LES with optimal eddy viscosities compares favorably to the LES with an optimal closure model proposed by Langford & Moser (1999).
based on a stochastic estimator, which has a less restrictive structure than the Leith model. Finally, we remark that the eddy viscosities constructed here to maximize the performance of the LES are unlikely to be useful in practice due to their highly irregular behavior. However, physically more applicable eddy viscosities can be obtained with the approach presented here when stronger regularization is used.
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