Objective Momentum Barriers in Wall Turbulence
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We use the recent frame-indifferent theory of diffusive momentum transport to identify internal barriers in wall-bounded turbulence. Formed by the invariant manifolds of the Laplacian of the velocity field, the barriers block the viscous part of the instantaneous momentum flux in the flow. We employ the level sets of single-trajectory Lagrangian diagnostic tools, the trajectory rotation average and trajectory stretching exponent, to approximate both vortical and internal wall-parallel momentum transport barrier (MTB) interfaces. These interfaces provide frame-indifferent alternatives to classic velocity-gradient-based vortices and boundaries between uniform momentum zones (UMZs). Indeed, we find that these elliptic manifold approximations and MTBs also significantly outperform standard vortices and UMZ interfaces in blocking diffusive momentum transport.

1. Introduction

Early studies of turbulent boundary layer structures were fundamentally inspired by experimentally discovered structures, such as the streaks in boundary layers photographed by Kline et al. (1967) and the typical-eddies forming large scale motions described by Falco (1977), shown in Fig. 1. Later advances in experiments and simulation provided highly resolved velocity fields that stimulated the development of quantitative criteria for the identification of structures seen in tracer experiments. Some of these criteria extract isosurfaces of velocity components to define uniform momentum zones (UMZs), while others employ diagnostic scalar fields, such as the $Q$, $\lambda_2$, $\Delta$- and $\lambda_3$-parameters, to define vortices (Adrian et al. 2000; Hunt et al. 1988; Jeong & Hussain 1995; Zhou et al. 1999; Gao et al. 2011). Yet other approaches identify a relevant temporal or spatial scale and employ a conditional averaging prior to feature extraction (see Dennis & Nickels 2011; Gul et al. 2020).

UMZs were first documented in the early experimental study of Meinhart & Adrian (1995), leading to the seminal work of Adrian et al. (2000) who suggested that wall-bounded turbulence may be described as a collection of layered zonal structures distinguished by their common streamwise velocities. These structures appear to be organized by strong shear regions generated by hairpin vortices or other vortical features. The core statistical methods used to make these inferences about UMZs and their boundaries were developed by Adrian et al. (2000) with additional modifications proposed by De Silva et al. (2015); Laskari et al. (2018); Fan et al. (2019) and others. With the help of these tools, UMZs have been investigated in a number of wall-bounded flows, including turbulent boundary layers, channel flows and pipe flows at various Reynolds numbers (Adrian et al. 2000; Kwon et al. 2014; De Silva et al. 2015, 2017; Gul et al. 2020). UMZs have also been widely used as tools to validate models (Saxton-Fox & McKeon 2017).
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Bautista et al. (2019) and generate descriptions of wall-turbulence organization (Adrian 2007; Hwang & Sung 2018).

Despite these advances, several practical issues are known with the currently used probability-based UMZ identification scheme, including UMZ sensitivity to the size of the domain, to the number of velocity vectors used in identifying significant velocities (and thus extension to three-dimensional data), and to the number of bins used to reveal streamwise velocity peaks. Two more fundamental issues, however, also arise. First, the broadly hypothesized ability of UMZs to minimize wall-transverse transport of streamwise linear momentum is often cited but has not yet been directly verified (e.g., Westerweel et al. 2009; Lozano-Durán et al. 2012; Philip et al. 2014; Eisma et al. 2015). Second, the topology of streamwise velocity level sets (UMZ interfaces) is not objective, i.e., depends on the frame of reference of the observer. This is at odds with the tracer patterns arising in foundational tracer experiments (e.g., Kline et al. 1967; Falco 1977; Head & Bandyopadhyay 1981) that inspired the study of UMZs to begin with, given that those patterns are material and hence are inherently frame-indifferent.

One might dismiss the concern about observer dependence by saying that a correct understanding of UMZs in the frame of the experiment is sufficient. The problem with this argument is that a description of features tied to material observations cannot be correct if it only holds in the current frame of observation, whether or not one ever intends to change that frame. More broadly speaking, truly unsteady flows may have convenient frames but have no distinguished frames, as already noted by Lugt (1979). This is the reason why objectivity (or frame-indifference) as a litmus test for flow feature identification was already proposed in the 1970’s (Drouot & Lucius 1976; Drouot 1976; Astarita 1979; Lugt 1979), prompting a number of recent approaches to adopt observer-indifference as a minimal requirement in coherent structure detection (see Haller 2005, 2015; Peacock et al. 2015; Kirwan 2016; Günther & Theisel 2018 for reviews).

Descriptions of experimentally observed vortical features within UMZs also face objectivity as a minimal self-consistency requirement. Yet the $Q$, $\lambda_2$, $\Delta$- and $\lambda_{ci}$-isosurfaces used for this purpose are not objective and hence their predictions for observed material tracer patterns cannot be accurate (see Haller 2005, 2021). Several formal modifications of these scalar fields have been proposed to make them objective, but only the approach of Liu et al. (2019a,b) would be generally applicable, as found by Haller (2021). Yet, for lack of a direct connection to material mixing and transport, even correct objectivizations of the currently used $Q$, $\lambda_2$, $\Delta$- and $\lambda_{ci}$-procedures for vortex identification would depend on their users. Indeed, the users of these procedures are expected to pick values for visualized isosurfaces based on their own expectations for the results (see, e.g., Dubief &
This commonly used parameter-tuning approach results in a subjective view of the flow, as recently highlighted by Dong & Tian (2020).

In a parallel development, objective mathematical descriptions of long-term and short-term material deformation have lead to the notions of Lagrangian coherent structures (or LCS, see Haller (2015)) and objective Eulerian coherent structures (or OECS, see Serra et al. (2017); Beron-Vera et al. (2018); Serra et al. (2020)), respectively. Some of these approaches have also been used to identify vortices away from turbulent/non-turbulent interfaces (TNTIs) in gravity current experiments (Neamtu-Halic et al. 2019). LCSs and OECSs are, however, constructed as boundaries of coherent structures in passive tracer advection rather than minimizers of momentum transport, as would be required for a physical UMZ interface analog.

Recently, Haller et al. (2020) developed a theory of objective material barriers for the transport of active vector fields, such as vorticity and momentum. These active barriers are sought as material surfaces that block an objectively-defined transport of momentum or vorticity more than any other neighboring material surface. Solving this optimization problem leads to an associated steady, three-dimensional (3D), incompressible dynamical system (the barrier equation) whose structurally stable stream surfaces (invariant manifolds) are precisely the active transport barriers. Haller et al. (2020) showed how active versions of LCS diagnostics, such as the active finite-time Lyapunov exponents (aFTLE) and the active polar rotation angle (aPRA) provide previously unseen levels of detail for momentum-transport barriers in direct numerical simulations of a turbulent channel flow. Instantaneous limits of active material barriers can also be extract via the same machinery. The latter Eulerian barriers are objectively defined surfaces that block the instantaneous flux of the active vector field in question.

Here, we use this recent theory of instantaneous active barriers to define and visualize both momentum trapping vortices and momentum blocking internal interfaces (MTBs) objectively based on their broadly envisioned role as minimizers of momentum transport. Using this theory, we develop a simple, systematic procedure that visualizes both MTBs and momentum-trapping vortices in general 3D, wall-bounded turbulence. To reduce the computational burden in locating the invariant manifolds of the active barrier equations, we use very recent single-trajectory-based objective coherent structure diagnostics, the trajectory rotation average (TRA) and trajectory stretching exponent (TSE), from Haller et al. (2021). We also show that the active-barrier-based approach developed here locates vortices and MTB interfaces with significantly lower momentum flux than the surfaces obtained from the broadly used velocity-gradient-based vortex diagnostics and non-objective UMZ definition.

2. Methods

2.1. Objective instantaneous barriers to momentum transport

For a 3D fluid velocity field \( \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}, t) \) with density \( \rho(\mathbf{x}, t) \), the equation of motion can be written as

\[
\rho \frac{D \mathbf{v}}{Dt} = -\nabla p + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{T}_{\text{vis}} + \mathbf{q},
\]

where \( \frac{D}{Dt} \) is the material derivative, \( p(\mathbf{x}, t) \) is the equilibrium pressure, \( \mathbf{T}_{\text{vis}}(\mathbf{x}, t) \) is the viscous stress tensor, and \( \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{x}, t) \) contains the external body forces. Fluid trajectories generated by the velocity field \( \mathbf{v} \) are solutions, \( \mathbf{x}(t; t_0, \mathbf{x}_0) \), of the ordinary differential equation \( \dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}, t) \) with initial position \( \mathbf{x}_0 \) at the initial time \( t_0 \). These fluid trajectories...
enable the definition of the flow map $F_{t_0}^t : x_0 \mapsto x(t; t_0, x_0)$. A material surface $\mathcal{M}(t)$ is then a two-dimensional (2D) manifold,

$$\mathcal{M}(t) = F_{t_0}^t[\mathcal{M}(t_0)],$$

(2.2)
evolving under the flow map from its initial position $\mathcal{M}(t_0)$.

As pointed out by Haller et al. (2020), the broadly used linear momentum flux

$$\text{Flux}_{\rho v}(\mathcal{M}(t)) = \int_{\mathcal{M}(t)} \rho v(\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}) dA$$

(2.3)
is unsuitable for systematic, observer-independent momentum-flux measurements through a material surface $\mathcal{M}(t)$ for several reasons. First, this flux expression originally arises from the application of the Reynolds transport theorem to quantify linear momentum carried by fluid trajectories through a non-material control surface. No such trajectory crossings are, however, possible through a material surface. Second, a flux of a quantity through a surface should have the units of that quantity divided by time and multiplied by the surface area, which is not the case for $\text{Flux}_{\rho v}$. Third, $\text{Flux}_{\rho v}$ is not objective because under Euclidean coordinate changes of the form

$$\mathbf{x} = Q(t) \mathbf{y} + b(t), \quad QQ^T = I,$$

(2.4)
the integrand in (2.3) does not transform as an objective velocity field, i.e., we have $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \neq Q\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{n}})$ for the transformed velocity field

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = Q^T (\mathbf{v} - \dot{Q}\mathbf{y} - \dot{b}).$$

This observer dependence is equally true for fluxes obtained from conditionally-averaged entrainment velocities used in TNTI studies (e.g., Westerweel et al. 2009; Da Silva et al. 2014; Eisma et al. 2015), as well as projections of momentum flux in the streamwise direction.

To address these shortcomings of $\text{Flux}_{\rho v}$, Haller et al. (2020) introduce a frame-indifferent flux for an arbitrary, dynamically active vector field $f(x,t)$ that satisfies a partial differential equation of the form

$$\frac{Df}{Dt} = h_{\text{vis}} + h_{\text{nonvis}} \quad \partial_{T_{\text{vis}}} h_{\text{vis}} \neq 0 \quad \partial_{T_{\text{vis}}} h_{\text{nonvis}} = 0.$$  

(2.5)

Here the term $h_{\text{vis}}(x,t,v,f,T_{\text{vis}})$, arising from diffusive forces (i.e., viscous Cauchy-stresses), is assumed to be an objective vector field, i.e., $h_{\text{vis}} = Qh_{\text{vis}}$. The other term, $h_{\text{nonvis}}(x,t,v,f)$, is assumed to have no explicit dependence on viscous forces. Instead, it contains terms originating from the pressure, external forces and possible inertial effects. For instance, if $f$ is the linear momentum of an incompressible Navier–Stokes flow with kinematic viscosity $\nu$, then the Navier–Stokes equations directly imply

$$h_{\text{vis}} = \rho \nu \Delta \mathbf{v},$$

(2.6)
which is an objective vector field, because $\Delta \mathbf{v} = Q \Delta \tilde{\mathbf{v}}$.

The diffusive flux of $f(x,t)$ through $\mathcal{M}(t)$ can then be defined as the surface integral of the diffusive part of the surface-normal material derivative of $f(x,t)$ over $\mathcal{M}(t)$:

$$\Phi(\mathcal{M}(t)) = \left[ \int_{\mathcal{M}(t)} \frac{Df}{Dt} \cdot \mathbf{n} dA \right]_{\text{vis}} = \int_{\mathcal{M}(t)} h_{\text{vis}} \cdot \mathbf{n} dA.$$  

(2.7)
In contrast to eq. (2.3), the diffusive momentum flux $\Phi(\mathcal{M}(t))$ has the correct physical
units of momentum flux and is objective. Indeed, under all observer changes of the form (2.4), we obtain \( h_{\text{vis}} \cdot n \, dA = (Q \tilde{h}_{\text{vis}}) \cdot (Q \tilde{n}) \, d\tilde{A} = \tilde{h}_{\text{vis}} \cdot \tilde{n} \, d\tilde{A} \). A measure \( \Phi_N(\mathcal{M}(t)) \) can also be define to quantify the degree to which the surface \( \mathcal{M}(t) \) aligns with \( h_{\text{vis}} \). Specifically, we let

\[
\Phi_N(\mathcal{M}(t)) = \int_{\mathcal{M}(t)} \frac{h_{\text{vis}}}{|h_{\text{vis}}|} \cdot n \, dA. \tag{2.8}
\]

By formula (2.7), a material surface \( \mathcal{M}(t) \) is a perfect instantaneous barrier to diffusive momentum flux if \( h_{\text{vis}} \cdot n \) (and thus \( |h_{\text{vis}}|^{-1}(h_{\text{vis}} \cdot n) \)) vanishes at each point of \( \mathcal{M}(t) \). In other words, the surface \( \mathcal{M}(t) \) must be tangent to the vector field \( h_{\text{vis}} \) at each of its points, i.e., it must be an invariant manifold of the differential equation \( x' = h_{\text{vis}} \). Here prime denotes differentiation with respect to the barrier time, a dummy evolution variable along trajectories of this differential equation.

Specifically, when \( f \) is the linear momentum, then we obtain from (2.6) that \( \mathcal{M}(t) \) is an invariant manifold of the instantaneous momentum barrier equation

\[
x'(s) = \Delta v(x(s), t). \tag{2.9}
\]

Here, for simplicity, we have dropped the scalar factor \( \rho \nu \) in the definition of \( h_{\text{vis}} \) (2.6) because it does not affect the shape of the trajectories of the autonomous dynamical system (2.9).

By construction, any 2D structurally stable invariant manifold \( \mathcal{M}(t) \) of the barrier equation (2.9) represents a perfect and robust instantaneous barrier to the diffusive transport of linear momentum. If \( v \) is incompressible, then the barrier equation (2.9) is an incompressible, steady dynamical system, given that the time \( t \) only plays the role of a parameter and the right-hand side of (2.9) has no explicit dependence on the barrier time \( s \). Therefore, as is well known from chaotic advection studies of 3D, steady, incompressible flows, structurally stable 2D invariant manifolds of (2.9) are stable manifolds, unstable manifolds and invariant tori. We note that Haller et al. (2020) also extends the barrier equation (2.9) to cover material transport barriers over a finite time interval, but here we will focus on instantaneous momentum barriers. Both the instantaneous and the material barrier equations are objective.

Invariant manifolds (or distinguished stream surfaces) of the barrier equation (2.9) can only be determined numerically and hence will be approximate. In order to evaluate the accuracy of our computations and compare the momentum-blocking ability of the computed barriers to those obtained from broadly used vortex and UMZ identification procedures, we will use the surface-area-normalized geometric momentum flux across a surface \( \mathcal{M}_0 \),

\[
\Psi(\mathcal{M}(t)) = \frac{\int_{\mathcal{M}(t)} |\Delta v \cdot n| \, dA}{\int_{\mathcal{M}(t)} dA}. \tag{2.10}
\]

This objective quantity does not allow for a cancellation of fluxes in opposite directions and hence vanishes only on perfectly computed momentum barriers. As a result, \( \Psi(\mathcal{M}(t)) \) provides an objective, nonnegative scalar metric for the permeability of the surface \( \mathcal{M}(t) \) with respect to momentum transport irrespective of its size.

Similarly, eq. (2.8) leads to a surface-area-normalized tangency measure, \( \Psi_N(\mathcal{M}(t)) \), with respect to the material surface \( \mathcal{M}(t) \), defined
\[ \Psi_N(M(t)) = \frac{\int_{M(t)} \frac{\Delta v}{||\Delta v||} \cdot n \, dA}{\int_{M(t)} dA} . \]  

(2.11)

This quantity measures the degree of tangency between an imperfect barrier and a perfect barrier (invariant manifold) of the linear momentum barrier field. Using \( \Psi_N \) enables a comparison of surfaces in different flow regions, measuring the extent to which they are close to perfect barriers with no bias for small \( \Delta v \) values. \( \Psi_N \), however, does not have the physical units of flux and hence will be referred to as barrier field tangency measure.

### 2.2. Identification of momentum barrier surfaces

A number of relevant techniques have been developed in the LCS literature to identify distinguished material surfaces of 3D steady flows from arrays of trajectories (see Haller 2015, for a review). These methods generally require a numerical differentiation of the flow map or of the velocity field along particle positions. The 3D steady dynamical system (2.9) already involves two spatial derivatives of the velocity field and hence further spatial differentiation can only be carried out accurately over sufficiently dense numerical grids (see Haller et al. (2020) for examples involving the aFTLE and aPRA diagnostics).

To avoid the numerical issues associated with further spatial differentiation of (2.9) and to reduce the number of integrated trajectories, here we use very recently developed single-trajectory diagnostics for elliptic (i.e., vortex-type) and hyperbolic LCS, respectively the trajectory rotation average (TRA) and trajectory stretching exponent (TSE), derived by Haller et al. (2021). On any discretized trajectory \( \{x(s_i)\}_{i=0}^N \) of the barrier equation (2.9) with initial condition \( x(s_0) = x(0) = x \), the TRA measures the temporal average of the angular velocity of the trajectory whereas the TSE measures the average hyperbolicity strength along the trajectory. Evaluated in the context of the barrier equation (2.9), the fields can be computed as

\[ \text{TRA}^s_{0N}(x) = \frac{1}{s_N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{\dot{x}(s_i), \dot{x}(s_{i+1})}{||\dot{x}(s_i)|| \cdot ||\dot{x}(s_{i+1})||} \right) \]  

(2.12)

and

\[ \text{TSE}^s_{0N}(x) = \frac{1}{s_N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \log \left( \frac{||\dot{x}(s_{i+1})||}{||\dot{x}(s_i)||} \right) \]  

(2.13)

To simplify our notation, we have omitted the overbar from the \( \text{TRA}^s_{0N} \) and \( \text{TSE}^s_{0N} \) which was used by Haller et al. (2021) to distinguish formula (2.12) and (2.13) from versions that allowed for cancellations along trajectories. TRA and TSE computed in (non-objective) physical velocity fields are not objective, but in our context, \( \text{TRA}^s_{0N}(x) \) and \( \text{TSE}^s_{0N}(x) \) are nevertheless objective fields, because they are computed along trajectories of the objective barrier vector field \( \Delta v \).

Calculating trajectories in the unit barrier field \( \Delta v / ||\Delta v|| \) preserves momentum barrier geometry but standardizes the length of all paths for the same barrier time \( s_N \). The TRA and TSE fields calculated from trajectories of the normalized barrier field, NTRA and NTSE, respectively, visualize features in both the highly turbulent near-wall layers and less turbulent flow regions with equal fidelity. As will be shown in the following sections, NTRA and NTSE provide previously unseen comparisons of objective turbulent structures over the full range of scales and strengths present in a turbulent flow. Indeed,
these diagnostic fields reveal additional, weaker structures in less turbulent regions that remain undetectable to available Eulerian methods. \cite{Haller2021} show that fronts and outer boundaries of nested cylindrical level surfaces of the TRA and TSE fields highlight the same hyperbolic and elliptic invariant manifolds as the finite-time Lyapunov exponent (FTLE, \cite{Haller2015}), polar rotation angle (PRA, \cite{FarazmandHaller2016}) and the Lagrangian-averaged vorticity deviation (LAVD, \cite{Haller2016}), but without relying on the spatial differentiation required by the latter three diagnostics. TRA and TSE fields are, therefore, computable from sparse data and their local value is independent of the number and proximity of other trajectories used in the analysis. In upcoming visualizations, influential invariant manifolds of the barrier equation will appear as 2D surfaces along which TRA or TSE exhibit large changes. The barrier time $s_N$ in (2.12) and (2.13) can be selected arbitrarily, as it is independent of the physical time of the flow data. An increase in $s_N$ enhances details in TRA and TSE visualizations, enabling a gradual, scale-dependent exploration of invariant manifolds in the phase space of the autonomous system (2.9) and its unit normalized analog.

For arbitrarily large barrier times, however, the quality of visualization begins to degrade. This is caused by barrier field trajectories leaving neighborhoods of the finite-sized codimension-one invariant manifolds influencing their initial paths. As TRA and TSE are monotonically non-decreasing functions of $s$, eventually hyperbolic and elliptic manifolds encountered away from trajectory initial positions will have outsized influence on the diagnostics. We thus suggest determining $s_N$ for a given region $U$ as the decorrelation time of instantaneous TRA (or TSE) values. For each $x_0 \in U$, we calculate the first zero of the autocorrelation

$$R(\tau, x_0) = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} f(s_i, x_0) f(s_i - \tau, x_0), \quad f(s, x) = \text{TRA}^{s_{i+1}}_{s_i}(x_0), \quad \tau \geq 0. \quad (2.14)$$

The median value of this decorrelation time over all $x_0 \in U$ provides a suitable integration time to visualize most invariant manifolds of the barrier field in $U$ with limited interference. We suggest using the same method for determining $s_N$ for the normalized NTRA and NTSE fields as well. We have found the decorrelation times for TRA and TSE to be approximately equal in our numerical studies.

### 2.3. Direct numerical simulation data

To facilitate reproducibility and foster further comparisons with future developments, we have selected from the publicly available Johns Hopkins University Turbulence Database (JHTDB) a direct numerical simulation of a $Re_\tau = 1000$ channel flow \cite{PerlmanLiGraham2007, LiGraham2008, Graham2016} to compare UMZ interfaces and velocity-gradient-based vortices with perfect instantaneous barriers to the diffusive transport of linear momentum. While UMZ studies are typically performed on turbulent boundary layers, \cite{Kwon2014} and \cite{Fan2019} have argued for the generalization of such features to channel flows as well.

The JHTDB channel flow data is available on a $2048 \times 512 \times 1536$ grid for a domain of size $8\pi h \times 2h \times 3\pi h$, where $h$ is the half-channel height. All figures and analysis will be displayed in dimensionless half-channel height units ($h = 1$). This dataset has been used in a number of studies, most notably by \cite{Bautista2019} to evaluate a model of velocity-based uniform momentum zones, and by \cite{Jie2021} to investigate inertial particle collection in the quiescent core.
To account for the instability caused by numerical integration through large $\Delta v$ fluctuations near the channel walls, we have implemented a quadratic buffer in the lower viscous sublayer, within 5 viscous lengths or $0.005h$ from the wall. That is, for $0.995h \leq |y| \leq 1$, we define $\Delta v(x, y) = v(x, \pm 0.995h)(\frac{y^\pm 1}{0.995h^\pm 1})^2$ for the appropriate wall. Eyink et al. (2020) examined this region and calculated these heights to be well within the viscous sublayer for our JHTDB channel data. We find that this minimal buffer zone does not modify the visualization of structure in the momentum barrier field. At the same time, it significantly expedites calculations and aids in fixed-time-step advection of trajectories at the long time scales necessary for determining optimal decorrelation times in (2.14).

3. Results

3.1. Objective momentum transport barrier visualization

Figure 2 compares a common turbulence visualization diagnostics, the vorticity magnitude, with the NTRA field computed for the normalized momentum barrier equation (2.9) on a streamwise-wall-normal plane of initial conditions in the channel at time $t = 0.065$. The predominant channel flow is in the positive $x^+$-direction with channel walls at $y^+ = \pm 1$. Both diagnostic fields were generated from precisely the same velocity field, and were calculated and visualized at the same spatial resolution ($\Delta x^+ = \Delta y^+ = 10^{-3}$). The barrier trajectories $x(s)$ used in these simulations were advected under the 3D normalized barrier equation until $s_N = 1$, the order of decorrelation time for the entire channel.

The shear generated by the upper and lower channel walls are evident as high rates of trajectory rotation and vorticity. Surprisingly, in the NTRA field there is strong evidence of many more vortical momentum barriers in the center of the channel which is typically viewed as a quiescent region. In this region, therefore, there are still numerous complex vortex interactions but their relatively weaker signature has made them impossible to identify in the weak gradients and uniformly low vorticity values. Thus, the NTRA field provides an enhanced visualization of structures at a much wider range of spatial scales structure strength for the same underlying velocity data. For identifying boundaries and the structure extraction discussed in the next sections, we find the large changes evident in TRA and TSE fields to be most beneficial, while NTRA and NTSE continue to provide unmatched visualizations of large domains.

Zooming in to the turbulent wall-region, we find the degree of detail of TRA fields for the original barrier equations (2.9) is also unattainable by classic velocity-gradient based vortex diagnostics. This first-order benefit can be seen in Fig. 3, in which TRA is compared with $Q$, $\lambda_2$, and $\lambda_{ci}$ (swirling strength) (Hunt et al. 1988; Jeong & Hussain 1995; Zhou et al. 1999) for a streamwise-wall-normal $(x, y)$ plane adjacent to the lower channel wall. Again, all four plots were generated with the same spatial resolution from the same single velocity snapshot of the DNS data, yet the TRA reveals substantially more of the complexity of the flow at the decorrelation advection time $s_N = 10^{-4}$.

The TRA plot in Fig. 3 reveals a complex connection network and a layering of unique rotational features not present in the velocity-gradient-based diagnostics. This level of detail provides increased accuracy in vortex detection. For example, at approximately $(x, y) = (0.8, -0.9)$ there is a clear maximum in all three velocity-gradient-based metrics, suggesting the potential presence of a coherent vortex (yellow box). Upon closer inspection of the TRA in the same region, however, we find a lack of nested cylindrical TRA level surfaces. Instead, filamenting invariant surfaces of the barrier equation are present that are not structurally stable and hence do not define robust vortical barriers...
Figure 2. A streamwise-wall-normal plane of the $Re_\tau = 1000$ JHTDB channel flow colored by vorticity magnitude and NTRA$_b$. Both visualizations of turbulent features were calculated at the same spatial resolution from the same underlying velocity data at one time step. The enhanced visualization possible with NTRA provides a striking comparison with classic techniques and illuminates many more weaker structures in the center of the channel while maintaining objectivity.

to momentum transport. The TRA field discerns these important structural features and has a significant advantage in preventing false-positive vortex identifications. An internal layering close to the wall is also present in the TRA field, as is the organization of vortices around a clearer transition between the more turbulent wall region and the less turbulent channel core. We discuss this interface in more detail in the Section 3.3.

3.2. Momentum-trapping vortices

In 2D cross-sections of the flow, vortex boundaries can be located as outermost members of nested families of closed level curves of the TRA. Launching trajectories of the 3D barrier equation (2.9) from these boundary curves generates instantaneous, vortical momentum barrier surfaces in the full 3D flow. In direct contrast to velocity-gradient-based vortex identification practices, this process is devoid of any user-defined parameters beyond a choice of spatial resolution of barrier-field trajectory initial positions, which only serves to control the level of detail in the TRA field. In contrast to velocity and velocity-gradient-based diagnostics, increasing the spatial resolution of TRA and TSE fields beyond that of the underlying velocity field can continue to increase the structural information revealed because of the lack of any a priori bound on the barrier field integration time.

Figure 4 shows one example of our momentum-trapping vortex identification method, with barrier trajectories starting from the $z^+ = 2.55$ plane. The left panel also reveals a strong similarity between the detailed structures in the TRA field and the material boundary layer structures visualized in smoke experiments (Fig. 1).

Through a simple search algorithm on TRA contours, we have identified a region with a nested set of closed TRA level curves. The outermost convex boundary curve for each vortex obtained in this fashion is highlighted in the top right of Fig. 4. If we
choose smaller members of the set of closed level curves of the TRA as a curve of initial conditions, we obtain an internal foliation of the vortex by smaller cylindrical momentum barriers. These block radial diffusive momentum transport within the vortex.

A simpler but only approximate way to visualize objective momentum barriers is to plot level surfaces of the TRA field. This is inspired by the observation that robust elliptic invariant manifolds (such as invariant tori) of the barrier equation (2.9) will be spanned by trajectories with the same averaged angular velocities in the limit of $s_N \to \infty$. For finite values of $s_N$, this relationship is only approximate and hence TRA isosurfaces are only proxies to exact invariant manifolds formed by the trajectories of (2.9). For such finite values, nearby particle trajectories that do not lie on the same invariant manifold may also accumulate the same TRA value. As a consequence, contour-plotting algorithms may connect approximations of different momentum barriers into one approximate level surface. Such artifacts arising from this simplified visualization can be discounted by launching actual barrier trajectories of (2.9) from the intersections of TRA level sets from a reference cross section and discounting parts of the level surface whose distance from such barrier trajectories exceeds a tolerance value.

An example of this isosurface separation process is detailed in Figure 5.
Figure 4. Momentum-trapping vortices in the turbulent channel flow. The vortex boundaries are determined as streamsurfaces of the objective Eulerian barrier vector field $\mathbf{x}' = \Delta \mathbf{v}$ that intersect the plane of investigation ($z^+ = 2.55$) along outermost closed and convex TRA contours.

Starting with the vortex identified by the lower (blue) 2D convex contour in Figure 4, we show multiple concentric 3D TRA shells in Figure 5. The outer and inner blue shells correspond with $\text{TRA}_{10^{-3}} = 11$ level sets, and the two red shells correspond to a higher rotation speed, the $\text{TRA}_{10^{-3}} = 16$ level set. Probability distribution functions of the distance between each isosurface and the barrier field streamlines generated from their intersection with the $z^+ = 2.55$ plane are shown inset in Figure 5. As is typical for all vortices we have investigated, there is a clear probability density function (PDF) peak close to zero that can be automatically isolated for both isosurfaces with a variety of algorithms. These values corresponds with points on the TRA level surface that closely approximate momentum-blocking invariant manifolds. Once points with streamsurface-distances outside this peak are removed from the visualization, the separation between each vortex shell is clearly visible. The selected distances of separation used in this visualization are shown in the inset PDFs as dashed vertical lines.

To quantify how well outermost cylindrical TRA level surfaces, denoted $I_{\text{TRA}}$, approximate a true momentum barrier, we calculate the normalized objective geometric flux $\Psi (I_{\text{TRA}})$ defined in (2.10), which vanishes only on perfect barriers to momentum
Figure 5. TRA isosurfaces as approximations to the momentum transport barriers shown in Figure 4. Blue and red surfaces correspond with two distinct TRA$^{10^{-3}}$ values. Shown in black are a subset of streamlines initiated on the TRA$^{10^{-3}} = 16$ contour on the $z^+ = 2.55$ plane. Inset are probability distribution functions of the minimum distance of unfiltered surface points to streamlines initialized on TRA contours at $z^+ = 2.55$.

transport. For comparison, we also extract representative isosurfaces of $\lambda_{ci}$, $\lambda_2$ and $Q$, denoted by $I_{\lambda_{ci}}$, $I_{\lambda_2}$ and $I_Q$, in the same 3D fluid volume and calculate $\Psi$ on these surfaces as well. While there are various empirical values proposed for representative $I_{\lambda_{ci}}$, $I_{\lambda_2}$ and $I_Q$ isosurfaces (see, e.g., Jeong & Hussain (1995); Zhou et al. (1999); Ganapathisubramani et al. (2006); Gao et al. (2011); Dong & Tian (2020)), we initially generate surfaces that correspond with their originally argued value, dividing strain-dominated and rotation-dominated regions. This value is zero for all velocity-gradient-based metrics (see Hunt et al. 1988; Jeong & Hussain 1995; Zhou et al. 1999).

The isosurfaces generated for each scalar metric are displayed in Figure 5.

As common practice, the swirling strength $\lambda_{ci}$ has been normalized by its maximum value in the volume of interest. Each isosurface in Fig. 6 is shown as it intersects the $z^+ = 2.55$ plane colored by TRA$^{10^{-3}}$. For the three velocity-gradient-based diagnostics, the corresponding diagnostic field on $z^+ = 2.55$ is shown inset next to the volumes. The surface-area-normalized momentum flux across each isosurface is also noted to the right of each respective volume.

In the $z^+ = 2.55$ insets of Fig. 6, the $\lambda_{ci}$, $\lambda_2$ and $Q$ values all show some indication of the presence of the upper vortex from the TRA field, though evidence of the lower vortex is not present in $\lambda_2$. Even as simplified approximations of true linear-momentum barriers, TRA isosurfaces come out from this comparison as by far the most effective momentum transport barriers. Indeed, $\Psi(I_{\lambda_{ci}})$ is only 24% of $\Psi(I_{\lambda_{ci}})$, 22% of $\Psi(I_{\lambda_2})$ and 26% of $\Psi(I_Q)$. We have found that with increased numerical accuracy in our barrier field integrations, TRA calculations improved and resulted in a further decrease in $\Psi(I_{\lambda_{ci}})$. This indicates one can more closely approximate the true momentum transport barriers
with more computational expense when a particular region of interest is identified. We have not found analogous numerical improvements in flux reduction upon refining the spatial differentiation or resolution of the velocity-gradient-based methods. Overall, we find that the classic vortex diagnostics we have tested do not provide a clear indication of a pair of 3D vortices when one directly implements the criteria arising from their derivations. Rather, significant user-interference and subjectivity needs to be applied before the vortex cores can be identified in two or three dimensions. This is problematic in turbulent flows where there is no ground-truth of structure topology against which one can validate their hypothesized threshold values.

To accommodate the wide range of empirical or heuristic thresholds used in the literature, we have also performed the same flux calculations for $\lambda_{ci}$, $\lambda_2$ and $Q$-isosurfaces for a range of values that includes and exceeds available suggestions found in the literature. The resulting fluxes are displayed in Figure 7. Note that $I_{\text{TRA}}$ continues to outperform all other diagnostics over the whole range of empirical threshold values for the latter diagnostics.

In Figure 8, we verify the surface tangency of arbitrary-valued TRA level-surfaces with invariant manifolds.

If isosurfaces of a given scalar field were exact streamsurfaces of the barrier equation, then their normals (i.e., the gradient of that scalar field) would be perpendicular to $\Delta \mathbf{v}$. Each subplot of Figure 8 shows the probability distribution of inner products of normalized scalar field gradient vectors with the normalized barrier field, $\Delta \mathbf{v} / |\Delta \mathbf{v}|$, over the entire 3D volume containing our vortices ($[2.26, 2.36] \times [0.34, 0.37] \times [2.5, 2.6]$). These
Figure 7. Comparison of momentum flux through $I_{\text{TRA}}$ and through structure boundaries defined by a wide range of isosurface values for the $\lambda_{ci}$, $\lambda_2$ and $Q$ metrics.

Figure 8. Probability distributions of the normalized inner product of momentum barrier field vectors and isosurface normals for TRA and the three standard velocity-gradient-based diagnostics for a 3D rectangular volume of fluid containing the vortices in Figure 6. The clear singular peak around 0 in the TRA PDF indicates a strong agreement between TRA surfaces and the underlying momentum transport blocking interfaces for both elliptic and hyperbolic surfaces. Similar behavior does not exist for the other three diagnostics. A $\pm 5^\circ$ difference between surface tangents and barrier vectors is delimited by dashed lines.

are precisely distributions of the signed integrands of the numerator in (2.11). Vertical dashed lines mark a $\pm 5^\circ$ deviation from perfect agreement between momentum barriers and barriers generated by each diagnostic level set. Notably, there is a clear peak around 0 for $\nabla \text{TRA}_{10^{-3}}$, while a nearly uniform (random) distribution can be seen for angles between barrier field vectors and velocity-gradient-based isosurface normals.

As the linear-momentum barrier vector field $\Delta \mathbf{v}$ is objective, extracting the classic $\lambda_{ci}$, $\lambda_2$ and $Q$ level surfaces from the $\Delta \mathbf{v}$ field would also be an objective procedure,
3.3. Momentum transport barrier interfaces

We have, so far, used level surfaces of the TRA field for the approximate visualization of vortices with a perfect instantaneous momentum-trapping property. We can also use the TSE field to interrogate the momentum barrier equation more globally in order to locate momentum-blocking interfaces between more and less turbulent areas of the flow. This can be achieved by constructing streamsurfaces of the barrier equation that partition the flow into a near-wall and a mean-flow region with the smoothest possible boundary between these two regions. We use TSE fields to aid in this interface identification as their level surfaces separate regions of distinct degrees of stretching in a manner analogous to hyperbolic invariant manifolds. We now describe a simple, automated algorithm for identifying such objective momentum transport barriers (MTB) as a physics-based alternative to the currently used TNTI or UMZ interface identification processes (Adrian et al., 2000; Da Silva et al., 2014; De Silva et al., 2015). As with our vortex identification, when using the trajectory decorrelation time for TSE calculations, the only free parameter in our MTB algorithm is the choice of spatial resolution. This ultimately controls the level of detail in the MTB interfaces and their momentum-blocking ability. In contrast to common TNTI or UMZ level-surface approaches, we can improve our momentum-barrier identifications by calculating TSE at progressively finer resolutions.
beyond the underlying velocity grid, thus improving surface triangulations and increasing
tangency with invariant manifolds in the barrier field.

We begin this algorithm by calculating the TSE for the active barrier equation (2.9)
on a 3D domain of interest. Here we use the decorrelation time as determined for the
wall-proximal (outer) half of the channel ($|y^+| \geq 0.75$) in an effort to visualize the
most turbulent and complex momentum blocking structures ($s_N = 10^{-4}$) below the
interface. Through a sensitivity analysis, we found MTB identification to be consistent
over six orders of magnitude of $s_N$, but the visual clarity of near-wall structures begins
to deteriorate away from our chosen $s_N$. This barrier time is shorter than the value
$s_N = 10^{-3}$ calculated for our focus on vortices near the center of the channel as the
magnitude of the $\Delta v$ is much greater near the wall.

To reduce the computational burden of finding the smoothest domain-spanning in-
terface, we first perform a series of 2D approximations. We select a set of $n \geq 1$
streamwise-wall-normal planes and identify the shortest TSE contour in each plane that
divides the plane into a lower (near-wall) and upper (mean-flow) region. For example,
see the candidate spanning contours at TSE = 3.11 for multiple $z^+$ planes in the top
row of Figure 10. Each such shortest, in-plane contour has a corresponding TSE value
whose corresponding 2D TSE level surface is a candidate for an MTB interface. Of
these candidate surfaces, we finally select the 2D TSE level surface whose intersection
curves with the $n$ streamwise-wall-normal planes have the lowest maximum length. This
procedure, therefore, yields the MTB interface as the TSE level surface that divides the
flow roughly into parallel near-wall and mean-flow regions while maintaining as low a
curvature as possible. The corresponding lower half-channel MTB determined from this
algorithm can be see in the lower plot of Figure 10. The boundaries of the three upper
planes of contour investigation are drawn in black. More involved algorithms targeting the
same objective can certainly be devised but will likely come with increased computational
cost.

The MTB interface in Figure 10 is a complex structure that reveals connections of
multiple vortices as they collect and migrate from the channel wall to the less turbulent
center of the channel. The MTB has been shaded by the distance from the lower channel
wall to help illuminate heterogeneity in the wall-normal extent of this MTB. Qualitatively
familiar material features from smoke and dye experiments can be seen in this objective
barrier. The characteristic interface eddies documented by Falco (1977) are evident along
the MTB as well as the large scale streamwise alignment and streaky structures noted
in the experimental results of Kline et al. (1967). There is also a striking similarity to
scalar concentrations visualized in jet-driven TNTI (e.g. Westerweel et al. 2009)
The MTB interface obtained in this fashion approximates the flattest invariant man-
ifold of the barrier equation that divides the flow into two disjoint quasi-wall-parallel
layers with minimal diffusive momentum transport between them. The low-curvature
requirement in the construction of this interface forces it to avoid highly turbulent regions
and effectively connect outer regions of the momentum-trapping vortices that we have
already discussed.

To illustrate this behavior, in Figure 11 we focus on a small subdomain of Figure 10
and compare our interface with two commonly used UMZ and TNTI identification diag-
nostics, vorticity and normalized streamwise velocity. We also include in this comparison
the NTSE field.

The top-left panel in Figure 11 shows TSE values calculated for initial conditions on
the $z^+ = 2.75$ plane with the interface drawn in blue. The interface effectively contours
around the outside of a strongly stretching spiral feature and separates the flow into a
less turbulent and more turbulent region. The NTSE field in the top-right panel reveals
many of the same structures tangent to the MTB with additional weaker features aligned above the interface. Slight differences between contours in TSE and NTSE fields on the edge of the domain can be attributed to fixed time step integration effects.

The bottom-right panel shows the streamwise velocity, a scalar field whose contours are broadly used for extraction of uniform momentum zones in wall turbulence (e.g., Adrian et al. 2000; Kwon et al. 2014; De Silva et al. 2015). Following the procedure of Kwon et al. (2014), we have normalized the velocities by the channel centerline velocity. We note that the predominant gradient in the velocity field does not always coincide with the MTB interface and the velocity contours are parallel with the interface in only a small region of the domain. We will further explore the differences between UMZ interfaces MTB interfaces below.

Lastly, the bottom-left panel of Figure 11 shows the vorticity norm in the same domain, a diagnostic commonly used in TNTI identification (see Holzner et al. 2006; Da Silva et al. 2014). This plot provides a similar but simpler picture of the flow dynamics in comparison with TSE, and the details do not indicate exactly where an interface should be drawn. There is no vorticity peak at the turbulent interface, as is sometimes possible at the TNTI (Da Silva et al. 2014). As well, the change in vorticity is quite gradual, not giving a clear drop in the vorticity PDF as is often used to separate rotational and irrotational flow fields. For these reasons, vorticity is not commonly used for internal interface diagnostics, but is included here as it does provide a closer comparison with momentum barrier field behavior than the streamwise velocity (UMZ) visualization. We recall that much of UMZ theory relies on an analogy with turbulent/non-turbulent interfaces.

The ability of the TSE field to identify divergent behavior of barrier streamlines and appropriately locate the MTB is illustrated in Figure 12. Here, we expand our focus from Figure 11 to a narrow subsection of the channel. The left column shows the local geometry of the MTB (blue) and UMZ (red) interfaces near the $z^+ = 2.75$ plane. The
Figure 11. Clockwise from the top left: The TSE field, the NTSE field for the unit barrier field, the streamwise velocity $u$ normalized by the centerline velocity $u_{cl}$, and the vorticity norm $||\omega||$. The MTB interface is superimposed in all plots as a blue curve. All image data was computed and displayed at the same spatial resolution.

The right column shows a zoomed-in view of the interfaces in the domain of Figure 11 and the nearby trajectories of the barrier equation (2.9).

Trajectories in Figure 11 are shaded by their TSE values. For the MTB interface, there is an obvious separation of minimally-stretching black trajectories in a less turbulent region above the blue interface and the multiple spiraling grey and white vortices below the interface. The MTB is also tangent to the barrier field streamlines, indicating the correct orientation with respect to the momentum barrier streamsurfaces. This is further confirmed in the inner-product probability distribution inset for the MTB on the left. Similar to the findings for TRA level-surfaces around vortices in Figure 8, the geometry of TSE level-surface interfaces is largely tangent to perfectly computed zero-flux linear momentum barriers.

The bottom-left panel of Figure 12 shows the universal $u/u_{cl} = 0.95$ quiescent core.
UMZ interface calculated over the 1.2h streamwise extent, as suggested by Kwon et al. (2014). The MTB and UMZ interfaces differ greatly, with the UMZ interface geometry poorly aligned with true momentum transport barriers. This can be see in the inner-product PDF on the left with one such highlighted example shown in the bottom-right panel. Here, barrier field streamlines around a vortex feature are seen to be perpendicular to the UMZ interface. This is in direct contrast with our automated MTB interface algorithm that has clearly succeeded in approximating a repelling (and hence structurally stable) invariant manifold of the incompressible barrier equation.

The MTB and UMZ also lie at different wall-normal heights. While TSE level surfaces that span the domain at the height of the UMZ do exist, the nearby TSE structures contour and fold around many hyperbolic and elliptic barriers and do not provide a clear interface between distinct wall-parallel flow zones. We suspect that, in the neighborhood of the quiescent core interface, a simple quasi-planar structure that blocks wall-transverse momentum flux may not actually exist as the elliptic and hyperbolic barrier field manifolds are less densely concentrated. Furthermore, transverse intersections of velocity level surfaces with invariant manifolds of (2.9) suggest any possible correlations between velocity level surfaces and true momentum barriers are insignificant for their momentum blocking ability.
To assess the validity of this impression more broadly, we compare the momentum transport through a range of UMZ interfaces and the MTB in Figure 13. The right panel shows the same TSE field for the $z^+ = 2.75$ plane as in Figure 11 with overlaid streamwise velocity contours. As there are numerous approaches to extracting the best streamwise velocity isosurface for UMZ identification (see, e.g., De Silva et al. 2015; Fan et al. 2019), we directly compare our MTB with a range of simply connected velocity level surfaces from the near-wall region well into the channel core. The top left panel shows the geometric diffusive flux across this range of interfaces in red, and our MTB flux in blue. The gray shading indicates the $u/u_{\text{cl}}$ isosurfaces closest to the MTB in the domain. As with the non-objective diagnostics in Section 3.2, these velocity isosurfaces exhibit around four times the flux as our nearby objective MTB.

As we increase the velocity of the UMZ interface, we also move away from the wall and into a region with smaller $\Delta v$ vectors. While we have seen that the quiescent core UMZ interface is largely transverse to momentum transport barriers, its diffusive momentum flux is smaller than for our MTB. We believe this is due to its location in a region with less turbulence and less flux, and not an ability to limit momentum transport. We thus calculate the normalized geometric flux (tangency measure) $\Psi_N$ from (2.11). In the middle panel, we present $\Psi_N$ for the same UMZ candidates. This shows the clear advantage of identifying internal momentum blocking interfaces with the MTB approach over any streamwise velocity isosurface. Triangles in the two flux plots mark several velocity isosurfaces of interest: the highest flux (0.63), the UMZ closest to the MTB (0.76), the trough between the two PDF peaks (0.88), and the quiescent core UMZ of Kwon et al. (2014) (0.95). The intersection of these four $u/u_{\text{cl}}$ isosurfaces with the $z^+ = 2.75$ plane are drawn in the right panel.

UMZ theory suggests that distinct regions of the fluid with uniform momentum, and the interfaces between them, should be identifiable from streamwise velocity vector histograms. Whether in boundary layers or channel flows, UMZ interfaces have been defined as minima between peaks in the PDF for $u$. The bottom left panel of Figure 13 shows a PDF for the bottom half of the channel flow over the 3D domain of focus. These PDFs are known to be highly sensitive to the size and location of the domain of investigation but there is no consensus available on their use in 2D or 3D analysis (Fan et al. 2019). The level set values contoured in the right panel are marked on the PDF with dashed lines.

It can be seen in Figure 13 that UMZ interfaces with relatively low diffusive momentum flux do not correspond with momentum barrier structures. Indeed, all $u/u_{\text{cl}}$ interfaces travel transverse to multiple vortex cores (including that highlighted in Figure 12) and meander in and out of high stretching regions. In the $\Psi$ and $\Psi_N$ plots, we can see the surface derived from the minima between the two largest PDF peaks, $u/u_{\text{cl}} = 0.88$, does not provide an even locally minimal momentum flux as has been suggested in UMZ theory. The steady increase in $\Psi_N$ and decrease in $\Psi$ for increasing $u$ shows the dominant influence of barrier field magnitude on $\Psi$ and a consistent lack of momentum barrier tangency. In fact, the spanning velocity level surface with minimum momentum flux occurs at $u/u_{\text{cl}} = 0.99$ which is well inside the less turbulent region of the flow. Of note, the quiescent core, $u/u_{\text{cl}} = 0.95$, interface does indeed appear adjacent to the dominant channel core PDF peak, as suggested by Kwon et al. (2014). However, as already mentioned, this fact is significant neither for its momentum blocking ability nor for its ability to reveal material structures.

Each panel in Figure 14 shows the normalized inner product of respective isosurface normals with the momentum barrier vector field $x' = \Delta v$. As before, values around zero in the PDFs indicate an alignment of isosurfaces with true streamsurfaces of
the momentum barrier equation. The top left panel shows a familiar peak around 0 for the MTB interface, confirming that the low momentum flux calculated across this interface is aided by its close alignment with a set of invariant manifolds of the barrier equation. There are impressively few isonormal vectors lying outside this peak even with the algorithm balancing strict coincidence invariance under the barrier equation with computational simplicity and moderate curvature.

In comparison, the PDF associated with the closest candidate UMZ interface to the MTB, $u/u_{cl} = 0.76$, exhibits a much less pronounced peak around zero. Note that this surfaces experiences more than three times the momentum flux across it than the MTB interface. The other two velocity isosurfaces, including the quiescent cored interface, exhibit similar minor peaks around zero, with much more uniform and random alignment of surface normals when compared to the momentum barrier field vectors. This confirms our previous suspicion that flux is only minimized across this surface because of its location in a less turbulent region of the flow, and not because it behaves as a physically significant barrier.

Lastly, the non-physical nature and limited momentum transport blocking ability of the quiescent core UMZ interface can be exhibited with a simple comparison. Taking the UMZ suggestion by Kwon et al. (2014), we determine the average height of the interface and replace it with a wall-parallel plane placed at that height. The geometric objective momentum flux through this arbitrary plane ($\Psi = 59$) is actually lower than the momentum flux through the interface suggested by UMZ theory ($\Psi = 63$). In other words, a simple wall-parallel plane in the neighborhood of the $u/u_{cl} = 0.95$ level surface is a more suitable candidate for a momentum barrier than a UMZ interface. For the MTB, though lying in a region of relatively large $\Delta v$, its flux ($\Psi = 101$) is nearly half that of the flux through its average wall-parallel plane ($\Psi = 196$).
4. Conclusions

Using the objective notion of diffusive momentum flux through a material surface, we have developed an algorithm for locating frame-invariant instantaneous barriers to linear momentum transport in near-wall turbulence. This algorithm builds on the recent theory of active transport barriers [Haller et al. 2020], which identifies momentum transport barriers as structurally stable invariant manifolds (stream surfaces) of the incompressible steady barrier equation (2.9). Our algorithm approximates these stream surfaces by level surfaces of recently developed coherent structure diagnostics, the trajectory rotation average (TRA) and trajectory stretching exponent (TSE) proposed by Haller et al. (2021). Other objective LCS diagnostics can also be used to identify invariant manifolds of (2.9), but TRA and TSE were used here due to their computational simplicity as single-trajectory-based diagnostic fields.

Our procedure targets both momentum-trapping vortices in the boundary layer and internal momentum-flux minimizing interfaces that locally define the flow into near-wall and far-from-wall layers. Specifically, vortex boundaries are identified as the outermost cylindrical level surfaces of the TRA field. This procedure is free from the empirical threshold values employed by classic, velocity-gradient-based vortex criteria which only
provide observer-dependent results. In addition, we find that classic vortex identification
diagnostics fail to generate surfaces that sufficiently block momentum transport.

The same barrier field trajectory data can also be used to compute TSE fields and
identify wall-parallel quasi-planar momentum transport barrier (MTB) interfaces that
locally minimize the diffusive transport of momentum. With TRA and TSE fields, the
diffusive linear momentum barrier vector field (2.9), therefore, links vortex diagnostics
with internal fluid interfaces that are objective analogues of the broadly used but frame-
dependent UMZ interfaces and TNTIs. We have found that MTB interfaces significantly
outperform the classic UMZ interface approaches, in terms of their ability to block viscous
momentum transport, regardless of the specific velocity chosen. In fact, UMZ approaches
define surfaces that often run transverse to true momentum barriers. Furthermore, the
use of TSE calculations for the barrier equations eliminates sensitivities in UMZ analysis
with respect to changes in the number of bins used in velocity histograms and variations
in the size of the domain of analysis. In comparison, the only free parameter in our vortex
and MTB algorithm is the spatial resolution of TSE fields, though this is a simple question
of computational resources. Whereas increases in spatial resolution reduce momentum
transport through vortex and MTB extractions, increases in the number of velocity
histogram bins eventually leads to the disappearance of any UMZ peak or interface.

Future research should investigate the role that parabolic invariant manifolds of the
momentum barrier equation (2.9) play in near-wall turbulence as well. Haller et al. (2020)
also derive a barrier equation for the transport of vorticity, which takes the form \( \dot{x} = \Delta \omega \). The streamsurfaces of the latter barrier equation generally differ from those of equation (2.9) and hence would highlight different internal interfaces in near-wall turbulence in a theory that seeks vorticity transport minimizing interfaces. Another extension of the present theory could use the Lagrangian active barriers introduced in Haller et al. (2020), which are material surfaces minimizing momentum or vorticity transport over a whole time interval rather than just instantaneously. Such material barriers should mimic the structures seen in the classic smoke experiments of Falco (1977) even more closely.
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