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We propose presumably the simplest model for turbulent cascade. The constructed model can be interpreted as a modified XY model with amplitude fluctuations, in which the spin is regarded as the “velocity” of a turbulent field. We show that the model exhibits an inverse “energy” cascade. Furthermore, we determine the functional form of the velocity correlation function, which corresponds to the non-Kolmogorov energy spectrum $\propto k^{-3}$.

Introduction.—Many phenomena in nature are far from ideal in the sense that they are difficult to understand by dividing them into simple noninteracting entities owing to highly complicated nonlinearity. Still, in many cases, these complicated many-body interactions cause universality, allowing phenomenological understandings. Such a phenomenological framework is insensitive to microscopic details, and there are thus many models that describe a given phenomenon. Therefore, if we are only interested in the universal aspect of a certain phenomenon, it is sufficient to investigate the simplest model among the models that can describe the phenomenon. Such a minimal model can be regarded as a sophisticated expression of our understanding of the phenomenon [1]. In fact, minimal models have provided us phenomenological perspectives with which to understand various phenomena, such as critical phenomena [2], phase separation [3, 4], directed percolation [5], surface growth [6, 7], and flocking [8].

One of the most extreme examples in which complicated nonlinearity plays a central role is turbulence [9]. Even for turbulence, there is some kind of universality, the properties of which are analogous to those of critical phenomena [10]. As an example, the energy spectrum follows the power-law $E(k) \propto k^{-5/3}$, the so-called Kolmogorov spectrum, independent of the details of the initial/boundary conditions or the mechanism of external stirring [9, 11–13]. Such universal behavior is observed even in systems different from ordinary fluids, such as quantum fluids and supercritical fluids near a critical point [14–19].

The turbulent cascade underlies this remarkable universality in turbulence. This is the phenomenon that the inviscid conserved quantity, such as the energy or enstrophy, is transferred conservatively and continuously from large (small) to small (large) scales [9]. In the scale range where the turbulent cascade occurs—the inertial range—the scaling of the distribution of the conserved quantity is governed by the corresponding conserved scale-to-scale flux. Although the mechanism of the turbulent cascade is intuitively explained by Richardson’s depiction of a large vortex splitting into smaller vortices [20], there is no clear understanding of how such splitting is sustained in complicated flow. Therefore, we must clarify and classify the mechanism of the turbulent cascade to reach a phenomenological understanding of turbulence.

In this Letter, we aim to understand the mechanism of the turbulent cascade by constructing a minimal model for the phenomenon [21, 22]. To this end, we first reflect on the minimum elements required for the turbulent cascade to occur and then attempt to construct presumably the simplest possible model. A model thus constructed would provide insights into the turbulent cascade. Therefore, by investigating the behavior of the model through theoretical and numerical analyses, we expect to reach an intuitive understanding of the turbulent cascade.

The constructed model can be interpreted as a two-dimensional modified XY model with amplitude fluctuations, in which the spin is regarded as the “velocity” of a turbulent field. We show that the model exhibits an inverse “energy” cascade. Furthermore, we determine the functional form of the velocity correlation function, which corresponds to the non-Kolmogorov energy spectrum $\propto k^{-3}$.

Insights into the turbulent cascade.—Let us consider the minimum elements required for a turbulent cascade to occur. Obviously, nonlinearity is indispensable because the essence of the turbulent cascade is strong inevitable interference between widely separated length scales. Furthermore, this nonlinearity must conserve “energy” if there is neither injection nor dissipation [23]. To ensure the existence of the “inertial range,” the injection and dissipation must act at large (small) and small (large) scales, respectively. Thus, the minimum elements required for the “energy” cascade to occur are (i) nonlinearity that conserves “energy”; (ii) injection at large (small) scales; and (iii) dissipation at small (large) scales.

We now construct a minimal model for the turbulent cascade by specifying these three elements. Respecting the ease of the intuitive interpretation of the nonlinear interaction, we consider the two-component “velocity” vector $\mathbf{v}$ at each site $i$ on a two-dimensional square lattice. In the case shown in Figs. 1(a) and 1(b), the “energy” $\langle |\mathbf{v}_i|^2 \rangle / 2$, where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes the ensemble average, may be localized at small and large scales, respectively. For the model to evolve from the state shown in Fig. 1(a) to that shown in Fig. 1(b) while conserving energy, “ferromagnetic interactions” may be suitable nonlinearity. Because this nonlinear interaction may induce an inverse energy cascade, where the energy is transferred from small to large scales, we must incorporate into the model injection and dissipation terms that act at small and large
The ease of analysis to choose a random force that is white
and perpendicular to \( R \) is a friction dissipation. Let \( \gamma > 0 \)
be the friction coefficient, and \( \epsilon > 0 \) represents the strength of the random
force, which is the zero-mean white Gaussian noise that satisfies
\[
\langle \xi^a_i(t) \xi^b_j(t') \rangle = \delta^{ab} \delta_{ij} \delta(t - t'),
\]
and \( |\mathbf{v}_i|^2 := v_i^a v_i^b \). Here and hereafter, we employ the
summation convention for \( a, b, c \) that repeated indices in one term are summed over \( \{1, 2\} \). A snapshot of the steady-state velocity profile of the model is shown in Fig.
1(c).

Basic properties.—Let \( |\mathbf{v}_i|^2 / 2 \) be the “energy” at site \( i \). A crucial property of the nonlinear term of the model (1) is that the term does not contribute to the energy exchange:
\[
v_i^a \left( \lambda \sum_{j \in B_i} R^{ab}(\mathbf{v}_j) v_j^b \right) = 0.
\]

Therefore, the time evolution of \( |\mathbf{v}_i|^2 / 2 \) is governed only by the dissipation rate \( \gamma |\mathbf{v}_i|^2 \) and injection rate \( \sqrt{\epsilon} v_i^c \xi_i^c \):
\[
\frac{\partial_t}{2} |\mathbf{v}_i|^2 = -\gamma |\mathbf{v}_i|^2 + \sqrt{\epsilon} v_i^c \xi_i^c,
\]
where the symbol \( \circ \) denotes multiplication in the sense of Stratonovich [24]. Thus, if there is neither injection nor dissipation (i.e., \( \epsilon = \gamma = 0 \)), the energy at site \( i \), \( |\mathbf{v}_i|^2 / 2 \), is conserved without any averaging. If \( \epsilon > 0 \) and \( \gamma > 0 \), it follows that \( \langle |\mathbf{v}_i|^2 \rangle = 2T \) in the steady-state, where we introduced the “temperature” as \( T := \epsilon / 2\gamma \).

It becomes easier to understand the behavior of the model by introducing the amplitude \( A_i \) and the phase \( \theta_i \) as \( \mathbf{v}_i = A_i (\cos \theta_i, \sin \theta_i) \). In terms of \( A_i \) and \( \theta_i \), (1) can be expressed as
\[
\partial_t A_i = -\gamma A_i + \frac{\epsilon}{2A_i} + \sqrt{\epsilon} \xi_i^A,
\]
\[
A_i \partial_t \theta_i = -\lambda \sum_{j \in B_i} A_j \sin(\theta_i - \theta_j) + \sqrt{\epsilon} \xi_i^\theta.
\]
Here, \( \xi_i^A := \xi_i^1 \cos \theta_i + \xi_i^2 \sin \theta_i \) and \( \xi_i^\theta := -\xi_i^1 \sin \theta_i + \xi_i^2 \cos \theta_i \), where the multiplication is interpreted in the Itô sense [24]. Note that (7) has the form of the random-bond XY model with asymmetric coupling. If \( A_i \) is frozen uniformly in space, the system exhibits the Kosterlitz-Thouless transition [25–27]. Therefore, we can say that this model is a modified XY model with amplitude (energy) fluctuations. We emphasize that, in contrast with the standard XY model, the detailed balance is broken in our model by the amplitude fluctuations. The absence of the detailed balance is necessary for the turbulent cascade to occur in the steady-state.

In the following, we use the property that the energy dissipation and injection act at large and small scales, respectively. Let \( K_i \equiv \ell_i^{-1} \) be the energy injection scale. Since the injection due to the noise \( \xi_i^c \) acts with uniform strength on each Fourier mode, \( K_i \) can be defined, for instance, as
\[
K_i := \frac{2\pi}{L} \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{n_z = -N/2}^{N/2} \sum_{n_y = -N/2}^{N/2} \sqrt{n_x^2 + n_y^2},
\]
where \( L \equiv N a \). The energy injection due to the “thermal noise” mainly acts at scales \( \ll \ell_i \). Similarly, let \( K_\gamma \equiv \ell_\gamma^{-1} \) be the dissipation scale. This scale may depend on the friction coefficient \( \gamma \) and dissipation rate \( \gamma |\mathbf{v}_i|^2 = \epsilon \). Therefore, \( K_\gamma \) is defined as \( K_\gamma := \gamma^{3/2} \epsilon^{-1/2} \) [28–30]. We thus expect that the dissipation is dominant at scales \( \gg \ell_\gamma \). Note that \( K_\gamma \to 0 \) as \( \gamma \to 0 \).

Main result.—Let \( \Pi(k) \) be the scale-to-scale energy flux, which represents the energy transfer from scales \( > k^{-1} \) to scales \( < k^{-1} \). (The precise definition is given below.) In the steady-state, \( \Pi(k) \) becomes scale independent in the “inertial range” \( K_\gamma \ll k \ll K_i \):
\[
\Pi(k) \simeq -\epsilon < 0.
\]
Since \( \Pi(k) \) is negative, (9) states that the model exhibits an inverse energy cascade; i.e., the energy is transferred conservatively and continuously from small to
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FIG. 1. (color online). (a) and (b) Schematic illustration of
the idea of constructing a minimal model. The arrow on each
site represents the “velocity” of a turbulent field. (c) Snapshot
of the steady-state velocity profile of the model with \( T = \lambda = 1 \) and \( \gamma = 0.001 \). The color bar denotes the magnitude of the
velocity vector \( |\mathbf{v}_i| \).
large scales. Correspondingly, the equal-time correlation function
\[ C(\ell) = \langle v_i^n v_i^o \rangle, \]
where \( \ell := r_i - r_i \) and \( r_i \) denotes the position of site \( i \), follows a power-law:
\[ C(\ell) \sim \frac{1}{16} (\lambda a^2)^{-1} \ell^2 \quad \text{for} \quad \ell_i \ll \ell \ll \ell_\gamma. \quad (10) \]

From (10), the one-dimensional energy spectrum \( E^{(1D)}(k) \) reads
\[ E^{(1D)}(k) = C(\lambda a^2)^{-1} k^{-3} \quad \text{for} \quad K_\gamma \ll k \ll K_i, \quad (11) \]
where \( C \) is a positive dimensionless constant.

Numerical simulation.—We here present the results of numerical simulation. Time integration is performed using the simplest discretization method with \( \Delta t = 0.01 \). The initial value of \( v^0_i \) is set as \( v^0_i(0) = \sqrt{\epsilon} \Delta W^0_i \), where \( \{ \Delta W_i^0 \} \) denote the independent Wiener processes with variance \( \Delta t \). The parameter values are chosen as \( \lambda = 1 \), \( \epsilon = 0.002 \), and \( \gamma = 0.001 \), so that that \( T = 1 \). The system size is fixed as \( N = 1024 \) with \( a = 1 \). In this case, the injection and dissipation scales are estimated as \( K_\gamma a \approx 2.41 \) and \( K_\gamma a \approx 1 \times 10^{-3} \), respectively. Note that \( K_i \) does not increase but approaches a constant value as \( N \) increases.

Figure 2(a) shows the scale dependence of the scale-to-scale energy flux \( \Pi(k) \) at different times. As expected from the result (9), \( \Pi(k) \) is negative and scale independent in the inertial range \( K_\gamma \ll k \ll K_i \). The magnitude of \( \Pi(k) \) in the inertial range is on the order of \( \epsilon \), i.e., \( \Pi(k)/\epsilon \approx -1 \), which is consistent with (9). Furthermore, the scale range over which \( \Pi(k) \) is nearly constant extends to larger scales as time increases. This result also supports that the energy is continuously transferred from small to large scales. In Fig. 2(b), we plot the one-dimensional energy spectrum \( E^{(1D)}(k) \) for the same times as in Fig. 2(a). In the inertial range, \( E^{(1D)}(k) \) follows the power-law \( \propto k^{-3} \), which is consistent with the theoretical prediction (11). At scales larger than the injection scale \( K_i \), \( E^{(1D)}(k) \) is proportional to \( k \). This result implies that the “equipartition of energy” is realized for small scales \( \gtrsim K_i \). We can also confirm the existence of the inverse energy cascade by noting that the spectrum extends to larger scales as time passes. Note that the range over which \( \Pi(k) \) is flat does not exactly correspond to the range over which \( E^{(1D)}(k) \propto k^{-3} \). This discrepancy is similar to that observed in ordinary fluid turbulence [31].

Derivation of the main result.—Let \( \hat{v}_i^k \) be the discrete Fourier transform of \( v_i^0 \) with \( k := 2\pi n/L \), where \( n^1, n^2 \in \{-N/2 + 1, \ldots, 0, 1, \ldots, N/2\} \). We define the low-pass filtering operator by
\[ \mathcal{P}^{<K} v_i \mapsto v_i^{<K} := \sum_{|k|<K} \hat{v}_k e^{i k \cdot r_i}, \quad (12) \]
where \( \sum_{|k|<K} \) denotes the sum over all possible \( k \) that satisfy \( |k| < K \). This operator sets to zero all Fourier components with a wavenumber greater than \( K \). By applying this operator to both sides of (1) and taking the average, we obtain the low-pass filtered energy balance equation:
\[ \partial_t \frac{1}{2} \langle |v_i^{<K}|^2 \rangle = -\Pi(K) - \gamma \langle |v_i^{<K}|^2 \rangle + \sqrt{\epsilon} \langle v_i^{<K} \circ \xi_i^{<K} \rangle, \quad (13) \]
where \( \Pi(K) := -\lambda \left( \int v_i^{<K} \cdot P^{<K} \left[ \sum_{j \in B_i} R(v_i) \cdot v_j \right] \right) \quad (14) \]
denotes the scale-to-scale energy flux. Note that only \( \Pi(K) \) includes the contribution from the Fourier modes with \( |k| \geq K \) because of the nonlinear interaction. The dissipation mainly acts at scales \( \gg \ell_\gamma \), and it follows that \( \gamma \langle |v_i^{<K}|^2 \rangle \approx \gamma \langle |v_i^{<K}|^2 \rangle \approx \gamma \langle |v_i|^2 \rangle \) for \( K_\gamma \ll K \). Similarly, because the injection mainly acts at scales \( \ll \ell_i \), \( \gamma \langle v_i^{<K} \circ \xi_i^{<K} \rangle \approx 0 \) for \( K \ll K_i \). Therefore, in the

![FIG. 2.](color online). Scale dependence of (a) the scale-to-scale energy flux \( \Pi(k) \) and (b) the energy spectrum \( E^{(1D)}(k) \) with \( T = \lambda = 1 \) and \( \gamma = 0.001 \) at different times. The dash-dotted and dotted lines represent the power-laws \( \propto k^{-3} \) and \( \propto k \), respectively. The inset shows the compensated energy spectrum \( \lambda a^2 \epsilon^{-1} k E^{(1D)}(k) \), where the solid line represents \( C = 1/2 \).

steady-state, we obtain
\[
\Pi(K) = -\gamma \langle |v_i^K|^2 \rangle + \sqrt{\epsilon} \langle v_i^K \circ \xi_i^K \rangle \\
\simeq -\gamma \langle |v_i|^2 \rangle \\
= -\epsilon < 0 \quad \text{for } K_\gamma \ll K \ll K_i. \quad (15)
\]
The model thus exhibits the inverse energy cascade; i.e., the energy is transferred conservatively from small to large scales in the “inertial range” \(K_i \ll K < K_i\). Note that the above argument is essentially the same as that for the two-dimensional fluid turbulence [28-30, 32].

We now determine the functional form of the energy spectrum. To this end, we express the energy flux in terms of the velocity correlation function as in the derivation of the Kolmogorov 4/5-law [9]. We first note that \(\Pi(K)\) can be rewritten as
\[
\Pi(K) = -\partial_k \left. \frac{1}{2} |v_i^K|^2 \right|_{NL} \\
= -\sum_{|k| < K} \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{r_j-r_l} e^{-ik \cdot (r_j-r_l)} \partial_k \left. \frac{1}{2} |v_j^K|^2 \right|_{NL}, \quad (16)
\]
where \(\partial_k\) denotes the time evolution due to the nonlinear term. By taking the continuum limit, (16) can be expressed as
\[
\Pi(K) = -\int_{|k| < K} \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \int d^2 \ell e^{-ik \cdot \ell} \epsilon(\ell) \\
= -\int_0^\infty K d\ell J_1(K \ell) \epsilon(\ell). \quad (17)
\]
Here, \(J_1\) is the Bessel function of the first kind and we have assumed the homogeneity \(\epsilon(\ell) := \partial_k \langle v_i(\ell) v_i(0) \rangle/2\) and \(\epsilon(\ell) := \partial_k \langle v_i(r_j) v_i(r_l) \rangle/2\), and isotropy \(\epsilon(\ell) = \epsilon(\ell)\) with \(\ell := r_j-r_l\). We now substitute (17) into the relation (15) to find
\[
\int_0^\infty dx J_1(x) \left( \frac{x}{K} \right) \simeq \epsilon \quad \text{for } K_\gamma \ll K \ll K_i. \quad (18)
\]
By taking first the limit \(\gamma \to 0\) \((K_\gamma \to 0)\) and then the limit \(K \to 0\), we obtain, for large \(\ell\), [9]
\[
\epsilon(\ell) \simeq \epsilon, \quad (19)
\]
where we have used the identity \(\int_0^\infty dx J_1(x) = 1\). A simple expression for \(\epsilon(\ell)\) can be obtained by noting that \(v_i\) tends to align with \(\langle v_i \rangle := \sum_{j \in B} v_j/4\) because of the nonlinearity of the model. In other words, for the angle \(\alpha_i\) between \(\hat{v}_j\) and \(\langle v_i \rangle\), we conjecture that \(\alpha_i \ll 1\) in the steady-state. Therefore, by assuming that each angle between \(v_i\) and its nearest neighbor \(\hat{v}_j\) is on the order of \(\alpha_i \ll 1\), we find that
\[
R^{(b)}(v_i \langle v_i \rangle) = \langle v_i^{(b)} \rangle - \hat{v}_i^{(b)} \langle v_i \rangle \cos \alpha_i \\
\simeq \langle v_i^{(b)} \rangle - \hat{v}_i^{(b)} \langle v_i \rangle | \langle v_i \rangle | \\
\simeq \langle v_i^{(b)} \rangle - v_i^{(b)} + \hat{v}_i^{(b)} (A_1 - \langle A_1 \rangle). \quad (20)
\]
Since \(\{ A_1 \} \) are independent and identically distributed random variables, we obtain from (20) that
\[
\partial_a \frac{1}{2} \langle v_j^{(b)} v_j^{(c)} \rangle \bigg|_{NL} = 2\lambda \left[ \langle v_j^{(b)} R^{ac}(v_i) \langle v_i^{(c)} \rangle + \langle v_j^{(c)} R^{ac}(v_i) \langle v_i^{(b)} \rangle \rangle \right] \\
\simeq 2\lambda \left[ \langle v_j^{(b)} \rangle \langle v_j^{(c)} \rangle - v_j^{(b)} + \langle v_j^{(c)} \rangle - v_j^{(c)} \right], \quad (21)
\]
for \(|r_j - r_l| > a\). Note that \(\langle \cdot \rangle - \cdot\) is the discrete Laplacian. Therefore, \(\epsilon(\ell)\) in (19) can be expressed in terms of \(C(\ell) := \langle v_j^{(b)} v_j^{(c)} \rangle\):
\[
4\lambda a^2 \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \ell^2} + \frac{1}{\ell} \frac{\partial}{\partial \ell} \right) C(\ell) \simeq \epsilon. \quad (22)
\]
It follows from this equation that
\[
C(\ell) \sim \frac{1}{16} (\lambda a^2)^{-1} \ell^2 \quad \text{for } \ell_i \ll \ell \ll \ell_\gamma. \quad (23)
\]
Correspondingly, the asymptotic behavior of the one-dimensional energy spectrum \(E^{(1D)}(k)\) in the inertial range reads
\[
E^{(1D)}(k) \sim C(\lambda a^2)^{-1} \ell^{-3} \quad \text{for } K_\gamma \ll k \ll K_i, \quad (24)
\]
where \(C\) is a dimensionless positive constant.

Concluding remarks.—In summary, we constructed a minimal model for the turbulent cascade, which can be interpreted as a modified XY model with amplitude fluctuations, thereby allowing an intuitive understanding of the cascade process. By using a theoretical analysis and numerical simulation, we showed that the model exhibits an inverse energy cascade with the power-law \(E^{(1D)}(k) \propto k^{-3}\). We note that our results still hold in the quasistationary regime with \(\gamma = 0\), as in the case of two-dimensional fluid turbulence [28, 29, 32].

Interestingly, the behavior of the energy spectrum \(E^{(1D)}(k) \propto k^{-3}\) at large scales is also observed in quasi-two-dimensional atmospheric turbulence. In the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere, \(E^{(1D)}(k) \propto k^{-5/3}\) at scales between 10 and 500 km while \(E^{(1D)}(k) \propto k^{-3}\) at scales between 500 and 3000 km [32-38]. We also note that turbulent behavior similar to that of our model is found in so-called spin turbulence [39-44]. It would thus be interesting to investigate the relationship between such phenomena in nature and our model. We hope that our model will trigger further investigations for the phenomenological understanding of turbulence.
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