

# Role of initial separation for Richardson scaling of turbulent two-particle dispersion

Dhawal Buaria<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Tandon School of Engineering, New York University, New York, NY 11201, USA

<sup>2</sup>Max Planck Institute for Dynamics and Self-Organization, 37077 Göttingen, Germany

(Dated: February 8, 2023)

The role of initial separation for inertial range scaling of turbulent two-particle dispersion is reassessed in light of recent results. (slightly expanded version of Comment published in Physical Review Letters [1])

Using laboratory experiments and some previously published data, Tan & Ni [2] investigate turbulent dispersion of particle-pairs, characterized by the separation vector  $\mathbf{r}(t)$  as function of time  $t$ . The authors report that the anticipated Richardson cubic scaling in the inertial-range:

$$\langle |\mathbf{r}(t) - \mathbf{r}(0)|^2 \rangle = g \langle \epsilon \rangle t^3, \quad (1)$$

can only be realized at finite (Taylor-scale) Reynolds number  $R_\lambda$  for one critical initial-separation of  $r_0 = |\mathbf{r}(0)| \approx 3\eta$ ,  $\eta$  being the Kolmogorov length-scale, or for any  $r_0$  at infinite  $R_\lambda$ . However, the authors' methodology to assess Richardson scaling is unjustified, especially given the  $R_\lambda$  in their experiments is not high enough to produce Lagrangian inertial-range characteristics. Indeed, when considering results at significantly higher  $R_\lambda = 1000$  [3, 4] (currently the highest in Lagrangian studies), which were ignored in [2], a different conclusion is reached.




FIG. 1. Log-local-slope of  $\langle |\mathbf{r}(t) - \mathbf{r}(0)|^2 \rangle$  for various initial separations at  $R_\lambda = 1000$  (solid lines) and  $R_\lambda = 650$  (dashed lines).

By definition, Richardson scaling in the inertial-range requires  $t_0 \ll t \ll T_L$ , where  $t_0 = (r_0^2 / \langle \epsilon \rangle)^{1/3}$  is the Batchelor timescale, characterizing the memory of initial ballistic separation and  $T_L$  is the Lagrangian integral time-scale, marking the transition to diffusive behavior. However, Tan & Ni [2] assume a unique power-law  $\langle |\mathbf{r}(t) - \mathbf{r}(0)|^2 \rangle \sim t^{k_D}$  in the range  $2t_0 \leq t \leq T_L/2$

$r_0/\eta$ bin	effective $r_0/\eta$	$k_D$ ( $R_\lambda = 1000$ )	$k_D$ ( $R_\lambda = 650$ )
1 – 4	3	3.10	3.12
2 – 8	6	3.00	2.92
4 – 16	12	2.90	2.80
8 – 32	24	2.80	2.67

TABLE I. Inertial-range exponents  $k_D$  as extracted from Fig. 1.

and thereby obtain the exponents  $k_D$  for various  $r_0/\eta$ . This choice of fitting-window is ad-hoc and does not correctly reflect the inertial range behavior. In fact, a unique exponent cannot even be identified in this range, as evident from Fig. 1, which shows the log-local-slope of  $\langle |\mathbf{r}(t) - \mathbf{r}(0)|^2 \rangle$  using the data in ref. [3].

Instead, we extract the exponents  $k_D$  corresponding to where the curves plateau in Fig. 1. These exponents are *uniquely* determined and also correspond to  $t/t_0 > 10$ , nominally satisfying  $t \gg t_0$  as required for inertial-range. The  $k_D$  values are tabulated in Table I for various initial-separations and are substantially different than predicted by the proposed model in [2]. Evidently, Richardson scaling ( $k_D = 3$ ) is obtained for  $2 < r_0/\eta < 8$  (with an effective  $r_0/\eta \approx 6$  [5]) and trends with  $R_\lambda$  suggest that an increasing range of  $r_0/\eta$  will approach  $k_D = 3$  at finite  $R_\lambda$  (albeit significantly higher  $R_\lambda$  than currently available are required to obtain a sufficient scale separation, as discussed later).

Concurrently, one can also consider the so-called cubed-local-slope (CLS):

$$\frac{1}{\langle \epsilon \rangle} \left( \frac{d}{dt} [\langle |\mathbf{r}(t)|^2 \rangle]^{1/3} \right)^3, \quad (2)$$

which should plateau at the same  $g$  for various  $r_0/\eta$  if the Richardson scaling holds. Figure 2a shows the CLS versus  $t/t_0$  for various  $r_0/\eta$ , at  $R_\lambda = 1000$  and 650 (reproduced from Fig.4a of [3]). Evidently, based on the  $R_\lambda$ -trend, there is a clear tendency for various  $r_0/\eta$  bins to approach  $g \approx 0.55$ . An even more robust result is obtained in [4], by considering particle-pairs which additionally undergo diffusive (Brownian) motion – modeled by standard Wiener process – enabling them to lose memory of their initial separation faster. Figure 2b shows the CLS, corresponding to unity Schmidt number ( $Sc = 1$ ) for the diffusive motion (reproduced from Fig.6 of [4]).

For this case, a very clear tendency to plateau at  $g \approx 0.55$  is observed for various  $r_0/\eta$ , for both  $R_\lambda$ .




FIG. 2. Cubed-local slope, as defined by Eq. (2) for (a) fluid particles and (b) diffusive fluid particles with  $Sc = 1$ , for various initial separations. Solid lines are for  $R_\lambda = 1000$  and dotted lines for  $R_\lambda = 650$ . Horizontal dashed line at  $g = 0.55$ . The legend applies to both panels.

Overall, these results indicate that Richardson scaling is obtained in a critical range of  $r_0/\eta$ , which slowly increases with  $R_\lambda$ , as opposed to a single critical value of  $r_0/\eta = 3$ . It is well-known that the temporal scale-range in turbulence, identified by  $T_L/t_\eta$  ( $t_\eta$  being the Kolmogorov time-scale), is already significantly smaller than the spatial one, making robust inertial-range observations of Lagrangian statistics very difficult [6]. To

observe Richardson scaling, an additional constraint is imposed by  $t_0$ , since  $t_0/t_\eta = (r_0/\eta)^{2/3}$  implying the range  $T_L/t_0$  gets increasingly smaller for  $r_0/\eta > 1$ . At the highest  $R_\lambda = 1000$  currently available,  $T_L/t_\eta \approx 80$  [3], and for say  $r_0/\eta = 8$ , we have  $t_0/t_\eta = 4$ , implying  $T_L/t_0 \approx 20$ , which is barely one decade of effective scale-separation. The scale separation for smaller  $r_0/\eta$  would be larger. Considering the range of  $R_\lambda$  investigated by [2] is noticeably lower than  $R_\lambda = 1000$ , their conclusion that Richardson scaling holds for only  $r_0/\eta \approx 3$  can be readily explained in terms of available scale-separation. At higher  $R_\lambda$ , Richardson scaling would hold for an increasing range of  $r_0/\eta$  – as suggested by the trends in Fig. 1 and Table I.

---

\* dhawal.buaria@nyu.edu

- [1] D. Buaria, “Comment on “universality and intermittency of pair dispersion in turbulence”,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 029401 (2023).
- [2] S. Tan and R. Ni, “Universality and intermittency of pair dispersion in turbulence,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 114502 (2022).
- [3] D. Buaria, B. L. Sawford, and P. K. Yeung, “Characteristics of backward and forward two-particle relative dispersion in turbulence at different Reynolds numbers,” *Phys. Fluids* **27**, 105101 (2015).
- [4] D. Buaria, P. K. Yeung, and B. L. Sawford, “A Lagrangian study of turbulent mixing: forward and backward dispersion of molecular trajectories in isotropic turbulence,” *J. Fluid Mech.* **799**, 352–382 (2016).
- [5] Since the sample distribution is quadratic in  $r_0$ ; see Fig.1 of Ref. [3].
- [6] B. L. Sawford and P. K. Yeung, “Kolmogorov similarity scaling for one-particle Lagrangian statistics,” *Phys. Fluids* **23**, 091704 (2011).