

Shell Model of Two-dimensional Turbulence in Polymer Solutions

Roberto Benzi*, Nizan Horesh† and Itamar Procaccia†

* Dipartimento di Fisica and INFM, Università “Tor Vergata”,
Via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, I-00133 Roma, Italy

†Dept. of Chemical Physics, The Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, 76100 Israel

We address the effect of polymer additives on two dimensional turbulence, an issue that was studied recently in experiments and direct numerical simulations. We show that the same simple shell model that reproduced drag reduction in three-dimensional turbulence reproduces all the reported effects in the two-dimensional case. The simplicity of the model offers a straightforward understanding of the all the major effects under consideration.

The effect of soluble polymers on two-dimensional turbulent flows appear quite surprising [1, 2]. Instead of reducing the drag as in three-dimensional turbulence [3, 4] (thus increasing the large scale velocity components [5, 6, 7]), in two dimensions polymers appear to suppress the large scale velocity components. In addition, the polymers affect the probability distribution functions of the velocity field, changing them from sub-gaussian to super-gaussian, with approximately exponential tails. These phenomena appear generic, and were observed both in experiments in fast flowing soap films [1] and in direct numerical simulation of the two dimensional viscoelastic equations [2]. In this Letter we argue that these effects can be understood using a simple shell model of viscoelastic turbulence.

The shell model used to describe the effects of polymers on the turbulent velocity field had been derived [6, 7] on the basis of the FENE-P model of visco-elastic flows [8]. It was employed recently to understand successfully drag reduction in homogeneous three dimensional visco-elastic turbulence [6, 7]. It reads

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{du_n}{dt} &= \frac{i}{3}\Phi_n(u, u) - \frac{i}{3}\frac{\nu_p}{\tau}P(B)\Phi_n(B, B) - \gamma_n u_n + F_n, \\ \frac{dB_n}{dt} &= \frac{i}{3}\Phi_n(u, B) - \frac{i}{3}\Phi_n(B, u) - \frac{1}{\tau}P(B)B_n - \nu_B k_n^2 B_n, \\ P(B) &= \frac{1}{1 - \sum_n B_n^* B_n}. \\ \gamma_n &= \nu k_n^4 + \mu k_n^{-4}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

In these equations u_n and B_n stand for the Fourier amplitudes $u(k_n)$ and $B(k_n)$ of the two respective fields, but as usual in shell models we take $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and the wavevectors are limited to the set $k_n = 2^n$. The nonlinear interaction terms take the explicit form

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_n(u, B) &= k_n \left[(1-b)u_{n+2}B_{n+1}^* + (2+b)u_{n+1}B_{n+2}^* \right] \\ &+ k_{n-1} \left[(2b+1)u_{n-1}^*B_{n+1} - (1-b)u_{n+1}B_{n-1}^* \right] \\ &+ k_{n-2} \left[(2+b)u_{n-1}B_{n-2} + (2b+1)u_{n-2}B_{n-1} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

with an obvious simplification for $\Phi_n(u, u)$ and $\Phi_n(B, B)$. Here b is a parameter which can be used to distinguish

between three-dimensional and two-dimensional behavior (and see below for details). In accordance with the generalized energy of the FENE-P model, the non linear terms in our shell model conserves the total energy:

$$E \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_n |u_n|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\nu_p}{\tau} \ln \left(1 - \sum_n |B_n|^2 \right). \quad (3)$$

The dissipative term γu_n contains both a hyper viscosity at the small scales and a friction term at the large scales, to mimic wall friction in 2-dimensional turbulence. With $\nu_p = 0$ the first of Eqs. 1 reduces to the well-studied Sabra model of Newtonian turbulence [9]. As in the FENE-P case we consider ν_p/ν to be the concentration of the polymer c . For $\nu_p \neq 0$ we refer to the model as the SabraP shell model. The forcing in Eqs. (1) is chosen to input a fixed amount of energy per unit time, i.e.

$$F_n = \delta_{n,f} \tilde{F} / u_n^*, \quad \tilde{F} = 10^{-3} \sqrt{2} \quad \text{for } f = 10, 11. \quad (4)$$

The Sabra model with the parameter b in the range $-1 \leq b \leq 0$ agrees with the 3-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations in the sense that the energy cascade is normal, from the large scales to the smaller scales. For $b < b_c = -1 - 2^{-2/3}$ the situation changes qualitatively, since the energy flux changes direction, going from smaller to larger scales, as in 2-dimensional turbulence [10]. The role of the direct energy flux is taken by an enstrophy-like conserved variable H which cascades from larger to smaller scales:

$$H \equiv \sum_n \left(-\frac{1}{1+b} \right)^n |u_n|^2. \quad (5)$$

Thus, if the forcing is applied to an intermediate level k_f , there are two scaling regimes with an inverse energy flux supported on scales $k_n < k_f$ and a direct enstrophy-like flux for $k > k_f$. The spectrum $S_2(k_n) \equiv \langle u_n u_n^* \rangle$ has a Kolmogorov exponent $S_2(k_n) \sim k_n^{-2/3}$ in the inverse cascade regime, whereas in the direct cascade regime the spectrum reads (up to intermittency corrections) [10]

$$S_2(k_n) \sim k_n^{-2[1+\log_2(-1/1+b)]/3}. \quad (6)$$




FIG. 1: Power spectra $S_2(k_n)$ of the SabraP model (*times*) and the Sabra model (triangles) for $\nu_p = 10^{-6}$ and $\tau = 10^6$. Also shown is the spectrum of the B_n field, i.e. $\langle |B_n|^2 \rangle$, which is peaked at the Lumley scale k_c .

When the parameter b is in the range $-1 \leq b \leq 0$ the coupling to the B -field results in drag reduction, as had been discussed in refs. [6, 7]. We demonstrate here that for $b < -1 - 2^{-2/3}$ the coupling to the B -field suppresses the large scale velocity components. In Fig. 1 we show the respective spectra of the Sabra and the SabraP models, in which the forcing is identical. Note that we force at shells 10 and 11, and therefore we observe only the direct cascade, in agreement with the experimental and simulational works [1, 2]. The inverse cascade regime is destroyed by the large scale friction and is not observable here, as in [1, 2]. Eq. (6) predicts a spectral slope of -0.88 for the present value of b , while the observed slope is -0.96 ± 0.05 ; the difference is attributed to the usual intermittency correction. The main point is that the spectrum with the coupling to the B field exhibits a strong suppression of the large scales, and the slope reduces to about -0.66 ± 0.05 . We also show, in the same plot, the spectrum of the B_n field, $\langle |B_n|^2 \rangle$. This spectrum has a typical scale k_c which is known as the Lumley scale [11],

$$\sqrt{S_2(k_c)} k_c \approx \tau^{-1}. \quad (7)$$

For wavevector smaller than k_c the B_n -spectrum is strongly suppressed, whereas for $k_n > k_c$ the spectrum is a power law.

The advantage of the present simple model is that the drag enhancement observed in the spectra lends itself to a straightforward interpretation. The standard newtonian energy balance equation is now changed due to the second term in the generalized energy (3) which contributes to the dissipation a positive definite term of the form $(\nu_p/\tau^2)P^2(B)\sum_n |B_n|^2$. Thus the energy balance




FIG. 2: Probability distribution function of $\Re(u_{15})$ for the Sabra (squares) and the SabraP (triangles) models. The forcing is shown in Eq. (4).

equation reads

$$\tilde{F} = \epsilon + (\nu_p/\tau^2)P^2(B)\sum_n |B_n|^2 + \mu \sum_n k_n^{-4}|u_n|^2, \quad (8)$$

where

$$\epsilon = \nu \sum_n k_n^4 |u_n|^2 \quad (9)$$

is the dissipation due to hyper viscosity. In 3-dimensional turbulence the dissipation is independent of the viscosity ν (This fact is known in the jargon as “the viscous anomaly”). In the present case where the energy flux reverses direction ϵ vanishes in the limit $\nu \rightarrow 0$, and for large Reynolds numbers can be neglected [12]. Observing the fact that the last sum in (8) is strongly dominated by the forcing scale k_f we can safely estimate

$$|u_f|^2 \approx \frac{Ck_f^4}{\mu} \left[\tilde{F} - (\nu_p/\tau^2)P^2(B)\sum_n |B_n|^2 \right], \quad (10)$$

where C is a constant of the order of unity. The first term in the parenthesis represents the Sabra value of $|u_f|^2$. The subtraction of the positive definite second term is the explanation of the observed spectra in Fig. 1.

Another phenomenon that was discovered in the experiments and the direct numerical simulations is a significant change in the pdf’s of the velocity fluctuations. We demonstrate that the same phenomenon is recaptured in our SabraP model, showing that it is generic to the interaction with the B field. In Fig. 2 we present the probability distribution functions (pdf) of u_n for $n = 15$, which is within the bulk of the direct enstrophy cascade. The qualitative change in the pdf is obvious. We quantify




FIG. 3: Probability distribution function of $\Re(u_{10})$ with Gaussian forcing on level 10, 11. Symbols are as in Fig. 2. Fitting a stretched exponential tails (cf. Eq. (11)) we find exponents 2 ± 0.15 and 1.59 ± 0.2 for the Sabra and SabraP models respectively.

the difference by fitting the tails of the pdf's to stretched exponential forms

$$p[\Re(u_n)] \sim \exp(-\beta[\Re(u_n)]^{-\alpha_n}) \quad \text{for } \Re(u_n) > \sigma_n, \quad (11)$$

where $\sigma_n \equiv \sqrt{\langle |u_n|^2 \rangle}$. We find $\alpha_{15} \approx 3.45 \pm 0.15$ and $\alpha_{15} \approx 1.85 \pm 0.2$ for the Sabra and SabraP models respectively. We note that in [2] the forcing was Gaussian. We repeated our simulations for a Gaussian force and found results in correspondence with [2], see Fig. 3. The change in pdf's indicates that the coupling to the B -field results in increased intermittency. This can be quantified by measuring the scaling exponents of the standard structure functions $S_q(k_n)$,

$$S_q(k_n) \equiv \langle |u_n|^q \rangle \sim k_n^{\zeta_q}. \quad (12)$$

Indeed, the scaling exponents of the SabraP models are significantly more nonlinear (as a function of q) than the corresponding exponents of the Sabra model, cf. Fig. 4.

The simplicity of our model again allows us to offer a qualitative understanding of the increased intermittency. Focus on the Lumley scale k_c , Eq. 7. We denote $u_c = u(k_c)$ and $B_c = B(k_c)$. The total “energy” of the B field will be denoted by Q where $Q = \sum_n |B_n|^2$. In light of the spectrum shown in Fig. 1 we can estimate $Q \approx |B_c|^2$ up to coefficients of the order of unity. The flux of energy from the flow to the polymer is proportional to $k_c Q u_c$. cf. Eq. 2. Therefore we can write an approximate equation, in which we disregard the difference between complex numbers and their moduli:

$$\frac{dQ}{dt} \approx -\frac{Q}{\tau} + Q k_c u_c. \quad (13)$$




FIG. 4: Scaling exponents ζ_q for the Sabra (solid line) and SabraP (dashed line) models. The increased intermittency in the SabraP model is exhibited by the increased nonlinearity of ζ_q as a function of q .




FIG. 5: Probability distribution function of the quantity Q , see text for details.

From this equation we see that, because $k_c u_c \approx 1/\tau$, that the fluctuations of Q are expected to be very strong. Moreover, even if u_c in Eq. (13) were a Gaussian process, Q would turn out to be log-normally distributed, due to the multiplicative role of u_c in Eq. (13). Indeed, a direct measurement of the distribution of Q , see Fig. 5, confirms the existence of the anomalously long tail in this pdf. Finally, due to Eq. (10), we see that an anomalous tail in Q would directly induce an anomalous tail in the pdf of u_f , as seen in the simulations. Finally, it is interesting to ask whether in 2-dimensional flows we can have *enstrophy* drag reduction, since this quadratic

invariant replaces the energy as the quantity cascaded to smaller scales. In our model this is impossible; our forcing with constant energy flux also produces a constant enstrophy flux, and as can be seen from Eq. (5), the enstrophy is dominated by the larger scales (small k_n). Thus the reduction in energy is accompanied with the reduction of enstrophy. To switch the role of the scales to get the enstrophy to be dominated by the small scales (large k_n) requires changing b to compensate for the decrease of $|u_n|^2$ with increasing k_n . It is easy to check however that the change of roles occurs precisely at the value of b where the inverse cascade of energy disappears, i.e. $b = -1 - 2^{-2/3}$. We thus cannot have enstrophy drag reduction in this model, and in our opinion neither in the 2-dimensional Navier-Stokes case.

In summary, we conclude that the results observed for the effects of dilute polymers on 2-dimensional turbulence, as observed in experiments and direct numerical simulations, can be readily understood with a simple model of viscoelastic flows once the cascade of energy is inverted. The same model exhibits drag reduction when the parameters allow a direct energy cascade. These observations lend further support for the use of shell models as simple and transparent tools for understanding a variety of turbulent phenomena that remain more obscure when the full hydrodynamics equations are employed.

This work was supported in part by the European Commission under a TMR grant, the Minerva Foundation, Munich, Germany, and the US-Israel Binational Sci-

ence Foundation.

-
- [1] Y. Amarouchene and H. Kellay, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** 104502-1 (2002)
 - [2] G. Boffetta, A. Celani and S. Musacchio, arXiv:nlin.CD/0303008v1
 - [3] P.S. Virk, AIChE J. **21**, 625 (1975); Nature **253**, 109 (1975).
 - [4] K. R. Sreenivasan and C. M. White, J. Fluid Mech. **409**, 149 (2000).
 - [5] E. de Angelis, C. Casciola, R. Benzi, and R. Piva, Phys. of Fluids, submitted.
 - [6] R. Benzi, E. De Angelis, R. Govindarajan and I. Procaccia, "Shell Model for Drag Reduction with Polymer Additive in Homogeneous Turbulence", Phys. Rev. E, submitted.
 - [7] R. Benzi, E. S.C. Ching, N. Horesh and I.r Procaccia, "Theory of concentration dependence in drag reduction by polymers and of the MDR asymptote", Phys. Rev. Lett, submitted.
 - [8] R.B. Bird, C.F. Curtiss, R.C. Armstrong and O. Hassager, *Dynamics of Polymeric Fluids Vol.2* (Wiley, NY 1987).
 - [9] V.S. L'vov, E. Podivilov, A. Pomyalov, I. Procaccia and D. Vandembroucq., Phys. Rev. E **58** 1811 (1998).
 - [10] T. Gilbert, V. S. L'vov, A. Pomyalov, and I. Procaccia, Phys. Rev. Lett., **89**, 074501 (2002).
 - [11] J. L. Lumley, Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech. **1**, 367 (1969).
 - [12] G. Boffetta, A. Celani, S. Musacchio and M. Vergassola, Phys. Rev. E, **66**, 026304 (2002).