Lyapunov exponent for inertial particles in the 2D Kraichnan model as a problem of Anderson localization with complex valued potential

Péter Horvai*†

December 23, 2021

arXiv:nlin/0511023v1 [nlin.CD] 14 Nov 2005

Abstract

We exploit the analogy between dynamics of inertial particle pair separation in a random-in-time flow and the Anderson model of a quantum particle on the line in a spatially random real-valued potential. Thereby we get an exact formula for the Lyapunov exponent of pair separation in a special case, and we are able to generalize the class of solvable models slightly, for potentials that are real up to a global complex multiplier. A further important result for inertial particle behavior, supported by analytical computations in some cases and by numerics more generally, is that of the decay of the Lyapunov exponent with large Stokes number (quotient of particle relaxation and flow turn-over time-scales) as $St^{-2/3}$.

Contents

1 Introduction **3**

2 Smooth Kraichnan velocity field **3**
- 2.1 The strain matrix . . . 3
- 2.2 Strain matrix correlation tensor . . . 4
- 2.3 Translation invariance . . . 5
- 2.4 Isotropy . . . 5
- 2.5 Diagonalization, positivity . . . 5
- 2.6 The 2D case with broken symmetries . . . 6

3 Inertial particles in the linearized flow **7**
- 3.1 Basic equation . . . 7
- 3.2 Anderson localization form . . . 8
- 3.3 Analytical form . . . 9
- 3.4 Passing to an SDE . . . 9
- 3.5 Whatever convention (Itō etc.) . . . 9
- 3.6 The Markov process generated by the SDE . . . 10
- 3.7 Reducing the dimension of the driving noise . . . 10
- 3.8 An even stronger reduction . . . 11
- 3.9 A solvable case . . . 13

*Work done at Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Italy
†New address at University of Warwick, UK

4 The 2D case **14**
4.1 Passing to the complex notation in 2D . . . 14
4.2 An other solvable case . . . 15
4.3 Decay of Lyapunov exponent at large Stokes numbers . . . 16

5 Other solvable 2D flows **16**
5.1 Solvable flows . . . 17
5.2 Calculation of the Lyapunov exponent . . . 18

6 Numerical results **21**
6.1 Naive simulation of inertial particle separation . . . 21
6.2 Estimates of $\vec{v}$ and of the change of $\vec{r}$ during a time interval Δt . . . 21
6.3 Integrating $\mathrm{d}\log r^2$ . . . 22
6.4 Overcoming stiffness . . . 22
6.5 Extrapolation from moments of positive even order . . . 24

7 On some conjectured formulae in 2D **24**

8 Conclusions **25**

A Constant $\vec{r}$ approximation **25**

B The $\tau \to 0$ limit **26**

C Stratonovich convention for linearized velocity? **27**

D Positive even order moments of pair separation **27**
D.1 Arbitrary dimensions . . . 27
D.2 Simplified version in 2D . . . 28

1 Introduction

We propose in this paper to study evolution of inertial particle pair separation in a smooth random flow. The dynamics of pair separation, through a very simple change of variables, is equivalent to the Anderson localization problem [6] of a quantum particle in one-dimensional space with random potential, with the twist that the potential is not necessarily a real-valued function. This analogy permits us to calculate explicitly, in certain situations, the Lyapunov exponent of inertial particle pair separation. In our slightly generalized Anderson problem with complex potential, we find some additional cases when the Lyapunov exponent may be computed analytically. The article treats the topic from the viewpoint of inertial particles, but some results could also be interesting for the Anderson localization problem.

Understanding the behavior of inertial particles, and more specifically aerosols (tiny liquid or solid particles in a gas), has several important applications. For example rain formation inside clouds depends on collisions of water droplets [3], and a better understanding of this process is needed for reliable weather forecasts. We may also mention internal combustion engines (oil droplets, coal powder) where knowledge of particle behavior helps to optimize design. Since we will mostly study here the two dimensional situation, let us also mention the problem of particles floating on the free surface of a liquid, such as the surface of the ocean [10].

The Lyapunov exponent of particle separation is one of the most fundamental quantities describing relative motion of close-by particles. Finer details require knowledge of the distribution of finite-time Lyapunov exponents, which would permit to predict such things as collision rate of particles [2], to give an example. This paper is a first step in this direction.

Let us outline the plan of the paper. First we give a presentation of the smooth Kraichnan flow in which our particles shall evolve. We then describe dynamics of inertial particles and in particular of pair separation, which we reduce to a two-dimensional problem. After that we treat the special case of genuinely 2D flows. Later we exhibit some additional solvable cases which generalize that of the classical Anderson model. We then come to results of numerical simulations that sustain our findings and finally discuss inexactness of Piterbarg's formula in [10] as compared with numerics.

This paper also gives a review of the topic from the point of view of inertial particles, so that results already known are rederived within this framework and with our notations, thus serving possibly as reference for further investigation in this direction. Effort was made to give detailed and clear calculations.

The author would like to thank Krzysztof Gawędzki for sharing his ideas on the problem and pointing out the relationship with the Anderson model. Lot of credit goes to Alexander Fouxon, who collaborated in this work, details of which are to appear in a common paper [5]; this collaboration was made possible thanks to the European Network: "Fluid mechanical stirring and mixing: the Lagrangian approach". The author is grateful to Angelo Vulpiani who offered the postdoc position and grant (funded by COFIN 2003: "Statistical description of complex systems and systems with many electrons") while this work was prepared at the TNT group at the Physics Department of the Università di Roma "La Sapienza".

2 Smooth Kraichnan velocity field

2.1 The strain matrix

We consider a smooth Kraichnan velocity field. At small scale it may be linearized so that velocity increments behave like

$$\vec{U}(\vec{R}+\vec{r},t)-\vec{U}(\vec{R},t)=(\vec{r}.\vec{\nabla}_{\vec{R}})\vec{U}(\vec{R},t)=r_j\partial_j U_i(\vec{R},t)\vec{e}_i$$

($\vec{e}_i$ are unit vectors of the chosen basis. Also note the convention that we use uppercase R, U for absolute position and speed while later we will use lowercase r, v for the relative position and speed

of two particles.) It is convenient to introduce the velocity gradient matrix, also called strain matrix:

$$\sigma_{ij}(\vec{R},t) \equiv \partial_j U_i(\vec{R},t) \tag{1}$$

in order to write $\vec{U}(\vec{R}+\vec{r},t) - \vec{U}(\vec{R},t) = \sigma(\vec{R},t)\vec{r}$.

2.2 Strain matrix correlation tensor

In the Kraichnan model the velocity field U is a Gaussian, white-in-time vector field, also called Brownian vector field. We suppose $\sigma(\vec{R},t)$ to be a mean zero process (for all $\vec{R},t$), so that it is completely determined by its second moment $\langle \sigma(\vec{R},t) \otimes \sigma(\vec{R}',t') \rangle$, which is proportional to $\delta(t-t')$, because of the white-in-time hypothesis.

What will be important for us in tracking particle pair separation is the statistics of the strain matrix along the trajectory of the reference particle, as can be seen from (16). Suppose that the reference particle follows the trajectory $\vec{R}(t)$, which we shall always suppose *continuous*. Then define

$$\sigma(t) = \sigma(\vec{R}(t),t) \tag{2}$$

Since the matrix field σ is centered Gaussian delta-correlated in time, the same will hold for $\sigma(t)$. Thus it is enough to know the equal-time two-point function of $\sigma(t)$ to completely characterize it. In fact we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma(t) \otimes \sigma(t') \rangle &= \langle \sigma(\vec{R}(t),t) \otimes \sigma(\vec{R}(t'),t') \rangle \\ &= \langle \sigma(\vec{R}(t),t) \otimes \sigma(\vec{R}(t),t') \rangle \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where the first equality follows from the definition (2) of $\sigma(t)$, and the second equality holds because the correlator on its left hand side being proportional to $\delta(t-t')$, one may replace $\vec{R}(t')$ by $\vec{R}(t)$, since we suppose $\vec{R}(t)$ continuous in t and we suppose the two-point correlator of the field σ to be continuous in the spatial variable.

Let us now introduce the equal-time equal-position correlation tensor $C_{ik,jl}$ of the field σ, which may be defined through the equality

$$\langle \sigma_{ik}(\vec{R},t) \sigma_{jl}(\vec{R},t') \rangle = \delta(t-t')\, C_{ik,jl} \tag{4}$$

Since we suppose the statistics of the field σ homogeneous in space and time, $C_{ik,jl}$ is a constant independent of position and time. In Sect. 2.6 we point out that for the velocity field $\vec{U}$ it is enough to have spatially homogeneous increments, without $\vec{U}$ itself being spatially homogeneous, for σ to be homogeneous in the position variable.

Combining (3) and (4) we have

$$\langle \sigma_{ik}(t) \sigma_{jl}(t') \rangle = \delta(t-t')\, C_{ik,jl} \tag{5}$$

In the setup of the Kraichnan model, where $\sigma(t)$ is Gaussian white noise in time, it is often better to introduce and use

$$\mathrm{d}S = \sigma(t)\mathrm{d}t \tag{6}$$

and then we can talk about the covariance (better called *covariance process* in the mathematical literature) of $\mathrm{d}S$ and write the more correct

$$\langle \mathrm{d}S_{ik}, \mathrm{d}S_{jl} \rangle = C_{ik,jl}\, \mathrm{d}t$$

The covariance of $\sigma(t)$ may be derived from the velocity two-point function $\langle U_i(\vec{R},t) U_j(\vec{R}',t') \rangle$ as

$$\langle \sigma_{ik}(\vec{R},t) \sigma_{jl}(\vec{R},t') \rangle = \langle (\partial_k U_i(\vec{R},t))(\partial_l U_j(\vec{R},t')) \rangle \tag{7}$$

$$= \partial_{R_k} \partial_{R'_l} \langle U_i(\vec{R},t) U_j(\vec{R}',t') \rangle |_{\vec{R}'=\vec{R}} \tag{8}$$

2.3 Translation invariance

Supposing spatial homogeneity of the velocity statistics, which may be expressed as

$$\langle U_i(\vec{R},t)U_j(\vec{R}',t')\rangle = \delta(t-t')D_{ij}(\vec{R}-\vec{R}')$$

for some tensor-valued function D, permits to further write (8) as

$$\langle \sigma_{ik}(\vec{R},t)\sigma_{jl}(\vec{R},t')\rangle = -\delta(t-t')(\partial_k\partial_l D_{ij})(\vec{0})$$

which in particular, upon substitution into (4), leads to the relationship

$$C_{ik,jl} = -(\partial_k\partial_l D_{ij})(\vec{0}) \tag{9}$$

We thus arrive at the important conclusion that if the statistics of the velocity field $\vec{U}$ is spatially homogeneous, then $C_{ik,jl}$ is symmetric under exchange of k with l, or equivalently of i with j, since the symmetry under simultaneous exchange of both pairs is granted by the definition (4).

Note however that one can imagine flows where, at least in some bounded region of space, statistics of σ *is* homogeneous but that of the velocity field $\vec{U}$ is *not*. For example a uniformly expanding flow is like that. To give examples of such a flow, one can imagine either the surface flow of some liquid with adequate up- and down-welling in some region, or the surface of a bubble which grows and shrinks in time (but that is a curved surface, and we do not pretend to treat that situation in this paper), or perhaps a flat film whose boundary is attached to a growing and shrinking ring.

2.4 Isotropy

Coming back to the case when the velocity field *is* spatially homogeneous, if furthermore we suppose it isotropic and not breaking parity symmetry (defined here as orthogonal transformations of determinant -1), we have the second-order development for D (the velocity field is smooth!)

$$D_{ij}(\vec{r}) \approx D_0\delta_{ij} - D_1[(d+1-2\wp)\delta_{ij}r^2 + 2(\wp d-1)r_ir_j] + o(r^2)$$

where $\wp$ is the compressibility degree [4] of the flow and D_1 is a dimensional constant of dimension time^{-1}. Hence, from (9)

$$C_{ik,jl} = -(\partial_k\partial_l D_{ij})(\vec{0}) = 2D_1[(d+1-2\wp)\delta_{ij}\delta_{kl} + (\wp d-1)(\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}+\delta_{il}\delta_{jk})]$$

2.5 Diagonalization, positivity

As a side note, it is interesting to see that $C_{ik,jl}$ is indeed a positive matrix, and if we wanted to generate σ from independent white noises, it would be useful also to be able to diagonalize $C_{ik,jl}$. We start with the latter, and criteria for positivity will be obvious then.

Consider $C_{ik,jl}$ as the matrix of a linear transformation acting on $d\times d$ matrices by

$$\sigma_{jl} \mapsto \sigma_{ik} = C_{ik,jl}\sigma_{jl} \tag{10}$$

We identify three terms in $C_{ik,jl}$, namely $\delta_{ij}\delta_{kl}$, $\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}$ and $\delta_{il}\delta_{jk}$. The first one is clearly the identity, which we shall conveniently denote Id. The second acts as $M \mapsto (\operatorname{tr} M)1_d$, (where 1_{d} is the $d\times d$ identity matrix, that is $\mathrm{diag}_d(1,\ldots,1)$) and we shall call it Tr. The third acts as transposition and we will call it Tp.

From this it is clear that the three operators Id, Tr and Tp commute mutually and thus may be diagonalized in a common basis. It is also straightforward to find this basis: use as eigenspaces the

space 'asym' of anti-symmetric matrices, the space 'sym0' of symmetric traceless matrices, and 'scal' of scalar matrices. We have the following eigenvalue structure:

	Id	Tr	Tp	$C_{ik,jl}$
asym	1	0	-1	$2D_1(d+2)(1-\wp)$
sym0	1	0	1	$2D_1[(d-2)(\wp+1)+2]$
scal	1	d	1	$2D_1\wp(d+2)(d-1)$

For $C_{ik,jl}$ to be positive on each eigenspace we get thus, supposing $d \geq 2$ and $D_1 > 0$, the necessary and sufficient condition $0 \leq \wp \leq 1$.

Since the correlation matrix $C_{ik,jl}$ is symmetric, it can be diagonalized in a basis which is orthonormal with respect to the scalar product induced by the identity matrix, which here means $\delta_{ij}\delta_{kl}$ (see that this tensor is equal to 1 exactly when the ordered pairs (i,k) and (j,l) coincide, and equal to 0 otherwise), and this scalar product is simply the sum of products of corresponding matrix elements, formally given by $(\sigma,\sigma') = \sigma_{ik}\sigma'_{ik}$. In order to generate a (vector-valued) Gaussian random variable with covariance matrix $C_{ik,jl}$, it is enough to multiply each element (an eigenvector) of a given orthonormal diagonalizing basis of $C_{ik,jl}$ by the square-root of the corresponding eigenvalue and by an independent (for each basis element) standard normal random variable.

In the case of $d = 2$ dimensions, we can choose the following orthonormal diagonalizing basis:

asym	sym0		scal
$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$

(11)

In the case of $d = 3$ dimensions, we can choose the following orthonormal diagonalizing basis:

asym	sym0		scal
$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	
$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix}$		

2.6 The 2D case with broken symmetries

It is interesting to study more in detail the case of two-dimensional flows where the velocity field's statistics' translation invariance or parity invariance or both are not assumed. We will however still assume isotropy.

As mentioned in Sect. 2.3, translation invariance is broken if we don't have the symmetry of $C_{ik,jl}$ under exchange of k with l, or equivalently of i with j. This allows us to have different coefficients for $\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}$ and $\delta_{il}\delta_{jk}$ in $C_{ik,jl}$.

Not supposing parity invariance allows for introduction of an additional term in $C_{ik,jl}$, which can be written as $\epsilon_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \epsilon_{jl}\delta_{ik}$ (recall that simultaneous exchange of i with j and of k with l has to leave $C_{ik,jl}$ invariant). Other expressions of the kind (one ϵ and one δ) give either a zero tensor or the same one (up to a possible sign change). In particular (see next paragraph for idea of simple proof)

$$\epsilon_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \epsilon_{jl}\delta_{ik} = \epsilon_{il}\delta_{jk} + \epsilon_{jk}\delta_{il}$$

so that this term does not lead to breaking spatial homogeneity of the velocity field. Expressions with two ϵ can be expressed with δs only.

The covariance matrix $C_{ik,jl}$ is completely characterized by its action as defined in (10), and this action is linear. In particular it can be expressed as a matrix in the basis of 2×2 matrices of (11). For convenience, we order the basis elements as follows: the first two are those in sym0 , the third is of asym and the fourth is that of scal. Then we have the following actions:

$\delta_{ij}\delta_{kl}$	$\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}$	$\delta_{il}\delta_{jk}$	$\epsilon_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \epsilon_{jl}\delta_{ik}$
$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$

This representation is convenient also for finding identities between different expressions. For example we have the action

$$\epsilon_{ik}\epsilon_{jl} \quad : \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

from which we see that

$$\epsilon_{ik}\epsilon_{jl} = \delta_{ij}\delta_{kl} - \delta_{il}\delta_{jk} \tag{12}$$

Our next task is to find out when is $C_{ik,jl}$, constructed from the above four tensors, a positive matrix. For this, we see first that in general (for generic coefficients $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$) we have the action

$$a\delta_{ij}\delta_{kl} + b\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl} + c\delta_{il}\delta_{jk} + d(\epsilon_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \epsilon_{jl}\delta_{ik}) \ : \ \begin{pmatrix} a+c & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a+c & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a-c & 2d \\ 0 & 0 & 2d & a+2b+c \end{pmatrix}$$

The necessary and sufficient condition for $C_{ik,jl}$ to be positive is that all eigenvalues of the above matrix are positive. These eigenvalues are readily found to be

$$a + c \quad \text{(twice)}, \qquad a + b \pm \sqrt{(b+c)^2 + 4d^2}$$

The term under the square-root is always positive, and since the square-root itself is defined to be positive, it is enough to retain the two criteria

$$a + c \geq 0 \tag{13}$$

$$a + b - \sqrt{(b+c)^2 + 4d^2} \geq 0 \tag{14}$$

as necessary and sufficient for $C_{ik,jl}$ to be positive.

3 Inertial particles in the linearized flow

3.1 Basic equation

Let us turn to the inertial particles. An inertial particle is one whose velocity does not necessarily coincide with the speed of the fluid flow surrounding the particle. Instead its velocity relaxes to the latter by viscous friction, at an exponential rate whose time coefficient is the Stokes time, which we shall denote τ.

It is not completely clear what equation to use to describe inertial particles. The work of Maxey and Riley [7] is often cited and ad hoc simplifications of their formula are made. Also the fact that

describing particle separation is a different matter from describing single-particle motion is mostly neglected. Here we shall admit that for very heavy particles (the case of aerosols) the following equation is a good approximation both for particle movement and for extracting from it the equation on particle separation. Formally, we thus take a system where inertial particle evolution is described by the very simple equation:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\vec{R}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \vec{V}, \qquad \frac{\mathrm{d}\vec{V}}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{1}{\tau}(\vec{V} - \vec{U}(\vec{R}, t)) \tag{15}$$

Remark that, in the case of the Kraichnan model, (15) is in fact a stochastic differential equation (an SDE; see Sect. 3.4 for a justification of why (15) is an SDE: the idea is illustrated on (16)), so in principle we should also specify what interpretation (Itō , Stratonovich, etc.) we take, but arguments of Sect. 3.5 apply here too to show that the particular interpretation convention doesn't matter.

Eq. (15) gives for the infinitesimal separation $\vec{r}$ and relative velocity $\vec{v}$ of two (infinitesimally separated) particles:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\vec{r}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \vec{v}, \qquad \frac{\mathrm{d}\vec{v}}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{1}{\tau}(\vec{v} - \sigma(t)\vec{r}) \tag{16}$$

where $\sigma(t)$ is as defined in (2), and in particular depends on the trajectory $\vec{R}(t)$ of the reference particle, so that in principle (16) is not autonomous and should be coupled to (15). But for the purpose of calculating *statistical averages* of the particle separation it is quite enough to know just the *distribution* of the process $\sigma(t)$. As was already discussed in Sect. 2.2, in the case of a Kraichnan velocity field the process $\sigma(t)$ is centered Gaussian white noise with two-point function given by (5), and this is all that we need to know. Once again, for the Kraichnan velocity field, (16) is an SDE, and again interpretation convention doesn't matter, as developed in Sect. 3.4 and 3.5.

3.2 Anderson localization form

The two first-order differential equations of (16) can be combined to one second-order on $\vec{r}$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\vec{r}}{\mathrm{d}t^2} = -\frac{1}{\tau}\frac{\mathrm{d}\vec{r}}{\mathrm{d}t} + \frac{\sigma}{\tau}\vec{r}$$

or, introducing $\vec{\psi}(t) = e^{t/2\tau}\,\vec{r}$ to eliminate the first-order term:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\vec{\psi}}{\mathrm{d}t^2} = \left(\frac{1}{4\tau^2} + \frac{\sigma}{\tau}\right)\vec{\psi}$$

Introduce

$$E = -1/4\tau^2 \ \text{ (energy)}, \qquad V = \sigma/\tau \ \text{ (matrix white-noise potential)}, \tag{17}$$

consider t to be position rather than time, and we have the Schrödinger eigenvalue equation associated to the Anderson localization problem (though the wave function $\vec{\psi}$ takes values in $\mathbb{R}^d$ not simply in $\mathbb{R}$, and the potential V is accordingly matrix valued, not simply real):

$$-\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\vec{\psi}}{\mathrm{d}t^2} + V\vec{\psi} = E\vec{\psi} \tag{18}$$

This analogy between the system (16) and the Anderson model is hinted at (and used) in [9].

In the one-dimensional case (our $d = 1$), the Lyapunov exponent associated to the growth-rate of $|\vec{\psi}|$ (more exactly of $\sqrt{\vec{\psi}^2 + \vec{\psi}'^2}$) is known (cf. Sect. 3.9), but generally not in the multi-dimensional case.

3.3 Analytical form

The equation of evolution may also be written for matrices $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ instead of particle separations $\vec{r}$ and $\vec{v}$:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathcal{R}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \mathcal{V}, \qquad \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathcal{V}}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{1}{\tau}(\mathcal{V} - \sigma(t)\mathcal{R})$$

where every corresponding column of $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ correspond to a couple $\vec{r}$ and $\vec{v}$, evolving in the same velocity field but independently of the other columns.

It is straightforward to see that the matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} = \mathcal{V}\mathcal{R}^{-1}$ verifies the first-order equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^2 - \frac{1}{\tau}\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} + \frac{\sigma}{\tau}$$

since for any matrix-valued function $\mathrm{d}\mathcal{R}^{-1} = -\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\mathcal{R})\mathcal{R}^{-1}$. We may also introduce $\mathcal{Z} = \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} + 1/2\tau$ and write

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathcal{Z}}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\mathcal{Z}^2 + \frac{1}{4\tau^2} + \frac{\sigma}{\tau}$$

3.4 Passing to an SDE

Since $\sigma(t)$ is a finite-dimensional Gaussian process, it may be represented as linear combinations of a finite number (at most d^2) of independent white noises. Denoting the latter by $\underline{\mathrm{d}w}$ (with $\langle \mathrm{d}w_i, \mathrm{d}w_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}\mathrm{d}t$) clearly we may write, for some (not necessarily square) matrix $B(\vec{r})$

$$\tau^{-1}\sigma(t)\vec{r} = B(\vec{r})\,\underline{\mathrm{d}w}/\mathrm{d}t$$

or equivalently

$$\tau^{-1}\mathrm{d}S\vec{r} = B(\vec{r})\,\underline{\mathrm{d}w} \tag{19}$$

With this in mind, we may write the block-matrix form equation

$$\mathrm{d}\begin{pmatrix}\vec{r}\\ \vec{v}\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}\vec{v}\\ -\frac{1}{\tau}\vec{v}\end{pmatrix}\mathrm{d}t + \begin{pmatrix}0\\ B(\vec{r})\end{pmatrix}\underline{\mathrm{d}w} \tag{20}$$

The merit of this formulation is that we immediately see that we have a stochastic differential equation.

3.5 Whatever convention (Itō etc.)

Furthermore it doesn't matter what convention (Itō , etc.) we use to interpret (20), as we shall now show. Indeed, write the generic equation

$$\mathrm{d}\vec{X} = \vec{A}\mathrm{d}t + M\underline{\mathrm{d}w} \tag{21}$$

where $\vec{A}$ and B depend on $\vec{X}$. Then from passing from Itō to Stratonovich convention, we have the additional term $\frac{1}{2}\langle(((M\underline{\mathrm{d}w}).\vec{\nabla})M)\underline{\mathrm{d}w}\rangle$, easier to develop in coordinate notation:

$$\frac{1}{2}\langle M_{ij}\mathrm{d}w_j(\partial_i M_{kl})\mathrm{d}w_l\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(M_{ij}\partial_i M_{kl})\langle \mathrm{d}w_j\mathrm{d}w_l\rangle = \frac{1}{2}M_{ij}\partial_i M_{kj}\,\mathrm{d}t$$

since $\langle \mathrm{d}w_j\mathrm{d}w_l\rangle = \delta_{jl}\mathrm{d}t$. It is easy to check that in our case the above is 0 since $M_{ij}\partial_i$ will only involve derivatives with respect to $\vec{v}$ whereas M_{kj} depends only on $\vec{r}$.

The same reasoning as above applies to single-particle motion described by (15). It is then interesting to note that the $\tau \to 0$ limit may be taken and we thus get a *unique* convention both for the passive tracer particle and the separation of such particles, which can be seen to be the Itō convention (cf. Appendix B). In other words, in a Kraichnan flow a passive tracer that is the $\tau \to 0$ limit of an inertial particle is solution of the advection SDE with Itō convention.

3.6 The Markov process generated by the SDE

Now let us look at the Markov process generated by an SDE of form (21). We may write the probability density function of $\vec{X}$ as $P(\vec{x}) = \langle\delta(\vec{X}-\vec{x})\rangle$, and use the Itō formula

$$\mathrm{d}f(\vec{X}) = \mathrm{d}X_i(\partial_i f)(\vec{X}) + \frac{1}{2}\langle \mathrm{d}X_i \mathrm{d}X_j\rangle(\partial_i\partial_j)f(\vec{X})$$

to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d}P(\vec{x}) &= \mathrm{d}\langle\delta(\vec{X}-\vec{x})\rangle = \langle\mathrm{d}\delta(\vec{X}-\vec{x})\rangle \\ &= -A_i\partial_{x_i}\langle\delta(\vec{X}-\vec{x})\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle M_{ik}\mathrm{d}w_k M_{jl}\mathrm{d}w_l\rangle\partial_{x_i}\partial_{x_j}\langle\delta(\vec{X}-\vec{x})\rangle \\ &= \left[-A_i(\partial_i P)(\vec{x}) + \frac{1}{2}M_{ik}M_{jk}(\partial_i\partial_j P)(\vec{x})\right]\mathrm{d}t\end{aligned}$$

since $\langle \mathrm{d}w_k \mathrm{d}w_l\rangle = \delta_{kl}\mathrm{d}t$. Thus for the Markov process generated by the SDE (21) it is not M and w itself that are important, but only $M_{ik}M_{jk}$, in other words MM^T, so that (21) may be replaced by the effective equation

$$\mathrm{d}\vec{X} = \vec{A}\mathrm{d}t + \tilde{M}\underline{\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}} \tag{22}$$

for some driving noise $\underline{\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}}$, not necessarily of the same dimension as $\underline{\mathrm{d}w}$, with $\langle \mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_i \mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_j\rangle = \delta_{ij}\mathrm{d}t$. Note how this fixes only the number of rows of $\tilde{M}$ (to be the same as the dimension of $\vec{X}$), but not the number of its columns.

3.7 Reducing the dimension of the driving noise

Applying the general considerations of the preceding section to our case, with the particular form (20) of (21), i.e. having

$$\vec{X} = \begin{pmatrix}\vec{r}\\ \vec{v}\end{pmatrix} \qquad \vec{A} = \begin{pmatrix}\vec{v}\\ -\frac{1}{\tau}\vec{v}\end{pmatrix} \qquad M = \begin{pmatrix}0\\ B(\vec{r})\end{pmatrix}$$

we have

$$MM^T = \begin{pmatrix}0 & 0\\ 0 & B(\vec{r})B^T(\vec{r})\end{pmatrix}$$

and using formula (19) for $B(\vec{r})$ we get

$$(BB^T)_{ij}(\vec{r}) = B_{ik}(\vec{r})B_{jk}(\vec{r}) = \langle B_{ik}\mathrm{d}w_k B_{jl}\mathrm{d}w_l\rangle/\mathrm{d}t = \langle \mathrm{d}S_{ik}r_k \mathrm{d}S_{jl}r_l\rangle/\mathrm{d}t \tag{23}$$

$$= \tau^{-2}C_{ik,jl}r_k r_l = \frac{2D_1}{\tau^2}[(d+1-2\wp)r^2\delta_{ij} + 2(\wp d-1)r_i r_j] \tag{24}$$

We may choose any other $\tilde{B}(\vec{r})$ *with real coefficients* giving the same result, i.e. such that:

$$\tilde{B}_{ik}(\vec{r})\tilde{B}_{jk}(\vec{r}) = B_{ik}(\vec{r})B_{jk}(\vec{r}) = \tau^{-2}C_{ik,jl}r_k r_l \tag{25}$$

and use it in (22) by posing

$$\tilde{M} = \begin{pmatrix}0\\ \tilde{B}(\vec{r})\end{pmatrix}$$

Notice that for any orthogonal basis formed of $\vec{r}$ and $d-1$ other vectors of length r, whose matrix we shall denote R (i.e. the columns of R are the vectors of the basis), we have

$$BB^T = \frac{2D_1}{\tau^2}[(d+1-2\wp)RR^T + 2(\wp d-1)(R\vec{e}_1)(R\vec{e}_1)^T]$$

since $RR^T = r^2\,\mathrm{diag}_d(1,\dots,1)$ and $\vec{r} = R\vec{e}_1$; then note $\vec{e}_1\vec{e}_1^T = \mathrm{diag}_d(1,0,\dots,0)$ and get

$$BB^T = \frac{2D_1}{\tau^2} R\,\mathrm{diag}_d((2\wp+1)(d-1), d+1-2\wp, \dots, d+1-2\wp)R^T$$

(note $d+1-2\wp+2(\wp d-1) = (2\wp+1)(d-1)$) so that in particular we may take

$$\tilde{B} = R\,\mathrm{diag}_d(\sqrt{\beta_L}, \sqrt{\beta_N}, \dots, \sqrt{\beta_N}) \tag{26}$$

where we have introduced

$$\beta_L = 2\tau^{-2}D_1(2\wp+1)(d-1) \qquad \beta_N = 2\tau^{-2}D_1(d+1-2\wp) \tag{27}$$

The effective SDE we obtain for (20) is driven by a d-dimensional white-noise $\underline{\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}}$ instead of the d^2-dimensional white-noise $\underline{\mathrm{d}w}$, and is written

$$\mathrm{d}\begin{pmatrix}\vec{r}\\ \vec{v}\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}\vec{v}\\ -\frac{1}{\tau}\vec{v}\end{pmatrix}\mathrm{d}t + \begin{pmatrix}0\\ \tilde{B}(\vec{r})\end{pmatrix}\underline{\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}} \tag{28}$$

3.8 An even stronger reduction

Due to symmetries of the problem, a closed evolution equation may be written on the magnitudes and relative angle of particle separation $\vec{r}$ and relative speed $\vec{v}$. Let us begin by introducing the quantities

$$X = \vec{v}.\vec{r} \qquad Y = \vec{r}.\vec{r} \qquad Z = \vec{v}.\vec{v} \tag{29}$$

These verify the evolution equations (*note that throughout we use Itō convention to interpret the SDEs below*)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}X &= \mathrm{d}\vec{v}.\vec{r} + \vec{v}.\mathrm{d}\vec{r} = [-\frac{1}{\tau}\vec{v}.\vec{r} + \vec{v}.\vec{v}]\mathrm{d}t + \frac{1}{\tau}\vec{r}.(\mathrm{d}S\vec{r})\\
\mathrm{d}Y &= 2\vec{r}.\mathrm{d}\vec{r} = 2\vec{r}.\vec{v}\mathrm{d}t\\
\mathrm{d}Z &= 2\vec{v}.\mathrm{d}\vec{v} + \langle\mathrm{d}\vec{v}_i, \mathrm{d}\vec{v}_i\rangle = [-\frac{2}{\tau}\vec{v}.\vec{v} + \frac{2D_1}{\tau^2}(d+2)(d-1)\vec{r}.\vec{r}]\mathrm{d}t + \frac{2}{\tau}\vec{v}.(\mathrm{d}S\vec{r})
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle\mathrm{d}v_i, \mathrm{d}v_i\rangle &= \langle\mathrm{d}S_{ik}r_k, \mathrm{d}S_{il}r_l\rangle = \langle\mathrm{d}S_{ik}, \mathrm{d}S_{il}\rangle r_k r_l\\
&= C_{ik,il}\,\mathrm{d}t\,r_k r_l = 2D_1[(d+1-2\wp)d + 2(\wp d-1)]\,(\vec{r}.\vec{r})\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&= 2D_1(d+2)(d-1)\,Y\,\mathrm{d}t
\end{aligned}$$

It is convenient to introduce the new noises $\mathrm{d}\eta_1$, $\mathrm{d}\eta_2$ defined by $\mathrm{d}\eta_1 = \vec{r}.(\mathrm{d}S\vec{r})$ and $\mathrm{d}\eta_2 = \vec{v}.(\mathrm{d}S\vec{r})$. We only need to know their correlations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle\mathrm{d}\eta_1, \mathrm{d}\eta_1\rangle &= \langle\mathrm{d}S_{ik}r_i r_k, \mathrm{d}S_{jl}r_j r_l\rangle = \langle\mathrm{d}S_{ik}, \mathrm{d}S_{jl}\rangle r_i r_k r_j r_l\\
&= C_{ik,jl}\,\mathrm{d}t\,r_i r_k r_j r_l = 2D_1(2\wp+1)(d-1)\,(\vec{r}.\vec{r})^2\,\mathrm{d}t
\end{aligned}$$

In the same manner

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle\mathrm{d}\eta_2, \mathrm{d}\eta_2\rangle &= \langle\mathrm{d}S_{ik}v_i r_k, \mathrm{d}S_{jl}v_j r_l\rangle = C_{ik,jl}\,\mathrm{d}t\,v_i r_k v_j r_l\\
&= 2D_1[(d+1-2\wp)(\vec{r}.\vec{r})(\vec{v}.\vec{v}) + 2(\wp d-1)(\vec{v}.\vec{r})^2]\,\mathrm{d}t
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle\mathrm{d}\eta_1, \mathrm{d}\eta_2\rangle &= \langle\mathrm{d}S_{ik}r_i r_k, \mathrm{d}S_{jl}v_j r_l\rangle = C_{ik,jl}\,\mathrm{d}t\,r_i r_k v_j r_l\\
&= 2D_1(2\wp+1)(d-1)\,(\vec{v}.\vec{r})(\vec{r}.\vec{r})\,\mathrm{d}t
\end{aligned}$$

To sum it up

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}X &= [-\frac{1}{\tau}X + Z]\mathrm{d}t + \frac{1}{\tau}\mathrm{d}\eta_1 \\
\mathrm{d}Y &= 2X\mathrm{d}t \\
\mathrm{d}Z &= [-\frac{2}{\tau}Z + \frac{2D_1}{\tau^2}(d+2)(d-1)Y]\mathrm{d}t + \frac{2}{\tau}\mathrm{d}\eta_2
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathrm{d}\eta_1, \mathrm{d}\eta_1 \rangle &= 2D_1(2\wp+1)(d-1)\,Y^2\,\mathrm{d}t \\
\langle \mathrm{d}\eta_2, \mathrm{d}\eta_2 \rangle &= 2D_1[(d+1-2\wp)YZ + 2(\wp d-1)X^2]\,\mathrm{d}t \\
\langle \mathrm{d}\eta_1, \mathrm{d}\eta_2 \rangle &= 2D_1(2\wp+1)(d-1)\,XY\,\mathrm{d}t
\end{aligned}$$

We can now go on by introducing

$$A = X/Y \qquad\qquad B = Z/Y \tag{30}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}A = \mathrm{d}\frac{X}{Y} &= \frac{1}{Y}\mathrm{d}X - \frac{X}{Y^2}\mathrm{d}Y = (-\frac{1}{\tau}A - 2A^2 + B)\mathrm{d}t + \frac{1}{\tau}\mathrm{d}\gamma_1 \\
\mathrm{d}B = \mathrm{d}\frac{Z}{Y} &= \frac{1}{Y}\mathrm{d}Z - \frac{Z}{Y^2}\mathrm{d}Y = [-\frac{2}{\tau}B - 2AB + \frac{2D_1}{\tau^2}(d+2)(d-1)]\mathrm{d}t + \frac{2}{\tau}\mathrm{d}\gamma_2
\end{aligned}$$

with $\mathrm{d}\gamma_1 = Y^{-1}\mathrm{d}\eta_1$ and $\mathrm{d}\gamma_2 = Y^{-1}\mathrm{d}\gamma_2$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathrm{d}\gamma_1, \mathrm{d}\gamma_1 \rangle &= 2D_1(2\wp+1)(d-1)\,\mathrm{d}t \\
\langle \mathrm{d}\gamma_2, \mathrm{d}\gamma_2 \rangle &= 2D_1[(d+1-2\wp)B + 2(\wp d-1)A^2]\,\mathrm{d}t \\
\langle \mathrm{d}\gamma_1, \mathrm{d}\gamma_2 \rangle &= 2D_1(2\wp+1)(d-1)\,A\,\mathrm{d}t
\end{aligned}$$

Introduce $C = B - A^2$. Then

$$\mathrm{d}C = \mathrm{d}B - 2A\mathrm{d}A - \langle \mathrm{d}A, \mathrm{d}A \rangle = [-\frac{2}{\tau}C - 4AC + \frac{2D_1}{\tau^2}(d-1)(d+1-2\wp)]\,\mathrm{d}t + \frac{2}{\tau}\mathrm{d}\gamma_3$$

where we have introduced $\mathrm{d}\gamma_3 = \mathrm{d}\gamma_2 - A\mathrm{d}\gamma_1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathrm{d}\gamma_3, \mathrm{d}\gamma_3 \rangle &= \langle \mathrm{d}\gamma_2, \mathrm{d}\gamma_2 \rangle + A^2\langle \mathrm{d}\gamma_1, \mathrm{d}\gamma_1 \rangle - 2A\langle \mathrm{d}\gamma_1, \mathrm{d}\gamma_2 \rangle \\
&= 2D_1(d+1-2\wp)\,C\,\mathrm{d}t \\
\langle \mathrm{d}\gamma_1, \mathrm{d}\gamma_3 \rangle &= 0
\end{aligned}$$

Finally introducing $F = C^{1/2}$ we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}F = \mathrm{d}C^{1/2} &= \frac{1}{2}C^{-1/2}\mathrm{d}C - \frac{1}{8}C^{-3/2}\langle \mathrm{d}C, \mathrm{d}C \rangle \\
&= [-(\frac{1}{\tau} + 2A)F + \frac{D_1}{\tau^2}(d-2)(d+1-2\wp)F^{-1}]\,\mathrm{d}t + \frac{1}{\tau}\mathrm{d}\gamma_4
\end{aligned}$$

with $\mathrm{d}\gamma_4 = C^{-1/2}\mathrm{d}\gamma_3$ so that

$$\langle \mathrm{d}\gamma_4, \mathrm{d}\gamma_4 \rangle = 2D_1(d+1-2\wp)\,\mathrm{d}t$$

At this point, let us introduce $z = A + iF + 1/(2\tau)$ (so the real part of z is the (signed) component of $\vec{v}$ along $\vec{r}$, divided by r and then shifted by $1/(2\tau)$, while the imaginary part of z is the norm of the component of $\vec{v}$ perpendicular to $\vec{r}$, divided by r) and $\mathrm{d}\gamma = \mathrm{d}\gamma_1 + i\mathrm{d}\gamma_4$ to have

$$\mathrm{d}z = [\frac{1}{4\tau^2} - z^2 + i\frac{D_1}{\tau^2}(d-2)(d+1-2\wp)(\Im z)^{-1}]\,\mathrm{d}t + \frac{1}{\tau}\mathrm{d}\gamma$$

with (since $\langle \mathrm{d}\gamma_1, \mathrm{d}\gamma_4 \rangle = 0$)

$$\langle \mathrm{d}\gamma, \mathrm{d}\gamma \rangle = \langle \mathrm{d}\gamma_1, \mathrm{d}\gamma_1 \rangle - \langle \mathrm{d}\gamma_4, \mathrm{d}\gamma_4 \rangle = 4D_1(\wp d - 1)\,\mathrm{d}t$$

Or, using definitions from (17) and (27), we can write

$$\mathrm{d}z = [-E - z^2 + i\frac{d-2}{2}\beta_N(\Im z)^{-1}]\,\mathrm{d}t + \mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma} \tag{31}$$

with

$$\mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma} = \mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma}_L + i\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma}_N \tag{32}$$

where $\mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma}_L$ and $\mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma}_N$ are real white noises with correlation

$$\langle \mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma}_L, \mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma}_L \rangle = \beta_L\,\mathrm{d}t \qquad \langle \mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma}_N, \mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma}_N \rangle = \beta_N\,\mathrm{d}t \qquad \langle \mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma}_L, \mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma}_N \rangle = 0 \tag{33}$$

so that in particular $\langle \mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma}, \mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma} \rangle = (\beta_L - \beta_N)\,\mathrm{d}t$. We emphasize that γ and $\tilde{\gamma}$ are Brownian motions *not* on the real line but on the complex plane, each equivalent to a two-dimensional real Brownian motion. Formula (31) (with other notations) appears in [8].

We then see that the case $d = 2$ is special since then the equation on z is analytical. For $d > 2$ the additional drift comes from the fact that we reduced the diffusion of $\vec{v}$ perpendicularly to $\vec{r}$ to its radial part, exploiting rotational symmetry around the direction of $\vec{r}$. Then we have the well known inverse-radius drift term of the radial Laplacian.

Also the case $(d + 1 - 2\wp) = 0$ is special, but as we will see in the next subsection, it is a much more particular case, since $\vec{v}$ tends to align with $\vec{r}$ so that we recover the one-dimensional situation which is explicitly solvable.

Since we also have (cf. Eqs. (29), (30))

$$\mathrm{d}\log|\vec{r}| = \frac{1}{2Y}\,\mathrm{d}Y = A\,\mathrm{d}t = \left(\Re z - \frac{1}{2\tau}\right)\mathrm{d}t$$

we have the expression for the Lyapunov exponent of particle separations

$$\lambda = \left\langle \frac{\mathrm{d}\log|\vec{r}|}{\mathrm{d}t} \right\rangle = \langle \Re z \rangle - \frac{1}{2\tau} \tag{34}$$

3.9 A solvable case

The "physical" values for β_N/β_L are those that correspond to $0 \leq \wp \leq 1$, i.e. $\frac{1}{3} \leq \beta_N/\beta_L \leq 1 + \frac{2}{d-1}$, in the sense that only these correspond to the evolution of the separation of inertial particles in a linearized Kraichnan flow. However, the reduced SDE (28) or (31) is meaningful as long as $\beta_L, \beta_N \geq 0$ (cf. respectively (26) and (33)).

The case for which the Lyapunov exponent is known is when $\beta_N = 0$, and additionally the initial condition is such that $\vec{v} \parallel \vec{r}$, as then (31) has real initial z and both the imaginary term in the drift and in the diffusion (cf. (32), (33)) disappear. We thus recover the classical Anderson localization problem: introduce $\psi = e^{t/2\tau} r$ (here $r \in \mathbb{R}$ is the signed coordinate of $\vec{r}$ along the line defined by the initial condition $\vec{r}(0)$) verifying

$$-\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\psi}{\mathrm{d}t^2} + \frac{\mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma}}{\mathrm{d}t}\psi = E\psi$$

then $z = \psi'/\psi$ verifies (31), so $\langle z \rangle$ is the growth rate of $\ln|\psi|$ which we know from the Anderson problem. Hence, recalling the simple relationship (34) between $\langle z \rangle$ and λ, the latter may be expressed in terms of the Airy functions of first and second kind, Ai and Bi respectively, and their derivatives Ai' and Bi', as

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2\tau}\left[-1 + c^{-1/2}\frac{Ai'(c)Ai(c) + Bi'(c)Bi(c)}{Ai^2(c) + Bi^2(c)}\right] \tag{35}$$

where $c = 1/[4\tau^2(\beta_L/2)^{2/3}]$.

Later on we need to examine if the $\vec{v} \parallel \vec{r}$ initial condition is really necessary for the above formula to hold. Numerical simulations of (16) (in fact of (38), which is equivalent *even in $d \neq 2$ dimensions*, since (16) reduces to (31), which for $\beta_N = 0$ is identical to (41), and the latter is derived from (38) and is sufficient to give the corresponding Lyapunov exponent) show that (at least for the examined values of parameters), this condition is irrelevant.

It is tempting then to think that this irrelevance of the initial alignment of $\vec{v}$ with $\vec{r}$ is due to the asymptotic "collapse" of $\vec{v}$ onto the direction of $\vec{r}$ at long times. In other words, that z, even if initially it has an imaginary part, can be considered to be real at large times, because it would be "attracted" to the real axis by the dynamics of its evolution. However this is *not* the case, as evidenced by numerical simulations, since $|\Re z|$ has a finite limit when $t \to \infty$, which in fact we can also calculate. The more general treatment of Sect. 5 will shed light on this and justify the expression (35) even for non-aligned initial $\vec{v}$ and $\vec{r}$.

4 The 2D case

4.1 Passing to the complex notation in 2D

Recalling Sect. 3.7 and in particular the requirement (25) (see also the last equality of (24)), we can choose for $\tilde{B}(\vec{r})$, in the 2 dimensional case, the particular form

$$\tilde{B}(\vec{r}) = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\beta_L} r_1 & -\sqrt{\beta_N} r_2 \\ \sqrt{\beta_L} r_2 & \sqrt{\beta_N} r_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$\beta_L = 2\tau^{-2} D_1 (2\wp + 1) \qquad \beta_N = 2\tau^{-2} D_1 (3 - 2\wp) \tag{36}$$

This case is special, since R (the matrix of some orthogonal basis whose first vector is $\vec{r}$; cf. Sect. 3.7) can be given as a linear function of $\vec{r}$, namely we chose above $R = (\vec{r}, O_{\pi/2}\vec{r})$, where $O_{\pi/2}$ stands for rotation by angle $\pi/2$ in the positive direction. In general there is no such linear representation (however for dimensions d that are a power of 2, the Cayley-Hamilton algebra of dimension d permits to do a similar rewriting). Then

$$\tilde{B}(\vec{r})\underline{\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\beta_L} r_1 \mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_1 - \sqrt{\beta_N} r_2 \mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_2 \\ \sqrt{\beta_L} r_2 \mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_1 + \sqrt{\beta_N} r_1 \mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\beta_L}\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_1 & -\sqrt{\beta_N}\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_2 \\ \sqrt{\beta_N}\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_2 & \sqrt{\beta_L}\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} r_1 \\ r_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Thus, if we define

$$\tilde{\sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\beta_L}\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_1 & -\sqrt{\beta_N}\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_2 \\ \sqrt{\beta_N}\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_2 & \sqrt{\beta_L}\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_1 \end{pmatrix} / \mathrm{d}t$$

so that

$$\tilde{\sigma}\vec{r}\,\mathrm{d}t = \tilde{B}(\vec{r})\underline{\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}} \tag{37}$$

then (28) can be written as the system

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\vec{r}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \vec{v}, \qquad \frac{\mathrm{d}\vec{v}}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{1}{\tau}\vec{v} + \tilde{\sigma}\vec{r} \tag{38}$$

On the other hand we see that, if we identify $\mathbb{R}^2$ to $\mathbb{C}$ in the standard way, then $\tilde{\sigma}$ corresponds to multiplication by (and we re-employ $\tilde{\sigma}$ by abuse of notation)

$$\tilde{\sigma} = \sqrt{\beta_L}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_1}{\mathrm{d}t} + i\sqrt{\beta_N}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_2}{\mathrm{d}t} \tag{39}$$

We may pass altogether to the complex notation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}r}{\mathrm{d}t} = v, \qquad \frac{\mathrm{d}v}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{1}{\tau}v + \tilde{\sigma}r$$

where r and v are the complex equivalents of $\vec{r}$ and $\vec{v}$ respectively.

We may proceed further analogously to Sect. 3.2, keeping E from (17) and defining $V = \tilde{\sigma}/\tau$ which is now a complex-valued random potential. Then $\psi = e^{t/2\tau} r$ verifies

$$-\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\psi}{\mathrm{d}t^2} + V\psi = E\psi \tag{40}$$

similar to (18).

On the other hand one may proceed along the lines of Sect. 3.3, introducing $\tilde{z} = v/r$. Then z verifies $\mathrm{d}\tilde{z}/\mathrm{d}t = -\tilde{z}^2 - \tilde{z}/\tau + \tilde{\sigma}$ and $z = \tilde{z} + 1/2\tau$ verifies

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{\mathrm{d}t} = -z^2 + \frac{1}{4\tau^2} + \tilde{\sigma} \tag{41}$$

Note finally (notwithstanding that r is complex)

$$\lambda = \langle \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \log r \rangle = \langle \frac{v}{r} \rangle = -\frac{1}{2\tau} + \langle z \rangle$$

4.2 An other solvable case

Following ideas of [5], we will now show that in the 2D case the Lyapunov exponent may be explicitly computed also when $\beta_L = 0$. The important particularity of the $\beta_L = 0$ (i.e. $\wp = -1/2$) situation is that the steady-state distribution of z is concentrated entirely on the complex half-plane with $\Re z > 1/(2\tau)$, due to the fact that on the line $\Re z = 1/(2\tau)$ the velocity field always points inside the above-mentioned half-plane. Indeed, writing $z = x + iy = 1/(2\tau) + iy$ we have the velocity field

$$-E - z^2 = \frac{1}{(2\tau)^2} - (\frac{1}{2\tau} + iy)^2 = y^2 - \frac{i}{2\tau} y$$

and $y^2 > 0$ except for $y = 0$.

In this particular situation the Laplace transform $F(p) = \langle \exp(-pz) \rangle$ is well defined for $p \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Using the Itō formula

$$\mathrm{d}e^{-pz} = -pe^{-pz}\mathrm{d}z + \frac{p^2}{2} e^{-pz} \langle \mathrm{d}z, \mathrm{d}z \rangle$$

and substituting $\mathrm{d}z$ according to (41), we get for the steady state

$$0 = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} F(p) = \left\langle \left[(E + z^2)p - \frac{\beta_N}{2} p^2 \right] e^{-pz} \right\rangle = p \left[\partial_p^2 + E - \frac{\beta_N}{2} p \right] F(p)$$

Since the above is defined only for $p \geq 0$, we may safely divide by p and retain simply

$$0 = \left[\partial_p^2 + E - \frac{\beta_N}{2} p \right] F(p)$$

At $p = 0$ we have the obvious boundary condition $F(0) = 1$. For p going to $+\infty$ we need $\limsup |F(p)| < 1$ since in the steady state $|\exp(-pz)| < 1$ almost surely for $p \geq 0$ (due to z being almost surely in the positive half-plane). These two boundary conditions are in general sufficient to uniquely determine $F(p)$ in the steady state.

This differential equation can be readily solved (e.g. by introducing $u = p - 2E/\beta_N$ it reduces to the Airy equation $(\partial_u^2 - (\beta_N/2)u)f = 0$). The solution that decays (in fact the only one that does not grow exponentially) when $p \to +\infty$ and that verifies $F(0) = 1$ is

$$F(p) = \frac{Ai(-(\frac{\beta_N}{2})^{-2/3} E + (\frac{\beta_N}{2})^{1/3} p)}{Ai(-(\frac{\beta_N}{2})^{-2/3} E)}$$

where Ai stands for the Airy function of first kind. Finally we arrive at

$$\langle z\rangle = -(\partial F)(0) = -\left(\frac{\beta_N}{2}\right)^{1/3}\frac{Ai'(-(\frac{\beta_N}{2})^{-2/3}E)}{Ai(-(\frac{\beta_N}{2})^{-2/3}E)}$$

Introducing $c = 1/[4\tau^2(\beta_N/2)^{2/3}] = -(\frac{\beta_N}{2})^{-2/3}E$ (note that preceding definition of c was with β_L instead of β_N!), we have for the Lyapunov exponent

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2\tau}\left[-1 - c^{-1/2}\frac{Ai'(c)}{Ai(c)}\right] \tag{42}$$

4.3 Decay of Lyapunov exponent at large Stokes numbers

Let us introduce the adimensionalized Stokes time

$$St = D_1\tau$$

which is nothing else than the Stokes number for the case of a smooth Kraichnan velocity field. We are interested here by the decay of the adimensionalized Lyapunov exponent λ/D_1 when the Stokes number St goes to infinity.

Numerical results (see subsection 6.1 and figure 2) seem to show us that the Lyapunov exponent λ of pair separation varies monotonically with the compressibility degree $\wp$ of the advecting flow, notably the larger $\wp$ (i.e. the more compressible the flow) the smaller is λ. Thus the two extreme cases of $\wp = -1/2$ and $\wp = 3/2$ bound the other, intermediate cases.

It is then noteworthy that for large τ the exponents given by both (35) and (42) decay at the same rate. Indeed, we have $\beta_L, \beta_N \sim D_1\tau^{-2}$ so in both cases $c \sim St^{-2/3}$, and since $Ai(c)$, $Bi(c)$, $Ai'(c)$ and $Ai'(c)Ai(c) + Bi'(c)Bi(c)$ all have finite non-zero limits when $c \to 0$, we have the behavior $\lambda/D_1 \sim St^{-2/3}$ in both cases, so this should be also the general situation.

An other possible way to arrive at this result is by taking τ to ∞ while fixing $\tilde{\sigma}$ in (41). At the limit, when $1/\tau = 0$, we have simply $z = \tilde{z}$ and (41) reduces to

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{\mathrm{d}t} = -z^2 + \tilde{\sigma}$$

It would then be enough to see that this evolution equation leads to a (unique) stationary state with $\langle z\rangle$ finite and non-zero, and that this is indeed the $\tau \to \infty$ limit of $\langle z\rangle$ (i.e. commutation of $t \to \infty$ and $\tau \to \infty$ limits).

Indeed, since $\tilde{\sigma}$ is fixed, this means that in fact β_L, β_N are fixed, so that (recall (36)) $D_1 \sim \tau^2$ and $St \sim \tau^3$. Since we suppose that for fixed σ the Lyapunov exponent λ goes to a constant, the adimensionalized Lyapunov exponent λ/D_1 behaves like $D_1^{-1} \sim \tau^{-2} \sim St^{-2/3}$:

$$\frac{\lambda}{D_1} \underset{St\to\infty}{\sim} St^{-2/3}$$

5 Other solvable 2D flows

The idea in this section is that the above two special cases of solvable situations can be slightly generalized. The cases we could solve were when $\tilde{\sigma}$ of (39) was either $\sqrt{\beta_L}\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_1/\mathrm{d}t$ or $i\sqrt{\beta_N}\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_2/\mathrm{d}t$. In fact we will now deal with the more general case of

$$\tilde{\sigma} = \sqrt{\beta}\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}/\mathrm{d}t \tag{43}$$

for $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ (and $\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}$ is the standard white noise).

By analogy with Sect. 4, where $\beta_L + \beta_N = 8D_1/\tau^2$ (from (36)), we define here the characteristic inverse time-scale of the flow as

$$D_1 = \frac{\tau^2}{8}|\beta|$$

5.1 Solvable flows

Let us start by finding the 2D flows which lead to such $\tilde{\sigma}$. Noticing that one has (analogously to (23))

$$\tilde{B}_{ik}(\vec{r})\tilde{B}_{jk}(\vec{r}) = \langle \tilde{B}_{ik}\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_k \tilde{B}_{jl}\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}_l\rangle/\mathrm{d}t$$

and using (25) to re-express the left hand side and (37) to re-express the right hand side, we get

$$\tau^{-2}C_{ik,jl}r_k r_l = \langle \tilde{\sigma}_{ik}r_k\mathrm{d}t, \tilde{\sigma}_{jl}r_l\mathrm{d}t\rangle /\mathrm{d}t \tag{44}$$

so if we define

$$\tilde{C}_{ik,jl} = \langle \tilde{\sigma}_{ik}\mathrm{d}t, \tilde{\sigma}_{jl}\mathrm{d}t\rangle /\mathrm{d}t$$

then (44) can be written

$$\tau^{-2}C_{ik,jl}r_k r_l = \tilde{C}_{ik,jl}r_k r_l \tag{45}$$

Considering the complex $\tilde{\sigma}$ of (43) as a real linear transformation acting on $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{R}^2$, its matrix is written (also $\tilde{\sigma}$ by abuse of notation), with help of the notation $\sqrt{\beta} = \alpha = \alpha_L + i\alpha_N$ ($\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, $\alpha_L, \alpha_N \in \mathbb{R}$)

$$\tilde{\sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_L & -\alpha_N \\ \alpha_N & \alpha_L \end{pmatrix} \mathrm{d}\tilde{w}/\mathrm{d}t$$

In coordinate notation this gives

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{ik} = (\alpha_L\delta_{ik} - \alpha_N\epsilon_{ik})\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}/\mathrm{d}t$$

Leading to

$$\tilde{C}_{ik,jl} = (\alpha_L\delta_{ik} - \alpha_N\epsilon_{ik})(\alpha_L\delta_{jl} - \alpha_N\epsilon_{jl})$$

and using (12), this further gives

$$= \alpha_L^2\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \alpha_N^2(\delta_{ij}\delta_{kl} - \delta_{il}\delta_{jk}) - \alpha_L\alpha_N(\epsilon_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \epsilon_{jl}\delta_{ik})$$

With the above form for $\tilde{C}_{ik,jl}$ and using the most general form respecting isotropy for $C_{ik,jl}$ (cf. Sect. 2.6), that is:

$$C_{ik,jl} = a\delta_{ij}\delta_{kl} + b\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl} + c\delta_{il}\delta_{jk} + d(\epsilon_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \epsilon_{jl}\delta_{ik})$$

with arbitrary $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$, equation (45) becomes

$$\tau^{-2}(a\delta_{ij}r^2 + (b+c)r_i r_j + d(\epsilon_{ik}r_j r_k + \epsilon_{jk}r_i r_k)) = \\ \alpha_N^2\delta_{ij}r^2 + (\alpha_L^2 - \alpha_N^2)r_i r_j - \alpha_L\alpha_N(\epsilon_{ik}r_j r_k + \epsilon_{jk}r_i r_k)$$

Coefficients are identified

$$a = \alpha_N^2 \qquad b + c = \alpha_L^2 - \alpha_N^2 \qquad d = -\alpha_L\alpha_N$$

and since only the sum of b and c is determined, let us write $b = \alpha_L^2 - s$, $c = s - \alpha_N^2$ for some $s \in \mathbb{R}$. The positivity conditions (13), (14) give

$$s = a + c \geq 0$$
$$-s = a + b - \sqrt{(b+c)^2 + 4d^2} \geq 0$$

meaning that the only possibility is to take $s = 0$ giving

$$\begin{aligned} C_{ik,jl} &= \tau^2\left[\alpha_L^2\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \alpha_N^2(\delta_{ij}\delta_{kl} - \delta_{il}\delta_{jk}) - \alpha_L\alpha_N(\epsilon_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \epsilon_{jl}\delta_{ik})\right] \\ &= \tau^2(\alpha_L\delta_{ik} - \alpha_N\epsilon_{ik})(\alpha_L\delta_{jl} - \alpha_N\epsilon_{jl}) \end{aligned}$$

Such $C_{ik,jl}$ can occur only in a flow (cf. Sect. 2.6) where parity invariance is broken because $\epsilon_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \epsilon_{jl}\delta_{ik}$ appears, and spatial homogeneity is broken because $\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}$ and $\delta_{il}\delta_{jk}$ have different coefficients (namely $\tau^2\alpha_L^2$ and $-\tau^2\alpha_N^2$, which are equal only in the case $\tau\alpha_L = \tau\alpha_N = 0$, i.e. $C_{ik,jl} = 0$: a very trivial case).

5.2 Calculation of the Lyapunov exponent

This is very much like in Sect. 4.2.




Figure 1: The complex plane of z is represented. There is diffusion only in a single direction, parallelly to $\alpha = \sqrt{\beta}$. The dynamics of z, governed by (41) with $\tilde{\sigma}$ as in (43), is such that z can cross the boundary line between the hashed half-plane (unstable) and the clear half-plane (stable) only moving out from the hashed half-plane and into the clear one, whereby asymptotically the distribution of z will be supported entirely on the stable half-plane. $\mathbb{H}_-$ is the lower half-plane.

Let us first establish the existence of a stable half-plane for z, by which we mean one on whose boundary line the drift velocity of z points always towards the interior of the half-plane. We may suppose, without loss of generality, that $0 \leq \arg\beta \leq \pi$ and in consequence $0 \leq \arg\alpha \leq \pi/2$. We then claim that the half-plane

$$\{z : \frac{z - \frac{1}{2\tau}}{\alpha} \in \mathbb{H}_-\}$$

with $\mathbb{H}_-$ denoting the complex half-plane with negative imaginary part is such. Note that this half-plane may be parametrised as

$$\frac{1}{2\tau} + \mu\alpha - i\nu\alpha \qquad \mu \in \mathbb{R}, \nu \in \mathbb{R}_+ \tag{46}$$

In particular its boundary line is parametrised as $1/2\tau + \mu\alpha$ with $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, and $-i\alpha$ is perpendicular to the the boundary line and points to the interior of the stable half-plane.

What we need to show is that, on the boundary line, the scalar product of the drift of z with $-i\alpha$ (considered as a vector of $\mathbb{R}^2$) is positive. Remark that, viewed as vectors of $\mathbb{R}^2$, the scalar product of two complex numbers x and y may be written as $\Re(x\bar{y})$. Then we have for $z = 1/2\tau + \mu\alpha$

$$\begin{aligned}\Re[(-E - z^2)(\overline{-i\alpha})] &= \Re[(-\frac{1}{\tau}\mu\alpha - \mu^2\alpha^2)(\overline{-i\alpha})] \\ &= \Re[-\frac{1}{\tau}\mu i|\alpha|^2 - \mu^2|\alpha|^2 i\alpha] = \mu^2|\alpha|^2\Re(-i\alpha)\end{aligned}$$

The idea is again that in the stationary state the distribution of z will be supported by the stable half-plane, being identically zero outside of it. In this case the Laplace transform $F(p) = \langle\exp(pz)\rangle$ is well defined for $p \in (i\alpha)^{-1}\mathbb{R}_+$ since then $\Re(pz) \leq \Re(1/2\tau p)$ as can be easily read off from (46), making $|\exp(pz)|$ uniformly bounded in z for fixed p.

As previously, in the steady state we may write

$$0 = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}F(p) = \left\langle \left[-(E + z^2)p + \frac{\beta}{2}p^2\right] e^{pz} \right\rangle = p(-\partial_p^2 - E + \frac{\beta}{2}p)F(p)$$

We may divide the above by p without loss of information, since at $p = 0$ we have the boundary condition $F(0) = 1$, and as $|p| \to \infty$ with $p \in (i\alpha)^{-1}\mathbb{R}_+$, the $F(p)$ has to decay, and these two

conditions determine uniquely the solution.

$$(\partial_p^2 + E - \frac{\beta}{2}p)F(p) = 0 \tag{47}$$

This equation is related to the Airy equation, if we introduce the new variable $u = p - 2E/\beta$:

$$(\partial_u^2 - \frac{\beta}{2}u)f(u) = 0$$

of which two independent solutions are (formula 10.4.1 in [1]) $Ai((\beta/2)^{1/3}u)$ and $Ai(e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{1/3}u)$, where Ai denotes the Airy function of first kind, and $(\beta/2)^{1/3}$ is taken with the standard definition of the root, (i.e. real positive on the positive real axis and having branch cut along the negative real axis).

For large argument, to lowest order, the asymptotic expansion of the Airy function Ai reads (formulae 10.4.59 of [1])

$$Ai(\zeta) = \frac{1}{2\pi^{1/2}\zeta^{1/4}}e^{-\frac{2}{3}\zeta^{3/2}}(1 + O(\zeta^{-3/2})) \qquad (|\arg\zeta| < \pi) \tag{48}$$

Let us apply the above with $\zeta = (\beta/2)^{1/3}u = (\beta/2)^{1/3}(p - 2E/\beta)$. Since $p \in (i\alpha)^{-1}\mathbb{R}_+$ and $\alpha = \sqrt{\beta}$ (with standard definition of the root), when $|p| \to \infty$ we have $\arg u \to \arg p = -(\arg\beta)/2 - \pi/2$, whence $\arg\zeta \to -(\arg\beta)/6 - \pi/2$, so that for large enough $|p|$ we have $-\pi/2 \geq \arg\zeta \geq -2\pi/3$ (in particular $|\arg\zeta| < \pi$), and $-3\pi/4 \geq \arg(\zeta^{3/2}) \geq -\pi$. This implies, when $|p| \to \infty$, that $\Re(\zeta^{3/2}) < 0$, and since $|\zeta| \sim (|\beta|/2)^{1/3}|p|$, we get from (48) that $|Ai((\beta/2)^{1/3}(p - 2E/\beta))| \to \infty$.

Repeating the same treatment with $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{1/3}u = e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{1/3}(p - 2E/\beta)$, when $|p| \to \infty$ we have $\arg\zeta \to -(\arg\beta)/6 + \pi/6$, so that for large enough $|p|$ we have $0 \leq \arg\zeta \leq \pi/6$ (in particular $|\arg\zeta| < \pi$), and $0 \leq \arg(\zeta^{3/2}) \leq \pi/4$. This implies, when $|p| \to \infty$, that $\Re(\zeta^{3/2}) > 0$, and since $|\zeta| \sim (|\beta|/2)^{1/3}|p|$, we get from (48) that $|Ai(e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{1/3}(p - 2E/\beta))| \to 0$.

Hence the unique solution of (47) verifying the appropriate boundary conditions at 0 and at infinity is

$$F(p) = \frac{Ai(e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{1/3}(p - 2E/\beta))}{Ai(e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{1/3}(-2E/\beta))}$$

Remark that $\langle z\rangle = \partial_p F(p)|_{p=0}$, giving

$$\langle z\rangle = e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{1/3}\frac{Ai'(e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{1/3}(-2E/\beta))}{Ai(e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{1/3}(-2E/\beta))} \tag{49}$$

We see (if we evaluate the above formula for non-real β), that $\langle z\rangle$ is in general complex valued. By analogy with Sect. 4 we define

$$\lambda = \langle z\rangle - \frac{1}{2\tau}$$

The real part of λ once again gives the exponential growth rate of the pair separation $\vec{r}$, while the imaginary part of λ gives the average rotation speed of $\vec{r}$. In particular this mean angular velocity is in general non-zero.

Eq. (49) may be further simplified by noticing that $e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{1/3}(-2E/\beta) = -Ee^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{-2/3}$, and $|e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{-2/3}| = |\beta/2|^{-2/3}$ and $\arg(e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{-2/3}) = 2\pi/3 - (2/3)\arg\beta = (2/3)(\pi - \arg\beta)$, and since $0 \leq \arg\beta \leq \pi$ we have $\pi - \arg\beta = \arg(-1/\beta) = \arg((-\beta)^{-1})$ so that $\arg(e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{-2/3}) = \arg((-\beta)^{-2/3})$. From this we conclude that $e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{-2/3} = (-\beta/2)^{-2/3}$. Along the same lines, $\arg(e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{1/3}) = 2\pi/3 + (\arg\beta)/3 = (\arg\beta - \pi)/3 + \pi$. However we have to pay attention here since $\arg\beta - \pi = \arg(-\beta)$ is true only for $0 < \arg\beta \leq \pi$ but *not* for $\arg\beta = 0$, so to sum it up $\arg\beta - \pi = \arg(-\beta)$ is true only for $\beta \notin \mathbb{R}_+$. Thus, *except for the case of β real positive* we have $(\arg\beta - \pi)/3 + \pi = \arg(-(-\beta)^{1/3})$ so that $e^{2\pi i/3}(\beta/2)^{1/3} = -(-\beta/2)^{1/3}$. Thus we also have

$$\langle z\rangle = -(-\beta/2)^{1/3}\frac{Ai'(-E(-\beta/2)^{-2/3})}{Ai(-E(-\beta/2)^{-2/3}))} \qquad \beta \notin \mathbb{R}_+ \tag{50}$$

Note that throughout we have supposed β to be in the upper complex half-plane. However this last formula has the interesting feature that it is real, so that substituting β with its complex conjugate $\bar{\beta}$, we also get for $\langle z \rangle$ the conjugate value, and from simple symmetry considerations with respect to the real axis, this is the correct answer. Thus formula (50) applies for *all* $\beta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}_+$.

To understand the problem with $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$, note that in this particular case, when the diffusion is parallel to the real axis, there are *two* stable half-planes: the lower and the upper complex half-planes. The equilibrium distribution of z depends on the initial distribution of z, since z cannot cross the real line. As we have already showed, for z starting from the lower half-plane (this was only implicit in our considerations, through the fact that we considered the stable half-plane to be the lower one) we arrive at formula (49). Starting from the upper half-plane we arrive at its complex conjugate. Hence the natural branch cut in (50) for $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

We recover the two solvable cases presented in Sect. 3.9 and Sect. 4.2. The former one, with $\beta_N = 0$ (hence diffusion only in the real direction), corresponds to $\beta = \beta_L \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Using (49) and the identity (formula 10.4.9 of [1])

$$Ai(e^{2\pi i/3}\zeta) = \frac{1}{2}e^{\pi i/3}(Ai(\zeta) - iBi(\zeta))$$

leading also to the identity

$$Ai'(e^{2\pi i/3}\zeta) = e^{-2\pi i/3}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\zeta}Ai(e^{2\pi i/3}\zeta) = \frac{1}{2}e^{-\pi i/3}(Ai'(\zeta) - iBi'(\zeta))$$

we have

$$\langle z \rangle = (\beta_L/2)^{1/3}\frac{Ai'(-E(\beta_L/2)^{-2/3}) - iBi'(-E(\beta_L/2)^{-2/3})}{Ai(-E(\beta_L/2)^{-2/3}) - iBi(-E(\beta_L/2)^{-2/3})}$$

Introduce $c = -E(\beta_L/2)^{-2/3} = 1/[4\tau^2(\beta_L/2)^{2/3}]$, and multiply numerator and denominator in the above displayed formula by the complex conjugate of the denominator, finally use the Wronskian identity (formula 10.4.10 of [1], see Index of Notations p. 1045 of the cited source for sign convention for the Wronskian)

$$Ai(\zeta)Bi'(\zeta) - Ai'(\zeta)Bi(\zeta) = \pi^{-1}$$

in order to get

$$\langle z \rangle = \frac{1}{2\tau}c^{-1/2}\frac{Ai'(c)Ai(c) + Bi'(c)Bi(c) - i\pi^{-1}}{Ai^2(c) + Bi^2(c)}$$

So what is the meaning of this imaginary part ? Recall that our initial assumption was that z is inside the stable half-plane at asymptotically long times, and as a limiting case of $\arg\alpha \searrow 0$ this half-plane is that of negative imaginary parts. The asymptotic distribution of z is indeed supported in this half-plane if the initial z is in it. If however we start with z initially distributed with probability $1/2$ on each side of the real axis, or if we add infinitesimally small diffusion in the imaginary direction, then we get in the upper and lower half-planes distributions which are mirror images of one-another, and in the lower half-plane it is $1/2$ times that of the case when there was nothing in the upper half-plane.

That $\langle z \rangle$ does have the imaginary part predicted above can be readily verified in simulations (see Fig. 6, the $\beta = 1$ curve), even if we use the scheme of infinitesimal diffusion in the direction of the imaginary axis, by evaluating $\langle |\Im z| \rangle$ and confirming the relation

$$\langle |\Im z| \rangle = \frac{1}{2\tau}c^{-1/2}\frac{\pi^{-1}}{Ai^2(c) + Bi^2(c)}$$

We also recover the case $\beta_L = 0$ (hence diffusion only in the imaginary direction) corresponding to $\beta = -\beta_N \in \mathbb{R}_-$. Here we use (50) and get

$$\langle z \rangle = -(\beta_N/2)^{1/3}\frac{Ai'(-E(\beta_N/2)^{-2/3})}{Ai(-E(\beta_N/2)^{-2/3}))}$$

or, introducing $c = -E(\beta_N/2)^{-2/3} = 1/[4\tau^2(\beta_N/2)^{2/3}]$

$$\langle z \rangle = -\frac{1}{2\tau} c^{-1/2} \frac{Ai'(c)}{Ai(c)}$$

6 Numerical results

In this section we focus mainly on the $d = 2$ dimensional case.

6.1 Naive simulation of inertial particle separation

In order to get the Lyapunov exponent of pair separation, the most straightforward thing to do is to simulate the reduced equation (38). Note that this is better than simulating (41), since at moments when particles nearly collide (happens when particles are moving towards each other with small impact parameter (compared to τv)), the quotient $v/r = z - 1/2\tau$ turns very fast, which would require additional handling in the code, whereas in fact v evolves little at near collision since $v \gg r/\tau$ and r evolves linearly for which no special care is needed in the simulations.

The convergence of the Lyapunov exponent is quite slow, one can hope for a 0.1% relative precision at most, which is not enough to try to guess a functional form through Plouff's inverter, but more than enough to disprove some claims of formulae.

Note also that for τ small the system is stiff and convergence gets worse. The equation of evolution should be solved analytically between two time-steps, with taking for $\vec{r}$ on the right-hand side its value at the beginning of the time interval. Indeed in this case we have a linear (multi-dimensional) equation with time-independent homogeneous term (only the inhomogeneous term contains the driving noise) which can be explicitly solved, and we get an effective driving term whose statistics can be computed. This is treated in subsection 6.4.

Numerical simulations were done in series with fixed β_L, β_N (with additionally fixing $\beta_L + \beta_N = 1$; note the identity $\beta_L + \beta_N = 8D_1/\tau^2$ leading to $D_1 = \tau^2/8$ with our choice) instead of fixed D_1 (note that $\wp$ is fixed by the quotient of β_L, β_N). However we are only interested in the the adimensionalized Lyapunov exponent λ/D_1 in function of the Stokes number $St = D_1\tau$. Simulations were done for values of τ between 0.1 and 4, which, according to the above, correspond to Stokes numbers between $1.25{\cdot}10^{-4}$ and 8. Also, for reasons of better numerical stability, instead of taking $\beta_N = 0$, we used in that case $\beta_N = 10^{-6}$. Total time of simulation was $5{\cdot}10^5$ with time-step 10^{-4}.

The plot of numerical results, at the end of the paper, has been cut up into three pieces ($[0, 0.1]$, $[0.1, 1]$ and $[1, 7.5]$ that are shown on different scales). The vertical axis is λ/D_1 the adimensionalized Lyapunov exponent. The curves are ordered in the same top to bottom order as the keys. Solid line curves are the analytical solutions, dashed lines are just linear interpolation of numerical data. Data itself is represented by boxes, either open or closed.

6.2 Estimates of $\vec{v}$ and of the change of $\vec{r}$ during a time interval Δt

Let us estimate first $\vec{v}$ and then the jump in $\vec{r}$ during some time interval Δt. We suppose $|\vec{r}| \approx 1$ at the beginning of the time interval, without loss of generality, since the system under study is scale invariant. The case we are interested in is when Δt is the time-step of our simulation, but here we talk about the "real" $\vec{v}$ and $\vec{r}$, not the simulated ones. Hence we only consider the case where $\Delta t \ll D_1^{-1}$.

The forcing of $\vec{v}$ is a white noise with intensity proportional to $\tau^{-1}\sqrt{D_1}$ and the "memory" of $\vec{v}$ is of order τ, so that $|\vec{v}| \sim \tau^{-1}\sqrt{D_1}\sqrt{\tau} = \sqrt{D_1/\tau}$.

As for $\vec{r}$, we need to distinguish the cases when $\tau < \Delta t$ and when $\tau > \Delta t$. The time derivative of $\vec{r}$ is $\vec{v} \sim \sqrt{D_1/\tau}$. Now if $\tau < \Delta t$ then we can say that $\vec{v}$ is correlated over a time τ so that during each interval of time of length τ, the vector $\vec{r}$ changes by approximately $\tau\sqrt{D_1/\tau} = \sqrt{D_1\tau}$. There

are $\Delta t/\tau$ such independent changes which gives a total change of $\sqrt{D_1\tau}\sqrt{\Delta t/\tau} = \sqrt{D_1\Delta t}$, just as if $\vec{r}$ underwent a stochastic diffusion with diffusion constant not depending on τ.

In the other case of $\tau > \Delta t$ the velocity is correlated over times larger than Δt so that the change of $\vec{r}$ is approximately $|\vec{v}|\Delta t \sim \sqrt{D_1/\tau}\Delta t$. For later use, we remark that this latter can be estimated, due to the hypothesis $\tau > \Delta t$, as $\sqrt{D_1/\tau}\Delta t \leq \sqrt{D_1/\Delta t}\Delta t = \sqrt{D_1\Delta t}$, so that in this case also $\vec{r}$ changes by at most $\sqrt{D_1\Delta t}$.

6.3 Integrating $\mathrm{d}\log r^2$

To obtain numerically the Lyapunov exponent λ, we essentially make use of the formula

$$\lambda = \left\langle \frac{\mathrm{d}\log r^2}{2\,\mathrm{d}t} \right\rangle$$

However, as stated above, the change $\Delta\vec{r}$ of $\vec{r}$ during some time interval Δt can be bounded, in general, only as $\Delta\vec{r} < \sqrt{D_1\Delta t}$ (but at least this bound is uniform in τ). This is fine, but it means that to calculate the change of a non-linear function f of $\vec{r}$ we have to develop f to second order in $\vec{r}$, which means in other words that we need to use the Itō formula.

In practice, we have

$$\mathrm{d}\log r^2 = \frac{1}{r^2}2r_i\,\mathrm{d}r_i + \Big(-\frac{2}{r^4}r_ir_j + \frac{1}{r^2}\delta_{ij}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}r_i\,\mathrm{d}r_j \tag{51}$$

and this is the formula to use in simulations to get a correct result (in the simulations it appeared clearly that for $\tau < \Delta t$ the first-order formula gives completely false results).

6.4 Overcoming stiffness

For small values of the Stokes time τ the system has a large parameter (v.g. τ^{-1}), so that it is stiff. In principle one needs to take a time-step Δt to integrate it that is smaller by one or several orders of magnitude than τ. However in the $\tau \to 0$ limit the resulting process for $\vec{r}$ is still well defined, as a diffusion process, which may still be integrated with a finite time-step Δt which only has to be small compared to the inverse diffusion coefficient D_1^{-1}. Can we devise an integration scheme that doesn't need $\Delta t \to 0$ as $\tau \to 0$ and which is correct both for $\tau < \Delta t$ and for $\tau > \Delta t$, given $\Delta t \ll D_1^{-1}$?

The answer is affirmative as we now expose. Since in the $\tau \to 0$ limit the "fast" variable is $\vec{v}$ we will integrate its evolution over one time-step say between 0 and $t = \Delta t$ (for ease of notation we will use here t instead of the more clumsy Δt), analytically. This is possible if we keep in the evolution equation $\vec{r}$ fixed to its value $\vec{r}(0)$ at the beginning of the time-step, since then the system becomes linear with a constant evolution matrix and some time-dependent forcing:

$$\mathrm{d}\begin{pmatrix}\vec{r}\\ \vec{v}\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}0 & 1\\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\tau}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\vec{r}\\ \vec{v}\end{pmatrix}\mathrm{d}t + \begin{pmatrix}0\\ \mathrm{d}S\vec{r}(0)\end{pmatrix} \tag{52}$$

See Appendix A for justification of this approximation.

Let us start out with the study of a generic system of this form

$$\mathrm{d}\vec{X} = A\vec{X}\mathrm{d}t + \mathrm{d}\vec{B}_t \tag{53}$$

Its solution is

$$\vec{X}(t) = e^{tA}\vec{X}(0) + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A}\mathrm{d}\vec{B}_s \tag{54}$$

We thus have a deterministic part and a stochastic one which is linear in the increments of the Brownian driving process B_s, in other words the stochastic part is in the first chaos of B_s, hence it is a mean zero Gaussian random variable. Also since on (sub-intervals of) different time-step intervals

the increments of the driving B_s are independent, we really need to know only the covariance of the stochastic part on any given time-step:

$$\left\langle \left(\int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \mathrm{d}\vec{B}_s \right) \otimes \left(\int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \mathrm{d}\vec{B}_s \right) \right\rangle$$

Let us call $K(s) = \exp(sA)$, and notice that for a vector $\vec{u}$ we have the equivalent writings $\vec{u} \otimes \vec{u} = \vec{u}\vec{u}^T$. Introduce the equal-time correlation matrix χ such that $\langle \mathrm{d}\vec{B}_s \otimes \mathrm{d}\vec{B}_{s'} \rangle = \chi \delta(s - s')\, \mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}s'$. Then the above displayed formula simplifies to

$$\int_0^t \int_0^t K(t-s) \langle \mathrm{d}\vec{B}_s \otimes \mathrm{d}\vec{B}_{s'} \rangle K^T(t-s') = \tag{55}$$

$$\int_0^t \int_0^t K(t-s) \chi K^T(t-s') \delta(s-s')\, \mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}s' = \int_0^t K(t-s) \chi K^T(t-s)\, \mathrm{d}s \tag{56}$$

At this point one needs to write the above correlation matrix as UU^T for some matrix U. This is most easily done by way of the Cholesky decomposition which is simply the prescription of U being triangular (lower or upper), because the coefficients of U can then be recursively computed by using only algebraic operations and square roots. This is algorithmically much simpler than if for example we tried to diagonalize the correlation matrix to take its symmetric square-root.

In our case it is easily computed that

$$K(t-s) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \tau(1 - e^{-\frac{t-s}{\tau}}) \\ 0 & e^{-\frac{t-s}{\tau}} \end{pmatrix}$$

but note that this a block-matrix notation where each block is proportional to the 2×2 identity matrix. As for χ, we can see it also as a 2×2 block-matrix of 2×2 matrices, whose only non-zero block is the lower-right one, and in fact

$$\chi = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{B}(\vec{r}(0)) \tilde{B}^T(\vec{r}(0)) \end{pmatrix}$$

Since every block of $K(s)$ (each being a scalar matrix) commutes with the non-zero block of χ, we can start by evaluating

$$\begin{aligned} L(t,\tau) &= \int_0^t K(t-s) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} K^T(t-s)\, \mathrm{d}s \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \tau^2[t - \frac{\tau}{2}(1 - e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}})(3 - e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}})] & \frac{\tau^2}{2}(1 - e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}})^2 \\ \frac{\tau^2}{2}(1 - e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}})^2 & \frac{\tau}{2}(1 - e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}})(1 + e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}}) \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and its Cholesky decomposition can be given as

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \tau \sqrt{t - 2\tau \tanh \frac{t}{2\tau}} & \tau(1 - e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}}) \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{2} \tanh \frac{t}{2\tau}} \\ 0 & \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{2}(1 - e^{-2\frac{t}{\tau}})} \end{pmatrix}$$

Finally with the full Cholesky decomposition the driving noise process we need can be generated as

$$(U \otimes \tilde{B})\, \underline{\mathrm{d}\eta} = \begin{pmatrix} U_{11}\tilde{B} & U_{12}\tilde{B} \\ 0 & U_{22}\tilde{B} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{d}\eta_1 \\ \mathrm{d}\eta_2 \\ \mathrm{d}\eta_3 \\ \mathrm{d}\eta_4 \end{pmatrix}$$

with the η independent Gaussian white noises, $\langle \mathrm{d}\eta_i \mathrm{d}\eta_j \rangle = \delta_{ij} \mathrm{d}t$. It is interesting to notice that this is tantamount to using to *independent* realizations of the Kraichnan field ($\tilde{B}(\mathrm{d}\eta_1, \mathrm{d}\eta_2)$ and $\tilde{B}(\mathrm{d}\eta_3, \mathrm{d}\eta_4)$) to drive the inertial particle process. It is not difficult to see that this is the general case (i.e. more than two particles in a non-linear velocity field may be adequately driven in a finite time-step scheme by two independent realizations of the fluid velocity field, just as here).

6.5 Extrapolation from moments of positive even order

Another possibility is to compute the exponential growth rates of positive even order moments of the particle separation, which can be obtained analytically (though implicitly only, as the largest real root of some polynomial), as described in Appendix D. Then, the curve which we know only for even natural numbers has to be extrapolated in order to guess its derivative at 0. This is a tough business, and it is hard to get anything better than 10% accuracy.

There are several ways of calculating the top eigenvalue. For small order $2n$ of the moments (until $n \approx 10$), it is possible to calculate directly the characteristic polynomial of the matrix and solve numerically for the largest real root.

For larger n (up to $n \approx 100$) it is more convenient to iterate the system $x \mapsto Mx$ where M is the matrix of the system. Since M is a sparse matrix, this is fast and efficient and doesn't require a lot of memory.

For n even larger it is better to use the more memory intensive method of iterating $A \mapsto A^2$ with $A_0 = M$, since this way the power of M computed is in 2^N for N iterations, whereas for the previous method it was just N.

7 On some conjectured formulae in 2D

In [10] appeared the following conjectured formula for the top Lyapunov exponent of inertial particles in a 2D Kraichnan flow as described above:

$$\frac{\lambda}{D_1} = \Re\left(-\frac{1}{2\tau D_1}\left[1 + c^{-1/2}\frac{Ai'(c)}{Ai(c)}\right]\right) \tag{57}$$

with

$$c = [4\tau^2(\beta_N - \beta_L)^{2/3}]^{-1} = [16(1-2\wp)St]^{-2/3} \tag{58}$$

This would mean that λ/D_1 changes with $\wp$ only through simple rescaling. Indeed, introducing the function

$$F(x) = \Re\left(-\frac{8}{x}\left[1 + x^{\frac{1}{3}}\frac{Ai'(x^{-\frac{2}{3}})}{Ai(x^{-\frac{2}{3}})}\right]\right)$$

formula (57) is equivalent to

$$\frac{\lambda}{D_1} = (1-2\wp)F(16(1-2\wp)St) \tag{59}$$

with the only subtlety that F behaves differently for positive and negative arguments. In fact, we have for $x > 0$

$$F(x) = -\frac{8}{x}\left[1 + x^{\frac{1}{3}}\frac{Ai'(x^{-\frac{2}{3}})}{Ai(x^{-\frac{2}{3}})}\right]$$

but

$$F(-x) = \frac{8}{x}\left[1 - x^{\frac{1}{3}}\frac{Ai'(x^{-\frac{2}{3}})Ai(x^{-\frac{2}{3}}) + Bi'(x^{-\frac{2}{3}})Bi(x^{-\frac{2}{3}})}{Ai^2(x^{-\frac{2}{3}}) + Bi^2(x^{-\frac{2}{3}})}\right]$$

To see that (57) cannot agree with numerical results, the easiest is to see that (59) would imply $\lambda = 0$ for $\wp = 1/2$ for all values of St, since $F(0) = 2$, and clearly this is not the case.

We compare the conjectured formula with effective values. Notice that for $\wp = 0$ the match is not too bad, but for larger values of $\wp$ it becomes worse.

Later, in [9], it was recognized that (57) cannot be always correct, but it was hypothetized that perhaps it could be exact for the $\wp = 1/6$ case. To help compare their results with ours, we give the expressions of their parameters Γ, ϵ^2, γ and z in function of our variables:

$$\Gamma = \frac{3-2\wp}{1+2\wp} \qquad \epsilon^2 = (1+2\wp)St \qquad \gamma = \frac{1}{\tau} \qquad z = c$$

where c is that of formula (58).

They also give a modified formula, which in our notations is

$$\frac{\lambda}{D_1} = \chi(\wp) e^{-\frac{1}{6(1+2\wp)St}} + (1-2\wp) F(16(1-2\wp)St)$$

where $\chi(\wp)$ is an unknown prefactor, that according to the authors of [9] does not depend on St. But they only claim that the additional term should be some sort of leading order correction.

8 Conclusions

We succeeded, for certain time decorrelated flows, to find an analytical expression for the Lyapunov exponent of inertial particle pair separation. Other cases had to be dealt with numerically. It is however interesting that the analytically tractable cases bear lot of resemblance with the general case and thus have a predictive power. For example the $D_1^{-1}\lambda \sim St^{-2/3}$ behavior was first noticed for the analytically available solution.

The finding of slightly generalized cases of the Anderson localization problem which permit exact solution could be also of broader interest.

We have described so far only the Lyapunov exponent, but a more general object, the distribution (in fact large deviations) of finite-time Lyapunov exponents, contains further useful details of particle pair separation. Our work can be extended, following ideas of [11], to gain more information on this object.

Hence, the analogy between inertial particles in a random flow and the Anderson localization problem (which itself is related to the Edwards polymer model also known as the weakly self-avoiding Brownian motion (or random walk)) is fruitful and holds still more promises.

A Constant $\vec{r}$ approximation

Instead of using the approximated equation (52), we can start out from the true system

$$\mathrm{d}\begin{pmatrix}\vec{r}\\ \vec{v}\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}0 & 1\\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\tau}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\vec{r}\\ \vec{v}\end{pmatrix}\mathrm{d}t + \begin{pmatrix}0\\ \mathrm{d}S\vec{r}(t)\end{pmatrix}$$

which has the generic form (analogously to (53))

$$\mathrm{d}\vec{X} = A\vec{X}\mathrm{d}t + \mathrm{d}\vec{B}_t(\vec{X})$$

where it is in fact the covariance of $\mathrm{d}\vec{B}_t$ that depends on $\vec{X}(t)$ as $\langle \mathrm{d}\vec{B}_s \otimes \mathrm{d}\vec{B}_{s'}\rangle = \chi(\vec{X}(s))\delta(s-s')\,\mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}s'$

What is of interest to us in the numerical simulation is the mean and covariance of

$$\Delta\vec{X} = \int_0^t \mathrm{d}\vec{X} = \vec{X}(t) - \vec{X}(0)$$

We can again write a formula of type (54)

$$\vec{X}(t) = e^{tA}\vec{X}(0) + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A}\mathrm{d}\vec{B}_s(\vec{X}(s))$$

but now this is an implicit formula since it contains $\vec{X}(s)$ for $s > 0$ on the right hand side also.

For the mean displacement we still have immediately

$$\langle \Delta\vec{X}\rangle = (e^{tA} - 1)\vec{X}(0)$$

For the covariance however we only have, instead of (56), the semi-explicit

$$\langle[\Delta\vec{X}-\langle\Delta\vec{X}\rangle]\otimes[\Delta\vec{X}-\langle\Delta\vec{X}\rangle]\rangle=\int_0^t K(t-s)\,\chi(\vec{X}(s))\,K^T(t-s)\,\mathrm{d}s$$

It is at this point that we use the estimates of subsection 6.2, notably that $\vec{X}(s)-\vec{X}(0)\lesssim\sqrt{D_1 s}\leq\sqrt{D_1 t}$ if we take $|\vec{X}(0)|\approx 1$. Then we have a *relative* error by replacing $\chi(\vec{X}(s))$ with $\chi(\vec{X}(0))$ of order bounded by $\sqrt{D_1 t}$. This basically means that in our approximate method we simulate a system whose diffusion coefficient would fluctuate around the real one, with a *relative* precision of order $\sqrt{D_1 t}$. Since in the simulations that are reported here we took $D_1=\tau^2/8$ and a time-step of $t=10^{-4}$, we have $\sqrt{D_1 t}\tau\simeq 3.5\,10^{-3}\tau$, and since we used only $\tau<4$, we have $\sqrt{D_1 t}\tau\leq 1.5\cdot 10^{-2}$.

B The $\tau\to 0$ limit

When the Stokes time τ goes to 0, the movement of an inertial particle solving (15) tends to that of a passive tracer that follows the velocity field, solving the SDE

$$\mathrm{d}\vec{R}(t)=\mathrm{d}\vec{U}_t(\vec{R}(t)) \tag{60}$$

where we preferred writing $\mathrm{d}\vec{U}_t$ instead of $\vec{U}$ to clearly mark that the velocity field is a white noise in time. The solution of this equation depends, in general, on the convention we adopt (Itō or Stratonovich or other), except if the flow is incompressible or its statistics is locally isotropic.

However, as pointed out in Sect. 3.5, for finite τ the evolution of the inertial particle does not depend on the adopted convention: we don't have any degree of freedom. Thus, in the $\tau\to 0$ limit we must find also a unique prescription how to integrate (60).

The same reasoning can be carried out for individual particle trajectories and particle pair separation, and since we have mostly developed formulae for the latter, we will use that setting. From the development of $\vec{r}$ for a small time-step Δt, as obtained in subsection 6.4, we could deduce that in the $\tau\to 0$ limit our formulae lead to the Itō interpretation of (60).

We can also check on the simulations (done for small enough time-step that we don't even need the sophistications of subsection 6.4) that this is the case. Our simulation of particle separation is equivalent to tracing a single particle in a linear (in the spatial variable) velocity field, that is $\vec{U}=\sigma\vec{R}$ recalling (1). Hence the Lyapunov exponent of pair separation of the passive tracer is described by (60) with the identification $\vec{R}=\vec{r}$ and $\vec{U}=\vec{v}$. Now the Lyapunov exponent obtained from (60) depends on the convention we adopt for the latter. Taking the Itō convention leads to substituting $\mathrm{d}\vec{r}=\mathrm{d}S\vec{r}$ (recall (6)) into (51) and we get

$$\left\langle\frac{\mathrm{d}\log r^2}{2\mathrm{d}t}\right\rangle=-\frac{1}{r^4}C_{ik,jl}r_i r_k r_j r_l+\frac{1}{2r^2}C_{ik,il}r_k r_l=D_1(d-4\wp)(d-1)$$

In the simulations this is the value we get in the $\tau\to 0$ limit.

In comparison, Stratonovich interpretation of (60) would require considering $\mathrm{d}r_i=\mathrm{d}S_{ij}r_j+(1/2)\langle\mathrm{d}S_{ik}\mathrm{d}S_{kl}\rangle r_l=\mathrm{d}S_{ij}r_j+(1/2)C_{ik,kl}r_l=\mathrm{d}S_{ij}r_j+D_1\wp(d+2)(d-1)r_i$ which would give a Lyapunov exponent shifted by the non-zero $D_1\wp(d+2)(d-1)$.

The fact that for inertial particles the Lagrangian equation (60) must always be taken within the Itō convention is due to the fundamental time-irreversible behavior of such particles. Indeed, particles have some knowledge of fluid velocity in the past, which they forget only after about a time of the order of the Stokes time τ, however they know nothing of the future. It is this smoothing of the fluid velocity at time-scale τ, using *only past events*, that intuitively explains why the $\tau\to 0$ limit leads invariably to a passive tracer which obeys (60) with Itō convention.

C Stratonovich convention for linearized velocity?

This is just a short note to explain why one cannot naively *first* linearize (60) (in the position variable) and *then* change reading convention, say from Itō to Stratonovich. The two operations just do not commute with one another, and the physically meaningful order is the other one: linearizing the effective evolution of particles.

To put very simply what fails, note that when passing from Itō to Stratonovich interpretation in (60), an additional drift term of the form $(\vec{U}.\vec{\nabla})\vec{U}$ appears: the Stratonovich interpretation of (60) corresponds to the Itō SDE

$$\mathrm{d}\vec{R}(t) = \mathrm{d}\vec{U}_t(\vec{R}(t)) + \frac{1}{2}\langle(\mathrm{d}\vec{U}_t.\vec{\nabla})\mathrm{d}\vec{U}_t\rangle\,(\vec{R}(t)) \tag{61}$$

Clearly, linearization of this term involves linearization of the *derivative* of $\mathrm{d}\vec{U}_t$, that comes from the quadratic part of $\mathrm{d}\vec{U}_t$, which would have been lost if we were to linearize $\mathrm{d}\vec{U}_t$ first and change convention after.

Coming back to the simpler notation $\vec{U}$, we can write the gradient of $(\vec{U}.\vec{\nabla})\vec{U}$, in coordinate notation:

$$\partial_k[(U_j\partial_j)U_i] = (\partial_k U_j)(\partial_j U_i) + U_j\partial_j\partial_k U_i = \sigma_{ij}\sigma_{jk} + U_j\partial_k\sigma_{ij}$$

If the velocity field $\vec{U}$ has spatially homogeneous statistics, then $\langle(U_j\partial_j)U_i\rangle$ is independent of position so its gradient is 0, implying that the Stratonovich term vanishes when we linearize (61); we also have the identity:

$$\langle\sigma_{ij}\sigma_{jk}\rangle + \langle U_j\partial_k\sigma_{ij}\rangle = 0$$

Had we done linearization of the velocity field first, that is supposing σ to be constant, we would have $\partial_k\sigma_{ij} \equiv 0$, and the linearization of the Stratonovich term would, *incorrectly*, reduce to the non-zero quantity $\frac{1}{2}r_k\langle\sigma_{ij}\sigma_{jk}\rangle$ proportional to (with contraction on repeated indices) $\frac{1}{2}C_{ij,jk}r_k = 2D_1(d+2)(d-1)\wp r_i$, vanishing only in the incompressible case $\wp = 0$.

D Positive even order moments of pair separation

D.1 Arbitrary dimensions

Let us rewrite equation (18) as two coupled first-order equations for $\vec{\psi}$ and $\dot{\vec{\psi}} = \mathrm{d}\vec{\psi}/\mathrm{d}t$ in coordinate notation:

$$\mathrm{d}\psi_i = \dot{\psi}_i\mathrm{d}t\,, \qquad \mathrm{d}\dot{\psi}_i = -E\psi_i\mathrm{d}t + \tau^{-1}(\mathrm{d}S_{ij})\psi_j$$

(recall definition of E from (17) and of $\mathrm{d}S$ from (6)). The noteworthy fact is that this is a homogeneous equation in $\vec{\psi}$, $\dot{\vec{\psi}}$, so that moments of the same positive total order in the components will verify a closed system of equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}\langle\prod_{i,j=1}^{d}\psi_i^{m_i}\dot{\psi}_j^{n_j}\rangle = &\sum_k\langle m_k\psi_k^{m_k-1}(\mathrm{d}\psi_k)\prod_{i\neq k}\psi_i^{m_i}\prod_j\dot{\psi}_j^{n_j}\rangle\\
&+\sum_k\langle n_k\dot{\psi}_k^{n_k-1}(\mathrm{d}\dot{\psi}_k)\prod_i\psi_i^{m_i}\prod_{j\neq k}\dot{\psi}_j^{n_j}\rangle\\
&+\sum_k\langle\tfrac{n_k(n_k-1)}{2}\dot{\psi}_k^{n_k-2}(\mathrm{d}\dot{\psi}_k)(\mathrm{d}\dot{\psi}_k)\prod_i\psi_i^{m_i}\prod_{j\neq k}\dot{\psi}_j^{n_j}\rangle\\
&+\sum_{k\neq l}\langle n_k n_l\dot{\psi}_k^{n_k-1}\dot{\psi}_l^{n_l-1}(\mathrm{d}\dot{\psi}_k)(\mathrm{d}\dot{\psi}_l)\prod_i\psi_i^{m_i}\prod_{j\neq k,l}\dot{\psi}_j^{n_j}\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

which, upon replacing the $\mathrm{d}\psi$ and the $\mathrm{d}\dot\psi$ by their expressions, leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
= &\sum_k m_k \langle \psi_k^{m_k-1}\dot\psi_k \prod_{i\neq k}\psi_i^{m_i}\prod_j \dot\psi_j^{n_j}\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t \\
&-\sum_k En_k\langle \dot\psi_k^{n_k-1}\psi_k\prod_i\psi_i^{m_i}\prod_{j\neq k}\dot\psi_j^{n_j}\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t \\
&+\sum_k\sum_{p,q}\tfrac{n_k(n_k-1)}{2}\tau^{-2}C_{kp,kq}\langle\dot\psi_k^{n_k-2}\psi_p\psi_q\prod_i\psi_i^{m_i}\prod_{j\neq k}\dot\psi_j^{n_j}\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t \\
&+\sum_{k\neq l}\sum_{p,q} n_k n_l\tau^{-2}C_{kp,lq}\langle\dot\psi_k^{n_k-1}\dot\psi_l^{n_l-1}\psi_p\psi_q\prod_i\psi_i^{m_i}\prod_{j\neq k,l}\dot\psi_j^{n_j}\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t
\end{aligned}$$

Introduce the multi-coefficients $\underline{m}$ and $\underline{n}$ for the m_i and n_j, and use the notation $\underline{m}^k$ for adding 1 to the k^{th} coefficient of $\underline{m}$, and $\underline{m}_k$ for substracting 1 from the k^{th} coefficient of $\underline{m}$, etc. Also denote $c_{\underline{m},\underline{n}} = \langle\prod_{i,j=1}^d \psi_i^{m_i}\dot\psi_j^{n_j}\rangle$. Then we have the closed system for the $c_{\underline{m},\underline{n}}$ with $[\underline{m}]+[\underline{n}]$ constant (brackets stand for the size of the multi-coefficient):

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}c_{\underline{m},\underline{n}}}{\mathrm{d}t} = &\sum_k m_k c_{\underline{m}_k,\underline{n}^k} - \sum_k En_k c_{\underline{m}^k,\underline{n}_k} \\
&+\sum_k\sum_{p,q}\tfrac{n_k(n_k-1)}{2}\tau^{-2}C_{kp,kq}c_{\underline{m}^{p,q},\underline{n}_{k,k}} + \sum_{k\neq l}\sum_{p,q} n_k n_l\tau^{-2}C_{kp,lq}c_{\underline{m}^{p,q},\underline{n}_{k,l}} \qquad (62)
\end{aligned}$$

The idea which permits to compute the growth rate of $|\vec\psi|^{2N}$ for $N\in\mathbb{N}$ is that it should be given by the topmost eigenvalue (Lyapunov exponent) of (62) considered as a system of linear differential equations on $c_{\underline{m},\underline{n}}$ for $\sum m_i + \sum n_i = 2N$. The system in question is linear (in the $c_{\underline{m},\underline{n}}$) with constant coefficients (i.e. independent of t), so it has an associated matrix, and what we need is the top eigenvalue of this matrix. In general this eigenvalue should be the exponential growth rate of $|\vec\psi|^{2N}$.

D.2 Simplified version in 2D

In the two-dimensional case a somewhat simpler formulation of the above may be given. Let us introduce $\psi = e^{t/2\tau}r$, $\dot\psi = \mathrm{d}\psi/\mathrm{d}t$ and their conjugates $\bar\psi$ and $\dot{\bar\psi}$. Recall (40):

$$-\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\psi}{\mathrm{d}t^2} + V\psi = E\psi$$

Furthermore, denoting

$$c^n_{k,l} = \langle\psi^k\dot\psi^{n-k}\bar\psi^l\dot{\bar\psi}^{n-l}\rangle$$

the equivalent of the system (62) is

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}c^n_{k,l}}{\mathrm{d}t} = &\ kc^n_{k-1,l} - E(n-k)c^n_{k+1,l} + lc^n_{k,l-1} - E(n-l)c^n_{k,l+1} \\
&+\tfrac{(n-k)(n-k-1)}{2}(\beta_L-\beta_N)c^n_{k+2,l} + \tfrac{(n-l)(n-l-1)}{2}(\beta_L-\beta_N)c^n_{k,l+2} \\
&+(n-k)(n-l)(\beta_L+\beta_N)c^n_{k+1,l+1}
\end{aligned}$$

This system has been derived in [11] for similar purposes as here, in the framework of the Anderson localization problem.

References

[1] Milton Abramowitz and Irene A. Stegun, editors. *Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables.* Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1992. Reprint of the 1972 edition.

[2] J. Bec, A. Celani, M. Cencini, and S. Musacchio. Clustering and collisions of heavy particles in random smooth flows. Preprint at `arXiv:nlin.CD/0407013`.

[3] G. Falkovich, A. Fouxon, and M. G. Stepanov. Acceleration of rain initiation by cloud turbulence. *Nature*, 419:151–4, 2002.

[4] G. Falkovich, K. Gawędzki, and M. Vergassola. Particles and fields in fluid turbulence. *Rev. Modern Phys.*, 73(4):913–975, 2001.

[5] A. Fouxon and P. Horvai. Inertial particles and the Anderson localization problem. *In consideration for Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 2006. Preprint will be in `arXiv:cond-mat`.

[6] Bertrand I. Halperin. Green's functions for a particle in a one-dimensional random potential. *Phys. Rev. (2)*, 139:A104–A117, 1965.

[7] M. R. Maxey and Riley J. Equation of motion of a small rigid sphere in a nonuniform flow. *Phys. Fluids*, 26:883–889, 1983.

[8] B. Mehlig, M. Wilkinson, K. Duncan, T. Weber, and Ljunggren M. On the aggregation of inertial particles in random flows. *Submitted to Phys. Rev. E (3)*, 2005. Preprint at `arXiv:cond-mat/0410518`.

[9] Bernhard Mehlig and Michael Wilkinson. Coagualtion by random velocity fields as a Kramers problem. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 92(25):250602–1–4, 2004.

[10] Leonid I. Piterbarg. The top Lyapunov exponent for a stochastic flow modeling the upper ocean turbulence. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 62(3):777–800 (electronic), 2001/02.

[11] H. Schomerus and M. Titov. Statistics of finite-time Lyapunov exponents in a random time-dependent potential. *Phys. Rev. E (3)*, 66(6):066207, 11, 2002.




Figure 2: Adimensionalized Lyapunov exponent in function of Stokes number for different values of $\wp$. We see perfect agreement between theory (solid lines only, i.e. those with the empty boxes) and numerics (boxes, solid or empty) for $\wp = -1/2$ and $\wp = 3/2$.




Figure 3: Relative error of numerical results with respect to the formula conjectured in [10] and reproduced in our paper as formula (57), for $\wp < 1/2$. A zoom (not represented) on the curves for very small St is not incompatible with the prediction (according to the divergent asymptotic expansion in [9]) that all derivatives of the relative error curves should vanish at $St = 0$, but quality of our data in that range is too poor.




Figure 4: Non-collapse of numeric curves for $\wp > 1/2$, contradicting (59)




Figure 5: Real part of adimensionalized Lyapunov exponent in function of Stokes number for different values of β. We see perfect agreement between theory (solid lines) and numerics (empty boxes)




Figure 6: Imaginary part of adimensionalized Lyapunov exponent in function of Stokes number for different values of β. We see perfect agreement between theory (solid lines) and numerics (empty boxes)