

Direct verification of the kinetic description of wave turbulence

J. W. Banks,^{1,*} T. Buckmaster,^{2,†} A. O. Korotkevich,^{3,4,‡} G. Kovačič,^{1,§} and J. Shatah^{5,¶}

¹*Mathematics Sciences Department, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 110 8th St., Troy, NY 12180, USA*

²*Department of Mathematics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA*

³*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of New Mexico, MSC01 1115, 1 University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131-0001, USA*

⁴*L.D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics RAS, 2 Kosygin Str., Moscow, 119334, Russian Federation*

⁵*Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, 251 Mercer St., New York, NY 10012, USA*

(Dated: January 20, 2022)

The present work considers systems whose dynamics are governed by the nonlinear interactions among groups of 6 nonlinear waves, such as those described by the unforced quintic nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Specific parameter regimes in which ensemble-averaged dynamics of such systems with finite size are accurately described by a wave kinetic equation, as used in wave turbulence theory, are theoretically predicted. In addition, the underlying reasons that the wave kinetic equation may be a poor predictor of wave dynamics outside these regimes are also discussed. These theoretical predictions are directly verified by comparing ensemble averages of solutions to the dynamical equation to solutions of the wave kinetic equation.

PACS numbers: 47.27.ek, 47.35.-i, 47.35.Jk

The dynamics of large-scale nonlinear systems tend to be so complex that information gleaned from individual trajectories is insufficient to characterize the intrinsic properties of the system. Often such properties are best revealed through statistical measures from large ensembles of trajectories over long time intervals. For particle, plasma, and wave systems, both in and out of equilibrium, kinetic equations have proven to be a powerful theoretical tool for statistical ensemble descriptions [1–10].

For weakly nonlinear or weakly coupled wave systems, statistical description using the *wave kinetic equation* (WKE) is provided by the *wave turbulence theory* (WTT) [11, 12], which can be heuristically derived using relatively accessible perturbation-theoretic arguments [7–10]. (In contrast, descriptions of fully developed turbulence [13, 14] rely on scaling [13], models [15–19], numerical simulations [20, 21], or are simply still unattainable.) WKEs in WTT have been quite successful in explaining various statistical steady states in systems ranging from surface water waves [9, 22–26] to semiconductor lasers [27]. However, applicability of the WKE description to dynamically evolving systems has been much less explored (cf. [28–30]). Moreover, a host of assumptions concerning the physical systems at hand must be made for WKEs to hold, even in steady state. These include for example, weak nonlinearity, infinite system size, random phases of individual wave components, near-Gaussian distribution of wave amplitudes [11, 12]. The presence of coherent structures can easily lead to violations of these assumptions and destroy the validity of the WKE [31–34], at times necessitating additional modeling to ensure agreement of the WKE with the underlying physics [29, 35–37]. Therefore, delineating physical parameter regimes in which WKEs accurately describe the

dynamics of *finite size* systems remains a key challenge in WTT.

Delineating parameter regimes for which WKEs accurately describe ensemble dynamics can be achieved either via mathematical derivation, direct observation of large ensembles (either physically or numerically), or a combination of the two. The first approach was employed in [38–41], where members of our team and colleagues derived the validity of the WKE for the cubic Nonlinear Schrödinger equation in three and more dimensions. While conceptually important, the results describe dynamics only up to an infinitesimally small constant multiple of the characteristic timescale associated with the WKE. In addition, the work contains no clear delineation of the specific regimes for which the WKE holds. The present work theoretically delineates regimes of WKE applicability, and confirms those predictions on physically meaningful timescales via numerical simulations, thus remedying those deficiencies in prior work.

In this Letter, we discuss the validity regime of the WKE for one dimensional systems described by the defocusing quintic nonlinear Schrödinger equation (DQNLS),

$$iu_t + u_{xx} - \mu|u|^4u = 0. \quad (1)$$

Finite system size is modeled by spatial periodicity, $u(x, t) = u(x + L, t)$, for a given period L . The parameter $\mu > 0$, in combination with the amplitude of the (complex) wave $u(x, t)$, dictates the relative strength of the nonlinearity. Note that the squared norm $\|u\|^2 = \int_0^L |u(x, t)|^2 dx$ of any DQNLS wave is a conserved quantity. Therefore, due to the scaling symmetry of Eq. (1) and the presence of the nonlinearity strength μ in it, we are free to set $\|u\| = 1$ without loss of generality.

Due to the nature of the nonlinearity in Eq. (1), the dynamics of DQNLS waves are dominated by six-wave

interactions. Therefore, despite its simplicity, the considered model has direct relevance to physical systems dominated by six-wave interactions: for example Kelvin waves in superfluid turbulence [42], and small fluctuations around both the zero electric field and solitons in one-dimensional nonlinear optics [43].

The WKE corresponding to Eq. (1) describes the time evolution of the *wave action*, $n_k(t) = \langle |a_k(t)|^2 \rangle$, where $a_k(t)$ is the (complex) amplitude of the wave with wavenumber k , and the angle brackets represent averaging over ensembles of initial waves. Due to this system's finite size, each wavenumber k in the original system is an integer multiple of $\Delta k = 2\pi/L$, and the wave amplitudes are defined via the plane-wave expansion

$$u(x, t) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_k a_k(t) e^{i(kx - \omega_k t)}, \quad (2)$$

where $\omega_k = k^2$ is the linear dispersion relation for Eq. (1). The factor $1/L$ in Eq. (2) is used with an eye on the large L limit, required by the WKE description.

In order for WKE to apply, the phases of the wave amplitudes $a_k(t)$ must satisfy the *random phase approximation* (RPA), i.e., be close to randomly drawn from the uniform distribution of angles on the interval $[0, 2\pi)$ [11]. Together with the fact that $\|u\| = 1$, the RPA implies the scaling

$$\max |u(x, t)| = O(1/L^{1/2}). \quad (3)$$

In order to categorize scaling regimes for which we expect the WKE to apply, we link the nonlinearity parameter μ to L via the relation $\mu = L^p$. For waves with finite bandwidth, i.e., those whose wavenumbers k are restricted to a range $|k| \leq k_{\max}$, the scaling in Eq. (3) implies that the assumption of weak nonlinearity $\mu(\max |u|)^4 \ll \omega_{\max} = k_{\max}^2 = O(1)$ becomes

$$L^{p-2} \ll 1, \quad (4)$$

which implies validity of the WKE for $p < 2$.

Using the scaling $\mu = L^p$ and the RPA, the discrete analog of the WKE describing the evolution of n_k over a time interval $\Delta t \gg 1$, for systems of finite size is [39],

$$\Delta n_k = 12L^{2p-8} \sum_{K=0} \mathfrak{T} \frac{\sin^2(\Omega \Delta t / 2)}{(\Omega/2)^2}, \quad (5)$$

where $\Delta n_k = n_k(\Delta t) - n_k(0)$, and

$$K = \sum_{i=0}^2 k_i - \sum_{i=3}^5 k_i; \quad k_0 \equiv k \quad (6a)$$

$$\Omega = \sum_{i=0}^2 \omega_{k_i} - \sum_{i=3}^5 \omega_{k_i}, \quad (6b)$$

$$\mathfrak{T} = \left(\sum_{i=0}^2 \frac{1}{n_{k_i}} - \sum_{i=3}^5 \frac{1}{n_{k_i}} \right) \prod_{i=0}^5 n_{k_i}, \quad (6c)$$

and \mathfrak{T} is often called the collision term. To obtain the corresponding WKE for 6 wave interactions, we take the continuum limit of Eq. (5) by converting the sum to a Riemann sum, and recalling the limit

$$\frac{\sin^2(\Omega \Delta t / 2)}{(\Omega/2)^2} \rightarrow 2\pi \Delta t \delta(\Omega) \quad \text{for } \Delta t \gg 1. \quad (7)$$

The WKE is thus

$$\frac{dn_k}{d\tau} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathfrak{T} \delta(K) \delta(\Omega) dk, \quad (8)$$

where $\delta(\cdot)$ is the Dirac delta, $d\mathbf{k} = dk_1 dk_2 dk_3 dk_4 dk_5$, $\tau = t/\tau_{kin}$, and $\tau_{kin} = \pi L^{4-2p}/6$ is the *kinetic time scale* on which the wave actions experience $O(1)$ changes. Note that for the difference $\Delta n_k/\Delta t$ to become the τ -derivative, the inequality $\tau_{kin} \gg \Delta t$ must hold. This inequality confirms that ensembles of systems described by Eq. (1) evolve slowly, and is also consistent with the small-nonlinearity condition in Eq. (4). Nevertheless, note that Eq. (5) and the initial RPA only guarantee the validity of WKE in Eq. (8) on possibly very short τ -scales. This is because no theoretical argument can be used to guarantee RPA on longer τ -scales. The validity of WKE on τ -scales of length $O(1)$ must be verified by numerical simulations, which we carry out below.

Curiously, while the limit in Eq. (7) holds for small Ω , it is incorrect at $\Omega = 0$ where the limit is simply Δt^2 . This observation has important consequences for the validity of WKE in Eq. (8), and implies that the largest contributions to Eq. (8) are made by *quasi-resonant* terms in Eq. (5). That is to say, those terms for which the frequency difference, Ω , is small but does not vanish. Note that small frequency differences correspond to small but non-vanishing wavenumber differences, K defined in Eq. (6a). In fact, the Ω -width of the function described by the ratio on the left side of the formula in Eq. (7) is $1/\Delta t$. However, because that function has a point of discontinuity at $\Omega = 0$, terms corresponding to the *exact resonances*, where both K and Ω vanish simultaneously, should contribute additional terms of size $O(\Delta t^2 L^{2p-8})$ to Eq. (5). Their inclusion would indicate the possibility of linearly growing terms in Eq. (8), whose effect has not been accounted for. To estimate the cumulative effect of these neglected terms, notice that each term is of size $O(\Delta t L^{2p-8})$, and a naive count of their number is $O(L^2)$. [A more accurate count, which follows from number theoretic arguments described in [44], is $O(L^2 \ln L)$.] Therefore their cumulative contribution will be negligible, and thus the WKE in Eq. (8) will be valid, provided $\tau_{kin} L^{2p-6} \ll 1/\tau_{kin}$, i.e., $\tau_{kin} = O(L^{4-2p}) \ll L^{3-p}$. This implies the restriction $p > 1$. The important consequence of this argument is that WKE in Eq. (8) may not be valid for all times, but may instead break down at times $\tau = O(L^{p-1})$ on the kinetic timescale. This is an upper bound on the breakdown of the WKE on the




FIG. 1. L_2 -norm of mismatch between qNLSE and WKE as a function of L for the case $p = 1.4$ at $\tau = \tau_{kin}$, $2\tau_{kin}$, and $3\tau_{kin}$.

scale of the kinetic time, but in physical units of time the breakdown scale increases with L .

We now proceed with a numerical determination of the regimes for which the WKE gives a valid description of the dynamics governing ensembles of DQNLS waves on time intervals spanning several kinetic timescales. We expect WKE to apply to waves emerging from any initial conditions, as long as their constituent plane-wave amplitudes $a_k(0)$ satisfy the RPA. Therefore, as a particularly severe test, we choose discontinuous initial wave amplitudes such that $a_k(0) = C e^{i\gamma_k}$ for the wavenumbers k in some range $|k| \leq k_{max}$ and γ_k are all drawn from the uniform distribution of angles on $0 \leq \gamma_k < 2\pi$, and $a_k(0) = 0$ for k outside this range. Here, $C > 0$ is a constant selected so that $\|u\| = 1$. For definiteness, we choose $k_{max} = 1/2$.

Above, we theoretically determined that average ensemble dynamics of DQNLS waves should be well approximated by WKE in Eq. (8) when the parameter p satisfies the double inequality

$$1 < p < 2. \quad (9)$$

Using the intermediate value $p = 1.4$ [45], we proceed to show the correspondence between averaged DQNLS wave ensembles and the corresponding wave actions, $n_{k,WKE}$ in the limit of large L , which is necessary to guarantee that the weak nonlinearity condition in Eq. (4) is satisfied. Wave ensembles, $n_{k,DQNLS}$, are computed by averaging the squared wave amplitude moduli $|a_k(t)|^2$ from 1000 realizations of the random initial phases γ_k , followed by evolution via Eq. (1). These ensemble averages are then compared to the wave actions, $n_{k,WKE}$, obtained from WKE in Eq. (8). The discrepancy between $n_{k,DQNLS}$ and $n_{k,WKE}$ is measured in the squared norm in wavenumber space, i.e. $\|\phi\|^2 = (1/2\pi) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\phi(k,t)|^2 dk$, and the results presented

in Fig. 1. Also shown in the figure are least squares linear fits to the data in the log-log space. This evidence establishes convergence of wave ensembles derived from the DQNLS in Eq. (1), and the wave action defined from the WKE in Eq. (8), in the limit of large L .

Having shown agreement of the WKE and DQNLS for $L \gg 1$, the same ensemble averaging process is used to probe the validity of the WKE for a set of p using finite but large L and for predictions on time intervals of durations τ_{kin} , $2\tau_{kin}$, and $3\tau_{kin}$. In addition to values of p where good agreement is expected, we include results for the borderline case $p = 1$, and the case $p = 0.8$ which lies below the WKE validity range given by Eq. (9), i.e., in which exactly resonant interactions among six waves overwhelm the system dynamics before weakly turbulent dynamics describable by WKE in Eq. (8) could emerge. Note that for larger values of the power p , it is important to consider large system size L not only to satisfy the weak nonlinearity condition in Eq. (4), but also to avoid DQNLS waves that focus sharply towards a possible singularity. Clearly these focusing waves cannot be included in ensembles exhibiting weakly turbulent behavior. Fortunately, for fixed p , the likelihood of encountering such waves seems to decrease rapidly with L , and so by choosing a sufficiently large L , no focusing waves are encountered in our ensembles.

Results for all cases are presented in Fig. 2, which show that for values of p within the WKE validity range in Eq. (9), the best agreement between the ensemble averaged DQNLS wave dynamics and their description by the WKE in Eq. (8) occurs at moderate values of the wavenumber k , as expected. At these values, the agreement is almost perfect, and WKE even captures the remnants of the initial jump in the amplitudes of the individual plane-wave components at $k = \pm 1/2$. For small wavenumbers k , only excessively large ensemble sizes would improve the agreement. For very large wavenumbers no quantitative agreement other than vanishing smallness of both wave action measures, $n_{k,DQNLS}$ and $n_{k,WKE}$, is expected or seen. For the borderline case $p = 1$ and the invalid case $p = 0.8$, the ensemble averaged wave system dynamics appear to exhibit an initial tendency towards fast focusing and later growth slowdown, neither of which is captured by WKE. In particular, the case $p = 0.8$ waves overshoot the WKE prediction for small wavenumbers k , and both cases undershoot the WKE predictions in the moderate k regime in which the best agreement is expected.

In order to more closely investigate the transition in the dynamical behavior of DQNLS wave ensembles and the approximating WKE dynamics at the parameter value $p = 1$, we take a closer look at both for the parameter values $p = 0.9$ and $p = 1.1$, which are located close to this transition but on the opposite sides of it. Fig. 3 shows that for the parameter value $p = 1.1$, which lies just over the threshold of the WKE validity range in




FIG. 2. Comparison of averaged squared amplitudes of harmonics from simulations of qNLSE and WKE for different values of parameter p .




FIG. 3. Solutions of qNLSE at different times for $p = 0.9$, slightly below the threshold in (9) and for $p = 1.1$, slightly above the threshold in (9). In both cases $t = \tau_{kin}$ and $L = 80$.

Eq. (9) at $p = 1$, the WKE gives an excellent approximation to the ensemble averaged shape and dynamics of the corresponding DQNLS waves. In particular, at the time $t = \tau_{kin}$, the WKE captures well the diminishing initial discontinuity of the waves and also accurately approximates the ensemble averaged squared wave amplitudes. This accuracy continues at the time $t = 2\tau_{kin}$. This is not the case for the parameter value $p = 0.9$, which lies just below the left threshold in Eq. (9). The ensemble averaged wave system dynamics in this case again appear to exhibit an initial tendency towards fast focusing and later growth slowdown not captured by WKE. Thus, comparing the behavior of DQNLS wave ensembles and WKE solutions in these two fairly close parameter regimes clearly illustrates the threshold behavior predicted in Eq. (9).

Simulations of the DQNLS were performed on the periodic domain $x \in [-L/2, L/2]$. The spatial discretization used 12th-order accurate central finite differences with $N = \lceil 5L \rceil + 2$ discretization points, where $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ indicates the next largest even integer. This grid resolution

is sufficiently fine that the differencing remain accurate to nearly machine precision throughout the simulation. Time advancement was performed using 6th-order accurate explicit Runge-Kutta time stepping. The combination of 12th-order spatial differencing and 6th-order time stepping with Δt chosen as indicated implies that the accuracy of the overall method is $O(h^{12})$.

The WKE (8) was solved numerically using an algorithm inspired by Webb-Resio-Tracy [46–48] approach to simulation of WKE for gravity waves. In short, the six-dimensional wavenumber space is scanned, and only those mode sextets which satisfy resonant conditions are retained. Details of the algorithm will be published elsewhere. All simulations of WKE were performed using 81 harmonics.

To conclude, in the case of the DQNLS, we provided a clear delineation of parameter regimes for which its corresponding WKE predicted by WTT is expected to be valid. These predictions are verified directly via numerical simulation. Furthermore, we laid out straightforward theoretical justification for our parameter regime predictions. These same arguments are malleable and may be used to infer parameter regimes of validity for other WKEs predicted by WTT.

The authors are grateful for support from the Simons Collaboration on Wave Turbulence. We also acknowledge NSF support DMS-1900149, DMS-1615859 and DMS-1363013. The simulations presented in this article were performed using the Princeton Research Computing resources at Princeton University and NYU IT High Performance Computing resources. We would like to thank P. Kramer and Y. Lvov for useful suggestions.

* banksj3@rpi.edu
 † tjb4@math.princeton.edu
 ‡ alexkor@math.unm.edu
 § kovacg@rpi.edu
 ¶ shatah@cims.nyu.edu

- [1] L. Boltzmann, Wien. Ber. **58**, 517 (1868; reprinted in Boltzmann *Abhandlungen*, **1**, Barth, Leipzig, 1909, page 49).
- [2] L. Boltzmann, Wien. Ber. **66**, 275 (1872; reprinted in Boltzmann *Abhandlungen*, **1**, Barth, Leipzig, 1909, page 316).
- [3] L. W. Nordheim, Proc. Royal Soc. A **119**, 689 (1928).
- [4] R. Peierls, Annalen der Physik **395**, 1055 (1929).
- [5] A. A. Vlasov, J. Phys. USSR, **291** (1938).
- [6] L. D. Landau, J. Phys. (USSR) **10**, 25 (1946).
- [7] K. Hasselmann, J. Fluid Mech. **12**, 481 (1962).
- [8] D. Benney and P. Saffman, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series A (Mathematical and Physical Sciences) **289**, 301 (1965).
- [9] V. E. Zakharov, J. Exp. Teor. Phys. **24**, 740 (1967).
- [10] D. J. Benney and A. C. Newell, Studies in Applied Mathematics **48**, 29 (1969).
- [11] V. E. Zakharov, V. S. Lvov, and G. Falkovich, *Kolmogorov Spectra of Turbulence I* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992).
- [12] S. Nazarenko, *Wave Turbulence* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011).
- [13] A. N. Kolmogorov, Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR **30**, 301 (1941).
- [14] U. Frisch, *Turbulence: The Legacy of A. N. Kolmogorov* (Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- [15] E. Gledzer, Soviet Physics Doklady **18**, 216 (1973).
- [16] V. Desnianskii and E. Novikov, Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics **38**, 468 (1974).
- [17] A. M. Obukhov, Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Atmos. Oceanic Phys. **10**, 127 (1974).
- [18] M. Yamada and K. Ohkitani, Physical review letters **60**, 983 (1988).
- [19] C. Foias, D. D. Holm, and E. S. Titi, Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena **152-153**, 505 (2001), advances in Nonlinear Mathematics and Science: A Special Issue to Honor Vladimir Zakharov.
- [20] A. Arnèodo, R. Benzi, J. Berg, L. Biferale, E. Bodenschatz, A. Busse, E. Calzavarini, B. Castaing, M. Cencini, L. Chevillard, R. T. Fisher, R. Grauer, H. Homann, D. Lamb, A. S. Lanotte, E. Lévèque, B. Lüthi, J. Mann, N. Mordant, W.-C. Müller, S. Ott, N. T. Ouellette, J.-F. Pinton, S. B. Pope, S. G. Roux, F. Toschi, H. Xu, and P. K. Yeung (International Collaboration for Turbulence Research), Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 254504 (2008).
- [21] R. Benzi and L. Biferale, Journal of Statistical Physics **161**, 1351 (2015).
- [22] M. Onorato, A. R. Osborne, M. Serio, D. Resio, A. Pushkarev, V. E. Zakharov, and C. Brandini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 144501 (2002).
- [23] A. I. Dyachenko, A. O. Korotkevich, and V. E. Zakharov, JETP Lett. **77**, 546 (2003), physics/0308101.
- [24] A. I. Dyachenko, A. O. Korotkevich, and V. E. Zakharov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 134501 (2004), physics/0308099.
- [25] V. E. Zakharov, A. O. Korotkevich, A. Pushkarev, and D. Resio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 164501 (2007), arXiv:0705.2838.
- [26] A. O. Korotkevich, A. Pushkarev, D. Resio, and V. E. Zakharov, Eur. J. Mech. B/Fluids **27**, 361 (2008), physics/0702145.
- [27] Y. V. Lvov and A. C. Newell, Physics Letters A **235**, 499 (1997).
- [28] A. C. Newell and V. E. Zakharov, Phys. Lett. A **372**, 4230 (2008).
- [29] A. O. Korotkevich, A. O. Prokofiev, and V. E. Zakharov, JETP Lett. **109**, 309 (2019), 1808.04953.
- [30] G. Falkovich and N. Vladimirova, Phys. Rev. E **91**, 041201 (2015).
- [31] A. J. Majda, D. W. McLaughlin, and E. G. Tabak, J. Nonlin. Sc. **7**, 9 (1997).
- [32] D. Cai, A. Majda, D. McLaughlin, and E. Tabak, PNAS **96**, 14216 (2000).
- [33] V. E. Zakharov, O. A. Vasiliev, and A. I. Dyachenko, JETP Lett. **73**, 63 (2001).
- [34] B. Rumpf and L. Biven, Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena **204**, 188 (2005).
- [35] A. O. Korotkevich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 074504 (2008), arXiv:0805.0445.
- [36] V. E. Zakharov, A. O. Korotkevich, and A. O. Prokofiev, AIP Proceedings, CP1168 **2**, 1229 (2009).
- [37] A. O. Korotkevich, Math. Comput. Simul. **82**, 1228 (2012), arXiv:0911.0741.
- [38] C. Collot and P. Germain, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1912.10368 (2019), arXiv:1912.10368 [math.AP].
- [39] T. Buckmaster, P. Germain, Z. Hani, and J. Shatah, Inventiones (to appear).
- [40] Y. Deng and Z. Hani, Forum of Mathematics, Pi **9**, e6 (2021).
- [41] Y. Deng and Z. Hani, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2104.11204 (2021), arXiv:2104.11204 [math.AP].
- [42] E. Kozik and B. Svistunov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 035301 (2004).
- [43] J. Laurie, U. Bortolozzo, S. Nazarenko, and S. Residori, Physics Reports **514**, 121 (2012), one-Dimensional Optical Wave Turbulence: Experiment and Theory.
- [44] T. Buckmaster, P. Germain, Z. Hani, and J. Shatah, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics **71**, 1407 (2018) <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/cpa.21749>.
- [45] We note that with $p < 2$ fixed, the requirement $\tau_{kin} \gg 1$ provides an additional practical bound on L for our simulations, which degenerates at $p = 2$.
- [46] D. Webb, Deep Sea Research **25**, 279 (1978).
- [47] B. Tracy and D. Resio, US Army Corps of Engineers: Washington, DC, USA **WIS Report 11** (1982).
- [48] D. Resio and W. Perrie, J. Fluid Mech. **223**, 603 (1991).