

Some results concerning the “dynamical systems approach” to the “turbulence problem”

K. R. Sreenivasan
Yale University, USA

Abstract. This is a selected summary of our recent work on the “dynamical systems approach” to the understanding of transition and turbulence in the so-called open flows, and covers three topics: universality in transition to chaos in wakes, the description and dynamics of intermittent fields in fully turbulent flows, and the nature of vorticity and scalar interfaces in turbulent free shear flows. I propose to show that novel techniques from low-dimensional chaos and fractal geometry yield new and useful information on quantities of central interest in turbulence, but the way ahead is long and uncharted.

1. Introduction and the scope of the paper

The so-called “turbulence problem” is not a monolithic entity. Its three essential elements are the origin of turbulence, the dynamics of fully developed turbulence, and the control of turbulence—by which is meant “making turbulent *flows* behave the way one wants.” The origin of turbulence may have some relation to the onset of complexity in nonlinear systems in general, and hence the currency for notions such as “universality.” On the other hand, a universal solution to the turbulence control problem is unlikely to exist, because it is specific to a given set of flow and geometric constraints. Fully developed turbulence has a mix of the “universal” (now in the slightly different sense of being common to a class of turbulent flows) and the particular, both of which are essential to predictive undertaking: The scaling properties of the turbulent energy dissipation and small scale mixing are examples of the former class while the variation with Reynolds number of the drag on a circular cylinder belongs to the latter. The different elements of the turbulence problem are all important in their own right, and the tools of trade are appropriately

different. The corollary is that the mastery over no single set of tools will be adequate to address the problem in its full glory.

Just as the turbulence problem is a diffuse one, so is the “dynamical systems approach”: As Holmes¹ points out, it is a loose but rich mixture of many tools including mathematical theorems, numerical work, experimental studies, and model building. As a result of recent developments in dynamical systems, one is now in a position to say essentially everything of interest (at least in a certain parameter range) about the dynamics of some paradigmatic nonlinear systems possessing global universality—the period-doubling system being the best known example. The situation is less satisfactory when such global universality is absent. The procedure then is to use the center manifold reduction and classify all possible phase portraits by unfolding the appropriate parameters.² In particular, one attempts to study all stable attracting sets. Except when the number of parameters needing unfolding is small (one or two), the possibilities are so huge that one is unlikely to succeed in any generality. One often strings together, by taking recourse to hindsight and symmetry, a number of local bifurcations “explaining” a particular sequence. In rare circumstances, one has been able to generate dynamical equations by this knowledge.

This paper is devoted to aspects of the dynamical systems approach to the turbulence problem. The first qualification is that it concentrates completely on the so-called “open flow systems,” by which I mean a large system (e.g., large aspect ratio) with a directionality due, for example, to the superimposed mean velocity. The decision to omit mention of some excellent work in “closed flow systems” simply reflects my belief that there are many articles written on the topic, and that there is a general feeling that such flows, at least when “small” and restricted to some parameter ranges, are amenable to the dynamical systems approach. The situation, it appears to have been perceived, is either less clear or essentially hopeless for open flows. One purpose of this paper is to address this issue; the other is to discuss fully turbulent flows.

There are some reasons (Ref. 3; see also Ref. 4) to believe that open flows behave differently from closed flows. In all closed flows—of which convection in small aspect ratio boxes and a narrow gap Taylor–Couette apparatus are familiar examples—the boundary is fixed so that only certain classes of eigenfunctions can be selected; this does not hold for open systems. For closed flows, each value of the control parameter (say, the rotation speed of the inner cylinder in the Taylor–Couette apparatus) characterizes a given state of the system globally. Consider, as an example of open flows, a fluid jet emerging from a circular nozzle. For a given Reynolds number, the flow is laminar and steady at the exit of the nozzle,

periodic somewhat downstream, and undergoes transition to strong turbulence even further down. Unless these different states are in some sense independent, it is difficult to see how notions from low-dimensional dynamics can be relevant to this flow. Further, the nature and influence of external disturbances (or “noise”) are delicate and harder to ascertain. In some cases (such as pipe flows), *sustained* (as opposed to transient) noise is essential for the continued loss of stability of the basic system. This only means that things are more complex, and the question of what circumstances permit low-dimensional description becomes extremely important.

This paper (which is a modified account of Ref. 5) is by choice a summary of recent results covering a range of topics under the broad heading—nothing will, however, be said here on the control of transitional and turbulent flows—and not a detailed account of any single problem. Parts of this work have yet to be taken to their logical conclusion, but selective questions can already be asked and partially answered.

In the context of transition to chaos, much effort has been spent on showing that transition to the chaotic state is universal in character. (This statement needs more precision, and we shall return to it later.) Predictions concerning universality (see Ref. 6 for the period-doubling route, and Ref. 7 for the quasiperiodic route) have been tested in detail, and there is enough evidence now that low-dimensional temporal chaos has provided new as well as useful ideas and tools for analyzing early stages of transition in (some types of) flow systems which are closed⁸ as well as open.^{3,9} In Sec. 2, I present a summary of some recent findings in the wake of a circular cylinder to demonstrate the existence there of universal features.

Experience shows that temporal chaos is of restrictive value once spatial three-dimensionality and classical power-law behaviors set in. Fully developed turbulence is high-dimensional¹⁰ and has distinct spatial structures, the gap between what one *can* do with low-dimensional chaos and what one *needs* to do in fully developed turbulence being very wide indeed! One type of advance made in a low-dimensional chaotic system that has found some application in turbulence is the invention of several dynamical measures of stochasticity such as Liapunov exponents¹¹ and scaling functions,⁶ or static measures such as the Hausdorff–Besicovich dimension,¹² fractal dimension,¹³ generalized dimensions,¹⁴ multifractal spectra,¹⁵ and various entropies.¹⁶ Such measures have been made accessible to an experimentalist because of the important notion that an attractor can be constructed by suitably embedding a time series in phase space,¹⁷ even though circumstances do exist in which the technique might not be accurate or even useful. These measures cannot be obtained in

practice for a high-dimensional phase space, but progress has been made by treating an instantaneous realization of a flow as a kinematic object consisting of various *measures distributed on fractal sets embedded in three-dimensional physical space*. I shall summarize this progress in Secs. 3–5, and remark on the possible utility of such measurements. Brief concluding remarks will be presented in Sec. 6.

2. Universality in transition to chaos in wakes behind cylinders

Briefly, with increasing Reynolds number, the flow behind a stationary circular cylinder first undergoes a Hopf bifurcation^{18,19} from the steady state to a periodic one characterized by the vortex shedding mode at a frequency f_o , say. We have shown¹⁹ that the supercritical state (above the critical Reynolds number of 46 when based on the cylinder diameter D and the oncoming velocity) can be modeled by the Landau–Stuart equation, and experimentally determined the relevant constants. These details appear not to depend on the aspect ratio (length to diameter ratio) if it exceeds about 60.

I had shown earlier³ that a quasiperiodic motion sets in at a somewhat higher Reynolds number. A view has been expressed²⁰ that the quasiperiodicity observed in Ref. 3 could be the result of aeroelastic coupling between the cylinder and the flow, but I must emphasize that no perceptible cylinder vibrations were present in our experiments; see Fig. 1. Recent work²¹ has shown that the observed quasiperiodicity is due to changes in spanwise direction of the vortex shedding pattern. It is of interest to note that quasiperiodicity is absent in recent numerical calculations²² on the ideal two-dimensional flow past an infinitely long cylinder in an infinite domain (the latter simulated by prescribing boundary conditions appropriately on a finite domain), but that complex effects from finite boundaries do give rise to the experimentally observed quasiperiodicity. Even very large aspect ratio cylinders in experiments produce quasiperiodicity if either the cylinder diameter or the oncoming stream is slightly nonuniform along the cylinder span. One may infer that quasiperiodicity is a real feature of most wakes set up in real systems.

A higher Reynolds number gives rise to chaos.³ To observe universality expected to accompany the breakdown of quasiperiodicity to chaos, complete control on flow parameters must be maintained. In contrast to the vortex shedding, features of quasiperiodicity depend on cylinder aspect ratio, its end conditions, and other boundary effects, all of which are not totally under control for a stationary cylinder. It is thus useful to




Fig. 1. The bottom figure is the time trace from the output of the optical probe (MTI Fotonic sensor) mounted to measure possible transverse displacements of the circular cylinder situated in uniform stream. The cylinder is "shedding" vortices at a frequency of 287.5 Hz and as discussed in Ref. 3, the quasiperiodic behavior in temporal dynamics is evidenced by the presence of sidepeaks with a difference frequency of 36 Hz. The power spectral density of the time trace is shown in the upper figure. The spectrum shows peaks at 14, 28, 60, 120 and 180 Hz. The last three are related to the response of the optical probe to indicator lights of the electronic instrumentation in an otherwise darkened laboratory. The first two frequencies are related to floor (and thus tunnel) vibrations which have since been damped—the data presented here were obtained in 1985—with no effect on the observed wake dynamics. More details are forthcoming in Ref. 21.

explore quasiperiodic dynamics of the wake by transversely oscillating the cylinder in a controlled manner.

In the work described in Ref. 9, the cylinder was placed in a specially designed wind tunnel that allowed more than the usual degree of control on flow parameters, and was oscillated transversely (in the first mode) at various known amplitudes. The Reynolds number was fixed at some value in the supercritical state (55 being the Reynolds number for which the bulk of the data has been obtained). The flow velocity was monitored by a standard hot-wire placed approximately $15D$ downstream and $0.5D$ to one side of its rest position. The imposed modulation on the cylinder was at the desired frequency f_e , the amplitude of oscillation A being then

a measure of the nonlinear coupling between the two modes. The system thus has two competing frequencies f_o and f_e , yielding two control parameters f_e/f_o and the nondimensional amplitude of oscillation, A/D . Once the external modulation is imposed, we expect f_o to shift to f'_o (say). By mapping the entire plane of f_e/f'_o and A/D , one can observe many features common to a class of nonlinear systems with two competing frequencies—no matter what precise differential equation governs the system. This is the spirit of universality.

In particular, these universal aspects of transition from quasiperiodicity to chaos have been worked out in detail for the sine circle map and are believed to be universal for any map with a cubic inflection point. In the subcritical state, iterates of the map lock on to rational frequency ratios in the so-called Arnold tongues which increase in width as the nonlinearity parameter increases. At the critical state corresponding to the onset of chaos, universal features occur. To observe them, it is best to proceed without phase locking, this constraint naturally leading to the choice of the golden mean σ_G for the frequency ratios: Note that the irrational number σ_G is least well approximated by rationals (since it contains only 1's in its continued fraction representation), and hence best suited for avoiding lock-ins—which in principle are possible at all rational frequency ratios.

Olinger and Sreenivasan⁹ have demonstrated that the wake of an oscillating cylinder at low Reynolds number is a nonlinear system in which a limit cycle due to natural vortex shedding is modulated, generating in phase space a flow on a Torus. They experimentally showed that the system displays Arnold tongues for rational frequency ratios, and approximates the devil's staircase along the critical line. At the critical golden mean point accompanying quasiperiodic transition to chaos, spectral peaks were observed at various Fibonacci sequences predicted for the circle map and, except for low frequencies, had the right magnitudes. A pseudoattractor was constructed by the usual time delay and embedding methods¹⁷ from the time series of velocity at the critical golden mean point, and Poincaré sections were obtained by sampling data at intervals separated by the period of forcing. The resulting Poincaré section was embedded in three dimensions (in which it was nonintersecting in all three views), and a smoothed attractor was obtained by performing averages locally. The data were then used to compute the generalized dimensions¹⁴ by using standard box-counting methods; in the appropriate log-log plots, the scale similarity regime extended typically over two decades. The multifractal spectrum, or the $f(\alpha)$ curve, was then obtained via the Legendre transform discussed in Ref. 15. The multifractal spec-

trum as well as the spectral peaks showed that the oscillating wake belongs to the same universality class as the sine circle map.

To push this correspondence further, consider the scaling function invented by Feigenbaum.⁶ This compact way of describing the dynamics of the system contains complete microscopic description (not merely statistical averages) of the attractor—modulo the information on its embedding dimension. The attractor at the onset of chaos can be regarded as constructed by a process that undergoes successive refinement and leads eventually to the observed scale-similar properties. Such a process can be mapped onto a subdividing tree structure whose branches now are the iterates of the dynamical system; the scaling function correctly organizes the intervals to be compared from one level of refinement to another. Extracting Feigenbaum's scaling function experimentally is a nontrivial task, but one can instead use a suitably modified version²³ based on comparing intervals within a single periodic orbit rather than of two different orbits at the same level of stability. Olinger *et al.*⁹ have obtained this modified scaling function at several successive approximations to the critical golden mean point, and shown that it is in good agreement with that calculated for the sine circle map.

These are detailed tests of (metric) universality, comparable to that in some experiments in closed flows. *I find it remarkable that a complex flow such as the wake should conform to predictions for the circle map.* This does not mean, however, that transition to chaos and chaos itself can necessarily be described in every flow equally neatly and in as much detail, or that they all belong to some universality class or another. It is believed that the wake is special because of the global nature of the vortex-shedding instability, which confers upon the flow an extraordinary spatial organization, but a broad knowledge of what special circumstances or features of the flow render such questions useful is accumulating only slowly.²⁴ There is room for further work, *but it is clear that the dynamical systems approach is useful even for some classes of open flows.* For further remarks on the implications of the results, I refer the reader to the papers cited.

In addition to demonstrating universality in a familiar flow, the work just summarized has the practical value of predicting the width of lock-in regions, and of organizing under a broad umbrella many isolated results on oscillating cylinders. I must remark, however, that the *relevance to fully turbulent state is unclear of these and similar demonstrations of universality accompanying transition to chaos; in fact, the role of chaos in bringing about turbulence is an outstanding question.* In simple dynamical systems—the circle map and the logistic map being two specific examples—one has been able to discover the underlying dynamical struc-

ture of the asymptotic state by unraveling the bifurcation sequence as the control parameter evolves. A lesson often emphasized²⁵ is that the ordering of the asymptotic state may be discerned by understanding the ordering during the evolution of the system to that state. This statement can at best be partially true, if that, for fluid turbulence. If the striking similarity between the coherent motion in a fully turbulent flow and the corresponding motion in its transitional stage is not accidental, it is probably true that the former can be understood in terms of transitional structures. On the other hand, it appears futile to seek the key to the understanding of universal aspects of fully developed turbulence in the transition process because different transition scenarios lead to the same end product. Some thoughts on these issues are taking shape, but I shall now move on to the fully turbulent state.

3. Internal intermittency in turbulent flows

As already remarked, an instantaneous realization of a fully turbulent flow such as a jet is an object I wish to study. In this section, I concentrate on aspects of internal structure which, in regions far away from the boundary, are statistically independent of the boundary and initial conditions; the specific quantities examined are the distribution of the turbulent energy dissipation, the “dissipation” rate of the variance of a passive scalar, and absolute values of turbulent vorticity and the Reynolds shear stress. These quantities are all dynamically important and distributed in some complex way in the three-dimensional real space. (The former two are always positive, but of real interest are vorticity and the Reynolds stress without the absolute sign. It is at the moment unclear as to how one should deal effectively with intermittent processes which are both positive and negative.) Figure 2 shows the distributions of one component of energy dissipation along a line in the fully turbulent part of a laboratory boundary layer at moderate Reynolds number and in the atmospheric surface layer at a much higher Reynolds number. It is clear that the spatial distribution becomes increasingly intermittent as the Reynolds number increases. The intermittency of the scalar “dissipation” as measured on a planar cut is shown in Fig. 3. This outstanding feature of high Reynolds number turbulence implies that thorough spatial mixing does not occur on small scales. The inexorable tendency to attain uniform levels due to molecular smearing is continually countered by the nonlinear processes that tend to maintain the observed inequalities from place to place.

Two points of interest here are the description of such intermittent distributions and the identification of the dynamical scenarios leading to




Fig. 2. Typical signals of $\epsilon' = (du/dt)^2$ normalized by its mean. The upper trace (a) was obtained in a laboratory boundary layer on a smooth, flat plate at the moderate Reynolds number R_λ of 150 (based on the Taylor microscale and the root-mean-square fluctuation velocity in the main flow direction). The lower trace (b) was obtained in the atmospheric surface layer a few meters above the roof of a four-story building. The Reynolds number R_λ is about 1500. It is believed that the statistics of ϵ' are representative of those of the total energy dissipation. For a description of experimental conditions, see Refs. 26 and 28. The figure is taken from Ref. 28.

them. Such highly intermittent processes cannot be described efficiently by the conventional moment methods known to be successful for Central Limit type processes. In particular, if a process is Gaussian, its mean and variance describe the process completely; for others close to Gaussian, a few low-order moments contain most of the information. On the other hand, for processes of the type shown in Figs. 2 and 3, the first few moments give little clue to the nature of the process.

Multifractal measures, as they are called in the present parlance of dynamical systems, have built-in intermittency which therefore makes it logical to examine their usefulness in our context; see Mandelbrot,¹⁴ Hentschel and Procaccia,¹⁴ and Ref. 15. Essentially, multifractals are built up by a procedure (which is often rather simple) that proceeds from one scale (the parent scale) to the next smaller ones (the offspring) in such a way that the measure (roughly, the amount of a positive quantity




Fig. 3. Dissipation rate χ of the concentration fluctuation c as a function of the two coordinates x (axial) and y (radial) in the fully turbulent part of an axisymmetric jet. The figure covers a grid of 150×150 pixels. The nozzle Reynolds number is about 4000, and the center of the picture is about 15 nozzle diameters downstream. $\chi(c)$ was approximated by the sum $(dc/dx)^2 + (dc/dy)^2 + (dc/dz)^2$ obtained at the Kolmogorov scale resolution; $\langle \chi \rangle$ is the average of χ . The figure is taken from Ref. 51.

such as the rate of energy dissipation) contained in the parent scale is unequally divided among its offspring. When this procedure repeats many times, the measure on the offspring of each successively higher generation will become increasingly uneven. If the basic rule determining the unequal division from a parent scale to its offspring is independent of the generation level, one expects certain scale-similar properties. Because the measure on an arbitrary offspring at a given generation level is determined by the product of the multipliers (that is to say, numbers characterizing the unequal division of the measure) of all its forefathers, a multifractal can be associated with a multiplicative process. The first order of business would be to determine the multifractal properties of the intermittent process interesting to us, and, if possible, identify the associated multiplicative process—if one exists.

Because the measure concentrated on an offspring at any level is the product of the multipliers of all its forefathers, it is clear that the scaling will only be local; there is therefore the expectation that many, in fact infinitely many, scaling indices will be required for a meaningful description. The purpose of analysis then is to quantify these various scaling indices and unravel their other properties. A possible vehicle for doing this is the $f(\alpha)$ spectrum¹⁵ to which I have made reference already in Sec.




Fig. 4. The multifractal spectrum $f(\alpha)$ obtained from Legendre transforming the generalized dimension data; a direct method of measurement yields the same results. Circles correspond to a long data set (10^7 points) in the laboratory boundary layer on a smooth, flat plate, and the squares to that in the turbulent wake behind a circular cylinder (5×10^6 points). Both flows have moderate Reynolds numbers (R_λ on the order of 200). The dashed lines represent results from ensemble averaging over many short data segments, each of which is of the order of ten integral scales. The error bars correspond to the standard deviation observed from the analysis of short records. The solid line is the average from Ref. 26 in various flows, including the atmosphere. To transform $f(\alpha)$ values from one dimension to three dimensions, add 2 to the ordinate. The applicability of this additive law has been discussed in Ref. 28 from which this curve has been taken.

2; the difference, however, is that we are now considering distributions in three-dimensional physical space rather than in the phase space. The $f(\alpha)$ curve has been measured for positive definite quantities characterizing small scale turbulence. (For the energy dissipation see Refs. 26–29, for the scalar dissipation rate see Ref. 30, for the squared and absolute vorticity see Refs. 31–32, and for the absolute value of the Reynolds stress in the boundary layer see Ref. 33. I invite the reader's attention especially to Ref. 28 where there is a detailed discussion of the measurement techniques, signal/noise ratios, the ambiguities in determining the scaling regimes, and scaling exponents.) Typical $f(\alpha)$ curve for the energy dissipation is given in Fig. 4. Some of its salient features are the minimum value of α corresponding to the largest singularity in the distribution of ϵ , the maximum value of α corresponding to the least intense regions of ϵ , the maximum value of $f(\alpha)$, which is 3 (showing that there is some dissipation everywhere in the flow domain), and the point $f = \alpha$, which corresponds to the fractal set on which all the dissipation is con-

centrated in the limit of infinite Reynolds number.³⁴ Towards the end of this section, I shall remark briefly on fluctuations in D_q 's and $f(\alpha)$'s.

The multifractal description of intermittent quantities is more powerful than other descriptions, most of which turn out to be special cases. For example, Kolmogorov's space-filling dissipation³⁵ corresponds to the point (3,3) in the f - α plane. Similarly, the β -model,³⁶ in which only the fraction β of the space is occupied by homogeneously distributed dissipative regions, corresponds to another point (D_β, D_β) on the plane depending on the precise value of β . If the $f(\alpha)$ curve can be approximated by a parabola, Kolmogorov's log-normal approximation³⁷ results. The random β -model³⁸ is also inadequate because the dimension of the support in that model is less than 3.

These measurements have allowed interesting inferences to be made, and I shall illustrate some of them presently (Sec. 4). I must point out here that *the overwhelming conclusion of this work is that multifractals are a plausible vehicle for describing intermittent fields in turbulent flows.*

In the measurements mentioned above, the spatial resolution was limited to scales of the order of the Kolmogorov scale. If the Schmidt number σ (the ratio of the fluid viscosity to scalar diffusivity) is much larger than unity, the smallest scalar scale, the so-called Batchelor scale,³⁹ η_b , is much smaller. In such cases, there are two scaling regimes—roughly speaking, that between L and η and another between η and η_b —and it is possible to examine these two scaling regimes separately. In Ref. 40, we have explored the multifractal spectrum of the scalar dissipation in the scale range between η and η_b using one-dimensional sections. Finite Schmidt number corrections remain important even when σ is of the order 1000, but the primary conclusion is that all generalized dimensions are essentially equal to the fractal dimension of the support in the limit of infinitely large Schmidt numbers; equivalently, the multifractal spectrum is simply the point (3,3) in the f - α plane. The natural conclusion is this: *It is not necessary to invoke multifractals—or even ordinary fractals—for describing scalar fluctuations in the range between η and η_b ; classical tools should be adequate here.*

4. The dynamical information

Recall that the multifractal description of Sec. 3, general though it is, is only a static description. It is usually not possible to deduce dynamics from such static descriptions, but some headway can be made by noting that the multifractal description of dynamical systems is equivalent to thermodynamic description of statistical mechanical systems.⁴¹ Specifi-

cally, then, the question is: Can one deduce something about dynamics given merely thermodynamic information?

Consider the multiplicative process in which each parent interval breaks up into “ a ” number of new subintervals; we would have at the end of n stages of the cascade a^n pieces. The general procedure is to map such a process onto an a -state n -particle spin system and find, by taking recourse to the measured multifractal properties, the appropriate transfer matrix describing the transition from the n th stage to the $(n + 1)$ -th stage, or from an n -particle system to an $(n + 1)$ -particle system. One then has a dynamic process yielding the observed thermodynamics. Usually, one can only get the leading approximations to the transfer matrix.⁴¹ Chhabra *et al.*⁴² have examined the issue in detail with particular reference to turbulence, and shown (not surprisingly) that the procedure yields nonunique solutions: There are many dynamic processes which yield the same thermodynamics. However, a knowledge of the constraints on the system can render the choice much less ambiguous. Meneveau and Sreenivasan⁴³ have shown that the manifest part⁴⁴—that is, the part with $f > 0$ in one-dimensional cuts—of the measured multifractal spectrum is in good agreement with a binomial cascade model (designated in Ref. 43 as the p -model) in which a parent eddy breaks up (in one dimension) into two equal-sized eddies such that the measure (say, the energy dissipation rate) is redistributed between its two offspring in the ratio 7/3. (For general multiplicative processes in three dimensions, see Ref. 28.) This allows several quantitative predictions (such as the Reynolds number variation of the skewness and flatness factor of the velocity derivative) to be made; in Refs. 5, 26, and 43, we have shown that these predictions are in good agreement with measurement.

Keep in mind that the inversion is nonunique, which means that I cannot claim that p -models and other multinomial models represent true dynamics of energy cascade—despite impressive agreement with experiment. What one can say is that simple dynamical models can be constructed in such a way that their outcome is statistically the same, up to some level of approximation, as those of the measured results. *To determine, among the host of existing possibilities, the true dynamic picture requires more information, and is an area of active research.*

Similar binomial and multinomial models have been constructed for other quantities mentioned earlier. Further, the multifractal formalism has been extended³² to more than one coexisting multifractal measure. The primary motivation for this work is the realization that a high Reynolds number turbulent flow subsumes several intermittent fields simultaneously, and that they display different degrees of correlation among

them. The formalism has been applied to simultaneous measurements in several classical turbulent flows of a component of the dissipation rate of the kinetic energy, the dissipation rate of the passive scalar, as well as the square of a component of the turbulent vorticity field. Several joint binomial models, also in agreement with measurement, can be deduced for these joint distributions. One further area of progress⁴⁵ has been the recognition that the $f(\alpha)$ curve possesses useful information on spatial correlations (since two distant boxes at a higher cascade level share the same forefather at some earlier level), and that it provides a vehicle for quantifying the relative importance to transport of large amplitude but rare events in comparison with small amplitude but ubiquitous events.

A very interesting aspect of the multifractal work in turbulence is that even when the scaling appropriate to the measurement of $f(\alpha)$ is unambiguous as in high Reynolds numbers, the slopes fluctuate from one system to another. These fluctuations may arise because the system is small in the thermodynamic sense. Even at high Reynolds numbers where the ratio of the external scale to the dissipation scale is large, $Re = (L/\eta)^{4/3}$, a system of size L (in practice, a few L 's) is not a large system. The multifractal spectra computed from one such system to another show fluctuations which are not random but structured.²⁶ It is of course possible to eliminate such fluctuations by blindly averaging over many L 's but, aside from difficulties in interpretation, this diminishes the quality of scaling. (I therefore believe that the issue of proper averaging in turbulence needs reexamination.) Mandelbrot's work⁴⁴ has suggested that these fluctuations probably arise from fluctuations in the multipliers from one stage to another. This latter may arise in one-dimensional sections because the conservation of measure, which holds strictly for three dimensions, does not hold for one-dimensional cuts except on the average. More work on this issue is in progress.

5. Interfaces in turbulent flows: An example of "outer" dynamics

We now turn to "outer" dynamics of turbulence, typified by the interface bounding the flow. It is well known⁴⁶ that an unbounded turbulent flow such as a jet develops at high Reynolds numbers "fronts" across which vorticity changes are rather sharp on scales larger than the characteristic thickness of the front. This is the vorticity interface. A passive scalar introduced in a fully turbulent flow gets dispersed by turbulence, but itself possesses a scalar interface. The interest in such surfaces arises because of their relation to entrainment and mixing.^{47,48}

Interfaces are complex objects residing in three-dimensional physical space, and convoluted over a range of scales which, according to conventional wisdom, may be statistically self-similar. It is therefore thought¹³ that fractal description of such surfaces is possible. A primary property of a fractal surface being its fractal dimension, much attention has been paid to measuring it. At high enough Reynolds numbers, the scale separation between the largest and smallest interface scales is rather large, and this allows the use of fractals in its characterization. Unlike a mathematical fractal, the scale-similar regime of the interface is bounded (just as in multifractals of Sec. 3) on both sides by physical effects. When averaging is restricted to systems of size L (or $10L$), the upper cutoff occurs at around the integral (or correlation) scale of motion, this being comparable to (though distinctly less than) the gross size of the flow such as the flow width; the inner cutoff occurs at a scale where the fluid viscosity is felt directly. This latter scale is approximately the Kolmogorov scale η (or some close multiple of it). The fractal dimension thus characterizes scale similarity in the approximate range between L and η . For the scalar interface corresponding to large Schmidt numbers, there are (as described in Sec. 3) two scaling exponents or fractal dimensions, the second one corresponding to the scale range between η and η_b .

Fractal dimension measurements of vorticity interfaces have been made only in one-dimensional intersections,^{31,49} but those of the scalar interface in the scale range between L and η have been made using one-, two-, and full three-dimensional mappings of the scalar field.⁴⁹⁻⁵¹ A detailed discussion of the experimental procedures including considerations of noise effects can be found in Ref. 50. In the scale range between η and η_b , the requirement that the Batchelor scale be resolved allows only trivial extents of the flow to be mapped in two and three dimensions; one therefore has to resort only to one-dimensional intersections. Such measurements have been reported in Ref. 40.

Table I summarizes the results on the fractal dimensions of both scalar and vorticity interfaces. *One principal result is that the vorticity interface in several of the classical turbulent flows has a fractal dimension of 2.36 ± 0.05 , and that the dimension of the scalar interface in the scale range between L and η is also the same.* This last result is consistent with the understanding that the scalar is dynamically passive. The fact that the dimension is independent of the flow is an indication that the scales that produce the fractal character (scales less than the integral scale) possess kinematic similarity at this level of description. In the scaling range between η and η_b , the dimension is close to 3, that is to say, fluctuations in this range are space-filling. This is consistent with the conclusion in Sec. 3 that *one need not invoke fractals to describe these sub-Kolmogorov*

Table I. Summary of fractal dimension measurements in classical turbulent flows; from Ref. 50.

Flow	Scale range between η and L			Scale range between ^a η and η_b
	Method of measurement			
	1- <i>D</i> cuts ^b	2- <i>D</i> images	3- <i>D</i> images	
Round jet	2.36	2.36	2.36	2.7(Sc = 1930) ^c
Plane wake	2.40	2.36	2.36	2.7(Sc = 1930)
Plane mixing layer	2.39	2.34
Boundary layer	2.40	2.38

^aAll measurements are from one-dimensional cuts, with Taylor's hypothesis.

^bThese one-dimensional measurements for jets and wakes were made both with and without Taylor's hypothesis. Note that one-dimensional measurements often yield slightly higher values for the fractal dimension, but the experimental uncertainties preclude us from attaching much significance to it. The slight difference from one flow to another may or may not be significant; the present thinking is that it is not.

^cThe Schmidt number is obtained from Ref. 52. Typical error bars for this estimate are ± 0.03 .

fluctuations in scalars. I must remark that this is true only in the limit of infinite Schmidt numbers (if the Reynolds number is also proportionately higher), and finite Schmidt number effects reduce this value; for σ of the order of 1000, the measured dimension in this scale range is 2.7 ± 0.03 ; see Ref. 40.

One use to which the fractal dimension has been put is in the explanation of small scale turbulent mixing. The basic idea is that the properties of the scalar interface (say) and the mixing of the scalar with the ambient fluid are related; the area of the surface involves fractal dimension and the ratio of inner to outer cutoff scales.^{47,48} The *amount* of mixing is governed by large eddies in the flow, but the small scale mixing is accomplished by diffusion across the surface whose geometry is determined exactly by this requirement. Thus, even though the process is initiated by large scales, one can legitimately try to understand small scale mixing by concentrating on the diffusion end. This approach neither minimizes the role of large eddies nor resorts to gradient transport models usually discredited in turbulence theory. It has been shown^{47,48} that this approach yields results of some universality, simply because the small scale features are, to a first approximation, independent of config-

urational aspects of the flow. In particular, the arguments presented in Ref. 48 yield semitheoretical estimates for fractal dimensions which agree well with measurements.

The outstanding question is to show that the dynamics of the Navier–Stokes equations (or, more precisely, that of the Euler equations, since the effect of viscosity is believed here to be benign in that it merely sets the inner cutoff) somehow implies that the features described here³⁴ are indeed multifractal in nature—that is, they possess a certain type of spatial scale similarity. In spite of much impressive work,⁵³ these issues have remained essentially untouched and invite the attention of a talented reader. In particular, this question has to be reconciled with the much poorer existence of scale similarity in temporal dynamics.

6. Conclusions

The dynamical systems approach has introduced a variety of new tools and ideas for analyzing nonlinear systems. This is an outstanding accomplishment and deserves to become an integral part of the lore of nonlinear phenomena, including turbulence. Whether all or some of them are useful for furthering our knowledge and predictive capabilities of transitional and turbulent flows depends to some extent on the ingenuity with which these new tools are applied. Just as initial exaggerations on the importance of the dynamical systems approach to the turbulence problem were unhealthy, so are gloomy thoughts that the approach is but a passing fad to be disparaged. The success one can have with the application of these new tools depends to some measure on how well one understands them, and on how well one can reduce sophisticated mathematical formalisms to realizable measurements. I have presented a summary of some results in transitional and turbulent flows of the open type. These measurements were inspired, in fact made possible, by recent advances in dynamical systems.

It is often believed that the success of the dynamical systems approach in open flows is much less tangible. Just so, but a part of the reason is the culture of the community which works extensively with such flows. It is true that not all open flows in the early stages of transition can be usefully described by the dynamical systems approach, but so is it true that not all closed flows can be described in this manner! As mentioned already, a broad understanding of which types of flows can be so described is accumulating only slowly and its detailed discussion should therefore await another occasion; but it seems that the classification of flows as “open” and “closed” is probably not specific enough for present purposes.

Many of the multifractal measures in real space have been useful, but I should note that not all aspects of turbulent flows can be described by fractals; in fact, there is some evidence to suggest that the behavior of turbulence near the mean value of the signal possesses distinctively non-fractal properties. For them, Central Limit type statistics are more appropriate.

Finally, mere description of turbulence is no end in itself, and one needs to make predictions by building working models. Some predictions rendered possible from the present work have been summarized at appropriate places. The point must be made that the inherent degeneracy of the multifractal description makes it difficult to read conclusively into the dynamical scenarios inferred. If other measures are better suited to describe turbulence, it is not clear what they are; a partial answer in low-dimensional systems is discussed in Refs. 6 and 25. Turbulence has the peculiar status of being at once a classical problem and one at the forefront of physics. There is no complete agreement as to what information is essential and should be acquired, and there is room for fresh air here!

Acknowledgments

This work is the result of a collaborative effort with A. B. Chhabra, M. S. Fan, R. V. Jensen, A. Johnson, P. Kailasnath, C. Meneveau, D. J. Olinger, R. Ramshankar, R. R. Prasad, and P. J. Strykowski; to them all, I am grateful. I have benefited from discussions at various times with M. J. Feigenbaum, D. Gottlieb, B. Knight, B. B. Mandelbrot, M. V. Morkovin, M. Nelkin, and L. Sirovich. I am thankful to A. B. Chhabra, B.-T. Chu, C. Meneveau, D. J. Olinger, and P. P. Wegener for their comments on a draft of this paper, and to M. J. Feigenbaum for his hospitality during its writing. Different aspects of this work were supported by grants from AFOSR, DARPA (URI), and NSF.

References

1. P. Holmes, in *Whither Turbulence, or Turbulence at Cross Roads*, edited by J. L. Lumley (Springer, New York, 1989).
2. J. Guckenheimer and P. Holmes, *Nonlinear Oscillations, Dynamical Systems and Bifurcation of Vector Fields* (Springer, New York, 1983).
3. K. R. Sreenivasan, in *Frontiers of Fluid Mechanics*, edited by S. H. Davis and J. L. Lumley (Springer, New York, 1985), p. 41.
4. M. V. Morkovin, AIAA Paper-88-3675 (1988).
5. K. R. Sreenivasan, in *Whither Turbulence, or Turbulence at Cross Roads*, edited by J. L. Lumley (Springer, New York, 1989), pp. 269–291.

6. M. J. Feigenbaum, *J. Stat. Phys.* **19**, 25 (1979); M. J. Feigenbaum, *J. Stat. Phys. Lett.* **74A**, 375 (1979).
7. S. J. Shenker, *Physica (Utrecht)* **5D**, 405 (1982); M. J. Feigenbaum, L. P. Kadanoff, S. J. and Shenker, *Physica (Utrecht)* **5D**, 370 (1982); S. Ostlund, D. Rand, J. Sethna, and E. Siggia, *Physica (Utrecht)* **8D**, 303 (1983); D. Rand, S. Ostlund, J. Sethna, and E. Siggia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 596 (1985).
8. A. Libchaber and J. Maurer, *J. Phys. (Paris) Colloq.* **41**, C3-51 (1987); J. Stavans, F. Heslot, and A. Libchaber, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 596 (1985); M. H. Jensen, L. P. Kadanoff, A. Libchaber, I. Procaccia, and J. Stavans, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 2798 (1985); A. P. Fein, M. S. Heutemaker, and J. P. Gollub, *Phys. Scr.* **T9**, 79 (1985).
9. D. J. Olinger and K. R. Sreenivasan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 797 (1988); D. J. Olinger, A. Chhabra, and K. R. Sreenivasan, in *ASME Forum on Chaotic Dynamics of Fluid Flows*, edited by K. N. Ghia, Fluids Eng. Div. (1989).
10. L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, in *Fluid Mechanics*, Vol. 6 of the Course of Theoretical Physics (Pergamon, New York, 1982); P. Constantin, C. Foias, O. Manley, and R. Temam, *J. Fluid Mech.* **150**, 427 (1985).
11. A. M. Liapunov, see *Stability of Motion*, Vol. 30 of the series in Mathematics in Science and Engineering (Academic, New York, 1966).
12. F. Hausdorff, *Math. Ann.* **79**, 157 (1919); A. S. Besicovitch, *Math. Ann.* **101**, 161 (1929).
13. B. B. Mandelbrot, *The Fractal Geometry of Nature* (Freeman, San Francisco, 1982); see also G. Bouligand, *Bull. Sci. Math.* **II-52**, 320, 361 (1928).
14. A. Renyi, *Probability Theory* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1970); B. B. Mandelbrot, *J. Fluid Mech.* **62**, 331 (1974); H. G. E. Hentschel and I. Procaccia, *Physica (Utrecht)* **8D**, 435 (1983).
15. U. Frisch and G. Parisi, in *Turbulence and Predictability in Geophysical Fluid Dynamics*, edited by M. Ghil *et al.* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985), p. 84; T. C. Halsey, M. H. Jensen, L. P. Kadanoff, I. Procaccia, and B. I. Shraiman, *Phys. Rev. A* **33**, 1141 (1986).
16. A. N. Kolmogorov, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR* **124**, 754 (1959); see also V. I. Arnold and A. Avez, *Ergodic Problems in Classical Mechanics* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1968).
17. N. H. Packard, J. P. Crutchfield, J. D. Farmer and R. S. Shaw, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45**, 712 (1980); F. Takens, in *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Vol. 898, edited by D. A. Rand and L. S. Young (Springer, New York, 1981), p. 366; J.-P. Echmann and D. Ruelle, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **57**, 617 (1985).
18. C. Mathis, M. Provansal, and L. Boyer, *J. Phys. Lett.* **45**, L483 (1984); M. Provansal, M. Mathis, and L. Boyer, *J. Fluid Mech.* **182**, 1 (1987).
19. K. R. Sreenivasan, P. J. Strykowski, and D. J. Olinger, in *ASME Forum on Unsteady Flows*, edited by K. N. Ghia, Fluids Eng. Div. (1987), Vol. 52, p. 1.
20. C. Van Atta and M. Ghardib, *J. Fluid Mech.* **174**, 113 (1987).
21. D. J. Olinger, Ph.D. thesis, Yale University (in preparation).
22. S. Abarbanel, W. Don, D. Gottlieb, D. Rudy, and J. Townsend, *J. Fluid Mech.* (submitted).
23. A. L. Belmonte, M. J. Vinson, J. A. Glazier, G. H. Gunaratne, and B. G. Kenney, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 539 (1988).
24. P. Huerre and P. Monkewitz, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **22**, 473 (1990).
25. M. J. Feigenbaum, *J. Stat. Phys.* **52**, 527 (1988).
26. C. Meneveau and K. R. Sreenivasan, *Nucl. Phys. B. (Proc. Suppl.)* **2**, 49 (1987).

27. C. Meneveau and K. R. Sreenivasan, *Phys. Lett. A* **137**, 103 (1989).
28. C. Meneveau and K. R. Sreenivasan, *J. Fluid Mech.* (to be published).
29. A. Chhabra, C. Meneveau, R. Jensen, and K. R. Sreenivasan, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 5284 (1989).
30. R. R. Prasad, C. Meneveau, and K. R. Sreenivasan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 74 (1988); R. Ramshankar, Ph.D. thesis, Yale University (1988).
31. M. S. Fan, *Fluid Mech. Rep.* 01/88, Yale University (1988).
32. C. Meneveau, K. R. Sreenivasan, P. Kailasnath, and M. S. Fan, *Phys. Rev. A* **41**, 894 (1990).
33. P. Kailasnath, *Fluid Mech. Rep.* EAS 753a, Yale University (1988).
34. K. R. Sreenivasan, and C. Meneveau, *Phys. Rev. A* **38**, 6287 (1988).
35. A. N. Kolmogorov, *C. R. Acad. Sci. USSR* **30**, 301, 538 (1941).
36. U. Frisch, P.-L. Sulem, and M. Nelkin, *J. Fluid Mech.* **87**, 719 (1978).
37. A. N. Kolmogorov, *J. Fluid Mech.* **13**, 82 (1962).
38. R. Benzi, G. Paladin, G. Parisi, and A. Vulpiani, *J. Phys. A* **17**, 3521 (1984).
39. G. K. Batchelor, *J. Fluid Mech.* **5**, 113 (1959).
40. K. R. Sreenivasan and R. R. Prasad, *Physica (Utrecht)* **38D**, 322 (1989).
41. M. J. Feigenbaum, *J. Stat. Phys.* **46**, 919 (1987); M. J. Feigenbaum, M. H. Jensen, and I. Procaccia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 1507 (1986).
42. A. Chhabra, R. Jensen, and K. R. Sreenivasan, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 4593 (1989).
43. C. Meneveau and K. R. Sreenivasan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 1424 (1987).
44. B. B. Mandelbrot, in *Fractals*, edited by L. Pietronero (Plenum, New York, 1988).
45. M. E. Cates and J. M. Deutsch, *Phys. Rev. A* **35**, 4907 (1987); C. Meneveau and A. B. Chhabra, *Physica A* **164**, 564 (1990).
46. S. Corrsin and A. L. Kistler, *NACA Tech. Rep.* 3133 (1954).
47. F. Gouldin, *AIAA J.* **26**, 1405 (1988).
48. K. R. Sreenivasan, R. Ramshankar, and C. Meneveau, *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A* **421**, 79 (1989).
49. K. R. Sreenivasan and C. Meneveau, *J. Fluid Mech.* **173**, 357 (1986).
50. R. R. Prasad and K. R. Sreenivasan, *Phys. Fluids A* **2**, 792 (1990).
51. R. R. Prasad and K. R. Sreenivasan, *J. Fluid Mech.* **216**, 1 (1990).
52. B. R. Ware *et al.*, in *Measurement of Suspended Particles by Quasi-Elastic Scattering*, edited by B. E. Dahneke (Wiley, New York, 1983), p. 255.
53. A. J. Chorin, in *Vortex Flows*, edited by K. Gustafson and J. Sethian (Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, 1990); P. Constantin, in Newport Conference on Turbulence, 1989 (to be published).