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Experimental or numerical data in turbulence are invariably obtained at finite Reynolds numbers whereas theories of turbulence correspond to infinitely large Reynolds numbers. A proper merger of the two approaches is possible only if corrections for finite Reynolds numbers can be quantified. This paper heuristically considers examples in two classes of finite-Reynolds-number effects. Expansions in terms of logarithms of appropriate variables are shown to yield results in agreement with experimental and numerical data in the following instances: the third-order structure function in isotropic turbulence, the mixed-order structure function for the passive scalar and the Reynolds shear stress around its maximum point. Results suggestive of expansions in terms of the inverse logarithm of the Reynolds number, also motivated by experimental data, concern the tendency for turbulent structures to cluster along a line of observation and (more speculatively) for the longitudinal velocity derivative to become singular at some finite Reynolds number. We suggest an elementary hydrodynamical process that may provide a physical basis for the expansions considered here, but note that the formal justification remains tantalizingly unclear.

1. Introduction

If there is a unique state of turbulence at infinitely high Reynolds number, the question arises as to how to discern its properties from experiments and simulations at finite Reynolds numbers. The successful history of critical phenomena can be thought to be due to a powerful interplay between experiments on the one hand and, on the other hand, theories that accounted for the ‘finite’ effects (such as due to finite size and finite ‘distances’ away from the critical point). In turbulence, we should admit to knowing no formal way of inferring the right expansions around the infinite-Reynolds-number state, but offer here a few suggestive examples where logarithmic or inverse logarithmic expansions can be given reasonable justification and seem to play a constructive role – in so far as they allow us to obtain some new results and organize existing data more systematically. Logarithmic expansions do arise in field theory, and their appropriateness can be established there by partial resummations but these tools do not work for turbulence. The only past instances where inverse logarithmic expansions were employed in turbulence seem to be those in Barenblatt (1993), Barenblatt & Goldenfeld (1995), Barenblatt, Chorin & Prostokishin (1997), Castaing, Gagne & Hopfinger (1990) and Dubrulle (1996). We shall not duplicate the examples that these authors have ably discussed, but examine other instances after introducing each of them briefly in the following sections.
The next two sections deal with logarithmic expansions: §2 considers the Kolmogorov and Yaglom laws in isotropic turbulence, while §3 considers wall-bounded flows. Sections 4 and 5 consider respectively inverse logarithmic expansions for the clustering exponents of turbulent structures along an axis of intersection, and for the flatness factor of velocity derivatives. In each case, results of these expansions are compared with data from experiments and direct numerical simulations (DNS). Section 6 discusses physical mechanisms in possible support of log-expansions in turbulence.

2. Results for the inertial range of isotropic turbulence

We restrict attention to stationary isotropic turbulence without concerning ourselves with the effects of shear, though we expect the results to hold for shear flows as well.

2.1. The Kolmogorov law in isotropic turbulence

The intermediate scales between the large scale $L$ and the dissipation (or Kolmogorov) scale $\eta$ is called the inertial range. The inertial range of scales is associated with the 4/5ths law of Kolmogorov (1941) which states that

$$\langle \Delta u_r^3 \rangle = -\frac{4}{5} \langle \varepsilon \rangle r. \quad (2.1)$$

Here, $\Delta u_r \equiv u(x + r) - u(x)$ is the longitudinal velocity increment, $u$ is the velocity component in the direction $x$, and $\langle \varepsilon \rangle$ is the average of the energy dissipation rate, $\varepsilon$. The Kolmogorov law has a special status in turbulence as it is exact – since it is derived from the Navier–Stokes equations subject only to the asymptotic requirement of ‘sufficiently high’ Reynolds number.

The qualitative behaviour of $\langle \Delta u_r^3 \rangle$, called the third-order structure function, across the entire range of scales is shown in figure 1. The part labelled (i) is obtained by a Taylor expansion in the limit of $r \to 0$, and that labelled (iii) corresponds to the region of constant energy flux where the Kolmogorov law is valid. Part (iv) depends on the properties of large scales of the flow. Very little is known about the form of the part labelled (ii), although there exists an interpolation formula for the corresponding
region in even moments (Batchelor 1951; Stolovitzky, Sreenivasan & Juneja 1993). The part (iii) corresponding to (2.1) is expected to appear at high Reynolds numbers and become more extensive with increasing Reynolds number. Experimentally, there are claims that part (iii) appears even at modest Reynolds numbers but that its enlargement is very slow in Reynolds number – certainly slower than the growth of the ratio between integral and Kolmogorov scales.

To analyse the behaviour at finite Reynolds numbers, consider the Navier–Stokes equations for a viscous incompressible fluid with random force \( f(x, t) \), given by

\[
\frac{\partial u_j}{\partial t} + u_j \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i} + \nu \frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial x_j^2} + f_i(x, t), \tag{2.2a}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i} = 0, \tag{2.2b}
\]

where \( \nu \) is kinematic viscosity and \( \rho \) is the fluid density. Since the potential part of the external force can be included in the pressure gradient, the force can be assumed to be solenoidal. To simplify considerations below, \( f \) will be assumed to be Gaussian with zero mean and a rapidly oscillating character, or a \( \delta \)-correlation in time (Kraichnan 1968). Such fields are defined completely by their second-rank correlation tensor

\[
\langle f_i(x + r, t + \tau) f_j(x, t) \rangle F_{ij}(r) \delta(\tau). \tag{2.3}
\]

Novikov (1965) used (2.2) and (2.3) to show that the second- and third-order longitudinal structure functions are related by the equation

\[
S_3 = 6 \nu \frac{dS_2}{dr} - \frac{2}{r^4} \int_0^r x^4 F_{ii}(x) \, dx, \tag{2.4}
\]

where \( S_n \equiv \langle \Delta u^n \rangle \). Novikov also showed that

\[
F_{ii}(0) = 2 \langle \varepsilon \rangle. \tag{2.5}
\]

Thus, \( F_{ii} \) corresponds to an external energy input rate, an assertion that is also supported by Novikov’s relation \( \langle f_i(x, t) v_j(x', t) \rangle = \frac{1}{2} F_{ij}(x - x') \).

For \( r \ll L \), it can be shown readily from (2.4) and (2.5) (see Novikov 1965) that

\[
S_3 \simeq 6 \nu \frac{dS_2}{dr} - \frac{4}{3} \langle \varepsilon \rangle r. \tag{2.6}
\]

Without the viscous term, this is indeed Kolmogorov’s 4/5ths law. Kolmogorov obtained the result without assumptions on the nature of forcing, but our point is that the formalism, which we use below, is consistent with the exact result.

Let us rewrite (2.4) formally as

\[
S_3 = -\frac{2}{r^4} \int_0^r x^4 \tilde{F}(x) \, dx, \tag{2.7}
\]

where we define the generalized energy input rate as

\[
\tilde{F}(x) \equiv F_{ii}(x) - \frac{3 \nu}{x^4} \frac{d(x^4 dS_2/dx)}{dx}. \tag{2.8}
\]

Assuming the existence of a local maximum of the generalized energy input rate, i.e. a local maximum of \( \tilde{F}(x) \) at \( x = x_m \) (where \( \eta < x_m < L \)), let us expand it in terms of the logarithm of the relative distance from \( x_m \):

\[
\tilde{F}(x) = \tilde{F}(x_m) - a_1(\ln(x/x_m))^2 + \cdots + a_{n-1}(\ln(x/x_m))^{n-1} + \cdots, \tag{2.9}
\]
with \( a_1 > 0 \). The novelty, even if it is obvious in hindsight, is the expansion in terms of \( \ln x \) instead of \( x \). This seems reasonable because the scale-to-scale energy transfer in turbulence is presumed to occur in logarithmically equal intervals.

Retaining only the two first terms in the expansion (2.9):

\[
\tilde{F}(x) \simeq \tilde{F}(x_m) - a_1(\ln(x/x_m))^2,
\]

we may rewrite (2.10) from dimensional considerations (see (2.5)) as

\[
\tilde{F}(x) \simeq 2\langle \varepsilon \rangle A[1 - B(\ln(x/x_m))^2],
\]

where \( A \) and \( B \) are dimensionless constants. This form also emphasizes the physical nature of \( \tilde{F} \) as a generalized energy input rate. Substituting (2.11) into (2.7) we obtain

\[
\langle \Delta u_r^3 \rangle \simeq -\frac{4}{3}\langle \varepsilon \rangle r C[1 - D \ln(r/r_m)]^2,
\]

where the constants \( C = A/(1 - B/2) \), \( D = B/(1 - B/2) \), \( r_m \simeq 1.22x_m \). Comparing (2.12) with the Kolmogorov law (2.1), it is appropriate to name \( r = r_m \) the inertial point. Equation (2.12) is the finite-Reynolds-number form of the third-order structure function.

Figure 2 shows \(-\langle \Delta u_r^3 \rangle /\langle \varepsilon \rangle r \) against \( \log(r/\eta) \) from the high-resolution DNS data of Gotoh, Fukayama & Nakano (2002) for homogeneous, isotropic and steady three-dimensional turbulence. The microscale Reynolds number \( R_\lambda = 125 \). A parabola indicates the applicability of (2.12). Figure 3 shows a similar plot for \( R_\lambda = 460 \) (triangles) and for the wind tunnel data of Pearson, Krogstad & van de Water (2002), obtained behind a grid for a close value of \( R_\lambda = 487 \). The parabola again shows (2.12).

Figures 2 and 3 demonstrate that (2.12) is a good approximation for the main part of \( S_3 \) at small and moderately high Reynolds numbers. The constant \( C \) approaches unity from below as \( R_\lambda \) increases, consistent with the Kolmogorov law; see figure 4 (the data point added from a high-Reynolds-number atmospheric boundary layer will be discussed below). The 4/5ths region is barely discernible for \( R_\lambda \approx 500 \) in some flows, though this is not true for all of them. The \( R_\lambda \)-variations of the inertial point \( r_m \) (i.e. \( x_m \)) and the constant \( D \) are shown in figures 5 and 6. These two variations are
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Figure 3. As in figure 2 but for $R_\lambda = 460$ (triangles) and for the wind-tunnel experiment of Pearson et al. (2002) at a close value of $R_\lambda = 487$ (circles).

Figure 4. Dependence of the dimensionless constant $C$ in (2.12) on $R_\lambda$. Symbols: circles, DNS of Donzis, Sreenivasan & Yeung (2005); diamonds, DNS of Gotoh et al. (2002); squares, wind-tunnel measurements of Pearson et al. (2002); inverted triangles, measurements behind an active grid of Kang, Chester & Meneveau (2003); upright triangles, measurements of Sreenivasan & Dhruva (1998) in the atmospheric surface layer.

not independent. Indeed, one can calculate the second derivative of the generalized energy input rate $\tilde{F}(x)$ at its maximum point $x_m$, and estimate $D$ in (2.12) as

$$D \sim (r_m/\eta)^{-4/3} \sim R_\lambda^{-0.97}. \quad (2.13)$$

This estimate is close to the scaling observed in figure 5.
Figure 5. Dependence of the normalized scale \( r_m/\eta \) on \( R_\lambda \) in log-log scales. The best linear fit indicates the scaling relation \( r_m/\eta \sim R_\lambda^{0.73\pm0.05} \). Symbols have the same meaning as in figure 4.

Figure 6. Dependence of the dimensionless constant \( D \) on \( R_\lambda \) in log-log scales. The best linear fit indicates the scaling relation \( D \sim R_\lambda^{-0.9\pm0.1} \). Symbols have the same meaning as in figure 4.

What occurs at even higher Reynolds numbers is unclear because no data are available in isotropic turbulence at substantially higher \( R_\lambda \). The highest-Reynolds-number data available today are from the simulations of Kaneda et al. (2003) but, for them, the third-order structure function has not been calculated. In any case, since
those data were run for only two turnover times of the large scale, it is unclear if $S_3$ has become independent of initial conditions. Thus, the transition from (2.12) to the Kolmogorov law $S_3 \equiv -\frac{4}{5} \langle \varepsilon \rangle r$ can be discussed only by using data from shear flows. This discussion will be somewhat speculative because the inevitably present anisotropy may play some role (see, for example, the jet data of Gagne et al. 2004).

Figure 7 shows the data for atmospheric turbulence at $R_\lambda = 10^{340}$ (see Sreenivasan & Dhruva (1998) for a description of the measurements). The dashed parabola, representing (2.12), is a good fit to region (ii) and some part of (iii) of figure 1. (It is from this fit that we obtained $C$ shown in figure 3.) The solid curve, corresponding to the approximation (2.9) up to the sixth order, fits the entire curve.

There are two possible interpretations. One is that, beyond a certain $R_\lambda$, the inertial point ceases to vary with $R_\lambda$, the log terms vanish identically, and the classical inertial range is recovered (Tabeling & Willaime 2002). The main change that would occur beyond such a limiting Reynolds number is that the flat region (iii) increases in extent and accumulates to the right of $r_m$. In this scenario, only the region (ii) of figure 1, up to and perhaps just beyond $r_m$, would be fitted by (2.12). If so, the left edge of the inertial range would correspond to $r < r_m$ (or $x_m$), and the generalized energy input rate $\tilde{F}(x) = \tilde{F}(x_m) = \text{const}$ to the right of $x_m$. Alternatively, the good agreement with the high-order expansion may suggest that the log expansion with additional terms is valid even at very high Reynolds numbers, and the classical inertial range is attained at much higher Reynolds numbers than ever considered before.

2.2. The Yaglom law for passive scalars

The equivalent of Kolmogorov’s law for passive scalars is due to Yaglom (Monin & Yaglom 1975) and states that the mixed third-order structure function is given by

$$\langle \Delta u_r \Delta \theta_r^2 \rangle = -\frac{4}{3} \langle \chi \rangle r, \quad (2.14)$$
where \( \Delta \theta_r \equiv \theta(x+r) - \theta(x) \) is the increment of the passive scalar \( \theta \) over a scale of size \( r \) and \( \langle \chi \rangle \) is the average value of the dissipation rate of scalar variance, \( \chi \).

This formula is valid in the so-called convective range of isotropic turbulence, which is analogous to the inertial range for hydrodynamic turbulence. The experimental situation of this fundamental law is similar to that of the 4/5ths law. On the one hand, indications of this law appear for rather small values of Péclet number. On the other hand, formation of the convective (inertial) range itself is quite slow with increasing Péclet number. Since the qualitative characteristics of the Yaglom law are similar to those of Kolmogorov’s, we will be brief in describing overlapping aspects.

The diffusion–convection equation for a passive scalar with random ‘force’ (source) \( f(x,t) \) is

\[
\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} + u_j \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_j} = \kappa \frac{\partial^2 \theta}{\partial x_j^2} + f(x,t), \tag{2.15}
\]

where \( \kappa \) is the molecular diffusivity. As before, we assume Gaussianity and \( \delta \)-correlation in time for the forcing. The Gaussian forces with zero mean are defined by their second-rank correlation

\[
\langle f(x + r, t + \tau)f(x, t) \rangle = F(r)\delta(\tau). \tag{2.16}
\]

It is known that the mixed (longitudinal) structure function of third order

\[
S_3^{\theta\theta}(r) = \langle \Delta u_r (\Delta \theta_r)^2 \rangle \tag{2.17}
\]

is related to the second-order structure function \( S_2^{\theta\theta}(r) = \langle (\Delta \theta_r)^2 \rangle \) by the equation

\[
S_3^{\theta\theta} = 2\kappa \frac{dS_2^{\theta\theta}}{dr} - \frac{2}{r^2} \int_0^r x^2 F(x) \, dx. \tag{2.18}
\]

Let us rewrite (2.18) formally as

\[
S_3^{\theta\theta} = -\frac{2}{r^2} \int_0^r x^2 \tilde{F}(x) \, dx, \tag{2.19}
\]

where we define generalized input rate for the variance of the passive scalar as

\[
\tilde{F}(x) \equiv \left( F(x) - \kappa \frac{d}{x^2} \frac{dS_2^{\theta\theta}}{dx} \right). \tag{2.20}
\]

Let us now assume the existence of a local maximum of the generalized input rate, i.e. a local maximum of \( \tilde{F}(x) \) at \( x = x_m \) (where \( \eta < x_m < L_\theta \), \( \eta \) being the molecular diffusion scale and \( L_\theta \) the integral scale). From dimensional considerations

\[
\tilde{F}(x) = \chi \psi(x/x_m) \tag{2.21}
\]

where \( \psi(x/x_m) \) is a dimensionless function. The inertial (convective) range is expected to appear in the flow for sufficiently large Péclet numbers (Monin & Yaglom 1975). We assume that \( \psi(x/x_m) = \psi(1) = \text{const} \) in this range and that, for \( r \) within that range, this particular value of \( \psi \) gives the main contribution to the integral (2.19).

From (2.19) follows the result that

\[
S_3^{\theta\theta}(r) = -\frac{2}{3} \chi \psi(1)r. \tag{2.22}
\]

Taking into account the Yaglom law (2.14) for the convective range, we obtain

\[
\psi(1) = 2. \tag{2.23}
\]
If the ideal convective range has not yet appeared, we may use a logarithmic expansion of the generalized input rate in a vicinity of its maximum:

$$\tilde{F}(x) = \tilde{F}(x_m) - \beta_1 (\ln(x/x_m))^2 + \cdots + \beta_{n-1} (\ln(x/x_m))^n + \cdots$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.24)

(with $\beta_1 > 0$). Again, this logarithmic expansion is the key ingredient of our analysis. It would be highly instructive if the logarithmic expansion could be derived at least for a model of the passive scalar such as the Kraichnan model (see e.g. Falkovich, Gawedzki & Vergassola 2001), but this is an unfinished task for now.

Taking into account (2.14) and (2.23), it is useful to rewrite (2.24) in the form

$$\tilde{F}(x) \simeq 2 \langle \chi \rangle E [1 - F((\ln(x/x_m))^2 + \cdots],$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.25)

where $E$ and $F$ are dimensionless constants. Then substituting (2.25) into (2.19) and assuming the symmetry of the $S_{3}^{u\theta}(r/r_m)$ in a vicinity of its maximum position $r = r_m$ we obtain

$$S_{3}^{u\theta}(r) = -\frac{4}{3} \langle \chi \rangle r G [1 - H_2 (\ln r/r_m)^2 + H_4 (\ln r/r_m)^4 + \cdots],$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.26)

where $r_m \propto x_m$, $G(\approx 1)$, $H_2$ and $H_4$ are constants.

Figure 8 shows $-S_{3}^{u\theta}/\chi r$ against log $r$ for the DNS data of homogeneous isotropic turbulence described in Watanabe & Gotoh (2004), Péclet number $P_\Lambda = 258$. The solid parabola follows (2.26) with the first two terms ($G \simeq 1$). Figure 9 shows analogous data obtained for $P_\Lambda = 427$, also from Watanabe & Gotoh (2004). The solid curve is the best fit to (2.26) with the next term included ($G \simeq 0.96$).

The discussion concerning the Kolmogorov law is relevant here as well. It is, however, clear that one could approximate the measured $S_{3}^{u\theta}(r)$ in the ‘convective range’ for any finite Péclet numbers by taking an increased number of terms in (2.25) (and, consequently, in (2.26)). This approach could complement the idea of the ideal convective range valid for $P_\Lambda = \infty$. 

Figure 8. Mixed third-order structure function $S_{3}^{u\theta}/\chi r$ against log $r$. The DNS data of Watanabe & Gotoh (2004) ($P_\Lambda = 258$) are shown as circles ($\eta$ is the Kolmogorov scale). The solid parabola corresponds to (2.26) with the first two terms.
Figure 9. As in figure 8 but for $P_2 = 427$. The solid curve corresponds to the approximation (2.26) with the first three terms.

3. Wall-bounded turbulence

Very close to the surface in wall-bounded flows such as pipes, channels and boundary layers, the mean velocity varies linearly with the wall-normal distance (e.g. Laufer 1954). Further away from the surface, the traditional understanding has been that the variation is logarithmic (Prandtl 1952). In a series of publications (e.g. Barenblatt 1993; Barenblatt et al. 1997), it has been proposed that power-law variation is more appropriate.† Even further out in the flow, the so-called wake function (Coles & Hirst 1968) is thought to codify experimental data. This section does not elucidate any of this work directly, but we merely use logarithmic expansions to construct an explicit expression for the mean velocity distribution near the position of maximum Reynolds shear stress, $y_m$.

Let us start with the exact equation

$$-⟨uv⟩^+ = \frac{dU^+}{dy^+} + (1 - y^+/R^+), \tag{3.1}$$

valid for pipes and channel flows, in which we have used the standard notation: $u$ and $v$ are velocity fluctuations in the streamwise and wall-normal directions $x$ and $y$, respectively, $U(y)$ is the mean velocity in the direction $x$, $R$ is the pipe radius or the channel half-height, and the suffix + indicates normalization by wall variables $u_τ$ and $ν$, which represent, respectively, the friction velocity and the (kinematic) fluid viscosity. Elementary considerations show that the turbulent stress term $-⟨uv⟩^+$ increases cubically with $y^+$ very close to the wall; it changes rapidly into a form that has not been studied carefully so far, before attaining its maximum value; it subsequently drops off to zero as the flow centreline is approached further outwards. The position of the maximum in the Reynolds shear stress, $y_m$, is empirically known

† Power laws themselves have been around for much longer, but the framework of intermediate asymptotics emphasized by this modern work is new.
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Figure 10. Plots of the Reynolds shear stress from the direct numerical simulations of a channel flow (Iwamoto, Suzuki & Kasagi 2002), for four different Reynolds numbers, $Re$, based on the bulk mean velocity and the width of the channel. The data have been fitted by the two-term expansion (3.3). The fit is very good for $y^+ > 10$.

(Sreenivasan & Sahay 1997) to obey

$$y_m^+ \approx 1.87(R^+)^{1/2}. \quad (3.2)$$

Such a fit has been proposed for some time (Long & Chen 1981; Sreenivasan 1987), but the multiplicative constant has been slightly different in each work because of the uncertainty associated with identifying $y_m$ from the measured data. The distribution of $-\langle uv \rangle^+$ in pipe and channel flows has been obtained by numerically differentiating the measured mean velocity distribution and using (3.1), and so (3.2) is not affected by the inaccuracies of measuring the Reynolds shear stress.

Let us expand $-\langle uv \rangle^+$ around $y_m^+$. Sreenivasan & Sahay (1997) have undertaken this exercise already but had not appreciated the importance of expanding $-\langle uv \rangle^+$ in terms of the logarithm of the distance from $y_m^+$. This appears to be the appropriate expansion because the number of hierarchical scales up to the height $y^+$ in the wall layer is of the order $\ln y^+$. We may then write

$$-\langle uv \rangle^+ = k[1 - \gamma_1(ln(y^+/y_m^+)^2) + \cdots + \gamma_n(ln(y^+/y_m^+)^n) + \cdots]. \quad (3.3)$$

Here, the unknown constants $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n$ are thought to be independent of the Reynolds number, at least when it is high enough, and $k \to 1$ as $Re \to \infty$.

The two-term (parabolic) fit works well for all Reynolds numbers shown in figure 10, roughly for $y^+ \geq 10$. The low end of the fitted region more or less borders the buffer region. Substituting (3.3) in (3.1), and retaining only the first two terms in the expansion (3.3), we obtain

$$U^+ = \text{const} + y^+[g(y^+) - (y^+/2R^+)], \quad (3.4)$$
where

\[ g(y^+) = p_0 + p_1 [\ln(y^+/y_1)]^2, \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.5)

with

\[ p_0 = 1 - k + k\gamma_1, \quad p_1 = k\gamma_1, \quad y_1 = e y_m^+. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.6)

The expression (3.4) is technically not expected to be valid all the way to the wall (see figure 10), but we can be somewhat rough and impose the no-slip condition \( U^+ = 0 \) at \( y^+ = 0 \) to obtain

\[ U^+ = y^+ [g(y^+) - y^+/d^+], \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.7)

where \( d^+ = 2R^+ \). In order to compare the last equation directly with experimental data, it is useful to rewrite it in the form

\[ U^+/y^+ + y^+/d^+ = g(y^+) = p_0 + p_1 [\ln(y^+/y_1)]^2. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.8)

If the present considerations are valid, the left-hand side of (3.8) must show a parabolic variation with respect to \( y^+ \) in logarithmic coordinates.

We show in figure 11 the recent data of McKeon et al. (2004) for one Reynolds number. The solid parabola corresponds to (3.8). The agreement with the data is excellent almost all the way to \( y^+ \) of the order 10 towards the wall, and to \( y^+ \) of the order 1000 or more outwards – in fact, almost all the way to the centreline.

The following remarks seem useful. In the traditional picture, the Reynolds shear stress attains a constant value of unity in an intermediate region, this being the fundamental factor leading to the logarithmic law (in analogy with the Kolmogorov ‘inertial range’ picture considered in §2; see e.g. Tennekes & Lumley 1972). If, on the other hand, the maximum in \(-\langle u'v' \rangle^+\) can indeed be identified at all Reynolds numbers, this feature would suggest a second viscous-dominated region around \( y_m^+ \), and has to be taken into account in some way. Such considerations introduce new
elements in the asymptotic analysis of the wall-bounded flows, and were the subject of Sreenivasan & Sahay (1997). Alternatively, it is possible that the relation (3.2) holds only for ‘low’ Reynolds numbers in which case the present considerations hold only that range of Reynolds numbers. It is possible that $y_m^+$ remains fixed beyond a certain Reynolds number so the major influence of increasing the Reynolds number further is simply to fill up more and more of the flat part of the Reynolds stress to the right of $y_m^+$. At present, we do not have sufficiently good data to choose one scenario over the other.

4. The clustering phenomenon

4.1. The telegraph approximation and the cluster exponents

The nature of scaling laws in turbulence is still a challenging problem. Even the basic cornerstone of the phenomenology of turbulence, namely Kolmogorov’s $-5/3$ spectral form for locally isotropic and incompressible turbulence, has not been obtained from the Navier–Stokes equations. Properties of intermittency are similarly beyond the reach of theory at present (although considerable progress has been made for passive scalars, see e.g. Falkovich et al. 2001). Intermittency consists of two aspects: different events cluster together so their density in space is uneven, and events of highly variable amplitudes are dispersed sporadically in space. In general, it has not been possible to separate the clustering effect from the amplitude effect. Here, we suggest a simplification using the so-called telegraph approximation for the velocity to separate the two effects, and discuss how the inverse logarithmic expansion appears naturally for dissipation intermittency.

The telegraph approximation is generated from the measured signal by setting the fluctuation magnitudes to 1 or 0 depending on whether the magnitude exceeds the mean value. Formally, for the fluctuation of measured quantity $u(t)$ (with zero mean), the telegraph approximation $u^*(t)$ is constructed as

$$u^*(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{u(t)}{|u(t)|} + 1 \right). \quad (4.1)$$

By definition, $u^*$ can equal either 1 and 0. Figure 12 illustrates the basic idea schematically.

In turbulence, the energy dissipation (or, more precisely, a component of it) is obtained by squaring the derivative of the velocity signal. As is well known (e.g. Grant, Stewart & Moilliet 1962; Meneveau & Sreenivasan 1991), the result at high Reynolds number is a highly intermittent quantity. For the telegraph approximation of the velocity, however, the ‘derivative’ (interpreted as the limit of differences) has a magnitude of $\pm 1$, situated at the shoulders of the pulses, and the equivalent of the dissipation is then a train of spikes of unity magnitude. Since there is no change in magnitude from one spike to another, the entire manifestation of intermittency is due to the tendency of the spikes to cluster together. This addresses one part of intermittency without involving the amplitude variability.†

† Another reason for the interest in the telegraph approximation is that it could provide a motivation for using symbolic dynamics to study Navier–Stokes equations. If some rigorous results could be derived by this means, one would then be able to make a more direct connection between the equations and the scaling properties to be discussed in this section. A more detailed discussion of these issues will be published separately.
In particular, let us construct, as is common for the energy dissipation, a running average within a time interval $\tau$ of the number of spikes generated from the telegraph signal; this quantity is simply equal to $N_\tau$, which is the average number of zero-crossing points in the interval $\tau$. Let us denote fluctuations of the running average by $N'_\tau = N_\tau - \langle N_\tau \rangle$, where the brackets mean long-time average. We now inquire about the scaling of the variance – that is, the Reynolds-number variation of the cluster exponent $\mu^*$ in the power-law relation

$$\langle N'^2_\tau \rangle^{1/2} \sim \tau^{\mu^*}. \quad (4.2)$$

The exponents for $\langle N'^q_\tau \rangle^{1/q}$ will also be $\mu^*$ for all $q$ because there is no amplitude variability in the telegraph approximation. (This has been checked empirically as well.)

### 4.2. Inverse logarithmic expansion

Data analysis has been performed using velocity signals measured at several Reynolds numbers and the cluster exponents have been obtained. After having experimented with different forms of variations with the microscale Reynolds number $R_\lambda$, we found that the best fit was obtained when the data were correlated with $\ln R_\lambda$. The first two terms in the expansion

$$\mu^*(\ln R_\lambda) = q_0 + \frac{q_1}{\ln R_\lambda} + \frac{q_2}{(\ln R_\lambda)^2} + \cdots \quad (4.3)$$
agree very well with the calculated values of $\mu^*$ for $200 < R_\lambda < 20000$. Figure 13 shows that the best linear fit is

$$\mu^*(\ln R_\lambda) \simeq 0.1 + \frac{3/2}{\ln R_\lambda},$$

which means that

$$\lim_{R_\lambda \to \infty} \mu^* \simeq 0.1.$$  (4.5)

There is finite clustering effect even in the limit of infinite Reynolds number. Again, $\ln R_\lambda$ seems to be the appropriate expansion parameter because the number of steps in the energy cascade is proportional to $\ln R_\lambda$. (In one interpretation (Sreenivasan & Stolovitzky 1995), the number of ‘particles’ on which one can do statistical mechanics is equal to $\log_2 R_\lambda$.)

4.3. Clustering of passive scalar fluctuations

Clustering of small scales of passive scalar in turbulent flows can also be characterized by a corresponding cluster exponent. The principal result, which will be stated without evidence for the sake of brevity, is that the coefficients $q_0$ and $q_1$ in the corresponding expansion for the cluster exponent are approximately 0.07 and 3/2, respectively. The smaller value of $q_0$, in comparison with that for velocity, suggests that there is a greater tendency for scalar fluctuations to cluster together.

5. Flatness of the velocity derivative

Observations show that the turbulent velocity becomes ‘rougher’ with increasing Reynolds number, but it is generally thought that the tendency to form singularities is
mitigated by the smoothing effects of viscosity. From an experimentalist’s perspective, if the singularities occur at all, they should be observed in velocity gradients (or combinations thereof), and statistical quantities such as the flatness (i.e., the normalized fourth-order moment) of the so-called longitudinal velocity derivative must detect them. We make a few remarks on this subject in the context of inverse logarithmic expansions. The experimental data available a few years ago were collected by Sreenivasan & Antonia (1997).

It is usually thought that the flatness increases as a power-law in $R_\lambda$, for $R_\lambda > 100$ or so. This range of $R_\lambda$ is thus thought to be fully developed. In reality, however, the data do not confirm a flawless power law in any Reynolds-number range and are open to different interpretations (e.g., Tabeling & Willaime 2002; Gylfason, Ayyalasomayajulu & Warhaft 2004). A new interpretation is attempted below using an inverse log expansion (for a few more details, see Sreenivasan & Bershadskii 2005).

5.1. Interpretation using logarithmic expansions

Figure 14 shows inverse flatness $F^{-1}$ (from the local average fit of the data from Sreenivasan & Antonia 1997) against $1/\ln(R_\lambda)$ (circles). New data from wind tunnel (Pearson et al. 2002) and atmospheric surface layer measurements (Sreenivasan & Dhruva 1998) are added (crosses). The straight line shows the two-term approximation of the inverse logarithmic expansion

$$F(x)^{-1} = q_0 + q_1 x + \cdots + q_n x^n + \cdots$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.1)

with

$$x = 1/\ln(R_\lambda).$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.2)

This fit is good from $R_\lambda \approx 50$ (which is on the order of the minimum Reynolds number at which turbulence-like behaviour sets in (Sreenivasan 1984)) and describes
all the measured data up to $R_\lambda \approx 20,000$. The figure shows that $q_0 < 0$, indicating the possibility of a finite-Reynolds-number singularity of the flatness. In this situation, to apply the expansion (5.1) as a Maclaurin series, one can do an analytic continuation of the variable $F^{-1}$ in the negative area defining $F(0)^{-1} \equiv q_0$, $dF^{-1}/dx|_{x=0} \equiv q_1$, etc. (In the theory of critical phenomena, analytic continuations are produced even in the complex plane.) The linear approximation of the $F(x)^{-1}$ results in critical-like expression for

$$F(x) \sim (x - x_c)^{-1} \tag{5.3}$$

in a certain vicinity of the ‘critical’ point $x_c = -q_0/q_1$.

Extrapolating this fit one can find the ‘critical’ value $x_c = \ln R_\lambda^{(c)} \simeq 12.6 \pm 1.5$, as the intersection point of the fitting straight line with the horizontal axis. This gives a ‘critical’ Reynolds number $R_\lambda^{(c)}$ of about 300,000. While the error bar in $1/\ln R_\lambda^{(c)}$ seems reasonable, it translates to huge error bars of between 66,000 and 1,300,000 in the value of $R_\lambda^{(c)}$ itself.

A slightly different perspective on the topic is provided in figure 15, which compares the smoothed data (circles) with the ‘critical’ approximation (5.3) (solid curve) as well as the conventional power law used in log-log coordinates (dashed straight line). Even though there is a slight suggestion that the data prefer the ‘critical’ line to the pure power-law (towards the upper end of $R_\lambda$), one needs an order of magnitude higher $R_\lambda$ in order to determine unambiguously whether the data will follow the traditionally expected power law or the critical behaviour. While such Reynolds numbers are outside the present experimental capability – and also outside terrestrial experience – the issue is of fundamental theoretical interest.

There is one possibility of testing this notion within our present capabilities. The velocity measurements, from which the derivative flatness is computed, have been made typically with a resolution on the order of the Kolmogorov scale. It is now known (Sreenivasan 2004; Yakhot & Sreenivasan 2005) that the required resolution
becomes more stringent as the Reynolds number increases. There is some evidence
to suggest that the flatness measured with adequate resolution reveals a tendency to
curve upwards. If this tendency is shared by the higher-$R_\lambda$ data, the evidence for the
critical scenario will be stronger. Adequately resolved flatness measurements at high
$R_\lambda$ are therefore an urgent necessity.

6. Discussion

In this paper, we have discussed a few examples to illustrate the range of problems
for which logarithmic expansions are useful. To the evidence presented, one can
add other instances, e.g. those involving thermal convection. Considering the present
examples in conjunction with others in which log-expansions have already been
carried out (e.g. Castaing et al. 1990; Barenblatt & Goldenfeld 1995; Dubrulle 1996),
the totality of evidence appears strong. Yet all the evidence is empirical. It is therefore
useful to seek a logical explanation for the appearance of logarithmic expansions
applicable in diverse turbulence problems.

Thin vortex tubes (or filaments) are the ubiquitous hydrodynamical elements of
turbulent flows at high Reynolds numbers (Küchemann 1965; Saffman 1968; Chorin
1994). Therefore, it is natural to seek a generic property of vortex filaments to provide
the required physical mechanism. We examine their stability in three-dimensional
space, in particular the propensity of a linear vortex to develop ‘kinks’. To estimate
the velocity of such a kink, let us first recall (Batchelor 1967) that a ring vortex
propagates with a speed $v$ that is related to its diameter $\lambda$ and strength $\Gamma$ through

$$v = \frac{\Gamma}{2\pi \lambda} \ln \left( \frac{\lambda}{2\eta} \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.1)

where $\eta$ is the radius of the core of the ring and $\lambda/2\eta \gg 1$ (see figure 16). If, for
instance, a linear vortex develops a kink with a radius of curvature $\lambda/2$, the velocity
perpendicular to the plane of the kink, generated by self-induction, can be calculated
using (6.1).

One can guess (see Saffman 1968) that in a turbulent environment, the most unstable
mode of a thin vortex tube of length $L$ (integral scale) and radius $\eta$ (Kolmogorov
scale), will be of the order of the Taylor microscale, $\lambda$. Then, the characteristic velocity
of the spatial scale $\lambda$ can be estimated from (6.1). Noting that the Taylor-microscale
Reynolds number is defined as

$$R_\lambda = \frac{\nu_0 \lambda}{\nu}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.2)
where $v_0$ is the root-mean-square value of a component of velocity, it appears that the velocity that is more relevant (at least from the point of view of vortex instabilities) for the spatial scale $\lambda$ is not $v_0$ but $v$ given by (6.1). The corresponding effective Reynolds number should be obtained by the renormalization of the characteristic velocity in (6.2), as

$$R_{\lambda}^{\text{eff}} = \frac{v\lambda}{v} \sim \frac{\Gamma}{2\pi v} \ln \left( \frac{\lambda}{2\eta} \right).$$  \hfill (6.3)

It can be readily shown from definitions that

$$\frac{\lambda}{\eta} = G R_{\lambda}^{1/2},$$  \hfill (6.4)

where $G = 15^{1/4} \approx 2$. Hence

$$R_{\lambda}^{\text{eff}} \sim \frac{\Gamma}{4\pi v} \ln(R_\lambda).$$  \hfill (6.5)

The strength $\Gamma$ can be estimated as

$$\Gamma \sim 2\pi v_\eta \eta,$$  \hfill (6.6)

where $v_\eta = v/\eta$ is the velocity scale for the Kolmogorov scale $\eta$. Substituting (6.6) into (6.5) we obtain

$$R_{\lambda}^{\text{eff}} \sim \ln R_\lambda.$$  \hfill (6.7)

Thus, for turbulence processes determined by vortex instabilities, the relevant dimensionless characteristic is $\ln R_\lambda$ rather than $R_\lambda$. This is a plausible justification for the relevance of expansions in terms of the inverse logarithm of the microscale Reynolds number.

We now turn to the logarithmic expansions used in the first part of the paper, where the finite-size corrections to the ideal scaling laws were considered as functions of $\ln(r/r_m)$. A plausible explanation for this procedure is as follows. In the finite-size computations, the cut-off corrections from above to $\Delta u_r$ arising from vortex instabilities (see figure 17) can be calculated by the ‘local induction’ approximation to the Biot-Savart formula (Batchelor 1967). This suggests that, at the level of the present approximation, contributions to the velocity fluctuation in the immediate vicinity of a given point on the filament, arising from distances $r \gg \eta$, can be neglected. The cut-off from below is provided by the core radius $\eta$ of the vortex. Then the dynamics of the vortex filament obey the equation

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = \frac{\Gamma}{4\pi} \left\{ \ln \left( \frac{r}{\eta} \right) \right\} \gamma b,$$  \hfill (6.8)

where $X$ is the position vector of a point on the filament, $\gamma$ is the local curvature, and $b$ is the unit binormal vector of the filament. In this approximation, since the
dependence on $r$ is exclusively determined by the logarithmic term in the right-hand side of (6.8), a correction function to the turbulent velocity fluctuations, related to the finite-size effects, is also a function of $\ln(r/\eta)$.

Let us now consider a finite-size correction function $f(\ln(r/\eta))$ with its maximum at $r = r_m$ (see §2). This function can be rewritten as $f(\ln(r/\eta)) \equiv f(\ln(r/r_m) + \ln(r_m/\eta))$.

In the vicinity of the maximum, we have

$$\ln \frac{r_m}{\eta} \gg \ln \frac{r}{r_m}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.9)

Therefore we can effectively use a power series expansion in this vicinity:

$$f\left(\ln \frac{r}{\eta}\right) \equiv f\left(\ln \frac{r}{r_m} + \ln \frac{r_m}{\eta}\right) = a_0 + a_2 \left(\ln \frac{r}{r_m}\right)^2 + \cdots + a_n \left(\ln \frac{r}{r_m}\right)^n + \cdots,$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.10)

where

$$a_0 = f\left(\ln \frac{r_m}{\eta}\right), \quad a_n = \left.\frac{1}{n!} \frac{d^n f(x)}{dx^n}\right|_{x=\ln(r_m/\eta)}.$$ 

That is, all turbulent processes – for which the instability of the vortex filaments determines finite-size effects – can be expanded in terms of logarithmic power expansions. Equation (6.9) provides a condition of effective applicability of such expansions. Taking into account that the effective length of the vortex filament is $\sim L$, one can roughly estimate $r_m \sim (L\eta)^{1/2} \sim R^{3/4}\lambda$. This result is in agreement with the scaling shown in figure 5.

In summary, we have argued here that, instead of expansions in terms of powers of the Reynolds number or its inverse, those in terms of powers of the logarithm of the Reynolds number or its inverse are more generic, at least in those instances where vortex instabilities are involved. Since most turbulent processes are likely to be related to such instabilities, it is reasonable to speculate that such expansions are natural for turbulence theories. We have discussed a few instances where they have proved to be useful, and there is little doubt that more are likely to be identified.
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