

David Dritschel
Editor

IUTAM Bookseries

IUTAM Symposium on Turbulence in the Atmosphere and Oceans

Proceedings of the IUTAM Symposium
on Turbulence in the Atmosphere and Oceans,
Cambridge, UK, December 8–12, 2008

 Springer

IUTAM Symposium on Turbulence
in the Atmosphere and Oceans

IUTAM BOOKSERIES

Volume 28

Series Editors

G.M.L. Gladwell, *University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada*

R. Moreau, *INPG, Grenoble, France*

Editorial Board

J. Engelbrecht, *Institute of Cybernetics, Tallinn, Estonia*

L.B. Freund, *Brown University, Providence, USA*

A. Kluwick, *Technische Universitt, Vienna, Austria*

H.K. Moffatt, *University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK*

N. Olhoff, *Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark*

K. Tsutomu, *IIDS, Tokyo, Japan*

D. van Campen, *Technical University Eindhoven, Eindhoven,
The Netherlands*

Z. Zheng, *Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China*

Aims and Scope of the Series

The IUTAM Bookseries publishes the proceedings of IUTAM symposia under the auspices of the IUTAM Board.

David Dritschel

Editor

IUTAM Symposium on Turbulence in the Atmosphere and Oceans

Proceedings of the IUTAM Symposium
on Turbulence in the Atmosphere and Oceans,
Cambridge, UK, December 8–12, 2008

 Springer

Editor
David Dritschel
University of St Andrews
Mathematical Institute
St Andrews, Fife KY16 9SS
UK
dgd@mcs.st-and.ac.uk

ISSN 1875-3507

e-ISSN 1875-3493

ISBN 978-94-007-0359-9

e-ISBN 978-94-007-0360-5

DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0360-5

Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2010

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

Cover design: VTEX, Vilnius

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

عرضه را آورده بودند همون
اندر آن تاریکی اش کف می بود
گفت همچون ناودان است این نهاد
آن بر او چون بادبزن شدید
اختلاف از کشتان بیرون شدی

The elephant was in a dark house
As it was impossible to see it by eye
The palm of one fell on the trunk
The hand of one reached the ear
Had they had a candle in their palms

پیل اندر خانه تاریک بود
دیدنش با چشم چون ممکن نبود
آن یکی را کف به خرطوم اوقاد
آن یکی را دست بر کوشش رسید
د کف هر کس اگر شمعی بدی

Some Hindus had brought it for exhibition
In the dark people felt it with their palms
'This is like a water-spout' he said
To him it was evidently like a fan
They would have said the same

Preface

The text of the Persian poet Rūmī, written some eight centuries ago, and reproduced at the beginning of this book is still relevant to many of our pursuits of knowledge, not least of turbulence. The text illustrates the inability people have in seeing the whole thing, the ‘big picture’. Everybody looks into the problem from his/her viewpoint, and that leads to disagreement and controversy. If we could see the whole thing, our understanding would become complete and there would be no controversy.

The turbulent motion of the atmosphere and oceans, at the heart of the observed general circulation, is undoubtedly very complex and difficult to understand in its entirety. Even ‘bare’ turbulence, without rotation and stratification whose effects are paramount in the atmosphere and oceans, still poses great fundamental challenges for understanding after a century of research. Rotating stratified turbulence is a relatively new research topic. It is also far richer, exhibiting a host of distinct wave types interacting in a complicated and often subtle way with long-lived coherent structures such as jets or currents and vortices. All of this is tied together by basic fluid-dynamical nonlinearity, and this gives rise to a multitude of phenomena: spontaneous wave emission, wave-induced transport, both direct and inverse energy scale cascades, lateral and vertical anisotropy, fronts and transport barriers, anomalous transport in coherent vortices, and a very wide range of dynamical and thermodynamical instabilities.

This book stems from the IUTAM symposium “Rotating Stratified Turbulence and Turbulence in the Atmosphere and Oceans” which took place at the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences in Cambridge from 8 to 12 December 2008, and came at the end of a four-month Programme on “High Reynolds Number Turbulence”. This symposium, widely attended by researchers from around the world, aimed to better understand the complex nature of fluid flows found in Nature, particularly in the Earth’s atmosphere and oceans, but also in other planetary atmospheres and in the Sun’s interior. Talks covered a broad range of subjects, from theoretical studies of fundamental vortex interactions, to laboratory experiments and observations, and to state-of-the-art computational studies. The full programme and videos

of many of the talks can be found at www.newton.ac.uk/programmes/HRT/hrtw04p.html.

The present volume presents a cross-section of the research presented at the symposium, or in some cases, of the research inspired by it. Herein, 23 peer-reviewed papers are collected (39 talks were presented). The research is loosely divided into four main topics: (1) Waves and Imbalance, (2) Turbulence and Convection, (3) Instability and Vortex Dynamics, and (4) Jets: Formation and Structure. In (1), the impact of waves, principally inertia–gravity waves, on the circulation of the atmosphere and oceans is examined. In (2), the distinguishing anisotropic features of atmospheric and oceanic turbulence, and of solar convection, that arise from rotation and stratification are discussed. In (3), vortex dynamical instabilities as well as the interactions between coherent vortices in rotating, stratified flows are examined. And in (4), various models and theories are put forward to explain the formation and persistence of “jets”, nearly zonal currents in the atmosphere and oceans, in the giant gas planets, and probably also in the solar interior.

Research on these topics is rapidly developing, yet we still have much to learn, and there is no shortage of controversy! This volume brings together in a concise way current research by eminent mathematicians, scientists and engineers. As such, this makes an excellent resource for future studies exploring fundamental aspects of atmospheric and oceanic turbulence.

St Andrews,

July 2010

David Dritschel

Acknowledgements Generous support of the Isaac Newton Institute in Cambridge and the International Union of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics made this work possible, and moreover provided the opportunity for researchers to meet in a stimulating environment to discuss common research ideas and future directions. This was greatly appreciated by all involved. I would like to thank the staff of the Isaac Newton Institute for their highly professional conduct and for their help in all aspects of the organisation of the symposium. I would also like to thank the Scientific Organising Committee — Peter Bartello, Peter Davidson, Ross Griffiths, Keith Moffatt, Joël Sommeria, Kraig Winters, and Shigeo Yoden — for their extensive help along the way, from conceiving and developing the original idea to creating and running the final programme.

The Persian text and its translation (adapted from www.khamush.com/tales_from_masnavi.htm#The%20Elephant) were generously provided by Ali Mohebalhojeh. This story of the elephant, we feel, reflects beautifully the struggle we face in understanding many things, and the importance of seeing the whole.

Contents

Part I Waves and Imbalance

On spontaneous imbalance and ocean turbulence: generalizations of the Paparella–Young epsilon theorem	3
Michael E. McIntyre	
1 Introduction	3
2 Spontaneous imbalance	5
3 Epsilon theorems for realistic ocean models	7
4 Specific examples	11
5 Concluding remarks	13
References	14
Inertia-gravity-wave generation: a geometric-optics approach	17
J. M. Aspden and J. Vanneste	
1 Introduction	17
2 Geometric-optics approach	18
3 Applications to simple flows	21
3.1 Horizontal strain and vertical shear	21
3.2 Elliptical flow	21
3.3 Dipole	22
3.4 Random-strain models	23
4 Discussion	24
References	25
Parallels between stratification and rotation in hydrodynamics, and between both of them and external magnetic field in magnetohydrodynamics, with applications to nonlinear waves	27
S. Medvedev and V. Zeitlin	
1 Introduction	27
2 Models	28
2.1 2D stratified Boussinesq equations	28
2.2 2.5D rotating Euler equations	28

2.3	2D magnetohydrodynamics	29
3	Similarity between models I: waves and structures	30
3.1	Linear waves	30
3.2	Structures: nonlinear waves/vortices	31
4	Similarity between models II: geometry	32
4.1	Hamiltonian structure	32
4.2	Geometry of the phase space and nonconstrained dynamical variables	33
4.3	Casting PB to the canonical form	33
5	Triad and quartet wave interactions and wave turbulence (WT) . . .	34
5.1	The WT algorithm	34
5.2	Known situations leading to get-it-by-hand solutions for stationary energy spectra in WT	35
5.3	WT: decay spectra for gravity, gyroscopic and Alfvén waves	35
5.4	WT: non-decay spectra for gravity and gyroscopic waves	36
6	Conclusions	36
	References	37
	Generation of an internal tide by surface tide/eddy resonant interactions .	39
	M.-P. Lelong and E. Kunze	
1	Introduction	39
2	Problem definition	40
2.1	Governing equations	40
2.2	Wave-triad interactions	41
2.3	Multiple-scale analysis	42
3	Numerical simulations	45
4	Conclusions	48
	References	49
	Generation of harmonics and sub-harmonics from an internal tide in a uniformly stratified fluid: numerical and laboratory experiments	51
	Ivane Pairaud, Chantal Staquet, Joël Sommeria and Mahdi M. Mahdizadeh	
1	Introduction	51
2	Experimental set-ups	52
2.1	Laboratory experiments	52
2.2	Numerical simulations	54
3	Emission of the wave beam	55
4	Spatial structure of the wave beam	56
5	Parametric instability of the wave beam	57
6	Generation of harmonics	59
7	Conclusion	59
	References	60

Deep ocean mixing by near-inertial waves 63
 Victor I. Shrira and William A. Townsend

- 1 Introduction 64
- 2 Basic Equations and WKB 64
- 3 Mixed Bottom Layer 69
- 4 Discussion 71
- References 72

Part II Turbulence and Convection

Eddies and Circulation: Lessons from Oceans and the GFD Lab 77
 Peter B. Rhines

- 1 Introduction 77
- 2 Deep pathways in the oceanic overturning circulation 82
- 3 Eddies and Rossby waves in the upper ocean 83
- 4 Notes from the GFD Lab 89
- 5 Conclusion 91
- References 92

Observations on Rapidly Rotating Turbulence 95
 P A Davidson, P J Staplehurst and S B Dalziel

- 1 Introduction 95
- 2 How Columnar Eddies Form at Low Ro 97
- 3 The Experimental Evidence at $Ro \sim 1$ 100
- 4 Why Linear Behaviour at $Ro \sim 1$? 101
- 5 Why a Cyclone-Anticyclone Asymmetry? 101
- 6 The Rate of Energy Decay 102
- References 103

Equilibration of Inertial Instability in Rotating Flow 105
 Daan D.J.A. van Sommeren, George F. Carnevale, Rudolf C. Kloosterziel
 and Paolo Orlandi

- 1 Introduction 105
- 2 Pure Barotropic Instability 107
- 3 Pure Inertial Instability 109
- 4 Full 3D Simulation vs. Prediction 110
- 5 Discussion 114
- References 114

Quasigeostrophic and stratified turbulence in the atmosphere 117
 Peter Bartello

- 1 Introduction 117
- 2 Divergent and geostrophic modes 120
- 3 The numerical configuration 121
- 4 Results 123
- 5 Conclusions 126

References 128

A Perspective on Submesoscale Geophysical Turbulence 131

James C. McWilliams

1 The Dynamical Regime of Submesoscale Turbulence 131

2 The Frontogenetic Route 133

3 Other Submesoscale Generation Routes 136

4 Stratified, Non-Rotating Turbulence 139

5 Summary 140

References 140

Spectra and Distribution Functions of Stably Stratified Turbulence 143

Jackson R. Herring & Yoshifumi Kimura

1 Equations of Motion and their Economical Representation 143

2 Some Historical Comments 145

3 More Recent Numerical Results 147

4 Interpretation of DNS 150

5 Concluding Comments 151

References 153

Modeling mixing in two-dimensional turbulence and stratified fluids 155

Antoine Venaille and Joel Sommeria

1 Introduction 155

2 An analogy between statistical mechanics of 2D flows and density stratified fluids 157

2.1 Statistical mechanics of 2D flows 157

2.2 Statistical mechanics of stratified fluids 158

3 Relaxation toward statistical equilibrium 161

4 Dissipation of density fluctuations by turbulent cascade 162

5 A simple example: mixing of a two layer stratified fluid 163

6 Coupling the model with an equation for the kinetic energy 165

7 Conclusion and perspectives 166

References 167

The solar tachocline: a study in stably stratified MHD turbulence 169

Steven Tobias

1 Introduction 169

2 The Solar Tachocline 170

2.1 Properties of the solar tachocline 170

2.2 Why is the tachocline there — and so thin? 172

3 Simplified models of stratified MHD turbulence 174

3.1 The parameter regime 174

3.2 A hierarchy of models 174

3.3 Formation of jets on a magnetised β -plane 175

4 Future directions 176

References 177

Some Unusual Properties of Turbulent Convection and Dynamos in Rotating Spherical Shells 181
 F. H. Busse and R. D. Simitev

- 1 Introduction 181
- 2 Mathematical formulation of the problem and methods of solution 182
- 3 Convection in rotating spherical shells 185
- 4 Chaotic convection 186
- 5 Distinct turbulent dynamos at identical parameter values 189
- 6 Concluding remarks 192
- References 192

Part III Instability and Vortex Dynamics

Zigzag instability of the Kármán vortex street in stratified and rotating fluids 197
 Axel Deloncle, Paul Billant and Jean-Marc Chomaz

- 1 Introduction 197
- 2 Problem formulation 198
 - 2.1 Pair of vortices in a stratified and rotating fluid 198
 - 2.2 Kármán vortex street in a stratified and rotating fluid 200
- 3 Results 202
- 4 Conclusion 205
- References 205

Instabilities of a columnar vortex in a stratified fluid 207
 Patrice Meunier, Nicolas Boulanger, Xavier Riedinger and Stéphane Le Dizès

- 1 Introduction 207
- 2 A Gaussian vortex in a stratified fluid 208
- 3 Instabilities of a tilted vortex 209
 - 3.1 Spatial structure of a tilted vortex 209
 - 3.2 Tilt-induced instabilities 210
 - 3.3 Consequences 212
- 4 Radiative instability 212
 - 4.1 Linear stability analysis 212
 - 4.2 Experimental evidence? 213
- 5 Conclusion 214
- References 215

Geostrophic vortex alignment in external shear or strain 217
 Xavier Perrot, Xavier Carton and Alan Guillou

- 1 Introduction 217
- 2 Physical configuration and model equations 218
- 3 Evolution of two point-vortices in external strain and rotation 219
- 4 Nonlinear regimes of finite-area vortices with background strain and rotation 223

5 Conclusions 225
Appendix: Melnikov Theory 226
References 227

Equilibrium States of Quasi-geostrophic Point Vortices 229

T. Miyazaki, H. Kimura and S. Hoshi

1 Introduction 229
2 Quasi-geostrophic Approximation and Equations of Motion 230
3 Equilibrium States of Quasi-geostrophic Point Vortices 232
4 Maximum Entropy Theory 235
4.1 Zero Inverse Temperature State 235
4.2 Positive and Negative Temperature States 236
4.3 Patch Model 236
5 Summary 238
References 238

Part IV Jets: Formation and Structure

The structure of zonal jets in shallow water turbulence on the sphere 243

R. K. Scott

1 Introduction 243
2 Jet undulations 245
3 The potential vorticity staircase 247
4 Equatorial superrotation 248
5 Open questions: the nature of forcing and dissipation 250
References 251

Jet formation in decaying two-dimensional turbulence on a rotating sphere 253

Shigeo Yoden, Yoshi-Yuki Hayashi, Keiichi Ishioka, Yuji Kitamura, Seiya Nishizawa, Sin-ichi Takehiro, and Michio Yamada

1 Introduction 254
2 Parameter sweep experiments (Hayashi et al., 2007) 255
3 Ensemble experiments (Kitamura and Ishioka, 2007) 258
4 Summary and Discussion 260
References 262

Triple cascade behaviour in QG and drift turbulence and generation of zonal jets 265

Sergey Nazarenko, Brenda Quinn

1 Introduction and the model 265
2 Charney-Hasegawa-Mima model 267
3 Conservation of energy and enstrophy 268
4 Conservation of zonestrophy 268
5 Triple cascade behaviour 270
5.1 Dual cascades in 2D Navier-Stokes turbulence 270

5.2	Triple cascades in CHM turbulence	271
5.3	Alternative argument for zonation	273
6	Numerical study	275
6.1	Centroids	276
6.2	Settings for the weakly nonlinear and the strongly nonlinear runs	277
6.3	Weakly nonlinear case	277
6.4	Strongly nonlinear case	279
7	Summary	281
	References	286
	The HyperCASL algorithm	289
	David G. Dritschel and Jérôme Fontane	
1	Introduction	289
2	Brief Description of the Numerical Algorithm	290
2.1	Fully Lagrangian Advection	291
2.2	Transfer of Diabatic Forcing to Point Vortices	292
3	An Example: A Diabatically-Forced Jet	293
4	Conclusions and Future Extensions	296
	References	297

List of Contributors

Jonathan Apsden

School of Mathematics and Maxwell Institute, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, UK, e-mail: j.m.aspsden@sms.ed.ac.uk

Peter Bartello

Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, McGill University, Montréal H3A 2K6, Quebec, Canada, e-mail: bartello@math.mcgill.ca

Paul Billant

Hydrodynamics Laboratory (LadHyX), Ecole Polytechnique, 91128 Palaiseau Cedex, France, e-mail: billant@ladhyx.polytechnique.fr

Nicolas Boulanger

Technologies Avancées pour le Génome et la Clinique, INSERM, 163 Avenue de Luminy, 13288 Marseille, France, e-mail: boulanger@tagc.univ-mrs.fr

Friedrich Busse

Institute of Physics, University of Bayreuth, D-95440 Bayreuth, Germany, e-mail: busse@uni-bayreuth.de

George Carnevale

Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University California San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA, e-mail: gcarnevale@ucsd.edu

Xavier Carton

LPO/UBO, 29200 Brest, France, e-mail: xcarton@univ-brest.fr

Jean-Marc Chomaz

Hydrodynamics Laboratory (LadHyX), Ecole Polytechnique, 91128 Palaiseau Cedex, France, e-mail: chomaz@ladhyx.polytechnique.fr

Stuart Dalziel

DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge, CB3 0WA, e-mail: S.Dalziel@damp.cam.ac.uk

Peter Davidson

University of Cambridge, Department of Engineering, Trumpington Street,
Cambridge, CB2 1PZ, UK, e-mail: pad3@eng.cam.ac.uk

Axel Deloncle

Hydrodynamics Laboratory (LadHyX), Ecole Polytechnique, 91128 Palaiseau
Cedex, France, e-mail: axel.deloncle@ladhyx.polytechnique.fr

David Dritschel

Mathematical Institute, University of St Andrews, St Andrews KY16 9SS, UK,
e-mail: dgd@mcs.st-and.ac.uk

Jérôme Fontane

ISAE – DAEP, 1 place Emile Blouin, BP 75064, 31033 Toulouse, France, e-mail:
j.fontane@isae.fr

Alan Guillou

IFREMER, 29280 Plouzane, France, e-mail: alain.guillou@ifremer.fr

Yoshi-Yuki Hayashi

Graduate School of Science, Kobe University, Kobe, 657-8501, Japan, e-mail:
shosuke@gfd-dennou.org

Jackson Herring

NCAR, Boulder CO 80307, USA, e-mail: herring@ucar.edu

Shintaro Hoshi

Department of Mechanical Engineering and Intelligent Systems, University of
Electro-Communications, Chofu, Tokyo, 182-8585, Japan, e-mail: s.hoshi@miyazaki.mce.uec.ac.jp

Keiichi Ishioka

Division of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Graduate School of Science, Kyoto
University, Kyoto, 606-8502, Japan, e-mail: ishioka@gfd-dennou.org

Hidefumi Kimura

Department of Mechanical Engineering and Intelligent Systems, University of
Electro-Communications, Chofu, Tokyo, 182-8585, Japan, e-mail: hidefumi@miyazaki.mce.uec.ac.jp

Yoshifumi Kimura

Graduate School of Mathematics, Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa-ku,
Nagoya 464-8602, Japan, e-mail: kimura@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp

Yuji Kitamura

Meteorological Research Institute, Japan Meteorological Agency, Tsukuba,
305-0052, Japan, e-mail: kitamura@mri-jma.go.jp

Rudolf Kloosterziel

School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology, University of Hawaii,
Honolulu, HI 96822, USA, e-mail: rudolf@soest.hawaii.edu

Eric Kunze

School of Earth and Ocean Sciences, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC V8P 5C2, Canada, e-mail: kunze@uvic.ca

Stéphane Le Dizès

Institut de Recherche sur les Phenomenes Hors Equilibre, CNRS, Aix-Marseille Universites, 49 rue Joliot-Curie, 13384 Marseille, France, e-mail: ledizes@irphe.univ-mrs.fr

M.-Pascale Lelong

NorthWest Research Associates, P.O. Box 3027 Bellevue WA 98009-3027, USA, e-mail: pascale@nwra.com

Mahdi Mahdizadeh

Hormozgan University, Bandar Abbas, Iran, e-mail: mehdizadeh@hormozgan.ac.ir

Michael McIntyre

DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge, CB3 0WA, e-mail: M.E.McIntyre@damtp.cam.ac.uk

James McWilliams

Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1567, USA, e-mail: jcm@atmos.ucla.edu

Sergey Medvedev

Institute of Computational Technologies, Novosibirsk, Russia, e-mail: medvedev@ict.nsc.ru

Patrice Meunier

Institut de Recherche sur les Phenomenes Hors Equilibre, CNRS, Aix-Marseille Universites, 49 rue Joliot-Curie, 13384 Marseille, France, e-mail: meunier@irphe.univ-mrs.fr

Takeshi Miyazaki

Department of Mechanical Engineering and Intelligent Systems, University of Electro-Communications, Chofu, Tokyo, 182-8585, Japan, e-mail: miyazaki@mce.uec.ac.jp

Sergey Nazarenko

Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Gibbet Hill Road, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK, e-mail: S.V.Nazarenko@warwick.ac.uk

Seiya Nishizawa

Graduate School of Science, Kobe University, Kobe, 657-8501, Japan, e-mail: seiya@gfd-dennou.org

Paolo Orlandi

Dipartimento di Meccanica e Aeronautica, Università di Roma, “La Sapienza,” via Eudossiana 18, 00184 Rome, Italy, e-mail: orlandi@kolmogorov.ing.uniroma1.it

Ivane Pairaud

IFREMER, La Seyne sur Mer, France, e-mail: Ivane.Pairaud@ifremer.fr

Xavier Perrot

LPO/UBO, 29200 Brest, France, e-mail: xperrot@univ-brest.fr

Brenda Quinn

Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Gibbet Hill Road, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK, e-mail: B.E.Quinn@warwick.ac.uk

Peter Rhines

School of Oceanography, University of Washington, Box 355351, Seattle, WA 98195, e-mail: rhines@ocean.washington.edu

Xavier Riedinger

Institut de Recherche sur les Phenomenes Hors Equilibre, CNRS, Aix-Marseille Universites, 49 rue Joliot-Curie, 13384 Marseille, France, e-mail: riedinger@irphe.univ-mrs.fr

Richard Scott

Mathematical Institute, University of St Andrews, St Andrews KY16 9SS, UK, e-mail: rks@mcs.st-and.ac.uk

Victor Shrira

Department of Mathematics, EPSAM, Keele University, Keele, Staffordshire ST5 5BG, UK, e-mail: v.i.shrira@maths.keele.ac.uk

Radostin Simitev

Department of Mathematics, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8QW, UK, e-mail: r.simitev@maths.gla.ac.uk

Daan van Sommeren

Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, 5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands, e-mail: d.d.j.a.v.sommeren@student.tue.nl

Joël Sommeria

LEGI UMR 5519, CNRS & Université de Grenoble, BP 53, 38041 Grenoble, France, e-mail: joel.sommeria@legi.grenoble-inp.fr

Chantal Staquet

LEGI, CNRS & Université de Grenoble, France, e-mail: Chantal.Staquet@hmg.inpg.fr

Philip Staplehurst

BP Exploration – Sunbury, Chertsey Road, Sunbury-on-Thames, Middlesex TW16 7LN, UK

Sin-ichi Takehiro

Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto, 606-8502, Japan, e-mail: takepiro@gfd-dennou.org

Steven Tobias

Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK,
e-mail: smt@maths.leeds.ac.uk

William Townsend

Department of Mathematics, EPSAM, Keele University, Keele, Staffordshire ST5
5BG, UK, e-mail: w.a.townsend@epsam.keele.ac.uk

Jacques Vanneste

School of Mathematics and Maxwell Institute, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh
EH9 3JZ, UK, e-mail: j.vanneste@ed.ac.uk

Antoine Venaille

GFDL-AOS Princeton University, Princeton NJ, 08540, USA, e-mail: venaille@princeton.edu

Michio Yamada

Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto, 606-8502,
Japan, e-mail: yamada@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Shigeo Yoden

Division of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Graduate School of Science, Kyoto
University, Kyoto, 606-8502, Japan, e-mail: yoden@kugi.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Vladimir Zeitlin

LMD, Univercity Paris VI and Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris, France, e-mail:
zeitlin@lmd.ens.fr

Part I
Waves and Imbalance

On spontaneous imbalance and ocean turbulence: generalizations of the Paparella–Young epsilon theorem

Michael E. McIntyre

Abstract Recent progress in understanding the balance–imbalance problem is highlighted, with emphasis on spontaneous-imbalance phenomena associated with the exponentially fast “wave capture” of inertia–gravity waves. These phenomena are excluded from shallow-water models and are outside the scope of the classical Lighthill theory. Also discussed is progress on a different topic, an effort to extend the Paparella–Young *epsilon theorem* to realistic ocean models. The theorem constrains turbulent dissipation rates ε in horizontal-convection thought-experiments, in which mechanically-driven stirring is switched off. The theorem bears on the so-called “ocean heat engine” and “ocean desert” controversies. The original theorem (2002) applied only to very idealized ocean models. Several restrictions on the original proof can now be lifted including the restriction to a linear, thermal-only equation of state. The theorem can now be proved for fairly realistic equations of state that include thermobaric effects, and nonlinearity in both temperature and salinity. The restriction to Boussinesq flow can also be lifted. The increased realism comes at some cost in terms of weakening the constraint on ε . The constraint is further weakened if one allows for the finite depth of penetration of solar radiation. This is collaborative work with Francesco Paparella and William Young.

1 Introduction

Following the organizers’ aims, I had originally undertaken to talk only about the first topic in this paper, spontaneous imbalance and accurate PV (potential vorticity) inversion. Recent progress in that field has been remarkable, throwing a clear light on where the Lighthill paradigm is relevant and where it is not, as well as finding the first accurate and completely self-consistent PV inversion operators. However,

Michael E. McIntyre, Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, Wilberforce Rd, Cambridge CB3 0WA, United Kingdom. <http://www.atm.damtp.cam.ac.uk/people/mem/>

most of what I had to say about this is already in print elsewhere [12; 13]. Here I give only a quick summary, in Section 2, then move on to the second topic.

The second topic concerns the oceanic MOC, the meridional overturning circulation. It is sometimes called the thermohaline “conveyor belt” despite having nothing like the inextensibility of a real mechanical conveyor belt. The aspect crucial to questions such as the desertification, or not, of the upper ocean under global warming is the rising branch relative to the stratification surfaces in the main thermocline and elsewhere. It is upward material transport across stratification surfaces that is germane to questions about the supply of nutrients to the upper ocean [21], and hence about desertification or not.

It has sometimes been thought that buoyancy forcing alone can “drive the conveyor belt”, a scenario much discussed under the heading “horizontal convection”. The idea seems to be that the cooling of the sea surface in high latitudes is the main control, not only driving the deep-convective plumes and gravity currents of which the downward branch is composed but also supplying sufficient stirring, hence diapycnal mixing, to sustain the upward branch against the stable stratification N^2 . Clearly the plumes and gravity currents must cause a certain amount of stirring and mixing.

Such a picture might tempt one to suppose that the “conveyor belt” circulation is something that can be shut off entirely by reducing the buoyancy forcing – by either warming or freshening the high-latitude sea surface, or both. A contrary view is that the *upward* branch depends, rather, on mechanical stirring by winds, tides, and possibly biota [2; 15; 25; 28]. In that case the upward branch would hardly be affected by shutting off the few tens of sverdrups [5] of flow in the downward branch. The sole effect would be to make the stratification surfaces drift downward, very gradually, without much affecting the upward material transport across them.¹

The theorem of Paparella and Young published in 2002 [19], hereafter PY02, puts important and mathematically rigorous constraints on our thinking about these questions. It does so by placing a severe upper bound on the average turbulent dissipation rates ϵ attainable in a horizontal-convection scenario for small molecular diffusivities. If one accepts the usual empirical (Ellison–Britter–Osborn) relation between ϵ values and diapycnal mixing rates

$$K_z \sim \gamma\epsilon/N^2 \tag{1}$$

where K_z is the vertical eddy diffusivity describing the mixing, and $\gamma \lesssim 0.2$, see e.g. [17], also [11], then one can strengthen the arguments for the importance of me-

¹ For instance “very gradually” would mean a downward drift of just under a kilometre per millennium for every ten sverdrups of downward flow that remained shut off. This downward drift of the stratification surfaces would not, however, detach the main thermocline from its Southern Ocean outcrop and therefore would not shut off the wind-driven mechanical stirring and Ekman transport across the outcropping stratification surfaces, contributing to the “upward” branch [25, & refs.]. This is because of the way in which the speed of the Antarctic Circumpolar Current is regulated internally, almost independently of wind stress but very much favouring the outcropping, e.g. [22] & refs. – a very different circumstance from that in the hothouse climate of the early Eocene 50 million years ago, when the Sun was about half a percent cooler but the Drake Passage still closed.

chanical stirring to the upward branch [14; 15; 28], including the superficial stirring and Ekman transport across the Southern Ocean outcrop [25, & refs.], and hence to the transports of nutrients across the ocean’s stratification surfaces into the upper ocean, along with other questions about the oceanic general circulation.

However, PY02’s epsilon theorem applies only to a highly idealized Boussinesq ocean model, in a rectangular domain, with a linear equation of state that neglects salinity altogether. In my talk at the international Workshop on 10 December 2008 I described a generalization in which all these restrictions were lifted except the Boussinesq approximation. (A video of the talk, “Beyond Lighthill...”, was made publicly available via <http://sms.cam.ac.uk/media/518985/formats> later that month.) In particular, the new epsilon theorem allowed for arbitrary bottom topography, curved geopotentials and an equation of state that included not only salinity, but also the two main nonlinearities of real seawater, the thermal and thermobaric nonlinearities. This was work in collaboration with Francesco Paparella and William R. Young. Young had earlier reported our first breakthrough, the first result for a nonlinear equation of state, to the Stockholm Sandström Centennial Meeting on 3 November 2008.

As shown in Sects. 3 and 4 below, the key to proving these generalized epsilon theorems, and further generalizations arrived at after the Workshop, was to exploit Young’s formulation of Boussinesq energetics. The formulation is a simple way of handling thermobaricity and is essentially that given, with due acknowledgement, on p. 73 of the textbook by Vallis [26]. Young (personal communication and ref. [30]) beautifully clarifies the way in which a vestige of the thermodynamic energies survives in the Boussinesq limit, adding to the gravitational potential energy.

Armed with Young’s formulation, we were able to go on to prove epsilon theorems for still more realistic equations of state, including those being standardized by the international SCOR/IAPSO Working Group 127 on the *Thermodynamics and Equation of State of Seawater*. The accuracies are state of the art, comparable to those in recent publications such as [3; 7]. In addition, we were able to lift the Boussinesq restriction and thereby shed a fundamentally new light on the subject. A full report is in preparation, whose first part is to be submitted to the *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, hereafter “JFM”.

A few days before submission of the present paper, we learned that Jonas Nycander [16] had independently arrived at a generalized epsilon theorem based on Young’s Boussinesq energy equation, (13) below, and a nonlinear equation of state almost the same as (20) below. Nycander’s Boussinesq result almost exactly parallels the result to be described in Sect. 4 below, and reported in my December Workshop talk.

2 Spontaneous imbalance

The recent progress in this area concerns spontaneous imbalance of the kind discovered in the 1990s by O’Sullivan and Dunkerton [18], in continuously stratified

flows. In particular, it is now clear why these continuously stratified scenarios – let us call them OSD-type scenarios – are at an opposite extreme to what would be expected from the Lighthill theory [9], which applies not only to Lighthill’s original case of acoustic imbalance but also to typical shallow-water scenarios [4]. The Lighthill theory is the classic milestone in the field. When it was published in 1952 it offered profound new insights. These were the first generic insights into the nature of spontaneous imbalance, even though not all-embracing, as it now turns out. A review and historical perspective may be found in [12].²

In brief, the continuously stratified, OSD-type scenarios differ drastically from Lighthill-type scenarios in three respects. First, the radiation reaction on the wave generation region is substantial. In a Lighthill scenario, by contrast, the radiation reaction is weak, permitting non-iterative computation of the spontaneous imbalance and the resulting wave emission after first computing the vortical motion using PV inversion, i.e. altogether neglecting the wave emission. This was Lighthill’s most fundamental point. The vortical motion can be regarded as known before computing the wave emission.

Such non-iterative computation is impossible in an OSD-type scenario. The vortical motion and wave emission are intimately part of each other throughout the wave source region. As pointed out in [12], the wave emission process is fundamentally similar to mountain-wave generation except in one crucial respect. In order for the analogy to be accurate, recognizing the substantial radiation reaction, one must consider the notional mountain to be made of an elastic substance so pliable that the wave emission process substantially changes the shape of the mountain, hence substantially changes the vertical velocity field.

The second and related respect is the lack of scale separation in the wave source region, in an OSD-type scenario. The reason why the spontaneous wave emission is weak in a Lighthill scenario is the destructive interference arising from scale separation. The emitted waves have typical scales, or reciprocal wavenumbers, that greatly exceed typical vortex scales. In an OSD scenario, by contrast, the waves arise in the source region with reciprocal wavenumbers indistinguishable from typical scales of the vortex motion. As they propagate away from the source region the waves undergo “wave capture”, or strain-enhanced critical-layer absorption, with wavenumbers increasing exponentially fast [20, & refs.]. This ensures that back-reflection and resonance phenomena are negligible and that the radiation reaction on the source is similar to that of waves satisfying a radiation condition.

The third respect is unsteadiness versus quasi-steadiness of the wave emission process. In a Lighthill scenario, unsteadiness of the vortical motion is a crucial part of the spontaneous-imbalance mechanism. In an OSD scenario, with its mountain-wave-like character, it is now clear that one can have inertia–gravity wave emission from a steady vortical flow. Perhaps the first work to point clearly to that fact was the study reported in [24], in which a surface temperature front was prevented from collapsing by applying an artificial diffusivity, holding the front approximately steady. Recently, examples have come to light for which perfectly steady flow is a natural

² Also available from www.atm.damtp.cam.ac.uk/people/mem/#imbalance

idealization. These are the propagating vortex dipoles described in several recent papers including [23] and [27]. They were discovered through high-resolution numerical experiments. The review in [12] gives a careful description and comparison between the two best-resolved cases, including the evidence for a substantial radiation reaction.

3 Epsilon theorems for realistic ocean models

PY02’s epsilon theorem [19] constrains the turbulent dissipation rates ε attainable in an idealized horizontal-convection scenario. A Boussinesq liquid in a rigid, thermally insulating, box-shaped container of depth H , with gravity uniform and the top surface exactly horizontal, is set in motion purely by maintaining a nonuniform temperature ϑ at the top surface. The buoyancy acceleration b is a linear function of ϑ alone. No mechanical stirring is allowed. A statistically steady state is assumed. For this scenario PY02 rigorously established a bound proportional to the range Δb of buoyancy-acceleration values at the top surface,

$$\langle\langle \varepsilon \rangle\rangle \leq \kappa \Delta b / H \quad (2)$$

where the double angle brackets denote the domain and time average and where κ is the thermal molecular diffusivity. Therefore, in particular, $\langle\langle \varepsilon \rangle\rangle$ goes to zero as the first power of κ in the limit of small molecular diffusivities, for instance holding the Prandtl number ν/κ constant where ν is the molecular diffusivity of momentum. The vanishing of $\langle\langle \varepsilon \rangle\rangle$ in that limit was at first called an “anti-turbulence theorem”. However, we now prefer to call it an “epsilon theorem” for two reasons, first because the theorem does not rule out locally finite ε values in the limit, in shrinking subvolumes of the domain, and second because, even if ε were to go to zero at the same rate as $\langle\langle \varepsilon \rangle\rangle$ in all locations, it would still be possible to have weak yet fully-developed turbulence in the sense of having a Richardson cascade and a vanishingly small Kolmogorov scale $(\nu^3/\varepsilon)^{1/4} \propto \kappa^{1/2}$.

Now the key to proving epsilon theorems is to avoid considering the complete energetics. Indeed, one must dissect the complete energetics in a certain way. This happens automatically for the Boussinesq equations and is one of the facts implicitly exploited in PY02’s proof, along with the linearity of the equation of state, $b \propto \vartheta$. In the Boussinesq equations the internal and chemical energies of seawater are relegated to an almost passive role. For the full equations the proof is harder to spot because the complete energetics must, of course, take account of the full thermodynamics including the internal and chemical energies.

Even within the Boussinesq equations there are nontrivial technical obstacles to be overcome, beyond making the geometry and the centrifugal–gravitational field more realistic. They concern the nonlinearities in realistic equations of state for seawater. The first steps toward overcoming these obstacles were taken by Francesco Paparella, William R. Young and myself, working together last year. The key was

to recognize first that a mathematical device used in PY02, consisting of two successive integrations with respect to altitude z – the steps leading from (2.1b,c) to (2.3) and then to (3.3), in ref. [19] – could be replaced by a single integration after multiplication by z . The second step was to recognize that this integration was a pointer toward using the Boussinesq energy formulation discovered by Young (personal communication and ref. [30]), working on a different problem after PY02 was published. For a general, nonlinear equation of state the crucial step is to introduce a quantity most aptly called the *dynamic enthalpy*, which in this context takes on the superficial appearance of a buoyancy-associated potential energy, the quantity denoted by Π in Eq. (2.116) of Vallis [26] but here denoted by h^{\ddagger} in order to flag the connection with enthalpy. That connection is carefully explained in [30]. It clarifies the “almost passive” role of the internal and chemical energies.

Consider a domain like that in Fig. 1 with arbitrary topography and curved geopotentials. It is now easiest to take the Boussinesq equations in coordinate-independent form

$$D\mathbf{u}/Dt + 2\mathbf{\Omega} \times \mathbf{u} + \nabla p - b\nabla Z = \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \quad (3)$$

$$D\vartheta/Dt = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\vartheta}, \quad (4)$$

$$DS/Dt = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}_S, \quad (5)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{\Omega}$ is the Earth’s angular velocity, D/Dt the material derivative $\partial/\partial t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla$, $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ the relative velocity, $p(\mathbf{x}, t)$ the pressure anomaly with the reference density $\rho = \rho_0 = 1$ in suitable units, $Z = Z(\mathbf{x})$ a scaled geopotential height to be defined below, with its zero level at the top surface, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ the viscous stress tensor with components $\sigma_{ij} = \sigma_{ji}$ while S and ϑ are salinity and conservative temperature [10], and \mathbf{J}_S




Fig. 1 Schematic of a model ocean. Instead of PY02’s idealized rectangular domain, arbitrary topography is allowed, across which there are no salt or heat fluxes. The geothermal heat flux is assumed negligible. Salinity as well as temperature variations are allowed, as is a fully nonlinear equation of state. The effective geopotentials (gravitational plus centrifugal) are allowed to curve realistically, with gravity plus centrifugal force nonuniform, and Z the geopotential altitude.

and \mathbf{J}_ϑ their molecular-diffusive fluxes in suitable units. These may include cross-diffusivities arising from the Soret and Dufour effects and other thermodynamic dependences. The nonlinear equation of state has the generic form

$$b = b(\vartheta, \mathcal{Z}, S). \quad (7)$$

To help formalize the Boussinesq limit, it is convenient to define \mathcal{Z} as the actual geopotential relative to the top surface divided by a constant reference value g_0 of the gravity acceleration g , so that \mathcal{Z} is approximately the geometric altitude and $\nabla \mathcal{Z}$ approximately a unit vertical vector. Then b is $-g_0$ times the fractional density anomaly. Thermobaric nonlinearities are represented within the Boussinesq framework by the dependence of b on \mathcal{Z} , since the background reference pressure $= -\rho_0 g_0 \mathcal{Z} + (\text{surface pressure})$. Defining $W := D\mathcal{Z}/Dt$ and $\varepsilon := \nabla \mathbf{u} : \boldsymbol{\sigma} = u_{i,j} \sigma_{ij}$, the local per-unit-mass viscous rate of conversion of mechanical energy into thermal energy, and taking the scalar product of (3) with \mathbf{u} we have, using incompressibility (6),

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right) - Wb + \nabla \cdot \left\{ \mathbf{u} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 + p \right) - \mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \right\} = -\varepsilon \quad (8)$$

where $\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}) = (u_i \sigma_{ij})_{,j}$. The problem now is what to do with the buoyancy term Wb . Standard ways to turn it into a rate of change of potential energy fail because of thermobaricity. The difficulty can be overcome by introducing Young's dynamic enthalpy h^\ddagger (personal communication and ref. [30]), whose definition is

$$h^\ddagger(\vartheta, \mathcal{Z}, S) := \int_{\mathcal{Z}}^0 b(\vartheta, \mathcal{Z}', S) d\mathcal{Z}'. \quad (9)$$

Then, by the chain rule,

$$\frac{Dh^\ddagger}{Dt} = -Wb + \mathcal{D}(\vartheta, \mathcal{Z}, S) \quad (10)$$

where the dissipative contribution

$$\mathcal{D}(\vartheta, \mathcal{Z}, S) := \frac{\partial h^\ddagger}{\partial \vartheta} \frac{D\vartheta}{Dt} + \frac{\partial h^\ddagger}{\partial S} \frac{DS}{Dt} \quad (11)$$

$$= -\frac{\partial h^\ddagger}{\partial \vartheta} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}_\vartheta - \frac{\partial h^\ddagger}{\partial S} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}_S. \quad (12)$$

Then from (6), (8) and (10) we have an equation whose left-hand side is in conservation form,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 + h^\ddagger \right) + \nabla \cdot \left\{ \mathbf{u} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 + p + h^\ddagger \right) - \mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \right\} = -\varepsilon + \mathcal{D}(\vartheta, \mathcal{Z}, S), \quad (13)$$

and whose domain and time average is, for the statistically steady state,

$$\langle\langle \varepsilon \rangle\rangle - \langle\langle \mathcal{D}(\vartheta, z, S) \rangle\rangle = 0, \quad (14)$$

there being no mass flow across the boundary, $\mathbf{u} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}} = 0$ where $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ is the outward normal, and no work done by surface viscous stresses since there is no mechanical stirring e.g. by wind stress at the top surface. Using (12) we now have

$$\langle\langle \varepsilon \rangle\rangle - \langle\langle \mathbf{J}_\vartheta \cdot \nabla(\partial h^\ddagger/\partial \vartheta) + \mathbf{J}_S \cdot \nabla(\partial h^\ddagger/\partial S) \rangle\rangle = 0 \quad (15)$$

after integrating by parts. This last step produces no boundary terms – the most crucial step in proving an epsilon theorem – because of (a) the vanishing of $\mathbf{J}_\vartheta \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}$ and $\mathbf{J}_S \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}$ on the topography and (b) the vanishing of $\partial h^\ddagger/\partial \vartheta$ and $\partial h^\ddagger/\partial S$, thanks to (9), on the top surface where $z = 0$. On the top surface $\mathbf{J}_\vartheta \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}$ and $\mathbf{J}_S \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}$ need not vanish, indeed cannot both vanish if the system is to be forced into motion without mechanical stirring.

Now the most accurate models of seawater all assume, with strong justification, that conditions are everywhere close to local thermodynamic equilibrium. Thus the temperature T is well defined, and \mathbf{J}_ϑ and \mathbf{J}_S can be expressed as linear combinations of ∇T and $\nabla \mu$ where μ is the chemical potential of salt relative to water [8]. The expressions for \mathbf{J}_ϑ and \mathbf{J}_S include the Dufour and Soret cross-diffusive terms. Respectively, those terms represent a contribution to \mathbf{J}_ϑ from $\nabla \mu$ and to \mathbf{J}_S from ∇T . Since T and μ are functions of state we may write

$$T = T(\vartheta, z, S) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu = \mu(\vartheta, z, S) \quad (16)$$

where the functional dependence, expressing local thermodynamic equilibrium, may reasonably be assumed smooth. Then \mathbf{J}_ϑ and \mathbf{J}_S become linear combinations of $\nabla \vartheta$, ∇z and ∇S , and the second term in (15) a quadratic form in the components of $\nabla \vartheta$, ∇z and ∇S . That is, (15) has the form

$$\langle\langle \varepsilon \rangle\rangle + \kappa_0 \langle\langle A |\nabla \vartheta|^2 + B \nabla \vartheta \cdot \nabla S + C |\nabla S|^2 + D \nabla \vartheta \cdot \nabla z + E \nabla S \cdot \nabla z + F |\nabla z|^2 \rangle\rangle = 0, \quad (17)$$

where the coefficients A, B, \dots are smooth functions of ϑ, z , and S . The coefficient κ_0 is a reference diffusivity, whose ratio to each actual molecular diffusivity and cross-diffusivity (including ν , the molecular diffusivity of momentum) will be held constant in the small-diffusivities limit $\kappa_0 \rightarrow 0$. This is the natural generalization of PY02's constant Prandtl number. The coefficients A, B, \dots, F are bounded as $\kappa_0 \rightarrow 0$.

As illustrated in the next section, the terms on the second line of (17) can be bounded as $\kappa_0 \rightarrow 0$, under reasonable assumptions, using the fact that z is a smoothly-varying field independent of κ_0 . An epsilon theorem $\langle\langle \varepsilon \rangle\rangle = O(\kappa_0)$ can then be proved whenever the first line of (17) is non-negative definite, which is true if

$$A \geq 0, \quad C \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad B^2 - 4AC \leq 0 \quad (18)$$

for all oceanographically relevant values of ϑ, z , and S . For if κ_0 times the second line of (17) goes to zero in the limit then both $\langle\langle \varepsilon \rangle\rangle$ and the rest of the first

line, when non-negative, must go to zero together in the limit. If (18) holds with A , B , and $B^2 - 4AC$ bounded away from zero for fixed, nonzero Z , then (17) also puts significant constraints on the mean square gradients of ϑ and S , supplementing comparison-function constraints of the kind found by Balmforth and Young [1] and Winters and Young [29]. By themselves, the latter constraints would be insufficient to control the mean square gradients tightly enough to produce an epsilon theorem.

As will be noted in the next section, (18) is satisfied by the usual nonlinear models of seawater properties as described, for instance, in [26]. We are currently investigating whether (18) is satisfied by the still more accurate, state-of-the-art model currently being standardized by SCOR/IAPSO Working Group 127. The calculations are laborious but it seems clear that (18) is satisfied by this model as well, albeit by a slender margin at abyssal depths. The slender margin is mainly due to a contribution to the coefficient B not from the Dufour and Soret effects but from the interdependence of T , ϑ and S expressed by (16).

If (18) were violated, as appears thermodynamically possible, and realizable for conceivable fluid microstructures, then our proof would fail. Rather than signalling any dramatically different fluid behaviour, I suspect that this would merely widen the gap between what is true and what is provable, or what has so far been provable.

4 Specific examples

For illustrative purposes we simplify the expressions for \mathbf{J}_ϑ and \mathbf{J}_S [8] to

$$\mathbf{J}_\vartheta = -\kappa(\nabla\vartheta - \Gamma_\vartheta\nabla Z) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{J}_S = -\kappa_S(\nabla S + \Gamma_S\nabla Z), \quad (19)$$

in units compatible with (4) and (5), where κ_S is the molecular salt diffusivity. The correction terms in Γ_ϑ and Γ_S are necessary in order that \mathbf{J}_ϑ and \mathbf{J}_S vanish when $\nabla T = 0$ and $\nabla\mu = 0$. Both Γ_ϑ and Γ_S are positive. In the case of Γ_S this allows the salinity S to find its natural scale height, with S diminishing upward under gravity at $\sim 3\text{‰ km}^{-1}$ in a stagnant ocean with $\mathbf{J}_S = 0$ [6, & refs.]. Conservative temperature ϑ , being numerically close to the ordinary potential temperature [10], increases upward at $\sim 0.15\text{ K km}^{-1}$ in an isothermal stagnant ocean. Other small contributions to the fluxes arising from (16) and from the Dufour and Soret effects are neglected. They will be re-introduced and carefully discussed in our JFM paper.

For the equation of state we take a model similar to that in [26] except for the inclusion of a nonlinear term in salinity S ,

$$b(\vartheta, Z, S) = g_0 \left\{ \beta_\vartheta (1 - \gamma^* \rho_0 g_0 Z) \vartheta + \frac{1}{2} \beta_\vartheta^* \vartheta^2 - \beta_S S + \frac{1}{2} \beta_S^* S^2 + \frac{g_0 Z}{c_0^2} \right\}, \quad (20)$$

$$\Rightarrow h^\ddagger = -g_0 Z \left\{ \beta_\vartheta \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \gamma^* \rho_0 g_0 Z \right) \vartheta + \frac{1}{2} \beta_\vartheta^* \vartheta^2 - \beta_S S + \frac{1}{2} \beta_S^* S^2 + \frac{g_0 Z}{2c_0^2} \right\}. \quad (21)$$