A Bound on Mixing Efficiency

Jean-Luc Thiffeault

Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London

Charles R. Doering

Department of Mathematics and Michigan Center for Theoretical Physics,

University of Michigan

John D. Gibbon

Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London

http://www.ma.imperial.ac.uk/~jeanluc

Summary

- Derive upper bound on the mixing efficiency for a scalar under the influence of advection and diffusion with a body source (e.g., differential heating between equator and poles).
- Inspired by work on Navier–Stokes by Doering & Foias (2002).
- Mixing efficiency measured in terms of an equivalent diffusivity.
- The precise value of the bound on the equivalent diffusivity depends only on the functional shape of both the source and the advecting field.
- Direct numerical simulations performed for a simple advecting flow to test the bounds.

The Setup



- Periodic system (2 or 3 dimensions)
- Stirring and source of scalar variance at scale l
- System of size L
- Velocity field regarded as given: could be time-dependent and even turbulent
- Source distribution and strength could also be time-dependent

$$\partial_t \theta + \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \theta = \kappa \, \Delta \theta + s \,, \tag{A-D}$$

where κ is the molecular diffusivity and s(x, t) is a source function with zero spatial mean.

$$\partial_t \theta + \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \theta = \kappa \, \Delta \theta + s \,, \tag{A-D}$$

where κ is the molecular diffusivity and s(x, t) is a source function with zero spatial mean.

To characterise the fluctuations in θ , we use the variance,

$$\Theta^2 \equiv \left\langle L^{-d} \left\| \theta \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 \right\rangle$$

The angle brackets $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denote a long-time average, and $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}$ is the L^2 norm on \mathbb{T}^d .

$$\partial_t \theta + \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \theta = \kappa \, \Delta \theta + s \,, \tag{A-D}$$

where κ is the molecular diffusivity and $s(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ is a source function with zero spatial mean.

To characterise the fluctuations in θ , we use the variance,

$$\Theta^2 \equiv \left\langle L^{-d} \left\| \theta \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 \right\rangle$$

The angle brackets $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denote a long-time average, and $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}$ is the L^2 norm on \mathbb{T}^d . Decompose *s* and *u* as

$$s(\boldsymbol{x},t) = \boldsymbol{S} \Phi(\boldsymbol{x}/\ell, t/\tau), \quad \left\langle L^{-d} \| \Phi \|_{L^{2}(\mathbb{T}^{d})}^{2} \right\rangle = 1,$$
$$\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x},t) = \boldsymbol{U} \Upsilon(\boldsymbol{x}/\ell, t/\tau), \quad \left\langle L^{-d} \| \Upsilon \|_{L^{2}(\mathbb{T}^{d})}^{2} \right\rangle = 1.$$

The Bounds

We will restrict to a time-independent source, so $\partial_t \Phi = 0$. (See paper for more general case.)

Introduce an arbitrary function Ψ that satisfies

$$\left\langle L^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Psi(\boldsymbol{x}/\ell) \Phi(\boldsymbol{x}/\ell) \,\mathrm{d}^d x \right\rangle = 1,$$

For example $\Psi = \Phi$ is a possible choice.

The Bounds

We will restrict to a time-independent source, so $\partial_t \Phi = 0$. (See paper for more general case.)

Introduce an arbitrary function Ψ that satisfies

$$\left\langle L^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Psi(\boldsymbol{x}/\ell) \Phi(\boldsymbol{x}/\ell) \,\mathrm{d}^d x \right\rangle = 1,$$

For example $\Psi = \Phi$ is a possible choice.

Multiply A-D by Ψ and space-time average. After some integration by parts and use of normalisations,

$$S = -\left\langle L^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left(\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \Psi + \kappa \, \Delta \Psi \right) \theta \, \mathrm{d}^d x \right\rangle.$$

The Cauchy–Schwartz inequality,

$$\|fg\|_{L^{1}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} \leq \|f\|_{L^{2}(\mathbb{T}^{d})} \, \|g\|_{L^{2}(\mathbb{T}^{d})}$$

implies the bound

$$S \leq \left\langle L^{-d} \| \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \Psi + \kappa \, \Delta \Psi \|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2 \right\rangle^{1/2} \Theta.$$

The unknown θ has now been extracted from the average and appears only as a norm that characterises its fluctuations.

We may think of this as a lower bound on the fluctuations in θ in terms of the source strength *S*, the vigor of stirring *U*, and their shape Φ and Υ .

Substituting the scaled variables $T = t/\tau$ and $y = x/\ell$, we have

$$S \leq \frac{U\Theta}{\ell} \left\langle \|\Omega\|_{L^2(\mathbb{I}^d)}^2 \right\rangle^{1/2}$$

where $\mathbb{I} = [0, 1]$ is the unit interval and

$$\Omega(\boldsymbol{y},T) \equiv -\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}(\boldsymbol{y},T) \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{y}} \Psi(\boldsymbol{y}) - \frac{1}{\text{Pe}} \Delta_{\boldsymbol{y}} \Psi(\boldsymbol{y}).$$

Here the Péclet number is $Pe = U\ell/\kappa$.

In principle the bound could be sharpened by varying the arbitrary function Ψ . Requires solution of the associated Euler–Lagrange equation for the specific problem at hand (*i.e.*, Φ and Υ).

We give up a bit of sharpness (inconsequential at large Pe) by using the triangle inequality, and find

$$S \leq \frac{U\Theta}{\ell} \left(c_1 + \operatorname{Pe}^{-1} c_2 \right),$$

where $c_1 \equiv \left\langle \| \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{y}} \Psi \|_{L^2(\mathbb{I}^d)}^2 \right\rangle^{1/2}, \quad c_2 \equiv \left\langle \| \Delta_{\boldsymbol{y}} \Psi \|_{L^2(\mathbb{I}^d)}^2 \right\rangle^{1/2}$

are dimensionless constants, independent of Pe and Θ .

 c_1 depends explicitly on the stirring shape-function Υ and implicitly on the source shape function Φ through the normalisation condition on Ψ .

$$\kappa_{\rm eq} \equiv \frac{S\ell^2}{\Theta} \le c_1 \ U\ell \ + c_2 \,\kappa,$$

• The equivalent diffusivity compares the source amplitude (S) to the steady-state fluctuations in the concentration field (Θ) .

$$\kappa_{\rm eq} \equiv \frac{S\ell^2}{\Theta} \le c_1 \ U\ell \ + c_2 \,\kappa,$$

- The equivalent diffusivity compares the source amplitude (S) to the steady-state fluctuations in the concentration field (Θ) .
- A high Péclet number (Pe $\equiv U\ell/\kappa$) mixing device should operate with as high a κ_{eq} as possible compared to κ .

$$\kappa_{\rm eq} \equiv \frac{S\ell^2}{\Theta} \le c_1 \ U\ell \ + c_2 \,\kappa,$$

- The equivalent diffusivity compares the source amplitude (S) to the steady-state fluctuations in the concentration field (Θ) .
- A high Péclet number (Pe $\equiv U\ell/\kappa$) mixing device should operate with as high a κ_{eq} as possible compared to κ .
- $\kappa_{eq} = \kappa$ for U = 0, which is the purely diffusive case (after a trivial rescaling, not included above).

$$\kappa_{\rm eq} \equiv \frac{S\ell^2}{\Theta} \le c_1 \left(U\ell \right) + c_2 \,\kappa,$$

- The equivalent diffusivity compares the source amplitude (S) to the steady-state fluctuations in the concentration field (Θ) .
- A high Péclet number (Pe $\equiv U\ell/\kappa$) mixing device should operate with as high a κ_{eq} as possible compared to κ .
- $\kappa_{eq} = \kappa$ for U = 0, which is the purely diffusive case (after a trivial rescaling, not included above).
- The scaling $U\ell$ is often used as a rough estimate for turbulent diffusivity, but here we have an explicit prefactor that depends on the stirring and source distribution.

Global Upper Bound

For a given source distribution Φ , we can use the Hölder inequality

$$||fg||_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \le ||f||_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} ||g||_{L^q(\mathbb{T}^d)}, \quad \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1,$$

Global Upper Bound

For a given source distribution Φ , we can use the Hölder inequality

$$||fg||_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \le ||f||_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} ||g||_{L^q(\mathbb{T}^d)}, \quad \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1,$$

and write

$$c_1 = \left\langle \left\| \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{y}} \Psi \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{I}^d)}^2 \right\rangle^{1/2} \le \left\langle \left\| \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{I}^d)}^2 \right\rangle^{1/2} \sup_{\boldsymbol{y},t} \left| \nabla_{\boldsymbol{y}} \Psi \right|$$

Global Upper Bound

For a given source distribution Φ , we can use the Hölder inequality

$$||fg||_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \le ||f||_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} ||g||_{L^q(\mathbb{T}^d)}, \quad \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1,$$

and write

$$c_{1} = \left\langle \left\| \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{y}} \Psi \right\|_{L^{2}(\mathbb{I}^{d})}^{2} \right\rangle^{1/2} \leq \left\langle \left\| \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \right\|_{L^{2}(\mathbb{I}^{d})}^{2} \right\rangle^{1/2} \sup_{\boldsymbol{y},t} \left| \nabla_{\boldsymbol{y}} \Psi \right|$$

$$c_1 \le \sup_{\boldsymbol{y},t} |\nabla_{\boldsymbol{y}}\Psi|$$

This bound is valid for any stirring velocity field u(x, t). No flow that can be more efficient than this! Alternating horizontal and vertical sine shear flows, with randomised phase. Source distribution (shaded) is fixed.



Shape function for the source:

$$\Phi = \sqrt{2} \, \sin 2\pi y_1,$$

and for the velocity field:

$$\Upsilon = \begin{cases} \sqrt{2} \ (0 \ , \ \sin(2\pi y_1 + \chi_1)) \ , & n < T < (n + \frac{1}{2}) \ ; \\ \sqrt{2} \ (\sin(2\pi y_2 + \chi_2) \ , \ 0) \ , & (n + \frac{1}{2}) < T < (n + 1) \ . \end{cases}$$

 χ_1 and χ_2 are random angles.

Shape function for the source:

$$\Phi = \sqrt{2} \, \sin 2\pi y_1,$$

and for the velocity field:

$$\Upsilon = \begin{cases} \sqrt{2} \ (0 \ , \ \sin(2\pi y_1 + \chi_1)) \ , & n < T < (n + \frac{1}{2}) \ ; \\ \sqrt{2} \ (\sin(2\pi y_2 + \chi_2) \ , \ 0) \ , & (n + \frac{1}{2}) < T < (n + 1) \ . \end{cases}$$

 χ_1 and χ_2 are random angles.

We choose $\Psi = \Phi$, though in principle this could be optimised.

$$\mathbf{\Upsilon} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \Psi = \begin{cases} 0, & n < T < (n + \frac{1}{2}); \\ 4\pi \sin(2\pi y_2 + \chi_2) \cos 2\pi y_1, & (n + \frac{1}{2}) < T < (n + 1). \end{cases}$$

$$\|\mathbf{\Upsilon} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \Psi\|_{L^{2}(\mathbb{I}^{d})}^{2} = \begin{cases} 0, & n < T < (n + \frac{1}{2}); \\ 4\pi^{2}, & (n + \frac{1}{2}) < T < (n + 1). \end{cases}$$

$$\|\mathbf{\Upsilon} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \Psi\|_{L^{2}(\mathbb{I}^{d})}^{2} = \begin{cases} 0, & n < T < (n + \frac{1}{2}); \\ 4\pi^{2}, & (n + \frac{1}{2}) < T < (n + 1). \end{cases}$$

.

$$c_{1} = \left\langle \left\| \mathbf{\Upsilon} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \Psi \right\|_{L^{2}(\mathbb{I}^{d})}^{2} \right\rangle^{1/2} = \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(0 + 4\pi^{2} \right) \right]^{1/2} = \sqrt{2} \pi.$$

$$\|\mathbf{\Upsilon} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{y}} \Psi\|_{L^{2}(\mathbb{I}^{d})}^{2} = \begin{cases} 0, & n < T < (n + \frac{1}{2}); \\ 4\pi^{2}, & (n + \frac{1}{2}) < T < (n + 1). \end{cases}$$

$$c_1 = \left\langle \left\| \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{y}} \Psi \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{I}^d)}^2 \right\rangle^{1/2} = \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(0 + 4\pi^2 \right) \right]^{1/2} = \sqrt{2} \pi.$$

After including a trivial rescaling of $(2\pi)^{-2}$ (so that κ_{eq} reduces to κ in the absence of stirring), we find

$$\kappa_{\rm eq} \le \frac{UL}{2\sqrt{2}\,\pi} + \kappa$$

Computing the Equivalent Diffusivity



Comparison with Numerical Results



Conclusions

- Simple bound on fluctuations in the concentration of a scalar, active or passive.
- The constants involved in the bound only depend on the shape of the source distribution and stirring field.
- Suffers from the same problems as all bounding approaches: Hard to tease out physics!
- Nevertheless, important to know where one expects the answer to lie, and little work is required for bounding.
- Exploit this to try and optimise mixing configurations: focus on the bound rather than a full solution of the A-D equation.