

ON AN ANALYTICAL CRITERION FOR DETECTING INTERMITTENT TURBULENT BEHAVIOUR OF SOLUTIONS OF PARTIAL DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

MICHELE V BARTUCELLI AND GUIDO GENTILE

Contribution to celebrate the 75th birthday of Professor Peter Constantin

ABSTRACT. A main question in the study of partial differential equations is the following: how do we understand the nature of the solutions and, in particular, how do we determine if a given solution shows turbulent or non-turbulent behaviour? Being able to answer such a question would be a major advance in the comprehension of the nature of turbulence. In this paper we focus on the case of intermittent turbulence and provide an analytical criterion, based on the crest factor, which captures the essential feature of the solutions. By computing the crest factor for the solutions of some classical equations, both linear and nonlinear, we illustrate the capability of the criterion for discerning between solutions exhibiting time-intermittent turbulence behaviour and solutions which either are not turbulent or show statistically stationary turbulence, like, for example, in the case described by Kolmogorov's theory.

1. INTRODUCTION

The American Nobel Prize laureate for Physics Richard Feynman is reported to have designated turbulence as “the most important unsolved problem of classical physics”, because a description of the phenomenon from first principles does not exist (a statement along these lines is found in [31, Vol. I, §3.7]). In fact, turbulence is still regarded as one of the most important problems in mathematical physics today. The main difficulties encountered in trying to understand the nature of turbulence are related to its random behaviour both in space and time, due to the chaotic evolution of the fluid particles for large Reynolds numbers. Also there are many different length scales involved in the motion of the fluid as a whole which interact with one another in a very complicated way; this interaction makes it extremely difficult to predict the evolution of any (even smooth) initial condition for large Reynolds numbers and for large time.

There is, of course, a huge literature on the problem of turbulence and, therefore, we are forced to restrict ourselves to give some classical references without claiming to be complete or exhaustive: for an introduction to the

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B40, 35B45, 35G20, 35K25, 46E20, 46E35.

Key words and phrases. Partial Differential Equations; Analysis of Solutions; Crest Factor; Turbulence.

subject see, for example, [21, 22, 23, 17, 34, 32, 33, 24, 27, 13, 35, 19, 3]. A distinctive feature of turbulence, in all its manifestations, is chaoticity. Kolmogorov's theory assumes the rate of energy transfer to change smoothly with space and time, in both the quasi-linear regime (weak turbulence) and the fully nonlinear regime (strong turbulence). On the other hand, experimental and numerical results show strong intermittent bursts which give rise to non-uniform energy cascades and, as a consequence, to spiky, rare and irregular fluctuations (intermittency). It is mainly the latter kind of hard turbulence that we have in mind in this paper.

Given the serious difficulties faced in investigating turbulence, it is apparent that it would be very helpful to devise some analytical tools which shed some light on this subtle conundrum. One of these tools is the so called crest factor [6, 7, 8, 9].

Essentially, considering a solution of a PDE, the crest factor is the ratio between the L^∞ and the L^2 norms of the solution – a more formal and detailed discussion is provided in Section 2. In this paper, we argue that, for hard and time-intermittent turbulence to be exhibited by the solution, the corresponding crest factor must be large and, besides depending explicitly on time, must be chaotic and characterised by strong fluctuations. This provides a criterion to detect time-intermittent turbulent behaviour in a PDE. Of course, in the case of hard turbulence, one expect to have strong intermittency in space as well. However, the criterion we propose allows us to recognise immediately that intermittent turbulence is to be excluded if the crest factor is either time-independent or has a non-chaotic dependence on time (for instance, if it is a periodic or quasi-periodic function). In addition, also in the case of non-intermittent turbulence, from the size of the crest factor one can infer what kind of turbulence may occur: mild turbulence if the crest factor is of order one, hard turbulence if it is much larger than one.

2. THE CREST FACTOR

Before briefly summarising more systematically what we mean by the crest factor of a solution of a given PDE, let us first introduce some essential notation and functional setting [1, 20, 54, 50].

2.1. Basic Definitions and Setup. Let Ω be a bounded or unbounded set in \mathbb{R}^d , where d is the spatial dimension, for example the d -dimensional torus $\Omega = [0, L]^d$ of side L . For $x \in \Omega$ we write, in general, $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$; if $d = 2$ and $d = 3$ in the following, when convenient, we also write $(x_1, x_2) = (x, y)$ and $(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x, y, z)$, respectively.

For any $p \geq 1$, consider the Banach space $L^p(\Omega)$ of continuous functions $\phi: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with norm

$$\|\phi\|_p := \left(\int_{\Omega} |\phi(x, t)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

and define the sup-norm (or L^∞ norm) as

$$\|\phi\|_\infty := \sup_{x \in \Omega} |\phi(x, t)|.$$

Here and in the following, the supremum is meant to be taken on the variable x only, and the dependence on time t of the involved norms is not explicitly shown. For $p = 2$, in particular, $L^2(\Omega)$ is the Hilbert space of square integrable functions on Ω , namely of functions $\phi: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|\phi\|_2 < +\infty$. Given a multi-index $\vec{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d)$, with all the n_i non-negative integers, set $|\vec{n}| := n_1 + \dots + n_d$ and

$$D^{\vec{n}} := \frac{\partial^{|\vec{n}|}}{\partial x_1^{n_1} \partial x_2^{n_2} \dots \partial x_d^{n_d}},$$

and consider the Sobolev space of n -times differentiable functions on Ω , with up to the n -th order derivative in $L^2(\Omega)$, that is

$$(2.1) \quad H^n(\Omega) := \left\{ \phi : \int_{\Omega} (D^{\vec{n}} \phi)^2 dx < +\infty \text{ for all } \vec{n} \text{ such that } |\vec{n}| = n \right\}.$$

For vector functions $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_d): \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, we set

$$\|\phi\|_p := \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_{\Omega} |\phi_i(x, t)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \|\phi\|_\infty = \max_{i=1, \dots, d} \|\phi_i\|_\infty.$$

Given a solution $u = (u_1, \dots, u_d)$ of a PDE in dimension d , we define the semi-norms

$$(2.2) \quad J_n := \sum_{\substack{n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0 \\ n_1 + \dots + n_d = n}} \frac{n!}{n_1! \dots n_d!} \|D^{\vec{n}} u\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{\substack{n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0 \\ n_1 + \dots + n_d = n}} \frac{n!}{n_1! \dots n_d!} \|D^{\vec{n}} u_i\|_2^2.$$

Note that, for $n = 0$, (2.2) reduces to the squared L^2 norm $\|u\|_2^2$. In (2.2), provided the solution u is sufficiently regular, which is often the case [2, 54, 50], we naturally identify the functions having the same mixed partial derivatives.

Also, if we consider the d -dimensional torus $\Omega = [0, L]^d$ and, for any infinitely differentiable periodic real function $\phi: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we take its Fourier series

$$\phi(x, t) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \phi_k e^{2\pi i k \cdot x / L}, \quad \overline{\phi_k} = \phi_{-k},$$

with the Fourier coefficients ϕ_k depending on t in general, then, from Parseval's identity, we have

$$\|D^{\vec{n}} \phi\|_2^2 = L^d \left(\frac{2\pi}{L} \right)^{2n} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |k|^{2n} |\phi_k|^2,$$

with $|k|^2 = k \cdot k = k_1^2 + k_2^2 + \dots + k_d^2$. By the same token the definition of Sobolev space (2.1) can be extended to any real number s as

$$H^s(\Omega) := \left\{ \phi = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \phi_k e^{2\pi i k \cdot x / L} : \bar{\phi}_k = \phi_{-k} \text{ and } \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |k|^{2s} |\phi_k|^2 < +\infty \right\},$$

and the corresponding norm is given by

$$\|\phi\|_{H^s}^2 := L^d \left(\frac{2\pi}{L} \right)^{2s} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |k|^{2s} |\phi_k|^2.$$

Our analysis of the various estimates obtained in this paper involves also taking long-time averages of several norms such as the energy or the enstrophy for the Navier-Stokes equations, where by long-time average we mean the following. Given a continuous function $\phi(t)$, which depends upon the solution $u(x, t)$ of a given PDE, with a given initial condition, for example

$$\phi(t) = \int_{\Omega} (u(x, t))^2 dx,$$

we define the long-time average of $\phi(t)$ along the solution $u(x, t)$ the quantity [2, 20, 54]

$$\langle \phi \rangle := \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \phi(s) ds \right].$$

2.2. The Crest Factor and Analysis of the Solutions. Consider a linear or nonlinear PDE in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $u(x, t)$ denote any of its solutions, with $x \in \Omega$ and t the time. We suppose that the solutions of our PDE possess all the classical properties such as existence, uniqueness, regularity and continuous dependence on the initial conditions. The boundary conditions will be specified case by case, including periodic and Dirichlet boundary conditions. In this setting we define the *crest factor* (CF) as the ratio between the sup-norm and the L^2 norm of solutions, namely

$$(2.3) \quad C_f := \frac{\|u\|_{\infty}}{J_0^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

with $J_0 = \|u\|_2^2$ and $\|u\|_{\infty} = \max_{i=1, \dots, d} \|u_i\|_{\infty}$. Thus, the CF of a given solution of a PDE “captures” the fluctuation and distortion of the amplitude measured by the sup-norm with respect to the L^2 norm of that particular solution. In fact, the CF, as defined in (2.3), is a well-known quantity in electrical engineering and signal analysis, where it is used, for instance, to measure the maximum of the velocity with respect to its average at the points of a grid in wind tunnels in real turbulence experiments in fluid dynamics [53].

One can see that dimensionally the CF is a length to the power $-d/2$. In the case of bounded domains it may be naturally made dimensionless. For

example, by choosing a d -dimensional cube of length L , namely $\Omega = [0, L]^d$, we can redefine the CF as

$$(2.4) \quad C_f := L^{\frac{d}{2}} \frac{\|u\|_\infty}{J_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

and, in such a case, we stick to this definition instead of (2.3).

Let us investigate further our definition of the CF to see what its important features are. First one can see that, in bounded domains with smooth boundaries, the CF is always bounded below. In particular, if the domain is the cube of length L , then the CF in (2.4) is larger than one. Indeed, one has

$$J_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|u\|_\infty L^{\frac{d}{2}}$$

and therefore it follows that $1 \leq C_f$. An upper bound is obtained by using the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (GNI). Here we take mean zero functions to make the analysis more transparent. Of course, in general, the mean of the solution is not zero and further terms appear in the formulae below; for non-zero mean functions see [9]. Thus, using a GNI for the L^∞ norm of the solution we obtain, for any $n > d/2$,

$$(2.5) \quad \|u\|_\infty \leq c(n, d, L) \left(\frac{J_n}{J_0} \right)^{\frac{d}{4n}} J_0^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $c(n, d, L)$ is a suitable constant depending on n , d and L , but not on the solution itself. Eventually, dividing by $J_0^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and multiplying by $L^{\frac{d}{2}}$, we arrive at bounding (2.4) by

$$1 \leq C_f \leq c(n, d, L) L^{\frac{d}{2}} \left(\frac{J_n}{J_0} \right)^{\frac{d}{4n}}.$$

Note that there is a connection between the CF and the length scale l of a given solution, as defined in [10, 29, 36], namely

$$l^{-\frac{d}{2}} := c(n, d, L) \left(\frac{J_n}{J_0} \right)^{\frac{d}{4n}}.$$

Indeed, we find that

$$(2.6) \quad C_f = L^{\frac{d}{2}} \frac{\|u\|_\infty}{J_0^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq L^{\frac{d}{2}} c(n, d, L) \left(\frac{J_n}{J_0} \right)^{\frac{d}{4n}} = \left(\frac{L}{l} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}}.$$

Hence effectively by measuring the crest factor of a solution one obtains some very important features shown by the solution itself. In particular, in bounded domains, if the crest factor is of order one then the dynamics is relatively “mild”, in the sense that the solution does not have major excursions in space-time. By contrast, when the sup-norm of the solution becomes much larger with respect to its spatial average, it suggests that the solution does have significant fluctuations in space-time; if these fluctuations are chaotic and intermittent they represent one of the characteristic

signature of hard turbulence. In the light of this we will therefore give the following

Criterion. *A solution of a PDE shows intermittent turbulent behaviour if its corresponding CF is a time-dependent chaotic function with strong intermittency.*

This definition encapsulates the essential features of intermittent turbulent and non-turbulent solutions of PDEs. In the following we will endeavour to elucidate our definition of intermittent turbulent behaviour by analysing some classical PDEs and their solutions in the various cases where turbulent features are either present or absent. Various examples have already been investigated in [6, 7, 8, 9]. In this work we extend that analysis, thereby strengthening the fact that the CF is a very good tool for the understanding of some of the aspects of turbulence.

3. LINEAR PDES

In this section we analyse the behaviour of solutions of some representative linear PDEs whose solutions can be found by using the method of separation of variables. We will analyse a non-separable case in Subsection 4.2.1. We first study linear PDEs on a bounded smooth domain with periodic or Dirichlet boundary conditions.

3.1. The Heat Equation. We start with the set of linear parabolic separable PDEs. The prototype of this class of PDEs is the heat equation on the torus. In space dimension $d = 1$, taking for instance $\Omega = [0, \pi]$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions, we have that the function $u = u(x, t)$ of the two variables (x, t) obeys the linear PDE

$$(3.1a) \quad u_t = ku_{xx}, \quad t > 0,$$

$$(3.1b) \quad u(x, 0) = \phi(x),$$

$$(3.1c) \quad u(\pi, t) = u(0, t) = 0, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where k is a positive constant and $\phi(x)$ is the initial condition, which is a prescribed integrable function. Here the solution $u(x, t)$ is cast into the form

$$u(x, t) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_n X_n(x) T_n(t),$$

with the functions $X_n(x)$ fixed by the boundary conditions, the functions $T_n(t)$ being decaying exponentials and the coefficients a_n depending on the initial condition. More precisely, the solution can be written as

$$u(x, t) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_n X_n(x) e^{-k\lambda_n t},$$

where X_n are the eigenfunctions and λ_n are the eigenvalues of the Laplacian operator.

Here, in addition to the analysis done in [9], we elucidate further a very important feature of solutions of linear PDEs, which are made of a finite or infinite linear superposition involving all the “harmonics” of the Fourier series. Taking any of these “modes” and analysing its evolution in space and time, one can see that the corresponding CF is constant. It is easy to see that the analysis extends to the case where all the modes are involved. Indeed, assuming, without loss of generality, the eigenfunctions $X_n(x)$ to be normalised so that $\|X_n\|_2 = 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have, according to (2.4),

$$C_f \leq \mathfrak{S}_f := \sqrt{\pi} \frac{\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_n \max_{x \in [0, 2\pi]} |X_n(x)| e^{-(\lambda_n - \lambda_0)t}}{\left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |a_n|^2 e^{-2(\lambda_n - \lambda_0)t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

For large t , we may bound

$$\mathfrak{S}_f \approx \sqrt{\pi} \max_{x \in [0, 2\pi]} |X_0(x)|,$$

so that, asymptotically in time, the CF is bounded by a constant which does not depend on the initial condition. In the case of finite time we refer to Appendix A: the CF is still found to be of order one.

To sum up, according to our definition of turbulent solutions, the solutions of the heat equation on the torus cannot have turbulent behaviour. Here we are using in an essential way the fact that our PDE is linear, and so we can use the superposition principle.

In more than one spatial dimension the analysis can be performed in a similar way. For example in two dimensions with Dirichlet boundary conditions on a square $\Omega = [0, L]^2$ one has

$$(3.2a) \quad u_t = k(u_{xx} + u_{yy}), \quad (x, y) \in \Omega, \quad t > 0,$$

$$(3.2b) \quad u(x, y, 0) = \phi(x, y), \quad (x, y) \in \Omega,$$

$$(3.2c) \quad u(x, y, t) = 0, \quad (x, y) \in \partial\Omega, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where the initial condition $\phi(x, y)$ is a prescribed integrable function in his domain. In this case the solution can be expressed as

$$u(x, y, t) = \sum_{n, m=1} a_{n, m} X_n(x) Y_m(y) e^{-k\lambda_{nm}t},$$

where the functions $X_n(x)Y_m(y)$ and the values λ_{nm} are the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of the Laplacian in two spatial dimensions for the fixed boundary conditions. This class of solutions retain the same structure in any smooth bounded domain Ω . Hence, by investigating the CF for each Fourier mode, one can see that the analysis above in one spatial dimension holds true in any smooth bounded domain as well. So the solutions of the heat equation on smooth bounded domains with Dirichlet boundary conditions cannot have turbulent behaviour according to our definition, given that the CF for

each mode is constant. The same holds for periodic boundary conditions, with minor changes in the analysis.

3.2. The Wave Equation. We now consider the class of linear hyperbolic separable PDEs. The prototype of this set of equations is the wave equation in $\Omega = [0, L]^d$, for instance in three dimensions, i.e. with $d = 3$,

$$(3.3a) \quad u_{tt} = k(u_{xx} + u_{yy} + u_{zz}), \quad (x, y, z) \in \Omega, \quad t > 0,$$

$$(3.3b) \quad u(x, y, z, 0) = \phi(x, y, z), \quad (x, y, z) \in \Omega,$$

$$(3.3c) \quad u_t(x, y, z, 0) = \psi(x, y, z), \quad (x, y, z) \in \Omega,$$

on the torus or on a cuboid with right angles with Dirichlet boundary conditions. The analysis, *mutatis mutandis*, follows closely that of the heat equation. In fact the fundamental solution here is made up of an infinite superposition of trigonometric oscillating modes both in space and time. So each mode of these solutions will follow a space-time periodic or quasi-periodic evolution and the corresponding CF is again of order one as for the heat equation. So, according to our definition of turbulent solutions, the solutions of the wave equation as well cannot have turbulent behaviour. Similar results are obtained for any other linear hyperbolic separable PDEs on smooth domains.

3.3. The time-dependent Stokes problem. The time-dependent Stokes problem on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is obtained as a linearisation of the Navier-Stokes equations, and is described by the equations

$$(3.4a) \quad u_t = \nu \Delta u - \nabla \mathcal{P} + f,$$

$$(3.4b) \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0,$$

$$(3.4c) \quad u(x, 0) = \phi(x), \quad x \in \Omega,$$

with \mathcal{P} , ν , f and $\phi(x)$ being the pressure, the kinematic viscosity, the external force and the initial condition, respectively. As shown in [39, 40], the solution $u(x, t)$ can be expressed through the Green formula in terms of the fundamental solution, which in turn is given by the 2×2 matrix $G(x, y, t)$ with entries [37]

$$\begin{aligned} G_{ij}(x, y, t) = & \frac{e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4\nu t}}}{4\pi\nu t} \left(\delta_{ij} - \frac{(x_i - y_i)(x_j - y_j)}{|x - y|^2} \right) \\ & - \frac{1 - e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4\nu t}}}{4\pi|x - y|^2} \left(\delta_{ij} - 2\frac{(x_i - y_i)(x_j - y_j)}{|x - y|^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $|x - y| = \sqrt{(x_1 - y_1)^2 + (x_2 - y_2)^2}$ and δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta. Thus, the CF is found to decay in t and no turbulent behaviour appears.

4. NONLINEAR PDES

We now endeavour to analyse the structure of the solutions and the corresponding CF of some important nonlinear PDEs. Some cases have already been investigated in [9], for example the Korteweg-de Vries equation which is the prototype of the so-called completely integrable non-linear PDEs having the celebrated soliton solution [15, 28], and the two-dimensional incompressible Navier-Stokes equations. Here we extend further our analysis by studying additional representative nonlinear PDEs with the aim to show the power that the CF has in extracting the turbulent or non-turbulent nature of their solutions.

4.1. Burgers' Equation. We start with the extensively studied quasi-linear diffusion equation known as Burgers' equation [42]. We consider the case of a finite interval and, for simplicity, we choose $\Omega = [0, \pi]$, with Dirichlet boundary conditions, namely

$$(4.1a) \quad u_t = \epsilon u_{xx} - uu_x, \quad 0 \leq x \leq \pi,$$

$$(4.1b) \quad u(x, 0) = \phi(x),$$

$$(4.1c) \quad u(0, t) = u(\pi, t) = 0, \quad t > 0,$$

with $\epsilon > 0$ and ϕ being the initial condition. This equation arises in a number of physical contexts where viscous and nonlinear effects are equally important and has been introduced as a toy model for mathematical turbulence, until Hopf and Cole proved that it can be integrated explicitly [38, 16]. Accordingly, here we show that it does not show any turbulent behaviour. In fact, nowadays the importance of Burgers' equation lies in the modelling of the long-term behaviour of a shock layer [45]; recently, there has been a renewal of interest in Burgers' equation, including extensions of the original one-dimensional model, with focus on the problem of the so-called Burgers turbulence [12].

By using the Cole-Hopf transformation $u \mapsto v$ [42, §1.7.1], defined as

$$u = -2\epsilon \frac{v_x}{v},$$

Burgers' equation becomes the heat equation, namely

$$(4.2a) \quad v_t = \epsilon v_{xx}, \quad 0 \leq x \leq \pi,$$

$$(4.2b) \quad v(x, 0) = \alpha g(x),$$

$$(4.2c) \quad v_x(0, t) = v_x(\pi, t) = 0, \quad t > 0,$$

where α is an arbitrary positive constant and

$$(4.3) \quad g(x) := e^{-\frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_0^x \phi(s) ds}.$$

By using a standard separation of variables method one obtains the solution

$$(4.4) \quad v(x, t) = \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n e^{-n^2 \epsilon t} \cos(nx), \quad a_n := \frac{2\pi}{\alpha} \int_0^{\pi} g(x) \cos(nx) dx.$$

Note that (4.3) and (4.4) imply that $a_n > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and hence $v(x, t) > 0$ for all $x \in [0, \pi]$ and all $t \geq 0$. Going back to the function $u(x, t)$ we obtain the solution in the form

$$(4.5) \quad u(x, t) = 2\epsilon \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n a_n e^{-n^2 \epsilon t} \sin(nx)}{\frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n e^{-n^2 \epsilon t} \cos(nx)}.$$

We now analyse the CF corresponding to the solution (4.5). The aim is to show that, according to our definition, the solution does not exhibit any turbulent behaviour. First observe that one can view (4.5) as

$$u(x, t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n(x, t), \quad u_n(x, t) := \frac{2\epsilon n a_n e^{-n^2 \epsilon t} \sin(nx)}{\frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k e^{-k^2 \epsilon t} \cos(kx)}.$$

Therefore, for large times, one can write

$$u_n(x, t) \approx \frac{4\epsilon n a_n e^{-n^2 \epsilon t} \sin(nx)}{a_0}$$

and the corresponding CF (2.4) becomes

$$C_f \approx \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \|u_n\|_{\infty}}{\|u_n\|_2} = \sqrt{2}.$$

The case of finite time may be discussed along the lines of Appendix A.

Thus, as in the case of the linear PDEs considered in Section 3, there is not any turbulent behaviour, essentially because the CF for each mode is constant.

From the above analysis it transpires that whenever we are in a context where there is separation of the Fourier modes, including asymptotic separation as in the case of Burgers' equation, there cannot be any turbulent behaviour.

4.2. Incompressible Navier-Stokes Equations. We now consider one of the most important systems of classical dynamics, namely the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations (NSE) on various domains and with various boundary conditions.

Let u denote the velocity field, with $u = (u_1, u_2)$ in $d = 2$ and $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$ in $d = 3$ with d the spatial dimension; each $u_i = u_i(x, t)$, where $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ and t is the time. The NSE, with initial condition $u_0(x)$, read

$$(4.6a) \quad u_t + (u \cdot \nabla)u = \nu \Delta u - \nabla \mathcal{P} + f,$$

$$(4.6b) \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0,$$

$$(4.6c) \quad u(x, 0) = u_0(x),$$

where \mathcal{P} is the pressure, f is the external force applied to the fluid and ν is the kinematic viscosity. Here, as usual, we assume the density of the fluid to be $\rho = 1$.

Rigorous results for the Navier-Stokes flow on the two-dimensional flat torus $\Omega = [0, 2\pi]^2$ show that for any periodic and divergence-free initial condition $u_0 \in J_1$ and any time-independent force $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ there is a unique and global strong solution which depends continuously on the initial condition u_0 [20, 2, 54, 50]. In $d = 3$ it is well known that, with the exception of small initial data or in presence of symmetries, we have global existence of the weak solution and short time existence and uniqueness of the strong solution [20]. Uniqueness of the weak solution is still an open problem and the global existence of the strong solution is one of the seven Millennium Prize Problems selected by the Clay Mathematics Institute.

Our analysis of the NSE performed below, in addition to the torus, also investigates other domains, both bounded and unbounded with corresponding appropriate boundary conditions. We begin with a famous problem, namely the Stokes second problem.

4.2.1. Stokes Second Problem. Consider an infinitely long plate which is oscillating periodically in its own plane (y, z) in the z direction with a periodic motion of the form $z = U_0 \cos(\Omega_0 t)$, where Ω_0 and U_0 denote the frequency and the amplitude, respectively [30]. The plate has on one of his sides an incompressible viscous fluid which extends indefinitely along the positive upward x -axis, so that it occupies the semi-infinite domain $V = [0, +\infty) \times (-\infty, +\infty) \times (-\infty, +\infty) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. Furthermore, if gravity is the only external force acting on the fluid, the only effect of the pressure is to compensate its effect [11]. Then, the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation reduces to a linear PDE which describes the evolution of the third component u_3 of the velocity field, which depends only on the spatial coordinate x ; consistently with the notation introduced above, we are writing $(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x, y, z)$, so that we may set for simplicity $u_3(x, y, z, t) = w(x, t)$. The linear PDE one obtains is given by [11, 30]

$$\begin{aligned} (4.7a) \quad & w_t = \nu w_{xx}, \\ (4.7b) \quad & w(0, t) = U_0 \Omega_0 \cos(\Omega_0 t), \\ (4.7c) \quad & \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} w(x, t) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This is again the linear diffusion equation which we investigated earlier, that is the heat equation (3.1) with $k = \nu$. Here, however, besides the special initial condition, we have different boundary conditions. In fact, due to the periodic motion of the plate, the separation of variable method does not work. Therefore we look for a solution in the form

$$(4.8) \quad w(x, t) = U e^{\alpha x} e^{i(\beta x + \Omega t)},$$

for suitable constants U , Ω , α and β to be fixed, and then we take its real part. Substituting and then doing the necessary calculations with the given

boundary conditions we find that a solution of the form (4.8) to (4.7) is

$$(4.9) \quad w(x, t) = U_0 \Omega_0 e^{-\sqrt{\frac{\Omega_0}{2\nu}} x} \cos\left(\Omega_0 t - \sqrt{\frac{\Omega_0}{2\nu}} x\right).$$

Looking at (4.9) one can see that the solution is in general quasi-periodic in (x, t) , when the two frequencies Ω_0 and $\sqrt{\Omega_0/2\nu}$ are incommensurate, and it becomes periodic when the two frequencies are commensurate.

Actually, it may be more convenient to investigate the presence of turbulence in terms of the vorticity rather than the velocity. The vorticity field $\omega := \nabla \times u$ becomes

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega(x, y, z, t) &= (\partial_y u_3 - \partial_z u_2, \partial_z u_1 - \partial_x u_3, \partial_x u_2 - \partial_y u_1) = (0, -\partial_x w, 0) \\ &= \left(0, \sqrt{\frac{U_0^2 \Omega_0^2}{2\nu}} e^{-\sqrt{\frac{\Omega_0}{2\nu}} x} \left(\cos\left(\Omega_0 t - \sqrt{\frac{\Omega_0}{2\nu}} x\right) - \sin\left(\Omega_0 t - \sqrt{\frac{\Omega_0}{2\nu}} x\right)\right), 0\right). \end{aligned}$$

From (4.10) we obtain

$$\|\omega\|_\infty = \sqrt{\frac{U_0^2 \Omega_0^2}{\nu}}, \quad \|\omega\|_2 = \sqrt{\frac{U_0^2 \Omega_0^2}{2\nu}} \left(\frac{2\nu}{\Omega_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{\frac{2 + \cos(2\Omega_0 t) - \sin(2\Omega_0 t)}{4}}.$$

The corresponding CF (2.3) is given by

$$(4.11) \quad C_f = \frac{\|\omega\|_\infty}{\|\omega\|_2} \sqrt{\frac{4}{2 - \sin(2\omega t)}} = \left(\frac{2\Omega_0}{\nu}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{\frac{4}{2 + \cos(2\Omega_0 t) - \sin(2\Omega_0 t)}}.$$

Note that a large amplitude U_0 yields large values of the two norms, but does not affect the CF. We ought to stress that looking at the values of the $\|\omega\|_\infty$ and $\|\omega\|_2$ individually, gives only a partial view of the effective turbulent behaviour of the above solution of the NSE. Even in the case of large frequency or small viscosity, (4.11) shows that the solution exhibits no turbulent behaviour, since the CF is periodic in time. In this example, the solution decays in space because the exponential damps down quickly any complexity in the region not close to the x -axis. In other words the relevant behaviour of the solution is confined in the region close to the (y, z) plane for x rather small; this region is the so-called *boundary layer*. However, the analysis above shows that not even inside the boundary layer turbulent behaviour may occur. Therefore, the two L^∞ and L^2 norms being large individually does not characterise turbulent behaviour. Besides the example considered above, this is easily seen even just by considering stationary solutions of the NSE – or more generally any stationary solution of any partial differential equation. By a judicious choice of the parameters present in the given solution one can construct very large L^∞ and L^2 norms, but because they are all time-independent, there is not, obviously, any turbulent behaviour. This is clearly illustrated by the example contained in [41, 11], which we briefly review here.

Consider the stationary solution of the NSE which describes the steady flow of a viscous fluid in a semi-infinite region bounded by an infinite disk

which rotates in its own plane with angular velocity Ω . Suppose also that the fluid at infinity has an arbitrary uniform angular velocity γ about the axis of rotation of the disk. Kármán's original problem [41] corresponds to $\gamma = 0$ and $\Omega \neq 0$, whereas $\gamma \neq 0$ and $\Omega = 0$ describes a flow which is rotating uniformly at infinity and which is bounded by a stationary disk. Under these conditions, even though the flow has not been determined in detail for any value of the ratio γ/Ω in $(-\infty, +\infty)$, numerical integrations and analytical computations for some values of the ratio, for instance when it is close to 1, show that there exist solutions which are independent of time [11, §5.5(c)] and hence, a fortiori, exhibit no sign of turbulence.

Similar flows which strengthen our point can be found in [49, §3.5.1 and §3.7.1], including the work by Stuart which generalises Kármán's problem [52] and the works by Landau and Squire on the round jets [46, 51], which provide further examples of time-independent solutions of the NSE.

In the light of the above discussion one can infer that it is the CF which provides the criterion to extract the real nature of a given solution regarding its time fluctuations. Thus, going back to the CF (4.11) for the Stokes second problem, we can see that we are not in the presence of any real turbulent behaviour. Note that, if the kinematic viscosity is small or the frequency is large, one can have large fluctuations in the evolution of the CF. However these fluctuations are periodic and therefore, according to our criterion, we do not have genuine turbulent behaviour. In addition, the fluctuations in the CF do not depend upon the amplitude of the periodic oscillations. In this kind of situations, the computation of the CF automatically rules out any possible turbulent behaviour.

4.2.2. Motion in a Half-Plane. Another instructive example is the motion of a two-dimensional viscous fluid moving on the upper half-plane with a zero gradient of pressure [47]. The NSE (3.4a) with $\nabla \mathcal{P} = 0$, in dimension $d = 2$ and in the absence of the external force, satisfies, besides the continuity equation for incompressible fluids (3.4b), the initial conditions

$$(4.12a) \quad u_1(x_1, x_2, 0) = U = \text{constant}, \quad x_2 > 0,$$

$$(4.12b) \quad u_2(x_1, x_2, 0) = 0,$$

and the boundary condition on the “wall” $x_2 = 0$ given by

$$(4.13) \quad u(x_1, 0, t) = 0.$$

The solution is [47, §1.4]

$$(4.14a) \quad u_1(x_1, x_2, t) = \frac{2U}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\eta e^{-y^2} dy, \quad \eta^2 := \frac{x_2^2}{4\nu t},$$

$$(4.14b) \quad u_2(x_1, x_2, t) = 0.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} u_1(x_1, x_2, t) & \quad \text{for } x_2 > 0, & \lim_{x_2 \rightarrow +\infty} u_1(x_1, x_2, t) &= U, \\ \lim_{x_2 \rightarrow 0^+} u_1(x_1, x_2, t) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u_1(x_1, x_2, t) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

As it is well known [11], the stationary irrotational solution $(u_1, u_2) = (U, 0)$ of the corresponding Euler equation in a half-plane with initial conditions (4.12) differs significantly from the solution (4.14) of the NSE only close to the boundary at $x_2 = 0$ (within a distance of order $\sqrt{\nu t}$). This region is the boundary layer where turbulence may normally occur.

Coming back to the solution (4.14), the corresponding vorticity field is

$$(4.15) \quad \omega(x_1, x_2, t) = \partial_{x_1} u_2(x_1, x_2, t) - \partial_{x_2} u_1(x_1, x_2, t) = -\frac{U}{\sqrt{\pi \nu t}} e^{-\frac{x_2^2}{4\nu t}}.$$

Note that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \omega(x_1, x_2, t) = \lim_{x_2 \rightarrow +\infty} \omega(x_1, x_2, t) = 0$; it is important to stress that the vorticity is generated by the boundary condition (4.13). The solution (4.15) is very similar to the solution of the diffusion equation on an infinite domain, in the case of a concentrated unit source of heat at the origin (say) which is switched on for an instant only [42].

We now compute the CF to see if there are significant fluctuations in the vorticity field, which might suggest that some turbulence behaviour is present in the dynamics of our problem. From (4.15) one can see that

$$\|\omega\|_\infty = \frac{U}{\sqrt{\pi \nu t}}, \quad \|\omega\|_2 = \frac{U}{(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{4}}} \frac{1}{(\nu t)^{\frac{1}{4}}}, \quad t > 0,$$

and hence

$$(4.16) \quad C_f = \frac{\|\omega\|_\infty}{\|\omega\|_2} = \left(\frac{8}{\pi e^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{1}{(\nu t)^{\frac{1}{4}}}, \quad t > 0.$$

Therefore, the CF is large only for a limited interval of time and does not depend on the value of U . If, on the one hand, it does not convey the information that the solution is non-trivial only within the boundary layer, namely close to the horizontal x_1 -axis, on the other hand, because of the decay in time, it shows that turbulent behaviour never arises in this case.

4.2.3. Incompressible Navier-Stokes Equations on the Torus. So far, we have considered situations where an explicit solution can be found. In this section we investigate the solutions of the NSE on the torus in a general setting, where explicit solutions are not known and hence the time-pointwise analysis of the CF, as well as the analysis of its asymptotic behaviour, is extremely difficult – if not impossible. Therefore, we resort to using the time average of our quantities, so as to extract some information about the solution.

Because of the operation of time averaging, naturally, we lose any information about the time evolution. In particular, we cannot detect the presence of strong time fluctuations and hence we cannot conclude whether

a given solution exhibits intermittent turbulence. Nevertheless, the averaged CF may provide information which allows one to exclude the presence of turbulent behaviour, for instance if it turns out to be of order one. In this section we will assume that our initial condition and our forcing function have zero mean, namely

$$\int_{\Omega} u_0(x) dx = 0, \quad \int_{\Omega} f(x) dx = 0.$$

This will allow us to make use of embedding inequalities such as the Gagliardo and Nirenberg inequality for mean zero functions.

Two-dimensional case

In this section we obtain the CF for the two-dimensional incompressible NSE on a flat torus $\Omega = [0, 2\pi]^2$. The CF for this case was thoroughly analysed in [9]. For the sake of the reader and as a introduction to the three-dimensional case, we report here the main result. First, we need to define semi-norms similar to (2.2), which involves the external force, namely

$$(4.17) \quad \Phi_n := \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{\substack{n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0 \\ n_1 + \dots + n_d = n}} \frac{n!}{n_1! \dots n_d!} \|D^{\vec{n}} f_i\|_2^2,$$

where f_i are the components of the periodic time-independent forcing function. We wish to add Φ_n to J_n as defined in (2.2), for each n , and so in order to make the involved quantities dimensionally equivalent we multiply each Φ_n by the quantity $\tau^2 := L^4 \nu^{-2}$, with $L = 2\pi$ in our case (for more details see [10, 29]). Hence we obtain the quantities

$$(4.18) \quad F_n := J_n + \tau^2 \Phi_n.$$

Note that $J_n \leq F_n$ and $\tau^2 \Phi_n \leq F_n$. Then, as discussed in [10, 9], in order to avoid dividing by semi-norms which may become small, we modify once more the definition of the CF and set

$$C_f := L^{\frac{d}{2}} \frac{\|u\|_{\infty}}{F_0^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

by taking into account also the time-independent, space periodic and mean zero external force.

In [9] we have made some mild restriction on the structure of the forcing function, namely we assumed that it has a *cut-off* in its spectrum. This is expressed mathematically by choosing forcing functions such that they have a smallest length scale [10, 29]

$$(4.19) \quad \lambda_f^{-2} := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left[\frac{\Phi_{n+1}}{\Phi_n} \right].$$

With this setting we have proved the following (for details see [9])

Theorem 4.1. *For small values of ν , the long time-averaged crest factor for the two-dimensional incompressible NSE on the torus $[0, 2\pi]^2$ obeys the estimate*

$$(4.20) \quad \langle C_f \rangle = \left\langle L \frac{\|u\|_\infty}{F_0^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\rangle \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi}} \frac{L}{\lambda_0} \left[\hat{\eta} + \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{\Phi_0 \Phi_1}{\nu^2} \right) + \frac{1}{2e} \frac{1}{\tau^2 \Phi_1} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where

$$(4.21) \quad \lambda_0^{-2} := \lambda_f^{-2} + L^{-2}, \quad \tau := L^2 \nu^{-1}, \quad \hat{\eta} := \eta - \frac{1}{4} \ln(4c_1 c_2),$$

with $L = 2\pi$, $\eta \approx 1.82$, and c_1 and c_2 two positive constants such that $c_1 + c_2 = 1$.

Looking at the theorem above one can see that, for very small ν , the crest factor for the solutions of the two-dimensional NSE on the torus, because of the term $\ln(\Phi_0 \Phi_1 \nu^{-2})$, goes like ν^{-2} logarithmically; this is effectively saying that, when the viscosity is relatively small, the crest factor of the solutions “follows” the smallest scale of the forcing function through the term L/λ_0 , whereas, when the viscosity is very small, the logarithmic correction becomes relevant. In other words one can say that the solutions of the two-dimensional NSE on the torus do not generally show strong turbulent behaviour unless the viscosity parameter is extremely small and so very close to the inviscid limit which coincide (on the torus) with the two-dimensional Euler equations; for the study of this very important problem on various boundary conditions and various domains see, for example, [20, 47, 17, 18, 19, 14, 25, 26, 4, 43, 44] and the references listed in these papers. However, in the argument above, small values of viscosity – and hence large values of CF – does not imply necessarily, in general, hard turbulence since we are not considering fluctuations in time (since we are taking the long-time average).

Three-dimensional case

The study of the three-dimensional NSE equations still presents challenging difficulties because there are not many strong results as in the two-dimensional case. The main open problem is one does not yet know about existence, uniqueness and regularity of the solution for all time for large Reynolds numbers: as mentioned earlier in this paper, this open problem is one of the Millennium Prize Problems. However, one can compute a “conditional” CF for the three-dimensional NSE as a function of the sup-norm of the spatial derivatives of the velocity field, namely $\|Du\|_\infty = \max\{\|\partial u_i / \partial x_j\|_\infty : i, j = 1, \dots, d\}$.

First, we rewrite some results from [10, 29] about the time evolution for the F_n in (4.18) in the $d = 3$ case and for $n = 0, 1$. For $n = 0$ one has [29, §6.5.2]

$$(4.22) \quad \frac{1}{2} \dot{F}_0 \leq -\nu F_1 + \nu \lambda_0^{-2} F_0,$$

with λ_0 as in (4.21). Dividing by F_0 and time averaging we find

$$(4.23) \quad \left\langle \frac{F_1}{F_0} \right\rangle \leq \lambda_0^{-2}.$$

Note that the left hand side term, once integrated, is zero because F_0 is bounded above and below provided $\tau^2 \Phi_0 > 1$.

The time evolution for F_1 is given by [29, §6.2]

$$(4.24) \quad \frac{1}{2} \dot{F}_1 \leq -\nu F_2 + (c_1 \|Du\|_\infty + \nu \lambda_0^{-2}) F_1,$$

where $c_1 = c(1, 3, L)$, with the notation in (2.5). Actually, the estimate of the constant c_1 can be improved with respect to the value provided by the GNI (see Appendix B). Likewise to our analysis of F_0 , we divide by F_1 and time average to obtain

$$(4.25) \quad \left\langle \frac{F_2}{F_1} \right\rangle \leq c_1 \nu^{-1} \langle \|Du\|_\infty \rangle + \lambda_0^{-2},$$

where we have used that the integrated left hand side term in (4.24) is zero as for (4.22) provided $\tau^2 \Phi_1 > 1$.

Looking at (4.25) we can see that we need solutions having the norm $\|Du\|_\infty$ – and hence, *a fortiori*, the norm $\|\omega\|_\infty$ as well – bounded for all time.

Before stating the theorem on the estimate of the CF for the 3d NSE on the torus we need the following

Lemma. *Given a real number α such that $0 < \alpha \leq 1/2$, and given two time-dependent functions $A(t)$ and $B(t)$ having an integrable long-time average, then the long-time average $\langle (AB)^\alpha \rangle$ satisfies*

$$\langle (AB)^\alpha \rangle \leq \langle A \rangle^\alpha \langle B \rangle^\alpha.$$

Proof. The result is just an application of the Hölder inequality using the conjugate numbers α and $1 - \alpha$. Indeed, we have

$$\langle (AB)^\alpha \rangle \leq \langle A \rangle^\alpha \langle B^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} \rangle^{1-\alpha} \leq \langle A \rangle^\alpha \langle B \rangle^\alpha,$$

where in the second inequality we have used that $0 < \alpha \leq 1/2$ and the long-time average property $\langle B^\delta \rangle \leq \langle B \rangle^\delta$, which holds for any real number $\delta \in (0, 1)$.

We can now state the following

Theorem 4.2. *The long time-averaged crest factor for the three-dimensional incompressible NSE on the torus $[0, L]^3$ obeys the estimate*

$$(4.26) \quad \langle C_f \rangle = \left\langle L^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{\|u\|_\infty}{F_0^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\rangle \leq L^{\frac{3}{2}} c_2 \lambda_0^{-\frac{3}{4}} \left(c_1 \nu^{-1} \langle \|Du\|_\infty \rangle + \lambda_0^{-2} \right)^{\frac{3}{8}},$$

where c_1 and c_2 are suitable positive constants. One can take $c_1 = 3$.

Proof. By computing the CF one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \langle C_f \rangle &= \left\langle L^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{\|u\|_\infty}{F_0^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\rangle \leq L^{\frac{3}{2}} c_2 \left\langle \left(\frac{F_2}{F_0} \right)^{\frac{3}{8}} \right\rangle \leq L^{\frac{3}{2}} c_2 \left\langle \left(\frac{F_2}{F_1} \right)^{\frac{3}{8}} \left(\frac{F_1}{F_0} \right)^{\frac{3}{8}} \right\rangle \\ &\leq L^{\frac{3}{2}} c_2 \left\langle \frac{F_2}{F_1} \right\rangle^{\frac{3}{8}} \left\langle \frac{F_1}{F_0} \right\rangle^{\frac{3}{8}} \leq L^{\frac{3}{2}} c_2 \lambda_0^{-\frac{3}{4}} \left(c_1 \nu^{-1} \langle \|Du\|_\infty \rangle + \lambda_0^{-2} \right)^{\frac{3}{8}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the GNI (2.5) with $n = 2$ and $d = 3$, so that $c_2 = c(2, d, L)$, and the outlined property that $J_n \leq F_n$ to obtain the first inequality, the lemma above to obtain the second inequality and, finally, the estimates (4.23) and (4.25) to obtain the last inequality.

Note that (4.26), among various things, corroborates the idea that the quantity which ultimately controls the solutions in the case of the three dimensional NSE is the norm $\|Du\|_\infty$ – a result that appears in the early work by Constantin and Fojaş (see [20] and references cited therein). Indeed, (4.26) shows that hard turbulence may appear only in the regime with large fluctuations of Du in space and time, which imply a large value of $\langle \|Du\|_\infty \rangle$, where one can approximate

$$(4.27) \quad \langle C_f \rangle \lesssim L^{\frac{3}{2}} c_2 \lambda_0^{-\frac{3}{4}} \left(c_1 \nu^{-1} \langle \|Du\|_\infty \rangle \right)^{\frac{3}{8}}.$$

What is also interesting in (4.26) – and hence in formula (4.27) – is the power 3/8: reaching a state of hard turbulence requires “very” strong and fluctuating vorticity fields because the power 3/8 is “not too large”. It is worth stressing that, in the absence of strong fluctuations of the vorticity, very small values of the viscosity alone are not sufficient to ensure hard turbulence because the crest factor would be large but nearly constant.

Another interesting point on formula (4.26) is the regime when

$$\|Du\|_\infty \approx L^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|Du\|_2.$$

In this situation, the crest factor expressed in terms of the vorticity field ω is close to one (see (4.29) below). Thus, if turbulence occurs, it may only be homogeneous and isotropic turbulence. This means that we may only be in the regime of Kolmogorov turbulence: the crest factor may be chaotic but without strong intermittency. Here one expects a flow with small spatial length scales similar to Kolmogorov’s dissipation length [29, §3.3]. This turns out to be the case, as we are about to show.

Suppose that

$$(4.28) \quad \|Du\|_\infty \approx L^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|Du\|_2.$$

Then, we have

$$\frac{\|\omega\|_\infty}{\|\omega\|_2} = \frac{\|\omega\|_\infty}{\|Du\|_2} \leq \frac{\|Du\|_\infty}{\|Du\|_2} \approx L^{-\frac{3}{2}},$$

because $\|\omega\|_2 = \|Du\|_2$ on periodic boundary conditions, so that we find approximately

$$(4.29) \quad C_f = L^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{\|\omega\|_\infty}{\|\omega\|_2} \approx L^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{\|Du\|_\infty}{\|Du\|_2} \approx 1.$$

Thus, the crest factor is nearly constant and close to one. Let us now obtain Kolmogorov's dissipation length λ_K using the approximations above. Recall that [29, §3.3]

$$(4.30) \quad \lambda_K := C_K \left(\frac{\nu^3}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad \varepsilon := L^{-3} \nu \langle \|Du\|_2^2 \rangle,$$

where ε is the average energy dissipation rate and C_K is a universal constant. Following [29, §7.4], we consider the length scales $l_{n,r}$, for $n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $n > r \geq 0$, with

$$l_{n,r}^{-2} := \left\langle \left(\frac{F_n}{F_r} \right)^{\frac{1}{n-r}} \right\rangle.$$

For $n = 2$ and $r = 1$, this gives

$$(4.31) \quad l^{-2} := l_{2,1}^{-2} = \left\langle \frac{F_2}{F_1} \right\rangle.$$

Using the bound (4.25), the definition (4.30) and the approximation (4.28) gives

$$(4.32) \quad \begin{aligned} l^{-2} &\leq c \nu^{-1} \langle \|Du\|_\infty \rangle + \lambda_0^{-2} \\ &\leq c L^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\nu^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right) \langle \|Du\|_2 \rangle + \lambda_0^{-2} \leq c L^{-\frac{3}{2}} \nu^{-\frac{3}{2}} (\nu \langle \|Du\|_2^2 \rangle)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda_0^{-2} \\ &\leq c \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\nu^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda_0^{-2} = c \left[\left(\frac{\epsilon}{\nu^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \right]^2 + \lambda_0^{-2} = c_K \lambda_K^{-2} + \lambda_0^{-2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have set $c_K := c C_K^2$. Note that, relying on [29, §6.2], the bounds (4.32) turn out to hold also for the length scales $l_{n,n-1}$, with $n \geq 2$, which we have not considered explicitly in the discussion above. From (4.32) we conclude that, when the crest factor is close to 1, Kolmogorov's dissipation length is the natural average length scale. Thus, Kolmogorov's dissipation length is the baseline and digressions from this are spiky solutions in the dissipation range.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Turbulence – and intermittent turbulence notably – is known to be an extremely complicated problem. In this work we have stated a criterion for detecting turbulence characterised by strong intermittence in a solution of a particular PDE: *a solution of a PDE shows intermittent turbulent behaviour*

if its corresponding CF is a time-dependent chaotic function with strong intermittency.

In particular, if the CF of a given solution is time-independent or has a smooth dependence on time, for instance is time periodic or quasi-periodic, then the solution does not show turbulent behaviour. According to this, we have checked that the CF of solutions of linear PDEs confirms that they do not have any turbulent behaviour in their evolution. We have explicitly considered the case of the heat equation and of the wave equation, but the analysis extends to any linear separable PDEs. Another example where the time-dependence is non-chaotic is provided by the time-dependent Stokes problem.

We have then investigated some nonlinear PDEs. Our first model was Burgers' equation on a finite interval with Dirichlet boundary conditions. The equation can be explicitly solved and the CF is easily computed: it shows that, in such a case as well, no turbulent behaviour appears (even though Burgers' equation was long considered a prototype for turbulence).

Furthermore, we have considered the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations and we have selected some representative situations which we believe are important to elucidate some features regarding the presence or absence of intermittent turbulence. We first considered the Stokes second problem, which can be reduced to a non-separable linear PDE. The CF turns out to be a periodic function of time and therefore, according to our criterion, any kind of turbulent behaviour is absent. Next, we have analysed the motion of a two-dimensional viscous fluid moving on the upper half-plane with a constant horizontal initial velocity field, a zero gradient of pressure and zero velocity on the "horizontal wall" for all time. Here we have computed the CF for the vorticity field and found that it has an algebraic time-decaying behaviour, which automatically excludes any turbulent behaviour.

So far we have mentioned situations where we do have an explicit expression of the solution of the problem under investigation. In all these case we did not find any turbulent intermittent behaviour. This scenario therefore suggests that turbulence cannot be expressed in closed or explicit form, but it has in its core a stochastic and erratic nature with many many different length scales interacting in a very strong nonlinear way. In the light of this, the last part of this paper was devoted to the analysis of the two-dimensional and three-dimensional NSE on the torus. Here, apart from relatively easy cases, generally it is not possible to provide an explicit solution, and so we have resorted to taking time averages of various quotients of norms of the solution.

In the two-dimensional case we have found a CF which goes like ν^{-2} logarithmically. Thus, for relatively small values of ν the time averaged CF of the solution mimics the smallest scale of the forcing function through the term L/λ_0 . In the case of very small values of ν the logarithmic term becomes relevant giving a large CF. This is effectively saying that in $d = 2$ the solutions of the NSE on the torus can not generally have intermittent

turbulent behaviour unless we are very close to the inviscid limit thereby going to the Euler equations. In this limit if we are in the presence of strong time fluctuations we can in principle have intermittent turbulent behaviour.

In the three-dimensional case, for the time averaged CF we found, for large values of $\langle \|Du\|_\infty \rangle$, the very expressive formula (4.27). We believe this formula is interesting because it implies that, in order to reach a regime of intermittent turbulence, one must have very strong fluctuations of spacial variations of the velocity field. Since the spatial derivatives of the velocity field generate the vorticity field, we expect the vorticity field as well to have strong and intermittent turbulent behaviour.

Of course, when considering the time-averaged CF, we can no longer detect the presence of time intermittency. However, computing the averaged CF still allows us to draw some conclusions. Indeed, depending on its value, we can conclude what kind of turbulence, if any, is possible:

- (1) The CF is of order one ($C_f \approx 1$). This is the regime of soft or mild turbulence, because we are in a situation where the L^∞ and the L^2 norm of the solution are close to each other. Therefore no strong intermittent excursions are experienced by the solution.
- (2) The CF is large ($C_f \gg 1$). This is the regime of hard turbulence. In this case, if the solution has relevant and intermittent excursion away from its mean square space average, then we are in the regime of intermittent turbulence.

An interesting problem to investigate would be to combine the criterion above with numerical analysis of PDEs, including the NSE on the torus. If a numerical solution is available in some form and its behaviour is not transparent, then from the computation of the CF one may deduce whether the solution is turbulent or not-turbulent. If no chaoticity in time appears, turbulence must be ruled out. If the CF is chaotic but the fluctuations are negligible, then we may have turbulence *à la* Kolmogorov. Finally, if besides chaoticity, also strong intermittency is present, then we are in the regime of intermittent turbulence.

Acknowledgements. We thank the anonymous Reviewer for suggesting us to show that, if one assumes $\|Du\|_\infty \approx L^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|Du\|_2$, then one obtains Kolmogorov's dissipation length.

APPENDIX A

With the notations of Section 3.1, set

$$b_n(t) := |a_n| T_n(t), \quad B(t) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} b_n(t).$$

For any $\delta > 0$, set also $N_1(\delta) := \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : b_n(t) \geq \delta\}$ and $N_2(\delta) := \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : b_n(t) < \delta\}$, and fix $\delta = \delta(t)$ so that

$$\sum_{n \in N_1(\delta(t))} b_n(t) \geq \frac{B(t)}{2}.$$

Then we obtain

$$B(t) = \sum_{n \in N_1(\delta(t))} b_n(t) + \sum_{n \in N_2(\delta(t))} b_n(t) \leq \sum_{n \in N_1(\delta(t))} b_n(t) + \frac{B(t)}{2}$$

and hence

$$B(t) \leq 2 \sum_{n \in N_1(\delta(t))} b_n(t) \leq 2\delta(t) \sum_{n \in N_1(\delta(t))} \frac{b_n(t)}{\delta(t)} \leq 2\delta(t) \sum_{n \in N_1(\delta(t))} \left(\frac{b_n(t)}{\delta(t)} \right)^2,$$

which implies that

$$\frac{\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} b_n(t)}{\sum_n b_n^2(t)} \leq \frac{1}{\delta(t)} \frac{\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (b_n(t)/\delta(t))}{\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (b_n(t)/\delta(t))^2} \leq \frac{2}{\delta(t)} \frac{\sum_{n \in N_1(\delta(t))} (b_n(t)/\delta(t))}{\sum_{n \in N_1(\delta(t))} (b_n(t)/\delta(t))^2} \leq \frac{2}{\delta(t)}.$$

In conclusion, if we set $K_0 = \sup\{|X_n(x)| : x \in [0, 2\pi], n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} C_f &\leq \sqrt{2\pi} K_0 \frac{\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} b_n(t)}{\left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} b_n^2(t) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2\pi} K_0 (B(t))^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} b_n(t) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} b_n^2(t) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq K_f(t) := \sqrt{\frac{4K_0^2 \pi B(t)}{\delta(t)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the last bound, if we do not assume any condition on the coefficients a_n and the function $T_n(t)$, is nearly optimal. For instance, if we take $b_n(t) = 1/(2N+1)$ for $|n| \leq N$ and $b_n(t) = 0$ for $|n| > N$, then we find

$$\delta(t) = \frac{1}{2N+1}, \quad B(t) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} b_n(t) = 1, \quad \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} b_n^2(t) = \frac{1}{2N+1},$$

so that $N_1(\delta(t)) = \mathbb{Z}$, and this gives $C_f = \sqrt{2\pi/(2N+1)} = \sqrt{2K_0^2 \pi B(t)/\delta(t)}$.

In general, since the functions $T_n(t)$ decay exponentially, we have that both $B(t)$ and $\delta(t)$ tend to a_0 when t tends to $+\infty$, so that the quantity $K_f(t)$ remains bounded.

APPENDIX B

In the case of the NSE with periodic boundary conditions, the bound (4.24) can be derived directly from the equations (4.6) without using the GNI. Using the definition (2.2) of J_1 and the equation (3.4a), and shortening for simplicity $\partial_i = \partial/\partial x_i$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \dot{J}_1 &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_j u_i\|_2^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} \partial_j u_i \partial_j (u_i)_t \, dx \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} \partial_j u_i \partial_j \left(- \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 u_k \partial_k u_i \right) + \nu \Delta u_i + f_i - \partial_i p \right) dx, \end{aligned}$$

with $\Omega = [0, L]^3$. We study separately the four contributions:

- the first one gives

$$- \sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} \partial_j u_i \left((\partial_j u_k) \partial_k u_i + u_k \partial_j \partial_k u_i \right) dx$$

where, as far as the second term is concerned, integrating by parts, we find

$$\int_{\Omega} \partial_j u_i (u_k \partial_j \partial_k u_i) \, dx = - \int_{\Omega} (\partial_k \partial_j u_i) u_k \partial_j u_i \, dx - \int_{\Omega} (\partial_j u_i)^2 (\partial_k u_k) \, dx$$

which implies

$$\sum_{k=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} \partial_j u_i (u_k \partial_j \partial_k u_i) \, dx = - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} (\partial_j u_i)^2 (\partial_k u_k) \, dx = 0,$$

with the last equality following from (3.4b), whereas the first term is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \left| \int_{\Omega} (\partial_j u_i) (\partial_j u_k) (\partial_k u_i) \, dx \right| \\ &\leq \max_{j,k} |\partial_j u_k| \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} \left((\partial_j u_i)^2 + (\partial_k u_i)^2 \right) dx \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \|Du\|_{\infty} \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^3 (\partial_j u_i)^2 + \sum_{i,k=1}^3 (\partial_k u_i)^2 \right) dx \\ &= 3 \|Du\|_{\infty} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} (\partial_j u_i)^2 \, dx = 3 \|Du\|_{\infty} J_1, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Young inequality;

- the second contribution, by integrating by parts, can be written as

$$\nu \sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} \partial_j u_i \partial_j \partial_k^2 u_i = -\nu \sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} (\partial_k \partial_j u_i) (\partial_j \partial_k 2u_i) = -\nu J_2,$$

because of the definition (2.2) of J_2 ;

- the third contribution is bounded by using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, so as to obtain

$$\left| \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} \partial_j u_i \partial_j f_i \, dx \right| \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \left(\int_{\Omega} (\partial_j u_i)^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} (\partial_j f_i)^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq (\Phi_1 J_1)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where we have used the definition (4.17) of Φ_1 ;

- the fourth contribution vanishes because, again by integrating by parts and using (3.4b), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} \partial_j u_i \partial_j \partial_i p \, dx &= - \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} (\partial_j \partial_i u_i) \partial_j p \, dx \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^3 \int_{\Omega} \partial_j \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \partial_i u_i \right) \partial_j p \, dx = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By collecting together the results above we arrive at

$$\frac{1}{2} \dot{J}_1 \leq -\nu J_2 + 3 \|Du\|_{\infty} J_1 + (\Phi_1 J_1)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

so that, using (4.18) and the fact that f – and hence Φ_n – does not depend on t , we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \dot{F}_1 \leq -\nu F_2 + \nu \tau^2 \Phi_2 + 3 \|Du\|_{\infty} F_1 + \tau^{-1} F_1,$$

which, once we take into account the definitions (4.19) and (4.21), gives (4.24) with $c_1 = 3$.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. A. Adams, *Sobolev spaces*, Academic Press, New York, 1975.
- [2] A. V. Babin and M. I. Vishik, *Attractors for evolution equations*, Nauka, Moscow, 1989.
- [3] C. Bardos and E. S. Titi, *Mathematics and turbulence: where do we stand?*, Journal of Turbulence **14** (2013), no. 3, 42–76.
- [4] C. Bardos, E. S. Titi and E. Wiedemann, *Onsager's conjecture with physical boundaries and an application to the vanishing viscosity limit*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **370** (2019), no. 1, 291–310.
- [5] M. V. Bartuccelli, *Sharp constants for the L^{∞} -norm on the torus and applications to dissipative partial differential equations*, Differential Integral Equations **27** (2014), no. 1-2, 59–80.
- [6] M. V. Bartuccelli, *On the nature of space fluctuations of solutions of dissipative partial differential*, Applied Mathematics Letters **96** (2019), 14–19.

- [7] M. V. Bartuccelli, *On the crest factor for dissipative partial differential equations*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A **475** (2019), no. 2229, 20190322, 12 pp.
- [8] M. V. Bartuccelli, J. H. B. Deane and G. Gentile, *Explicit estimates on the torus for the sup-norm and the crest factor of solutions of the modified Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation in one and two space dimensions*, Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations **32** (2020), no. 2, 791–807.
- [9] M. V. Bartuccelli and G. Gentile, *On the crest factor and its relevance in detecting turbulent behaviour in solutions of partial differential equations*, Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering **19** (2022), no. 8, 8273–8287. Special Issue: Celebrating the mathematical journey of Stephen A. Gourley – Theory and applications of delay differential equations.
- [10] M. V. Bartuccelli, C. R. Doering, J. D. Gibbon and S. A. Malham, *Length scales in solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Nonlinearity **6** (1993), 549–568.
- [11] G. K. Batchelor, *An introduction to fluid dynamics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [12] J. Bec and K. Khanin, *Burgers turbulence*, Physics Reports **447** (2007), 1–66.
- [13] L. C. Berselli, T. Iliescu and W. J. Layton, *Mathematics of large eddy simulation of turbulent flows*, Springer Series in Scientific Computation, Springer, Berlin, 2006.
- [14] L. C. Berselli and S. Spirito, *On the vanishing viscosity limit for the Navier-Stokes equations under slip boundary conditions in general domains*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **316** (2012), no. 1, 171–198.
- [15] F. Calogero and A. Degasperis, *The Spectral transform and solitons*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982.
- [16] J. D. Cole, *On a quasi-linear parabolic equation occurring in aerodynamics*, Quarterly of Applied Mathematics **9** (1951), 225–236.
- [17] P. Constantin, *Geometric and analytic studies in turbulence*, in “Trends and perspectives in applied mathematics”, Applied Mathematical Sciences 100, 21–54, Springer, New York, 1994.
- [18] P. Constantin, *On the Euler equations of incompressible fluids*, American Mathematical Society. Bulletin. New Series **44** (2007), no. 4, 603–621.
- [19] P. Constantin, *Euler and Navier Stokes Equations*, Publicacions Matemàtiques **52** (2008), no. 2, 235–265.
- [20] P. Constantin and C. Foias, *Navier-Stokes Equations*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1988.
- [21] P. Constantin, C. Foias and R. Temam, *Attractors representing turbulent flows*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society **53** (1985), no. 314, 67 pp.
- [22] P. Constantin, C. Foias, O. P. Manley and R. Temam, *Determining modes and fractal dimension of turbulent flows*, Journal of Fluid Mechanics **150** (1985), 427–440.
- [23] P. Constantin, C. Foias and R. Temam, *On the dimension of the attractors in two-dimensional turbulence*, Physica D **30** (1988), no. 3, 284–296.
- [24] P. Constantin, G. Gallavotti, A.V. Kazhikhov, Y. Meyer, S. Ukai, *Mathematical foundation of turbulent viscous flows*, Springer, Berlin, 2006.
- [25] P. Constantin, I. Kukavica and V. Vicol, *On the inviscid limit of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **143** (2015), no. 7, 3075–3090.
- [26] P. Constantin and V. Vicol, *Remarks on high Reynolds numbers hydrodynamics and the inviscid limit*, Journal of Nonlinear Science **28** (2018), no. 2, 711–724.
- [27] P. A. Davidson, *Turbulence*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2004.
- [28] R. K. Dodd, J. C. Eilbeck, J. D. Gibbon and H. C. Morris, *Solitons and nonlinear wave equations*, Academic Press, London, 1982.

- [29] C. R. Doering and J. D. Gibbon, *Applied analysis of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [30] J. B. Esteban, *The Stokes second problem and its extension to viscoelastic fluids*, Grau de Matemàtiques – Treball final de grau, Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics, University of Barcelona, 2000.
- [31] R. Feynman, R. B. Leighton and M. Sands, *The Feynman lectures on physics*, Addison-Wesley, Boston, 1964.
- [32] C. Foias, *What do the Navier-Stokes equations tell us about turbulence?*, Contemporary Mathematics **208** (1997), 151–180.
- [33] C. Foias, O. P. Manley, R. Rosa and R. Temam, *Navier-Stokes equations and turbulence*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [34] U. Frisch, *Turbulence: the legacy of A. N. Kolmogorov*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [35] G. Gallavotti, *Foundations of fluid dynamics*, Springer, Berlin, 2002.
- [36] S. A. Gourley and M. V. Bartuccelli, *Length scales in solutions of a scalar reaction-diffusion equation with delay*, Physics Letters A **202** (1995), 79–87.
- [37] R. B. Guenther and E. A. Thomann, *Fundamental solutions of Stokes and Oseen problem in two spatial dimensions*, Journal of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics **9** (2007), no. 4, 489–505.
- [38] E. Hopf, *The partial differential equation $u_t + uu_x = \mu u_{xx}$* , Communications in Pure and Applied Mathematics **3** (1950), 201–230.
- [39] S. Jiang, *Potential theory for initial-boundary value problems of unsteady Stokes flow in two dimensions*, CAMS report 1112-8, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark, New Jersey, 2011.
- [40] S. Jiang, S. Veerapaneni and L. Greengard, *Integral equation methods for unsteady Stokes flow in two dimensions*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing **34** (2012), no. 4, A2197–A2219.
- [41] T. von Kármán, *Über laminare und turbulente Reibung*, Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik **1** (1921), no. 4, 233–252.
- [42] J. Kevorkian, *Partial differential equations: analytical solution techniques*, Text in Applied Mathematics 35, Springer, New York, 2000.
- [43] I. Kukavica, V. Vicol and F. Wang, *The inviscid limit for the Navier-Stokes equations with data analytic only near the boundary*, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis **237** (2020), no. 2, 779–827.
- [44] I. Kukavica, T. T. Nguyen, V. Vicol and F. Wang, *On the Euler+Prandtl expansion for the Navier-Stokes equations*, Journal of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics **24** (2022), no. 2, paper 47, 46 pp.
- [45] J. G. L. Laforgue and R. E. O’Malley Jr., *Shock layer movement for Burgers’ equation*, SIAM Journal of Applied Mathematics **55** (1995), no. 2, 332–347.
- [46] L. D. Landau, *A new exact solution of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR **43** (1944), 286–288.
- [47] C. Marchioro and M. Pulvirenti, *Mathematical Theory of incompressible nonviscous fluids*, Applied Mathematical Sciences 96, Springer, New York, 1994.
- [48] R. C. McOwen, *Partial Differential Equations, Methods and Application*, Second Edition, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 2003.
- [49] N. Riley and P. Drazin, *The Navier-Stokes equations: a classification of flows and exact solutions*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [50] J. C. Robinson, *Infinite-dimensional dynamical systems*, Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [51] H. B. Squire, *The round laminar jet*, The Quarterly Journal of Mechanics and Applied Mathematics **4** (1951), 321–329.

- [52] J. T. Stuart, *On the effects of uniform suction on the steady flow due to a rotating disk*, The Quarterly Journal of Mechanics and Applied Mathematics **7** (1954), 446–457.
- [53] P. Voke, L. Kleiser and J. P. Chollet, *Direct and large-eddy simulation I: Selected papers from the First ERCOFTAC Workshop on Direct and Large-Eddy Simulations*, The University of Surrey, Guildford, UK, 27-30 March 1994, Springer Science and Business Media, Springer, Dordrecht, 1994.
- [54] R. Temam, *Infinite-dimensional dynamical systems in mechanics and physics*, Second edition, Applied Mathematical Sciences 68, Springer, New York, 1997.

(M. V. Bartuccelli) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, UNIVERSITY OF SURREY, GUILDFORD, GU2 7XH, UK

Email address: `m.bartuccelli@surrey.ac.uk`

(G. Gentile) DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E FISICA, UNIVERSITÀ ROMA TRE, ROMA, I-00146, ITALY

Email address: `guido.gentile@uniroma3.it`