

GENERAL ARTICLES

- 25 Canuto, C., Hussaini, M. Y., Quarteroni, A. and Zang, T. A., *Spectral Methods in Fluid Dynamics*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.
- 26 Sinha, U. N. *et al.*, Report PD ST 9133, National Aeronautical Laboratory, Bangalore, 1991.
- 27 Basu, A. J., Narasimha, R. and Sinha, U. N., *Curr. Sci.*, 1992, **63**, 734-740.
- 28 Rogallo, R. S. and Moin, P., *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 1984, **16**, 99-137.
- 29 Ferziger, J. H., in *Theoretical Approaches to Turbulence* (eds. Dwoyer, D. L., Hussaini, M. Y. and Voigt, R.), Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985, pp. 51-72.
- 30 Narasimha, R. and Prabhu, A., *J. Fluid Mech.*, 1972, **54**, 1-17.
- 31 Richardson, L. F., *Weather Prediction by Numerical Process*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1922. (The jingle goes like this: Big whorls have little whorls Which feed on their velocity. And little whorls have lesser ones And so on to viscosity)
- 32 Sreenivasan, K. R., *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 1991, **23**, 539-600.
- 33 Kuchemann, D., *J. Fluid Mech.*, 1965, **21**, 1-20.
- 34 Ashurst, U. T., in *Turbulent Shear Flows* (eds. Durst, F. *et al.*), Springer-Verlag, 1977, pp. 402-413.
- 35 Dutta, P. K., Report PD CF 8944, National Aeronautical Laboratory, Bangalore, 1989.
- 36 Leonard, A., *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 1985, **17**, 523-559.
- 37 Basu, A. J., Prabhu, A. and Narasimha, R., *Computers Fluids*, 1992, **21**, 1-30.
- 38 Shariff, K. and Leonard, A., *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 1992, **24**, 235-279.

Received 23 December 1992; accepted 24 December 1992

other: the information required from experiment may by clever analysis be reduced (usually by simple applications of a certain kind of group theory¹⁰, involving the assumption of some kind of similarity among the solutions), but it cannot be eliminated. Liepmann¹¹ has charted 'the rise and fall of ideas' in turbulence, and shown how the history of the subject is littered with the debris of 'promising' ideas that have rarely lived up to their promise.

This is an unsatisfactory state of affairs for two reasons. First of all the basic laws governing the motion of fluids, including in particular when in a state of turbulent flow, are known beyond reasonable doubt; the laws are contained in the Navier–Stokes equations, written down for the first time by the French engineer Navier in 1822 (ref. 3). Because of their strong nonlinearity, however, no solutions of these equations relevant to turbulent flow are known, not even for the simplest geometry. Computer solutions are only just now being obtained, fully one and a half centuries after Navier declared that 'The true engineer always calculates'.

Secondly, while a great deal is known based on experimental information, the lack of a fundamental *understanding* of the nature of the solutions means that certain classes of questions cannot be answered, perhaps not even raised. For example, during the last two decades several novel methods of turbulence management (which would include both promotion and suppression, depending on the application: promotion could increase heat transfer, suppression could reduce drag) have been studied, and some have been quite successful¹². Thus, it is now established beyond doubt that fine streamwise grooves on a surface, forming what are known as 'riblets' (height and width of the order of a millimetre in aircraft applications), can reduce turbulent skin friction drag by 5–10%. (A recent victory of the United States in the Americas Cup has been attributed, although not entirely convincingly, to the use of ribbed sails. It would not be surprising if aircraft surfaces in the next decade are rough to the touch, the engineered roughness resulting in lower fuel consumption!) Now the point is that such turbulence 'managers' derive little inspiration from any theory available today: they have come rather from a sophisticated kind of tinkering with the flow by engineers steeped in experimental lore, and in particular by the discovery that there is much order ('coherent structure') in the apparent chaos of turbulent flow^{13,14}.

There is nothing more practical than a good theory, but such a theory does not exist for turbulence yet. In this situation, three lines of attack on the subject have emerged: Figure 1 summarizes the relations between the approaches that have been adopted. First, experimentation, and there has been a great deal of this which now needs more sophisticated 'cataloguing' than has been




Figure 1. *Different approaches to turbulence.* Mathematical models (currently all *ad hoc*) have till now been chiefly derived from experimental data, but may in future be influenced by direct numerical solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations, which are best seen as providing data from numerical (rather than physical) experiments. Large-eddy simulation is a hybrid, with modelled small-scale motion. Experiments and DNS should help discover principles and construct or verify theories, of which there is nothing satisfactory today.

done till now, along the lines of Coles's *Young Person's Guide to the Data* on boundary layers. Secondly (and here the computer makes its first entry), one can construct mathematical models that engineers could solve for making estimates in design. This has become an industry in its own right now, and computer codes of various kinds have proliferated in the market place¹⁶. Many of these are refinements of ideas put forward by Ludwig Prandtl¹⁷, the founder of modern engineering fluid dynamics. Prandtl was, at one end of the spectrum of such models, the author of the simplest of them, which proposes a mixing length analogous to the mean free path of the kinetic theory of gases—but unfortunately the analogy is not strictly valid, as in turbulent flow eddy interaction and separation distances are of the same order, making the statistical-mechanical situation closer to that in a liquid rather than a gas. (Eddies experience not the rare but sharp encounters of the balls on a billiard-table, but the continuous jostling of people in a crowd.) Prandtl¹⁸ also suggested, at the other extreme, a rather complicated partial differential equation to compute a velocity scale for any turbulent flow. Kolmogorov¹⁹ and Rotta²⁰ made proposals along similar lines, and these have been pursued vigorously with various refinements ever since.

By tuning the empirical parameters in such models one can obtain reasonable agreement with experimental data in certain classes of technologically important flows, and it has even been possible to produce, for example, novel aerofoils that give enormously high lift-to-drag ratios under certain conditions²¹. But these models have remained models and no more: the kind of luck that Planck had, when his quantum 'model' for

radiation turned out actually to hit the 'truth', has not favoured fluid dynamicists¹⁶. In a way the turbulence models now in wide use in industry are very sophisticated 'interpolations' among experimental data — interpolations carried out through the medium of partial differential equations, so to speak — to be used with caution outside the range of validation or the class of flows experimentally investigated. If around the turn of the century hydraulics depended on empirical algebraic relations (dismissively referred to by the great aeronautical fluid dynamicist von Karman as the 'science of variable constants'), in the age of computers we have empirical partial differential equations. The scientific basis of these models is weak, in the sense that their connection with the Navier–Stokes equations is dubious. But they have served the purposes of engineering design within a carefully limited area: as Heaviside pointed out, one does not wait to understand the process of digestion before starting to eat. It is important with such models to appreciate what they can and cannot do, to exploit them where possible, to treat them with caution and scepticism where necessary¹⁶.

The third possibility is to compute numerically exact solutions of the full, unsteady, three-dimensional Navier–Stokes equations. (Even if the overall geometry of the *mean* flow is simple and possesses symmetries, e.g. axisymmetry in a round jet, real-life turbulent flow is basically three-dimensional in the fluctuations, so all components of the velocity vector need to be retained.) Right from the early days of electronic computers turbulence has been near the top of the computing agenda: in that same ONR essay von Neumann⁷ spoke of 'some hope to "break the deadlock" by extensive, but well-planned, computational efforts'. It has long been known that this is very demanding on computer power: in 1970 Emmons²² concluded that 'like every previous attempt at solution this one fails too', but, noting the rapid pace at which computer speeds had been growing, suggested that 'in the not-too-distant future the low Reynolds number turbulent flows may be within range of investigation'. In actual fact the first such solutions were published only two years later²³.

The problem in obtaining direct Navier–Stokes solutions (often abbreviated to DNS, also standing for direct numerical simulation—i.e. without the use of *any ad hoc* modelling) is the vast range of time and space scales that need resolution. The largest scales in a turbulent flow are comparable to the scale of variation of the mean flow (say diameter of pipe or jet); the smallest are those where viscous action is strong, and are named after Kolmogorov, who first characterized them in terms of the dissipation of turbulent kinetic energy to heat²⁴. The ratio of the large eddy scale to the Kolmogorov scale increases with Reynolds number like $Re^{3/4}$, so volumes corresponding to these scales go like $Re^{9/4}$; time scales go like $Re^{1/2}$. Based on

considerations like these it can be shown²⁵ that the total number of operations to compute even the highly idealized case of *homogeneous* turbulence (i.e. a flow that is statistically homogeneous in space) is proportional to

$$Re^{11/4} [c_1 \log_2 R^{3/4} + c_2],$$

where c_1 and c_2 are constants; and the storage requirement is proportional to $Re^{9/4}$. The time required for computing one realization of homogeneous turbulence on a 100 MFLOPS computer works out to 3 min at $Re=100$, and 9 h at $Re=400$ (these Reynolds numbers being based on large-eddy length and velocity scales). The computation of *high* Reynolds number turbulence must therefore await vastly more powerful computers before becoming practical, but relatively low Re flows are amenable to supercomputers of the present day.

This kind of computing power has not been available in India till recently. But with the commissioning of the Flosolver Mk-3 at NAL²⁶, the required computing power is now on hand, and the first such solution has been reported by Basu *et al.*²⁷. As this has appeared in print recently in *Current Science*, I shall not devote space here to describe it again.

The great advantage of DNS is that it provides access to *any* flow variable, including all those that are virtually impossible to measure at present; e.g. the three-dimensional chaotic vorticity field that is the defining characteristic of real-life turbulence, or the total viscous dissipation to heat that governs the dynamics of both large and small eddies. It is therefore possible to use DNS to obtain insights that are not available from experimental techniques²⁷. Of course DNS has its limitations as well: apart from the fact that it can now handle flow past bodies only at Reynolds numbers of the order of 10^3 – 10^4 (based on body size and free-stream velocity), there are (somewhat surprisingly) difficulties associated with prescribing boundary conditions on the surface of the (necessarily finite) computational domain within which the equations are solved. It does sometimes happen therefore that different simulations of turbulence for the same flow problem do not agree among themselves, a situation that is strangely similar to the difficulties that wind tunnel engineers have in accounting for what they call 'wall interference'!

As computers grow in power the Reynolds numbers at which DNS can be carried out will also increase, but are unlikely to match the values encountered in aerospace technology (where they are of order 10^7 – 10^8) atleast for another decade. But, quite apart from this consideration, there is a further paradoxical difficulty with DNS, namely that, for the vast majority of applications, it provides *too much* information. It is not uncommon for a new problem to take a year or two in

formulation, execution and verification: but the analysis of the results may continue for several years. It is becoming the standard practice to create an archival database containing carefully verified computer solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations, to be retrieved and analysed against any new idea or proposal that may emerge in the course of research. But to obtain an immediate answer to an engineering problem direct numerical simulations will turn out not only to be numerically and financially expensive, but in fact to generate far more information than is necessary: DNS may be too ‘rich’.

There is therefore an urgent need in applications for something that is more rational than the *ad hoc* models in current engineering use but less expensive and rich than DNS. This hybrid could well turn out to be the technique known as large eddy simulation (LES)^{28,29}. The basic idea here is that the large scale motions in the flow, which are known to be flow-specific and sensitive to initial conditions (they have a long memory³⁰), should be solved ‘exactly’ on the computer except for their interaction with the small scales. The small scales, which are much more nearly universal than the large scales (from which they receive their energy, which is then dissipated into heat as in Richardson’s celebrated jingle³¹), are handled by a suitable model rather than by exact numerical solution of the Navier–Stokes equations. This procedure, which is basically what is widely used in numerical weather prediction (weather being a complex form of turbulence on a gigantic scale), has the advantage that dynamics is directly invoked only where it is essential, and is therefore both financially and intellectually economical. Its success however depends crucially on the ability to formulate adequate universal models for the fine structure of turbulence. This has been the subject of much fundamental research since the time of Kolmogorov’s profoundly influential papers²⁴. Although the last word on the subject has not yet been said, enough progress has been made in recent years to give cause for hope³².

There is one other alternative line of attack. As turbulence is chaotic vorticity, and vorticity is a more compact field than the fluid velocity, chasing vortices on a computer seems like an attractive proposition. Küchemann³³, an aeronautical engineer, aptly characterized vortices as the ‘muscles and sinews of fluid motion’. Several computational techniques have been devised to handle vortex lines or rods^{34–36}, sheets³⁷, rings³⁸ and so on. These attempts are very suggestive, and certainly mimic turbulence. But there are difficulties in a rational treatment of viscosity, and the highly contorted geometry of vortex structures in turbulent flows requires tools for handling that we do not yet possess.

So the future for doing turbulence on computers is

likely to lie in two directions. For modest, and modestly increasing, Reynolds numbers, direct numerical solutions will provide insights into the structure of turbulent flows that will begin to surpass what is available from experiment in standard or classical flows. Experiments will continue to remain important at high Reynolds numbers, and, at lower Reynolds numbers, will act as scouts exploring unusual flow situations where surprises may await us, as they have done in the past. Engineers will chase vortices or develop hybrid techniques like large-eddy simulations, which will tackle full-scale or nearly full-scale Reynolds numbers by doing dynamics on large scales and models for small scales, the latter drawing upon all the insights that have resulted from much inspired fundamental research. These hybrid simulations will probably replace the numerous models in current use some day, but exactly when is not entirely clear, and that may well depend on how rapidly technology will provide greater computing power at low cost.

1. Reynolds, O., *Philos. Trans. R. Soc.*, 1883, 174, 935–982.
2. McDowell, D. M., Jackson, J. D. (eds.), *Osborne Reynolds and Engineering Science Today*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1970.
3. Rouse, H. and Ince, S., *History of Hydraulics*, Dover, New York, 1957.
4. Reynolds, O., *Philos. Trans. R. Soc.*, 1895, 186, 123–164.
5. Rott, N., *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 1990, 22, 1–11.
6. Govindarajan, R. and Narasimha, R., *J. Fl. Engg.*, 1991, 113, 147–149.
7. Von Neumann, J., in *Collected Works* (Taub, A. H. Gen. ed.), Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1963, vol. 6, pp. 437–472.
8. Lamb, H., *Hydrodynamics*, Cambridge University Press, 1932, 6th edn.
9. Goldstein, S., *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 1969, 1, 1–28.
10. Birkhoff, G., *Hydrodynamics*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1960; also Bluman, G. W. and Kumei, S., *Symmetries and Differential Equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989.
11. Liepmann, H. W., *Am. Sci.*, 1979, 67, 221–228.
12. Liepmann, H. W. and Narasimha, R. (eds.), *Turbulence Management and Re-laminarisation*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988.
13. Roshko, A., *AIAA J.*, 1976, 14, 1349–1357.
14. Narasimha, R., *Curr. Sci.*, 1987, 56, 629–645.
15. Coles, D., in *Computation of Turbulent Boundary Layers* (eds. Coles, D. and Hurst, E. A.), AFOSR IFP–Stanford Conference, Stanford University, 1969.
16. Narasimha, R., in *Whither Turbulence* (ed. Lumley, J. L.), Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1989, pp. 13–48.
17. Prandtl, L., *ZAMM*, 1925, 5, 136–139.
18. Prandtl, L., *Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Goettingen, Math. — Phys. Klasse*, 1945, pp. 6–19.
19. Kolmogorov, A. N., *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Fiz.*, 1942, 6, 56–58, (translation available as Rep ON 6, Mech. Engg. Dept. Imperial College, London, 1968).
20. Rotta, J. C., *Z. Phys.*, 1951, 129, 547–572.
21. Liebeck, R. H., *J. Aircraft*, 1978, 15, 547–561.
22. Emmons, H. W., *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 1970, 2, 15–36.
23. Orszag, S. A. and Patterson, G. S. Jr., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1972, 28, 76–79.
24. Kolmogorov, A. N., *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 1941, 30, 299–303, 32, 19–21; *J. Fluid Mech.*, 1962, 13, 82–85.

25. Canuto, C., Hussaini, M. Y., Quarteroni, A. and Zang, T. A., *Spectral Methods in Fluid Dynamics*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.
26. Sinha, U. N. *et al.*, Report PD ST 9133, National Aeronautical Laboratory, Bangalore, 1991.
27. Basu, A. J., Narasimha, R. and Sinha, U. N., *Curr. Sci.*, 1992, **63**, 734-740.
28. Rogallo, R. S. and Moin, P., *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 1984, **16**, 99-137.
29. Ferziger, J. H., in *Theoretical Approaches to Turbulence* (eds. Dwyer, D. L., Hussaini, M. Y. and Voigt, R.), Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985, pp. 51-72.
30. Narasimha, R. and Prabhu, A., *J. Fluid Mech.*, 1972, **54**, 1-17.
31. Richardson, L. F., *Weather Prediction by Numerical Process*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1922. (The jungle goes like this: Big whorls have little whorls which feed on their velocity. And little whorls have lesser ones and so on to viscosity.)
32. Sreenivasan, K. R., *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 1991, **23**, 539-600.
33. Kuchemann, D., *J. Fluid Mech.*, 1965, **21**, 1-20.
34. Ashurst, U. T., in *Turbulent Shear Flows* (eds. Durst, F. *et al.*), Springer-Verlag, 1977, pp. 402-413.
35. Dutta, P. K., Report PD CF 8944, National Aeronautical Laboratory, Bangalore, 1989.
36. Leonard, A., *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 1985, **17**, 523-559.
37. Basu, A. J., Prabhu, A. and Narasimha, R., *Computers Fluids*, 1992, **21**, 1-30.
38. Shariff, K. and Leonard, A., *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 1992, **24**, 235-279.

Received 23 December 1992; accepted 24 December 1992

The movement and implications of the Ganges-Brahmaputra runoff on entering the Bay of Bengal

Satish R. Shetye

The Ganges-Brahmaputra rivers discharge annually approximately 10^{12} m^3 of freshwater into the Bay of Bengal at its northern end. We propose that the spread of this water, accompanied by mixing with the ambient waters, occurs in three phases. The Ganges-Brahmaputra discharge appears to lead to cooler sea surface temperatures in the northern Bay and to a stronger coastal current along the west coast of India, both during the northeast monsoon.

THE Earth's hydrologic cycle is maintained in a quasi-steady state by a complex network of pathways transporting water between various natural reservoirs—oceans, atmosphere, rivers, etc. One component of this system is the riverine freshwater runoff to the ocean. It is of interest to determine how such a runoff spreads on reaching a sea, the dynamics underlying the spread and the impact it has on the ocean.

The Bay of Bengal offers an eminently suitable location to address these issues. The four major rivers bordering the Bay—Brahmaputra, Irrawady, Ganges and Godavari—discharge approximately $1.5 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}^3$ of freshwater into the Bay¹. About two thirds of this discharge comes from the Ganges-Brahmaputra (GB) rivers. Only three other rivers—Amazon, Congo and Orinoco—have annual discharge higher than the

discharge of GB, which drains into the Bay at its northern end (Figure 1). Most of the discharge (72%) occurs during 5 months, June-October (Figure 2), a consequence of the southwest monsoon. The discharge carries with it a heavy load of sediments, but very little of it appears to escape the continental shelf; it most probably accumulates on the subaerial parts of the GB delta². The path that the discharge follows as it moves in the Bay away from the mouth of GB is not known. In this paper we use hydrographic data and theoretical estimates of wind-driven circulation in the Bay to speculate on how the GB discharge may be spreading and the impact it might have on the Bay and surrounding region.

Seasonal cycle of surface salinity in the Bay of Bengal

A useful tracer to record spread of freshwater in the sea is salinity (weight of dissolved salts expressed as parts per thousand³). Freshwater being lighter than sea water

Satish R. Shetye is in the Physical Oceanography Division, National Institute of Oceanography, Dona-Paula, Goa 403 004, India. This article is the written version of a talk given at the Mid-Year Meeting of the Indian Academy of Sciences, Bangalore, 24 July 1992.