Absence of Evidence for the Ultimate Regime in Two-Dimensional Rayleigh-Bénard Convection

C. R. Doering,[1] S. Toppaladoddi,[2] and J. S. Wettlaufer[3,2,4]

[1] *University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1043, USA*
[2] *University of Oxford, Oxford OX2 6GG, United Kingdom*
[3] *Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06520-8109, USA*
[4] *Nordita, Royal Institute of Technology and Stockholm University, SE-10691 Stockholm, Sweden*

Zhu *et al.* [1] report direct numerical simulations of turbulent thermal convection in two dimensions (2D) with planar no-slip isothermal walls and Rayleigh numbers (Ra) ranging from 10^8 to 10^{14}. For the Nusselt number (Nu) the authors report a scaling of $Nu \sim Ra^{0.35}$ for the four data points with $10^{13} \leq Ra \leq 10^{14}$. They also decomposed Nu into contributions from "plume-ejecting" (Nu_e) and "plume-impacting" (Nu_i) regions of the spatial domain reporting $Nu_e \sim Ra^{0.38}$ for those four data points, interpreting this as evidence of a so-called 'ultimate' regime of thermal convection characterized by *bulk* heat transport scaling $Nu \sim Ra^{1/2}$ modulo logarithmic corrections [2].

Although hypotheses concerning the nature of boundary layers [2] constitute one ingredient of this system, the fundamental characterization of the state of convection is the asymptotic Nu-Ra relation [2–4]. Zhu *et al.* [1] drew an arbitrary line through the final four heat flux data [$10^{13} \leq Ra \leq 10^{14}$]. When we perform an objective least-squares power law fit to these data we find $Nu = 0.035 \times Ra^{0.332}$ with an empirical exponent that is *indistinguishable* from 1/3, the so-called 'classical' scaling exponent [5–8].

Moreover, the data from $Ra = 10^8$ to 10^{13} are extremely well described by extrapolation of a previous fit, $Nu = 0.138 \times Ra^{2/7}$, from high resolution simulations for $10^7 \leq Ra \leq 10^{10}$ [9]. Indeed, the power law fit of those 5 decades of their data yields the scaling exponent 0.289, indistinguishable (less than 1.2%) from 2/7.

Compare Fig. 1 here to Fig. 1 of [1]. The clear deviation the full data set from pure scaling, combined with the limited range of Ra (one decade) and the small size of the data set (just four points) over which the classical 1/3 scaling appears, precludes definitive extrapolation to asymptotically large Ra. Nevertheless the 2D heat transport results reported by Zhu *et al.* are reminiscent of previous 3D simulations [10, 11] and experiments [12–14] consistent with crossovers from $Nu \sim Ra^{2/7}$ to $Nu \sim Ra^{1/3}$ for various Rayleigh numbers between 2×10^9 and 10^{11}.

In summary, while Zhu *et al.* [1] do not report any detailed statistical analysis of their data, we have shown that when dividing their data into different segments and forcing a power law fit for the last decade as they have proposed, the reduced data set is consistent with $Nu \sim Ra^{1/3}$—in quantitative agreement with the classical theories [5–7]—*not* the $Ra^{0.35}$ scaling reported by Zhu *et al.* [1]. Moreover, the remaining data up to $Ra = 10^{13}$ are consistent with $Nu \sim Ra^{2/7}$ scaling in qualitative accord with other reported 2D [9] and 3D results [10–14].




FIG. 1. Compensated plots of $Nu \times Ra^{-\beta}$ vs. Ra. Circles (top) are data of Zhu *et al.* [1] with $\beta = 2/7$ while squares (bottom) are the same data with $\beta = 1/3$.

Therefore the claim by Zhu *et al.* [1] that their data suggests that two dimensional convective turbulence reaches an 'ultimate' regime characterized by bulk heat transport scaling $Nu \sim Ra^{1/2}$ with logarithmic corrections [2] is not, in fact, supported by their data.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by National Science Foundation award DMS-1515161, Vetenskapsrådet No. 638-2013-9243, and All Souls College, Oxford.

[1] X. Zhu, V. Mathai, R. J. A. M. Stevens, R. Verzicco, and D. Lohse, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 144502 (2018).
[2] R. Kraichnan, Phys. Fluids **5**, 1374 (1962).
[3] L. P. Kadanoff, Phys. Today **54**, 34 (2001).

[4] G. Ahlers, S. Grossmann and D. Lohse, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 503 (2009).
[5] C. H. B. Priestley, Aust. J. Phys. **7**, 176 (1954).
[6] W. V. R. Malkus, Proc. R. Soc. A **225**, 196 (1954).
[7] L. N. Howard, in Applied Mechanics, Proceedings of the Eleventh International Congress of Applied Mechanics, Munich, Germany, ed. H. Görtler (Springer, Berlin, 1966), 1109-1115.
[8] See Supplemental Material at [URL will be inserted by publisher].
[9] H. Johnston and C. R. Doering, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 064501 (2009).
[10] R. Verzicco and R. Camussi, J. Fluid Mech. **477**, 19 (2003).
[11] R.J.A.M. Stevens, R. Verzicco and D. Lohse, J. Fluid Mech. **643**, 495 (2010).
[12] P. Urban, V. Musilova, and L. Skrbek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 014302 (2011).
[13] See data in Figure 4 and related text in Ref. [4].
[14] C. Sun, L.-Y. Ren, H. Song and K.-Q. Xia, J. Fluid Mech. **542**, 165-174 (2005).