

# Asymptotic ultimate regime of homogeneous Rayleigh–Bénard convection on logarithmic lattices

Amaury Barral, Berengere Dubrulle

## ▶ To cite this version:

Amaury Barral, Berengere Dubrulle. Asymptotic ultimate regime of homogeneous Rayleigh–Bénard convection on logarithmic lattices. Journal of Fluid Mechanics, 2023, 962, pp.A2. 10.1017/jfm.2023.204 . hal-04141097

## HAL Id: hal-04141097 https://hal.science/hal-04141097v1

Submitted on 26 Jun 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

Banner appropriate to article type will appear here in typeset article

# Asymptotic Ultimate Regime of Homogeneous Rayleigh-Bénard Convection on Logarithmic Lattices

## 4 Amaury Barral<sup>1</sup> and Berengere Dubrulle<sup>1</sup><sup>+</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>SPEC/IRAMIS/DSM, CEA, CNRS, University Paris-Saclay, CEA Saclay, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

6 (Received xx; revised xx; accepted xx)

We investigate how the heat flux Nu scales with the imposed temperature gradient Ra in 7 Homogeneous Rayleigh-Bénard convection using 1, 2 and 3D simulations on logarithmic 8 lattices. Logarithmic lattices are a new spectral decimation framework which enables us to 9 span an unprecedented range of parameters (Ra, Re, Pr) and test existing theories using little 10 computational power. We first show that known diverging solutions can be suppressed with 11 a large-scale friction. In the turbulent regime, for  $Pr \approx 1$ , the heat flux becomes independent 12 of viscous processes ("asymptotic ultimate regime", Nu ~  $Ra^{1/2}$  with no logarithmic 13 correction). We recover scalings coherent with the theory developed by Grossmann & Lohse, 14 for all situations where the large-scale frictions keep a constant magnitude with respect to 15 viscous and diffusive dissipation. We also identify another turbulent friction dominated 16 regime at  $Pr \ll 1$ , where deviations from GL prediction are observed. These two friction 17 dominated regimes may be relevant in some geophysical or astrophysical situations, where 18 large scale friction arises due to rotation, stratification or magnetic field. 19

#### 20 1. Introduction

Convection is a dynamical process that governs heat transport and mixing in a variety of 21 systems ranging from planetary and astrophysical flows to industrial devices. In that respect, 22 23 a crucial question is how the heat flux in the system is connected with the temperature gradient. Near equilibrium, where both quantities are small, Fourier laws apply, and the 24 heat flux is simply proportional to the temperature gradient. For larger values, the system 25 enters a non-linear then turbulent regime, where thermal energy in converted into mechanical 26 energy, and the relation becomes nonlinear. The deviations from linearity are quantified by 27 the relation between the Nusselt number, Nu, the ratio between the heat flux and its laminar 28 value, and the Rayleigh number Ra, the non-dimensional temperature gradient. 29 In fluid mechanics, the paradigmatic system describing convection is a fluid enclosed 30

in a volume, in which thermal energy is injected at the bottom via imposed heat flux or temperature gradient. Its dynamics is described by the Rayleigh-Bénard (RB) equations. Despite decades of theoretical, experimental and numerical developments, the scaling of the heat transfer in RB remains a subject of discussion and active research. In bounded domains at low Ra, a simple argument by Malkus & Chandrasekhar (1954) based on the criticality

† Email address for correspondence: berengere.dubrulle@cea.fr

## Abstract must not spill onto p.2

1

**Table 1:** Scaling predictions for HRB observables in the turbulent regime with and without friction. The observables are given by Table (2). DNS stands for Direct Numerical Simulation using regular Fourier modes (Calzavarini *et al.* 2005) while LL refers to simulations using Fourier modes on a LogLattices (this paper).  $U_{ls}^2$  and  $\Theta_{ls}^2$  are large scale kinetic and thermal energy. Exponents are computed by fitting over Ra > 10<sup>7</sup> (resp. 1 < Pr < 50) for varying Ra (resp. Pr). Errors represent std of fit parameters.

LL f = 1

Nu ~	$\sqrt{\text{Ra}\text{Pr}}$	Pr <sup>0.43</sup> Ra <sup>0.50</sup>	Pr <sup>0.51±0.01</sup> Ra <sup>0.53±0.03</sup>
Re ~	$\sqrt{Ra/Pr}$	$Pr^{-0.55} Ra^{0.5}$	$Pr^{-0.54\pm0.01} Ra^{0.54\pm0.01}$
$\epsilon_{\theta} \sim$	$c_1\sqrt{\text{Re}/\text{Ra}} + c_2 \text{Re} \sqrt{\text{Pr}/\text{Ra}}$	$({\rm Re}{\rm Pr})^{-0.17}$	$\operatorname{Re}^{x}\operatorname{Pr}^{x-0.5}/\sqrt{\operatorname{Ra}}, 1 \leq x \leq 1.2$
$\epsilon_u \sim$	${\rm Re}^{3}({\rm Pr}/{\rm Ra})^{3/2}$	$Re^{2.77}(Pr/Ra)^{3/2}$	$Re^{2.88\pm0.03}(Pr^{0.95\pm0.01}/Ra)^{3/2}$

DNS f = 0

of the thermal boundary layer gives  $Nu \sim Ra^{1/3}$ , observed in many experiments (see Ahlers 36 et al. (2009) for review). As we increase Ra  $\rightarrow \infty$ , viscous processes (and their associated 37 boundary layers) are believed to become irrelevant, resulting in an "ultimate regime of 38 convection", where Nu ~  $Ra^{1/2}$  (hereafter called "asymptotic ultimate regime") (Spiegel 39 1963; Grossmann & Lohse 2000), with possible logarithmic corrections (Kraichnan 1962; 40 Grossmann & Lohse 2011) (hereafter called "ultimate regime"). Experimental or numerical 41 observations of the (asymptotic) ultimate regime prove to be very difficult, and no final 42 consensus has been reached so far about its existence in a pure RB setting (Chavanne et al. 43 1997; Urban et al. 2019; Doering & Constantin 1996; Zhu et al. 2018, 2019a; Roche 2020) 44 (see Ahlers et al. (2009) for a less recent but more synthetic review)." When the gravity 45 is artificially increased using centrifugal force, one can indeed observe hints of an ultimate 46 regime (Jiang et al. 2022). On the other hand, various modifications of the RB geometry 47 aiming at modifying the influence of the boundary layers result in experimental observation 48 of a regime where Nu ~  $Ra^{1/2}$ : using highly elongated cells (Castaing *et al.* 2017; Pawar 49 & Arakeri 2016), using rough (Ciliberto & Laroche 1999; Rusaouën et al. 2018; Zhu et al. 50 51 2019b; Kawano et al. 2021) or porous" (Zou & Yang 2021; Motoki et al. 2022) boundaries, or radiatively heating the flow (Lepot et al. 2018; Bouillaut et al. 2019). 52

From a numerical point of view, a simple way to remove boundary layers is to consider 53 a triply periodic geometry, and heat the flow via an applied temperature gradient. This 54 setting was first explored by Borue & Orszag (1997); Lohse & Toschi (2003); Calzavarini 55 56 et al. (2005, 2007) and called Homogeneous Rayleigh-Bénard (HRB) convection. The corresponding scalings and predictions are summarized in Table 1. Although the results 57 of those simulations are consistent with the predictions of Grossmann & Lohse (2000) 58 (hereafter called "GL theory"), they are undermined by several drawbacks: statistics polluted 59 by the growth of uncontrolled exponential instabilities (Calzavarini et al. 2006) of unclear 60 physical relevance, a small Ra and Pr range, sparse data points due to difficulties in running 61 numerically challenging simulations. Indeed, pushing the Rayleigh number to large values 62 increases the numerical burden beyond the capacity of present computers, as the number of 63 grid points needed to describe the flow usually scales like  $Re^3$  with  $Re \sim Ra^{1/2}$ . In an attempt 64 to reduce the number of degrees of freedom, models based on sparse interacting Fourier 65 modes have been recently devised (Campolina & Mailybaev 2018, 2021). Those modes are 66 evenly spaced points in log space (thus thereafter called "log-lattice") and are interacting 67 via nonlinear equations that are derived from the fluid equations by substituting for the 68

GL Theory f = 0

69 convolution product a new operator, that can be seen as a convolution on the log-lattice, and preserves all the main symmetries and conservation laws of the original equations. As 70 such, log-lattices are likely to preserve properties of the original equations that are directly 71 linked to these symmetries and conservation laws. This was indeed checked for the Burgers 72 73 and Navier-Stokes equation in the Fourier space (energy spectrum, energy transfers), over an unprecedented wide range of scales (Campolina & Mailybaev 2021). Another interesting 74 75 feature of log-lattices is that in 1D, they encompass classical shell models of turbulence for special values of the log-lattice spacing (Campolina & Mailybaev 2021), such as the Sabra 76 shell model of turbulence (Gloaguen et al. 1985; Biferale 2003). 77 78 1D shell models of turbulence were used previously in the context of HRB (Ching & Ko 2008) in an effort to increase the Ra and Pr range of results. They successfully display 79 the asymptotic ultimate regime of convection, at the price of tuning several parameters of 80 the model to get rid of the uncontrolled exponential instabilities. This, combined with the 81

1D nature of the model, renders the informative and conclusive nature of the observations 82 questionable. The goal of the present letter is therefore to re-explore the HRB equation using 83 the log-lattice framework, that allows both the exploration of a wide range of parameters 84 on a large array of wavenumbers, and a flexibility of dimensionality from 1D to 3D, at low 85 numerical cost, and without additional empirical parameters. Given that they preserve all 86 87 main conservations laws and symmetry of the original HRB equation, many features of the original equation are still valid, like the exact conservation laws of Table 1. Whether the 88 GL theory still applies, and what are the modifications of the asymptotic ultimate regime 89 implied by the log-lattice geometry are interesting open questions that we investigate here. In 90 that respect, the present paper offers an exploration of the analogy and differences between 91 log-lattices and classical fluid dynamics in a more complex case (HRB) than previous 92 examples (Campolina & Mailybaev 2018, 2021). 93

#### 94 2. Numerical simulations

#### 95

#### 2.1. Generalities

<sup>96</sup> The dynamics of a homogeneous fluid, with coefficient of thermal dilation  $\alpha$ , viscosity  $\nu$ <sup>97</sup> and diffusivity  $\kappa$ , subject to a temperature gradient  $\Delta T$  over a length *H* and vertical gravity *g* <sup>98</sup> is given by the HRB set of equations (Lohse & Toschi 2003; Calzavarini *et al.* 2005, 2006, <sup>100</sup> 2007),

$$\partial_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \boldsymbol{u} + \frac{1}{\rho_{0}} \nabla p = \boldsymbol{v} \nabla^{2} \boldsymbol{u} + \alpha g \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{z},$$
  
$$\partial_{t} \boldsymbol{\theta} + \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \boldsymbol{\theta} = \kappa \nabla^{2} \boldsymbol{\theta} + u_{z} \frac{\Delta T}{H},$$
  
$$\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u} = 0,$$
  
(2.1)

101

where u is the velocity,  $\theta$  the temperature fluctuation,  $\rho_0$  is the (constant) reference density and p is the pressure. Here, the mean temperature gradient  $\Delta T$  acts as a forcing term. This gradient is non-dimensionalized into the Rayleigh number Ra =  $\alpha g H^3 \Delta T / (\nu \kappa)$ . The Prandtl number Pr =  $\nu/\kappa$  is the ratio of the fluid viscosity to its thermal diffusivity. The mean total heat flux is the z direction is  $J = \langle u_z \theta \rangle - \kappa \Delta T$  which is adimensionalized into Nu =  $JH/\kappa \Delta T$ . Taking global space and time average of the equation (2.1), one can derive (Lohse & Toschi 2003; Calzavarini *et al.* 2005) two exact relation for the volume averaged kinetic and



**Figure 1:** Absolute value of the rate of growth of instability  $\sigma = d \log X/d \log t$  where  $X = \langle u\theta \rangle$  without large-scale friction (f = 0), vs. Rayleigh number. The green dashed line is the theoretical growth rate for  $k = k_c = 2\pi\sqrt{3}$ , corresponding to Eq. (2.4). The interval  $k < k_c$  corresponds to negative values of  $\sigma$ .

109 thermal dissipation, which respectively scale as

110 
$$v \left\langle (\partial_i u_j)^2 \right\rangle_V = v^3 H^{-4} \operatorname{Nu} \operatorname{Ra} \operatorname{Pr}^{-2}, \qquad (2.2)$$

$$\kappa \left\langle (\partial_i \theta)^2 \right\rangle_V = \kappa H^{-2} (\Delta T)^2 \operatorname{Nu}.$$
(2.3)

Additionally, to get rid of the pressure term, we take the rotational of the above equation  $(\omega = \operatorname{rot} u = ik \times u).$ 

#### 115 2.2. Quantities of interest

#### 116 2.3. Adaptation on log-lattices: HRB with friction

117 2.3.1. Exponential instabilities in HRB

As first shown by Calzavarini *et al.* (2006), HRB equations are prone to exponential instabilities, due to the conservation of the total energy. In the absence of large-scale friction, we also observe those instabilities in our log-lattice simulations (Figure 2a). As shown in Figure (1), the growth rate of the instability in the log-lattice simulations matches the theoretical growth rate given by Calzavarini *et al.* (2006); Schmidt *et al.* (2012):

123 
$$\sigma \sqrt{\operatorname{Ra}\operatorname{Pr}} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \sqrt{\left( (\operatorname{Pr}+1)k^2 \right)^2 + 4\operatorname{Pr}(\operatorname{Ra}-k^4)} - (\operatorname{Pr}+1)k^2 \right] \sim \sqrt{\operatorname{Ra}}, \quad (2.4)$$

124 for  $\theta, u \sim e^{\sigma t + i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x}}$ . This expression yields unstable solutions for Ra > Ra<sub>c</sub> =  $k_{\min}^4$  where 125  $k_{\min}$  is the modulus of the smallest mode on the grid, which is  $2\pi\sqrt{3}$  in our case.

However, the non-linear behavior of the instability in the log-lattice case is quite different 126 from the one reported by Calzavarini: instabilities tend to extend significantly further and 127 for longer times. Our interpretation is that in our log-lattice model, the modes are not 128 coupled enough to develop the nonlinear saturation. The instabilities widely interfere with 129 the statistical stability of observables and need to be removed for a meaningful analysis. 130 Physically, these exponential ramps originate for a lack of energy sink to absorb the constant 131 energy injection in the bulk by the (fixed) temperature gradient. Previous works on 1D 132 simulations (Ching & Ko 2008) have shown that without a large-scale sink to counteract 133 this source, energy diverges at large scales and scaling laws become incorrect. Therefore, 134 135 to get rid of the exponential instabilities, we include a large-scale friction f on both u and  $\theta$ . By doing so, the instability saturates, and we achieve a statistically stationary state for 136

### Focus on Fluids articles must not exceed this page length

111



**Figure 2:** Influence of the large-scale friction on the time behavior of the Nusselt number Nu in 3D HRB. (2a) Without friction: we observe the growth of an exponential instability. (2b) With friction: the instability saturates and the dynamics become statistically convergent. Parameters:  $Ra = 10^6$ , Pr = 1, N = 13.

**Table 2:** Physical quantities expressed as a function of the non-dimensional variables of Eq. (2.5).  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  denotes the temporal and spatial average.

$$Nu = \frac{JH}{\kappa\Delta T} - 1 \rightarrow \sqrt{\operatorname{Ra}\operatorname{Pr}} \cdot \langle u_{z}\theta \rangle - 1$$
$$\operatorname{Re} = \frac{\sqrt{\langle U_{i}U_{i} \rangle}H}{\nu} \rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{\operatorname{Ra}}{\operatorname{Pr}}} \cdot \sqrt{\langle u_{i}u_{i} \rangle}$$
$$\epsilon_{\theta} = \kappa \left\langle (\partial_{i}\Theta)^{2} \right\rangle \rightarrow \frac{\left\langle (\partial_{i}\theta)^{2} \right\rangle}{\sqrt{\operatorname{Ra}\operatorname{Pr}}}$$
$$\epsilon_{u} = \nu \left\langle (\partial_{i}U_{j})^{2} \right\rangle \rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{\operatorname{Pr}}{\operatorname{Ra}}} \cdot \left\langle (\partial_{i}u_{j})^{2} \right\rangle$$

137 the heat transfer, as displayed in figure 2. Note however that the fluctuations of Nu around the stationary value are very broad, and extend over one or two orders of magnitudes. The 138 same phenomenon was observed in the DNS of HRB (Calzavarini et al. 2005, 2006) and 139 mentioned to be a source of difficulty to achieve reliable results (Borue & Orszag 1997). For 140 this reason, very long simulations are necessary to get steady averages (Pumir & Shraiman 141 1995; Calzavarini et al. 2006). In DNS, this cannot be achieved without cutting down the 142 resolution, which may impact the reliability of dissipation estimates (Yeung et al. 2018). In 143 144 the log-lattice framework, we do not have this problem, and we performed high resolution very long time averages on the log of Nu, and represent all quantities in log-log variables. 145 146

#### 147 2.3.2. Equations

To investigate the ultimate regime, it is natural to adimensionalize the equation in terms of 'inertial quantities'', i.e. using the vertical width *H* as a unit of length, the free fall velocity  $U_{\rm ff} = \alpha g \Delta T H$  as a unit of velocity, and  $\Delta T$  as a unit of temperature. Table 2 indicates the form taken by observables after rescaling as indicated. The equations including the temperature gradient and the friction can then be written in terms of velocity as (with the Einstein 154 convention on summed repeated indices):

155

$$\partial_{t}u_{i} = \mathbb{P}\left[-u_{j}\partial_{j}u_{i} + \theta\delta_{i=z} + \sqrt{\frac{\Pr}{\operatorname{Ra}}}\nabla^{2}u_{i} - fu_{i}\delta_{k\approx k_{min}}\right]_{i},$$

$$\partial_{t}\theta = -u_{i}\partial_{i}\theta + u_{z} + \frac{\nabla^{2}\theta}{\sqrt{\operatorname{Ra}\operatorname{Pr}}} - f\theta\delta_{k\approx k_{min}},$$
(2.5)

where the Dirac  $\delta_{k \approx k_{\min}}$  filters out the small scales, and the projector, given in the Fourier space by  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{A} - \frac{k_i}{k^2} k_j A_j$ , accounts for the pressure term under the divergence-free condition. We also looked at those equations expressed in terms of the vorticity  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \nabla \times \boldsymbol{u}$ :

$$\partial_{t}\omega_{i} = -\omega_{j}\partial_{j}u_{i} - u_{j}\partial_{j}\omega_{i} + \theta[\nabla \times z]_{i} + \sqrt{\frac{\Pr}{\operatorname{Ra}}}\nabla^{2}\omega_{i} - f\omega_{i}\delta_{k\approx k_{min}},$$

$$\partial_{t}\theta = -u_{i}\partial_{i}\theta + u_{z} + \frac{\nabla^{2}\theta}{\sqrt{\operatorname{Ra}\operatorname{Pr}}} - f\theta\delta_{k\approx k_{min}},$$
(2.6)

160

183

Adding a large-scale friction to damp the inverse cascade is a classical trick-it is e.g. 161 routinely used numerical simulations of 2D turbulence to avoid Bose condensation at k = 0162 and enable stationarity (Sukoriansky et al. 1999). The present case is 3D, but we interpret 163 the formation of exponential ramps as a signature of back-scattering of energy, a feature that 164 was already mentioned previously in shell models of Rayleigh-Bénard convection (Ching 165 & Ko 2008). The addition of the friction is therefore a convenient way to damp the large-166 scale modes that are generated by the large-scale instability. Such friction is also added in 167 many models of climate, as a subgrid model to account for the friction at the boundary 168 169 layer that cannot be resolved in the stratified case. The hand waving argument is that, within boundary layers, a shear profile develops, with extraction of energy at the boundaries, which 170 is proportional to the square of the shear. Assuming the shear to be constant in the boundary 171 layer, we can then estimate it by the difference between the velocity at the top of the layer, 172 minus the velocity at the boundary which is zero. In total, the energy pumped by friction is 173 proportional to the square of the velocity, which is exactly the law we have implemented. 174 Such friction is termed Rayleigh friction in the climate community (Stevens et al. 2002) and 175 can actually be seen as a way to take into account the boundary conditions that we have 176 removed in the HRB setting. 177

#### 178 2.3.3. Conservations laws for HRB with and without friction

In the absence of friction, the conservation laws for HRB are given by Eqs. (2.2) and by (2.3). The presence of the friction just adds a supplementary term proportional to f in each equation. The result can be made non-dimensional using  $U_{\rm ff}$ , H and  $\Delta T$  as units of velocity, length and temperature, resulting in :

$$f\left\langle u^{2}\delta_{k\approx k_{min}}\right\rangle + \epsilon_{u} = \frac{\mathrm{Nu}+1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Ra}\,\mathrm{Pr}}},\tag{2.7}$$

$$f\left\langle \theta^2 \delta_{k \approx k_{min}} \right\rangle + \epsilon_{\theta} = \frac{\mathrm{Nu} + 1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Ra}\,\mathrm{Pr}}},\tag{2.8}$$

186 From now on, we define  $U_{ls}^2 = \langle u^2 \delta_{k \approx k_{\min}} \rangle$  and  $\Theta_{ls}^2 = \langle \theta^2 \delta_{k \approx k_{\min}} \rangle$ .

#### 2.4. Log-lattices

188 Log-lattice models fit into the more general framework of REduced Wavenumber set Approximation (REWA) (Grossmann et al. 1994)) or fractal decimated models (Frisch et al. 189 2012; Lanotte et al. 2015). The spirit of these methods is to use a reduced subset of modes 190 obeying a well-defined hierarchy, so as to stick closer to the observed organized nature of 191 turbulence. In the original REWA models (Grossmann et al. 1994), non-linear-interactions 192 are projectively decreased either in a random manner or such that they are distributed over 193 a fractal set (Frisch et al. 2012; Lanotte et al. 2015). In log-lattice models, the modes 194 reduction is achieved by keeping modes following a geometric progression, thereby allowing 195 to reach very small scales with a very small number of modes. The construction is detailed 196 in Campolina & Mailybaev (2021), where it is shown that fluid equations on log-lattices 197 respect all symmetries of the Euler equations, and retain classical and basic properties of the 198 199 Navier-Stokes equation, such as constancy of energy flux in the inertial range.

There are several key differences compared to shell models (Brandenburg 1992; Ching & Ko 2008) or the original REWA model. Like in a shell model, simulations are carried out in Fourier space on an logarithmically-decimated grid. Unlike shell models, log-lattices are truly multidimensional, and unlike the original REWA model, the decimation does not have a fixed number of points per shell:  $k(n_1, \ldots, n_d) = \sum_i \lambda^{n_i} e_i, n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  with *d* the spatial

dimension and  $e_i = x, y, z, \dots$  Log-lattices are endowed with a scalar product:

$$(f,g) = \Re\left(\sum_{k} f(k)\overline{g(k)}\right),\tag{2.9}$$

207 and a convolution operator:

208

206

$$(f * g)(\boldsymbol{k}) = \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q} \\ \boldsymbol{p} + \boldsymbol{q} = \boldsymbol{k}}} f(\boldsymbol{p})g(\boldsymbol{q}), \qquad (2.10)$$

that naturally extend the corresponding operators on regular Fourier grids. This ensures 209 that the log-lattice operators respect the symmetries of the Navier-Stokes equation, which 210 ensures the conservation of energy, helicity (3D) or enstrophy (2D), etc. provided that they 211 are conserved in the original equation. The constrain on the interacting triads on log-lattices 212  $\exists p, q \in \lambda^{\mathbb{Z}} : p + q \in \lambda^{\mathbb{Z}}$  restricts the acceptable values of  $\lambda$  to three main families:  $\lambda = 2$ , 213 the plastic number  $\lambda = \rho \approx 1.324$ , and  $\lambda^b - \lambda^a = 1$ ,  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ , whose biggest solution is 214 the golden number  $\lambda = \phi \approx 1.618$ . From a numerical point of view,  $\lambda = 2$  is the "fastest" 215 option, as it has both a maximal span for a given number of points, and the least interactions 216 per point. However, as outlined in the next part, we believe that  $\lambda = 2$  should be avoided for 217 incompressible simulations. We thereafter perform all our simulations with  $\lambda = \phi$ , which is 218 the second biggest value of  $\lambda$ , and has the second least number of interactions per grid point. 219

220

#### 2.5. Numerical details

#### 221 2.5.1. Configuration

The minimum wave vector of the grid is set to  $k_{\min} = 2\pi$  to match a simulation on a box of size  $\tilde{L} = 1$ . The grid size N is then set so as to reach the dissipative scale both for velocity and temperature. We alternate between several initial condition (IC) choices for our simulations: large-scale initialization, Kolmogorov spectrum, flat-spectrum. All those choices are modulated by a weak multiplicative complex noise. We find no significant influence of those initial conditions on the scaling laws. As Ra or Pr increase, the simulations become slower and slower. This sets the upper bound on the range of parameters we can



**Figure 3:** Exact conservation laws for  $\epsilon_{\theta}$  in 3D results. Black points correspond to varying Ra, gray points correspond to varying Pr. (3a)  $\epsilon_{\theta} + f\Theta_{ls}^2$  vs  $(Nu+1)/\sqrt{Ra Pr}$ . (3b) Compensated plot  $(\epsilon_{\theta} + f\Theta_{ls}^2)/((Nu+1)/\sqrt{Ra Pr})$  vs  $(Nu+1)/\sqrt{Ra Pr}$ .

integrate while retaining statistically relevant observables in a reasonable simulation time 229 (one CPU days at most). In 3D, this yields  $Ra_{max} \approx 10^{10}$  for Pr = 1 and  $Pr_{max} \approx 5 \cdot 10^4$ 230 for  $Ra = 10^8$ . The lower bound is set by the value of the Nusselt number, which must obey 231 Nu  $\gg$  1, the value Nu  $\approx$  1 corresponding to the laminar regime with trivial scaling laws. 232 Finally, integrating equations on log-lattices yields interesting and new numerical challenges. 233 We built our own ODE integrator to solve them, as detailed in Supplementary Materials. 234 Once we have ran a simulation for a long enough time, we compute Nu,  $\epsilon_{\theta}$ ,  $\epsilon_{u}$  by taking 235 long time and space averages (with  $\langle ab \rangle = \frac{1}{T} \int_{t}^{t} dt(a, b)$ ) according to table 2. The accuracy 236 of our results is controlled by checking that we recover the exact laws of HRB convection 237 Eqs (2.8) and (2.7). This is shown in Fig. 3 and 4, for all 3D data sets used in the present 238 paper (see Table 3). Furthermore, the ratio between the friction term and the dissipation is 239 shown in Fig. 5. 240

#### 241 2.5.2. Simulation sets

The results we obtained come from seven types of simulation that are described in the Table 3. For comparison, we also included in some graphs the results by (Calzavarini *et al.* 2005), obtained using DNS of the same equations, but at f = 0.

Historically, we performed first vorticity simulations, then velocity simulations, improving 245 the integrator scheme in between to be able to better handle various numerical challenges 246 raised by simulating wavenumbers as high as  $k \sim 10^5$  in 3D. For transparency reasons, 247 we decided to include all datasets we had at our disposal, but we believe that the velocity 248 simulations are the more faithful ones, in the sense that they deal better with the small 249 scales at large Rayleigh or Reynolds number. This sensitivity to small scale modeling (and 250 resolution) is also a well-known feature of direct numerical simulations, especially when it 251 comes to statistics of gradients or energy dissipation (Yeung et al. 2018). 252

We have verified that the size of the grid for 3D simulations (N = 13) does not affect the mean value of the observables Nu, Re, ..., which is already converged for grids of size  $N \ge 6$ . However the tail of the pdfs does depend on N. Another 3D simulation set at N = 20(not shown here, both vs Ra and Pr) displays the same scaling laws as the N = 13 case, confirming this analysis.



**Figure 4:** Exact conservation laws for  $\epsilon_u$  in 3D results. Black points correspond to varying Ra, gray points correspond to varying Pr. (4a)  $\epsilon_u + fU_{ls}^2$  vs  $(Nu+1)/\sqrt{RaPr}$ . (4b) Compensated plot  $(\epsilon_u + fU_{ls}^2)/((Nu+1)/\sqrt{RaPr})$  vs  $(Nu+1)/\sqrt{RaPr}$ .



**Figure 5:** Ratio between friction  $f_x = f X_{ls}^2$  and dissipation  $\epsilon_x$  for x = u,  $\theta$  (5a) versus Ra at Pr = 1 and (5b) versus Pr at Ra = 10<sup>8</sup>.

258 2.5.3. A case against  $\lambda = 2$ 

This section explains why the log-lattice parameter  $\lambda = 2$  is ill-suited to simulating divergence-free equations. It is not specific to HRB simulations, however we believe this issue has not been reported in a publication before.

262  $\lambda = 2$  is the biggest grid parameter that can be accommodated on a log-lattice. For a fixed 263 grid size *N* in dimension *D*, it is therefore very tempting to use  $\lambda = 2$ , since among all the  $\lambda$ s 264 it spans the greatest range of wavenumbers (the convolution's complexity rises as  $O(N^D)$ ). 265 However,  $\lambda = 2$  misrepresents the convection term  $u_i \partial_i u_i$ .

The heart of the problem is easily understood through a simple 2D example. Consider the convection term  $u_x \partial_x \omega + u_y \partial_y \omega$  of a divergence-free flow, with a large-scale initialization  $u(k > k_0) = \omega(k > k_0) = 0$  for some  $k_0$ . From a physical point of view, we expect convection to populate the  $k \ge k_0$  region as time advances. However, with  $\lambda = 2$ , this does not happen, as is demonstrated below.

**Table 3:** Parameters of the data sets used in the present paper. *D* is the dimension. The "velocity" datasets are obtained by integration of Eq. (2.5), while the "vorticity" datasets are obtained by integration of Eq. (2.6). *DNS* refers to direct simulations of (Calzavarini *et al.* 2005), using a classical spectral Fourier code (on a regular grid). The ++ label refers to an integration using an improved integrator, using a reshuffling of variable matrices that allows faster simulations. The Ra and Pr column provides the Rayleigh and Prandtl number range of the simulations. *f* is the large scale friction,  $N = 1 + \log k_{max}/\log(\phi)$ , where  $k_{max}$  is the maximal wavenumber of the simulation and  $\phi$ , the golden mean, is a measure of the spatial resolution. For log-lattices, its corresponds to the number of modes in each direction.  $N_{av}$  is the length of the simulation, divided by the large eddy turnover time. It provides the number of decorrelated frames that can be used to estimate statistical averages. The tolerance refers to the absolute and relative tolerances that are fixed equal in all the simulations.

Name	D	Туре	Ra	Pr	f	Ν	$N_{av}$	Tolerance	Symbol
(I)	1 <i>D</i>	Velocity	$[10^5, 10^{50}]$	1	1	120	-	10 <sup>-3</sup>	•
(II)	2D	Vorticity	$[10^5, 10^{50}]$	1	1	20	-	$10^{-3}$	•
(III)	3D	Velocity	$[1, 10^{10}]$	1	1	13	> 480	$10^{-6}$	•
(IV)	3D	Vorticity	$[1, 10^{10}]$	1	1	13	> 480	$10^{-6}$	
(V)	3D	Velocity	$10^{8}$	$[5 \cdot 10^{-4}, 10^2]$	1	13	> 50	$10^{-6}$	
(VI)	3D	Vorticity	$10^{8}$	$[5 \cdot 10^{-4}, 10^2]$	1	13	> 50	$10^{-6}$	
(VII)	3D	++Velocity	$\{10^9, 10^{10}, 10^{11}\}$	$[5 \cdot 10^{-4}, 10^2]$	1	13	> 80	$10^{-6}$	-
(VIII)	3D	Velocity	$[10^6, 10^{10}]$	1	1	13	> 50	$10^{-6}$	•
Calzavarini	3D	DNS	$[10^5, 10^8]$	$[10^{-1}, 10]$	0	-	> 64	-	<b>*•</b>

In a divergence-free flow,  $u_x * \partial_x \omega = -i \left(\frac{\omega k_y}{k^2} * k_x \omega\right), u_y * \partial_y \omega = i \left(\frac{\omega k_x}{k^2} * k_y \omega\right)$  where \* denotes a convolution. In a  $\lambda = 2$  log-lattice, convolutions are defined as  $\dagger f * g(\lambda^n, \lambda^m) = f(\lambda^{n-1}, \lambda^{m-1}) \cdot g(\lambda^{n-1}, \lambda^{m-1})$ . Due to the initial conditions, this yields:

274 
$$\left(u_x * \partial_x \omega + u_y * \partial_y \omega\right) (k \approx k_0) = 0$$

There is no forward convection at all, therefore there can be no forward cascade in such case.

This does not happen for other values of  $\lambda$ , for which the convolution is evaluated at asymmetric positions. We therefore advise against using  $\lambda = 2$  in divergence-free fluids, and suggest to rather use  $\lambda = \phi$  (the second-biggest grid parameter).

#### 280 2.5.4. Zero-divergence problem in 1D

In the 1D case, we cannot impose the zero-divergence condition, so that quantities like  $u_x \partial_x \theta$ and  $\partial_x (u_x \theta)$  are not equivalent. Here, we have followed the same choice than Ching & Ko (2008), and wrote the equation as:

$$\partial_{t}u = -u\partial_{x}u + \theta + \sqrt{\frac{\Pr}{\operatorname{Ra}}}\nabla^{2}u - fu\delta_{k\approx k_{min}},$$
  

$$\partial_{t}\theta = -u\partial_{x}\theta + u + \frac{\nabla^{2}\theta}{\sqrt{\operatorname{Ra}\operatorname{Pr}}} - f\theta\delta_{k\approx k_{min}}.$$
(2.11)

285

 $\dagger$  excluding the k = 0 mode, which is not used in this paper

## Rapids articles must not exceed this page length



**Figure 6:** Non-dimensional heat transfer Nu vs Rayleigh number Ra in 1D and 2D. Correspondence between symbols and datasets are given in Table 3. (6a) Nu vs Ra. The gray dashed line corresponds to Nu ~  $\sqrt{Ra}$ , corresponding to ultimate regime scaling. (6b) Compensated plot  $A \text{ Nu}/\sqrt{Ra}$  vs Ra., where A is adjusted to collapse the 1D and 2D data in the ultimate regime.

#### 286 3. Results and Discussion

287

#### 3.1. One and two-dimensional cases

Figure 6 presents the Nu vs Ra scaling in 1D and 2D. The 1D Nu scaling law extends over 50 orders of magnitude in Ra (Fig. 6a), and follows closely the law Nu ~  $Ra^{1/2}$ , as can be checked by the compensated plot in Fig. (6b), in agreement with Ching & Ko (2008). In 2D, the scaling also extends approximately over 30 orders of magnitudes for Ra >  $10^{23}$ . Moreover, the compensated plot highlights small fluctuations around this law, see Fig. (6b), due to statistical noise.

#### 3.2. In 3D

In 3D, the simulations get significantly more turbulent and results are subject to more statistical fluctuations. Another source of fluctuations comes from a physical phenomenon, associated with the existence of friction. To showcase this effect, we plot in Fig. 5a and Fig. 5b the ratio between the energy dissipated by friction and the energy dissipated by viscosity or diffusivity for both the kinetic energy and the thermal energy.

Fixing Pr = 1 and varying Ra between  $10^3$  and  $10^8$ , we observe in Fig. 5a that both  $f_u = fU_{ls}^2/\epsilon_u$  or  $f_\theta = f\Theta_{ls}^2/\epsilon_\theta$  behave in the same way as a function of Ra at low Ra, the dissipation due to friction is small, and gradually increases towards reaching a plateau around Ra ~  $10^7$ , where energy dissipated by frictions reach about 90% of the energy dissipated by viscosity or diffusivity. We can thus define a "non-universal" regime where  $f/\epsilon$  depends on Ra, Pr and a "universal" regime where  $f/\epsilon$  does not depend on Ra, Pr.

The critical Rayleigh number where the plateau occurs is likely to depend on the Prandtl 306 number. To check this; we now fix  $Ra = 10^8$  and vary Pr from several order of magnitude. 307 In Fig. 5b, we then observe an interesting symmetrical behaviour, with respect to Pr = 1: 308 decreasing Pr, we observe that the energy dissipated by the velocity friction remains of the 309 same order of magnitude than the dissipation by viscosity, while the energy dissipated by 310 thermal friction strongly decays and become negligible. As Pr shifts away from 1, we observe 311 312 the symmetrical behavior, with velocity friction becoming negligible, while thermal friction remains of the same order of magnitude than the thermal energy dissipation. As we will see, 313



**Figure 7:** Non-dimensional heat transfer Nu vs Rayleigh number Ra in 3D for Pr = 1. Correspondence between symbols and datasets are given in Table 3. The gray dashed line separates the non-universal (left) and the universal (right) friction dominated regimes for data corresponding to Fig.5. (7a) Nu vs Ra. The black dashed line corresponds to Nu ~  $\sqrt{Ra}$ , corresponding to asymptotic ultimate regime scaling. (7b) Compensated plot Nu/ $\sqrt{Ra}$  vs Ra.



**Figure 8:** Scaling of non-dimensional heat transfer Nu as a function of Prandtl number Pr in 3D for Ra =  $10^8$ . Correspondence between symbols and datasets are given in Table 3. The gray dashed line separates the non-universal (left) and the universal (right) friction dominated regimes for data corresponding to Fig.5. (8a) Nu vs Pr. The black dashed line corresponds to Nu ~  $\sqrt{Pr}$ , corresponding to asymptotic ultimate regime scaling. (8b) Compensated plot Nu/ $\sqrt{Pr}$  vs Pr.

- this will have an impact on the thermal transport. Note that at small (resp. large) Pr, all the
- thermal (resp. velocity) modes become concentrated at large scale, where the friction occurs.
- Therefore, in the large Pr regime, the kinetic friction and viscous dissipation compete, while
- at small Pr the same remark holds for the thermal friction and diffusive dissipation. This may
- then explain the vanishing of the friction in those regime.
- We now focus on the regimes where the ratio of friction to dissipation is approximately constant. These regimes are friction dominated, but, as we will see, are characterized by interesting universal scaling regimes.



**Figure 9:** Scaling of Reynolds number Re as a function of Rayleigh number Ra in 3D for Pr = 1. Correspondence between symbols and datasets are given in Table 3. The gray dashed line separates the non-universal (left) and the universal (right) friction dominated regimes for data corresponding to Fig.5. (9a) Re vs Ra. The black dashed line corresponds to Re ~  $\sqrt{Ra}$ , corresponding to asymptotic ultimate regime scaling. (9b) Compensated plot Re/ $\sqrt{Ra}$  vs Ra.



**Figure 10:** Scaling of Reynolds number Re as a function of Prandtl number Pr in 3D for Ra =  $10^8$ . Correspondence between symbols and datasets are given in Table 3. The gray dashed line separates the non-universal (left) and the universal (right) friction dominated regimes for data corresponding to Fig.5. (10a) Re vs Pr. The black dashed line corresponds to Re ~  $1/\sqrt{Pr}$ , corresponding to ultimate regime scaling. (10b) Compensated plot Re/ $(1/\sqrt{Pr})$  vs Pr.

Figures 7 and 8 presents the 3D Nu vs Ra, Pr scalings. Figures 9 and 10 presents the 3D Re vs Ra, Pr scalings. Scaling are always displayed both directly and in compensated form.

At low Ra, we first observe a transition from a laminar regime, where Nu = 1 up to a turbulent regime starting around Ra  $\sim 10^7$  at Pr = 1. In this transition regime, the Nusselt number varies approximately like Nu  $\sim Ra^{2/3}$ , while the Reynolds number remains less than 10<sup>4</sup>, but follows approximates laws Re  $\sim Ra^{1/2}$ . In this regime, the friction is negligible, as we saw, so that it corresponds to a laminar, frictionless regime.



**Figure 11:** Scaling of heat transfer Nu as a function of Prandtl number Pr in 3D results at fixed Ra, dataset VII (Table 3) (11a) Nu/ $\sqrt{Pr}$  vs Pr for various Ra. (11b) Re/ $(1/\sqrt{Pr})$  vs Pr for various Ra.

which Nu ~ Ra<sup>1/2</sup> and Re ~ Ra<sup>1/2</sup>, like GL theory. The exact value of the exponent is provided in Table 1. In this regime, the friction are non-negligible, so that it is a "turbulent friction dominated regime" However, as both ratio  $f_u = f U_{ls}^2 / \epsilon_u$  or  $f_{\theta} = f \Theta_{ls}^2 / \epsilon_{\theta}$  remain independent of Ra, they do not change the scaling of the total kinetic and thermal energy dissipation. Therefore, the argument developed by GL theory should still apply in this situation, as is indeed observed, with minor corrections due to the small variations of the ratios.

In that respect, it is not surprising that the the extent of this regime varies with Pr, as is 337 shown in Fig. 11 for various Ra. At  $Ra = 10^8$ , the "universal GL" regime stops for Pr  $< \sim 10^{-1}$ . 338 In this range of parameters, Re is still large, so that the flow is turbulent. However, Nu drops 339 340 quicker with decreasing Pr than in the universal GL regime, as can be seen from the filled data points in Fig. 8, in parallel with a similar drop for the thermal friction observed in Fig. 5b. 341 This regime seems therefore dependent of the variation on the friction, and is non-universal. 342 In this regime, the Reynolds number variation with Pr is milder than in the universal regime, 343 as can be seen in Fig. 10. 344

As the Rayleigh number increases, we nevertheless observe in Fig. 11 that the extent of the universal turbulent regime extends towards smaller and smaller values of Pr, so that the universal scaling regime corresponds to an "asymptotic scaling regime" at low value of Pr < 1, valid in the limit of infinite Ra.

Figures 12 and 13 plot the kinetic and thermal dissipation rates  $\epsilon_{\mu}, \epsilon_{\theta}$  against GL 349 predictions. In agreement with what has been observed previously, we observe agreement 350 with GL theory in the range of parameters where the friction ratios are approximately constant 351 with the parameters, i.e. at large value of Re Pr. Overall, it is interesting to note that even 352 when the friction is dominant, we can recover the ultimate regime scaling, as long as the 353 velocity friction ratio remain relatively constant as a function of the parameters and neither 354 there is not too big an asymmetry between the two frictions. In regimes where the asymmetry 355 356 prevails, there are no clear scaling laws that emerge, meaning that the scaling are probably not universal in Ra and Pr only, and that friction depending corrections need to be implemented. 357



**Figure 12:** Scaling of thermal dissipation rate  $\epsilon_{\theta}$  compared to the GL prediction Re  $\sqrt{Pr/Ra}$  in 3D results. Correspondence between symbols and datasets are given in Table 3). The gray dashed line separates the non-universal (left) and the universal (right) friction dominated regimes for data corresponding to Fig.5. (12a)  $\epsilon_{\theta}\sqrt{Ra Pr}$  vs Re Pr. The black dashed line corresponds to the GL prediction  $\epsilon_{\theta} \sim \text{Re}(Pr/Ra)^{1/2}$ . (12b) Compensated plot  $\epsilon_{\theta}\sqrt{Ra Pr}$  vs  $\sqrt{Re Pr}$ .



**Figure 13:** Scaling of kinetic dissipation rate  $\epsilon_u$  compared to the GL prediction  $\text{Re}^3(\text{Pr/Ra})^{3/2}$  in 3D results. Correspondence between symbols and datasets are given in Table 3). The gray dashed line separates the non-universal (left) and the universal (right) friction dominated regimes for data corresponding to Fig.5. (13a)  $\epsilon_u \sqrt{\text{Ra}^3 \text{Pr}}$  vs  $\text{Re}^3 \text{Pr}^2$ . The black dashed line corresponds to the GL prediction  $\epsilon_u \sim \text{Re}^3(\text{Pr/Ra})^{3/2}$ . (13b) Compensated plot  $\epsilon_u \sqrt{\text{Ra}^3 \text{Pr}}/\text{Re}^3 \text{Pr}^2$  vs  $\text{Re}^3 \text{Pr}^2$ .

#### 358 4. Conclusion

In this letter, we investigated scaling laws in the Homogeneous Rayleigh Bénard (HRB) equations through a new mathematical framework ("log-lattice"). Using a modified DOPRI solver, we are able to explore a range of parameters and wave-numbers way beyond what is accessible in direct numerical simulations of the equations. By adding a large-scale friction to the HRB equations, we are able to solve the issue of exponentially diverging solutions. This large scale friction become non-negligible when the fluid become turbulent enough, so that total energy balance depart from the energy balance considered in GL theory, where no friction is present. Despite this, we still observe scaling law for Nu and Pr that are very close to the universal turbulent predictions of Grossmann-Lohse (GL) theory: Nu ~ Ra<sup>1/2</sup> Pr<sup>1/2</sup>, Re ~ Ra<sup>1/2</sup> Pr<sup>-1/2</sup>,  $\epsilon_{\theta}$  ~ Re(Pr/Ra)<sup>1/2</sup>,  $\epsilon_{u}$  ~ Re<sup>3</sup>(Pr/Ra)<sup>3/2</sup> for an important range of parameters, corresponding to situations where the thermal friction is non-negligible and the kinetic friction does not vary significantly as a function of the parameters. This is obtained at large enough Ra and for Pr depending on the value of Ra.

In addition to this regime, we also observe another turbulent friction dominated regime at  $Pr \ll 1$ . This regime has no simple and universal dependence with the parameter, and depends on the variations of the kinetic friction with the parameters.

Our observation show that the inclusion of friction, which is necessary to obtain stationary regimes in the HRB framework, complexifies the phase space but nevertheless allows for the existence of a universal turbulent regime, where scaling laws are very close to the GL friction-less theoretical laws. In some geophysical or astrophysical situations, large scale friction arises due to rotation (Ekman friction), stratification (Rayleigh friction) or magnetic field (Hartman friction), and the two scaling regimes we find (one universal, and one nonuniversal) may be relevant and could be explored within the log-lattice framework.

More generally, we believe that log-lattices, with their unique performances in terms of 382 numerical complexity, due to a spectrally sparse representation and strong mathematical 383 qualities, have a great potential in numerical simulations of geophysical or astrophysical 384 flows. However, as they are still in their infancy, many different paths would benefit from 385 being explored to better understand their strengths and weaknesses. This in particular includes 386 a better understanding of the influence of the numerical scheme which, as discussed in the 387 supplementary materials, may misrepresent the viscosity at high wavenumbers. We believe 388 that methods such as Whalen et al. (2015) could prove most useful in that regard. Other topics 389 of interest include the behavior of observables when  $\lambda \to 1$  and the addition of the k = 0390 mode would prove very interesting to study. Likewise, in a similar spirit as was done for 391 the REWA model in Grossmann et al. (1996), a detailed comparison of DNS and log-lattice 392 results (which is far from trivial, as there is room for interpretation as to the mathematical 393 meaning of the fields simulated on a log-lattice) would be highly useful. 394

Acknowledgements. We thank A. Mailybaev and C. Campolina for initiating us to the log-lattice computations, and for stimulating discussions.

397 Funding. This work received funding from the Ecole Polytechnique, from ANR EXPLOIT, grant agreement

398 no. ANR-16-CE06-0006-01 and ANR TILT grant agreement no. ANR-20-CE30-0035.

399 Declaration of interests. The authors report no conflict of interest.

#### REFERENCES

- AHLERS, GUENTER, GROSSMANN, SIEGFRIED & LOHSE, DETLEF 2009 Heat transfer and large scale dynamics
   in turbulent Rayleigh-Bénard convection. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 81, 503–537.
- BIFERALE, LUCA 2003 Shell models of energy cascade in turbulence. Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics 35,
   441–468.
- BORUE, VADIM & ORSZAG, STEVEN A 1997 Turbulent convection driven by a constant temperature gradient.
   Journal of Scientific computing 12 (3), 305–351.
- 406 BOUILLAUT, VINCENT, LEPOT, SIMON, AUMAÎTRE, SÉBASTIEN & GALLET, BASILE 2019 Transition to the 407 ultimate regime in a radiatively driven convection experiment. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **861**, R5.
- BRANDENBURG, AXEL 1992 Energy spectra in a model for convective turbulence. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 69, 605–608.
- CALZAVARINI, E., DOERING, C. R., GIBBON, J. D., LOHSE, D., TANABE, A. & TOSCHI, F. 2006 Exponentially
   growing solutions in homogeneous Rayleigh-Bénard convection. *Phys. Rev. E* 73, 035301.
- 412 CALZAVARINI, E., LOHSE, D. & TOSCHI, F. 2007 Homogeneous Rayleigh-Bénard Convection. In Progress in

16

- *Turbulence II* (ed. Martin Oberlack, George Khujadze, Silke Günther, Tanja Weller, Michael Frewer,
   Joachim Peinke & Stephan Barth), pp. 181–184. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- 415 CALZAVARINI, ENRICO, LOHSE, DETLEF, TOSCHI, FEDERICO & TRIPICCIONE, RAFFAELE 2005 Rayleigh and 416 Prandtl number scaling in the bulk of Rayleigh–Bénard turbulence. *Physics of Fluids* **17** (5), 055107,
- 417 arXiv: https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1884165.
- CAMPOLINA, CIRO S. & MAILYBAEV, ALEXEI A. 2018 Chaotic Blowup in the 3D Incompressible Euler
   Equations on a Logarithmic Lattice. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 121, 064501.
- 420 CAMPOLINA, CIRO S & MAILYBAEV, ALEXEI A 2021 Fluid dynamics on logarithmic lattices. *Nonlinearity* 421 34 (7), 4684–4715.
- CASTAING, B., RUSAOUEN, E., SALORT, J. & CHILLA, F. 2017 Turbulent heat transport regimes in a channel.
   *Phys. Rev. Fluids* 2, 062801.
- CHAVANNE, X., CHILLÀ, F., CASTAING, B., HÉBRAL, B., CHABAUD, B. & CHAUSSY, J. 1997 Observation of
   the Ultimate Regime in Rayleigh-Bénard Convection. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 79, 3648–3651.
- CHING, EMILY S. C. & Ko, T. C. 2008 Ultimate-state scaling in a shell model for homogeneous turbulent
   convection. *Phys. Rev. E* 78, 036309.
- CILIBERTO, S. & LAROCHE, C. 1999 Random Roughness of Boundary Increases the Turbulent Convection
   Scaling Exponent. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82, 3998–4001.
- 430 DOERING, CHARLES R. & CONSTANTIN, PETER 1996 Variational bounds on energy dissipation in 431 incompressible flows. III. Convection. *Phys. Rev. E* **53**, 5957–5981.
- FRISCH, URIEL, POMYALOV, ANNA, PROCACCIA, ITAMAR & RAY, SAMRIDDHI SANKAR 2012 Turbulence in
   Noninteger Dimensions by Fractal Fourier Decimation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 108, 074501.
- GLOAGUEN, C., LÉORAT, J., POUQUET, A. & GRAPPIN, R. 1985 A scalar model for MHD turbulence. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* 17 (2), 154–182.
- GROSSMANN, SIEGFRIED & LOHSE, DETLEF 2000 Scaling in thermal convection: a unifying theory. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 407, 27–56.
- GROSSMANN, SIEGFRIED & LOHSE, DETLEF 2011 Multiple scaling in the ultimate regime of thermal
   convection. *Physics of Fluids* 23 (4), 045108, arXiv: https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3582362.
- GROSSMANN, SIEGFRIED, LOHSE, DETLEF, L'VOV, VICTOR & PROCACCIA, ITAMAR 1994 Finite size corrections
  to scaling in high Reynolds number turbulence. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 73, 432–435.
- GROSSMANN, SIEGFRIED, LOHSE, DETLEF & REEH, ACHIM 1996 Developed Turbulence: From Full
  Simulations to Full Mode Reductions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 5369–5372.
- JIANG, HECHUAN, WANG, DONGPU, LIU, SHUANG & SUN, CHAO 2022 Experimental Evidence for the Existence
   of the Ultimate Regime in Rapidly Rotating Turbulent Thermal Convection. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 129, 204502.
- KAWANO, KOKI, MOTOKI, SHINGO, SHIMIZU, MASAKI & KAWAHARA, GENTA 2021 Ultimate heat transfer in
  'wall-bounded' convective turbulence. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 914, A13.
- KRAICHNAN, ROBERT H. 1962 Turbulent Thermal Convection at Arbitrary Prandtl Number. *The Physics of Fluids* 5 (11), 1374–1389, arXiv: https://aip.scitation.org/doi/pdf/10.1063/1.1706533.
- LANOTTE, ALESSANDRA S., BENZI, ROBERTO, MALAPAKA, SHIVA K., TOSCHI, FEDERICO & BIFERALE, LUCA
  2015 Turbulence on a Fractal Fourier Set. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 115, 264502.
- LEPOT, SIMON, AUMAÎTRE, SÉBASTIEN & GALLET, BASILE 2018 Radiative heating achieves the ultimate regime
   of thermal convection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115 (36), 8937–8941, arXiv:
   https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1806823115.
- LOHSE, DETLEF & TOSCHI, FEDERICO 2003 Ultimate State of Thermal Convection. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 90, 034502.
- MALKUS, W. V. R. & CHANDRASEKHAR, SUBRAHMANYAN 1954 The heat transport and
  spectrum of thermal turbulence. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences* 225 (1161), 196–212, arXiv:
  https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/pdf/10.1098/rspa.1954.0197.
- 462 MOTOKI, SHINGO, KAWAHARA, GENTA & SHIMIZU, MASAKI 2022 Steady thermal convection
  463 representing the ultimate scaling. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*464 *A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 380 (2225), 20210037, arXiv:
  465 https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/pdf/10.1098/rsta.2021.0037.
- PAWAR, SHASHIKANT S. & ARAKERI, JAYWANT H. 2016 Two regimes of flux scaling in axially homogeneous
   turbulent convection in vertical tube. *Phys. Rev. Fluids* 1, 042401.
- PUMIR, ALAIN & SHRAIMAN, BORIS I. 1995 Persistent Small Scale Anisotropy in Homogeneous Shear Flows.
   *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 3114–3117.

- 18
- ROCHE, PHILIPPE-E 2020 The ultimate state of convection: a unifying picture of very high Rayleigh numbers
   experiments. *New Journal of Physics* 22 (7), 073056.
- RUSAOUËN, E., LIOT, O., CASTAING, B., SALORT, J. & CHILLA, F. 2018 Thermal transfer in Rayleigh–Bénard
  cell with smooth or rough boundaries. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 837, 443–460.
- SCHMIDT, LAURA E., CALZAVARINI, ENRICO, LOHSE, DETLEF, TOSCHI, FEDERICO & VERZICCO, ROBERTO 2012
   Axially homogeneous Rayleigh–Bénard convection in a cylindrical cell. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 691, 52–68.
- 477 SPIEGEL, EDWARD A 1963 A Generalization of the Mixing-Length Theory of Turbulent Convection. *The* 478 Astrophysical Journal 138, 216.
- STEVENS, BJORN, DUAN, JIANJUN, MCWILLIAMS, JAMES C., MÜNNICH, MATTHIAS & NEELIN, J. DAVID 2002
   Entrainment, Rayleigh Friction, and Boundary Layer Winds over the Tropical Pacific. *Journal of Climate* 15 (1), 30 44.
- 482 SUKORIANSKY, SEMION, GALPERIN, BORIS & CHEKHLOV, ALEXEI 1999 Large scale drag representation
  483 in simulations of two-dimensional turbulence. *Physics of Fluids* 11 (10), 3043–3053, arXiv:
  484 https://doi.org/10.1063/1.870163.
- URBAN, P., HANZELKA, P., KRÁLÍK, T., MACEK, M., MUSILOVÁ, V. & SKRBEK, L. 2019 Elusive transition to
   the ultimate regime of turbulent Rayleigh-Bénard convection. *Phys. Rev. E* 99, 011101.
- 487 WHALEN, PATRICK, BRIO, MOYSEY & MOLONEY, JEROME V 2015 Exponential time-differencing with 488 embedded Runge–Kutta adaptive step control. *Journal of Computational Physics* **280**, 579–601.
- YEUNG, P. K., SREENIVASAN, K. R. & POPE, S. B. 2018 Effects of finite spatial and temporal resolution in direct numerical simulations of incompressible isotropic turbulence. *Phys. Rev. Fluids* 3, 064603.
- ZHU, XIAOJUE, MATHAI, VARGHESE, STEVENS, RICHARD JAM, VERZICCO, ROBERTO & LOHSE, DETLEF 2019*a* Reply to "Absence of Evidence for the Ultimate Regime in Two-Dimensional Rayleigh-Benard
   Convection". *Physical Review Letters* 123 (25), 259402.
- ZHU, XIAOJUE, MATHAI, VARGHESE, STEVENS, RICHARD J. A. M., VERZICCO, ROBERTO & LOHSE, DETLEF
   2018 Transition to the Ultimate Regime in Two-Dimensional Rayleigh-Bénard Convection. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 120, 144502.
- 497 ZHU, XIAOJUE, STEVENS, RICHARD J. A. M., SHISHKINA, OLGA, VERZICCO, ROBERTO & LOHSE, DETLEF 498 2019b N $u \sim Ra^{1/2}$  scaling enabled by multiscale wall roughness in Rayleigh-Bénard turbulence. 499 Journal of Fluid Mechanics **869**, R4.
- ZOU, SHUFAN & YANG, YANTAO 2021 Realizing the ultimate scaling in convection turbulence by spatially
   decoupling the thermal and viscous boundary layers. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 919, R3.