On finite amplitude rotational waves in viscous shear flows

W.R.C. Phillips

January 8, 1997

Department of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801-2935, USA.

Abstract

Growing finite-amplitude initially spanwise-independent two-dimensional rotational waves and their nonlinear interaction with unidirectional viscous shear flows of various strengths are considered. Both primary and secondary instabilities are studied, but only secondary instabilities are permitted to vary in the spanwise direction. A generalized Lagrangian-mean formulation is employed to describe wave-mean interactions and a separate theory is constructed to account for the back effect of the developing mean flow on the wave field. Viscosity is seen to significantly complicate calculation of the back effect. The primary instability is seen to act as a platform for, and catalyst to, secondary instabilities. The analysis leads to an eigenvalue problem for the initial growth of the secondary instability; this being a generalization of the eigenvalue problem constructed by Craik [7] for inviscid neutral waves. Two inviscid secondary instability mechanisms to longitudinal vortex form are observed: the first has as its basis the Craik-Leibovich type-2 mechanism. The second, which is as yet unproven, requires that both the wave- and flow-field distort in concert at all levels of shear. Both mechanisms excite exponential growth on a convective rather than diffusive scale in the presence of neutral waves, but growing waves alter that growth rate.

1 Introduction

Fluid flow phenomena whose motions exhibit both mean and fluctuating parts are commonplace in Nature and engineering, ranging from water waves propagating on a shear current, to Tollmien-Schlichting waves in a transitory boundary layer. Important in each case is an understanding of the nonlinear processes that couple the

---

mean and fluctuating motions, and moreover the secondary and possible tertiary phenomena attributable to the nonlinear rectification of those oscillatory motions: *e.g.* modifications to the mean flow as a result of the waves; and the back effect, if any, of those mean flow modifications on the wave field.

Crucial to such studies are quantities which follow individual fluid particles; a task for which the Eulerian equations of mean motion are poorly suited. Indeed, Eulerian-mean vorticity as defined by Reynolds averaging has no simple conservative properties even when viscosity is ignored and thus acts to conceal the role played by nonlinear rectification (in its guise as Stokes drift) in vortex line deformation.

The quest for a more rational way to separate 'wave' from 'mean flow' and to define wave-mean interactions culminated, following much effort [3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 33] (and others), with the generalized Lagrangian-mean (GLM) equations of Andrews & McIntyre [1]. These equations describe the back effect of oscillatory disturbances upon the mean state and are exact provided the mapping between the true Lagrangian and the reference GLM remains invertible. Of course GLM still describes mean motions and is therefore conceptually equivalent to Reynolds averaging, but it describes Lagrangian aspects of the motion from an Eulerian framework and is consequently able to capture structural aspects of the flow.

Of interest in the present work are mean structures that arise in unidirectional viscous shear layers (of various strengths) owing to the presence of unstable or neutral finite-amplitude rotational waves (that are initially spanwise independent), and specifically the evolution equations that describe the aetiology of such structures. Also of interest are connections between the GLM approach and more conventional approaches to describe primary and secondary instability in bounded shear layers, with a view to determine which is more efficient.

1.1 Previous work

Mean structures that arise in wave-mean interactions of this ilk were first investigated by Craik [5] and Leibovich [18], who sought to model Langmuir circulations. These are organized convective motions that form in the surface layer of open bodies of water when winds of moderate strength blow over them. The motions take the form of longitudinal vortices that align with the wind and act at the free surface to concentrate flotsam and various organic films into clearly visible streaks or windrows. Craik and Leibovich considered $O(\epsilon)$ neutral irrotational waves interacting with an $O(\epsilon^2)$ unidirectional Eulerian mean shear flow. They found the interaction unstable to longitudinal vortex form *via* an instability now known as CL2, or Craik-Leibovich type-2 (see §4).

CL2 continues to operate in stronger shear. But although only minor modifications to the theory are required in $O(\epsilon)$ shear, that is not the case for $O(1)$ shear flows, where the back effect of the mean flow modification upon the wave field must be explicitly calculated (Craik [7]). In essence, waves do not drive CL2 [22] but act through the pseudomomentum as a catalyst: This means that the magnitude of the mean flow modification is bound not by the strength of the waves but by the magnitude of the pre-existing vorticity in the initial state. With sufficiently strong pre-existing

vorticity, therefore, the mean flow modification acts to distort the waves. Of course the detailed kinematics of the instability mechanism are less clear with $O(1)$ shear than with $O(\epsilon^2)$, though the seminal idea of the CL2 instability remains within the theory and for this reason we denote the former CL2-$O(\epsilon^2)$ and the latter CL2-$O(1)$.

In order to construct an inviscid theory for $O(1)$ shear flows in the presence of $O(\epsilon)$ rotational neutral waves, Craik employed the GLM equations and found the resulting eigenvalue problem for longitudinal vortices far more complicated than its counterpart for weaker shear; requiring *inter alia*, a further differential equation to account for wave distortion. That notwithstanding, Craik was able to obtain definite results analytically to demonstrate the existence of longitudinal vortex instability when the spanwise spacing of the vortices is small; and this technique was extended to a different, wider class of flows, by Phillips & Shen [29], who show the ubiquity of this instability. Detailed numerical results by Phillips & Wu [30] and Phillips, Wu & Lumley [31] concur, and further indicate that wave distortion acts (i), to diminish catalytic action for all but the shortest waves; and (ii), to suppress the instability markedly if the waves are sufficiently long. Furthermore, by comparison with the data of Gong, Taylor & Dörnbrack [13], Phillips *et al* determine that CL2-$O(1)$ is physically realizable.

Questions then arise regarding the influence of viscosity and growing waves on the instability, and these set the stage for the present study in which, as a precursor to future numerical work, we construct the relevant eigenvalue problems.

1.2   Scope of the present work

We begin with a brief review of GLM (§2) and then specialize the GLM-equations to the problem of $O(\epsilon)$ growing (or decaying) waves interacting with a unidirectional viscous shear flows whose strength may range from $O(\epsilon^2)$ to $O(1)$. The waves are initially two-dimensional and the shear flow is assumed composed of two parts (§3): one determined by the primary instability, which by definition can have no spanwise dependence, the other by a secondary instability, which is allowed to vary in the spanwise direction (*c.f.* Orszag & Patera [26]). In §4 we consider secondary instabilities which may arise in such circumstances: two are observed, CL2 (§4.1) and a possibly new instability to longitudinal vortex form, in which both the mean velocity and wave field distort in concert (§4.2).

Wave distortion owing to the secondary flow arising in $O(1)$ shear is considered in §5.3 and the resulting correction to the pseudomomentum field in §5.4. The ensuing formulation is significantly more complicated than its inviscid counterpart in $O(1)$ shear, because the second-order Rayleigh-Craik equation and its algebraic accomplice (which together account for wave distortion in Craik's theory) are replaced by two ordinary differential equations, one of fourth-order and the other of second. The resulting eigenvalue problems are discussed in §6.

Finally, to give the analysis physical basis, we shall view it from the context of two disparate physical problems: First, the growth of Langmuir cells beneath wind driven growing waves, where the waves typically are $O(\epsilon)$ and the shear can range from $O(\epsilon^2)$ to $O(1)$ [23]; and second, to compare our findings with well established

3

previous results, we look at plane Poiseuille flow, where the shear is typically $O(1)$.

2 The generalized Lagrangian-mean formulation

2.1 Background

Andrews & McIntyre's [1] generalized Lagrangian mean (GLM) equations are an exact and very general Lagrangian-mean description of the back effect of oscillatory disturbances upon the mean state. The Lagrangian-mean velocity so described, however, is not the 'mean following a single fluid particle', but rather the velocity field describing trajectories about which the fluctuating particle motions have zero mean, when *any* averaging process, be it temporal, spatial, ensemble or other is applied. To express ideas like 'steady mean flow', an Eulerian description of the Lagrangian mean, with position $\mathbf{x}$ and time t as independent variables, is employed. Hence the GLM description is really a hybrid Eulerian-Lagrangian description of wave mean flow interactions. Andrews & McIntyre emphasize the equations are *exact* and thus valid for waves of all amplitudes, although for practical purposes they have so far been restricted to waves of small amplitude, measured by a dimensionless parameter ϵ, so that any displacement $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ from the mean trajectory is $O(\epsilon)$ compared to the wavelength of the wavefield.

To define an exact Lagrangian-mean operator $\langle\ \rangle^L, (\ \bar{}\ )^L$, corresponding to any given Eulerian-mean operator $\langle\ \rangle, (\ \bar{}\ )$, necessitates defining with equal generality an exact, disturbance-associated particle displacement field $\boldsymbol{\xi}(\mathbf{x}, t)$. For any scalar or tensor field, φ, say, of any rank, it is then possible to write

$$\langle\varphi(\mathbf{x}, t)\rangle^L = \langle\varphi^\xi(\mathbf{x}, t)\rangle \quad \text{where} \quad \varphi^\xi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \varphi(\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\xi}, t).$$

Then provided the mapping

$$\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\xi} \tag{1}$$

is invertible, there is, for any given $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$, a unique 'related velocity field' $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}, t)$, such that when the point $\mathbf{x}$ moves with velocity $\mathbf{v}$ the point $\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\xi}$ moves with the actual fluid velocity $\mathbf{u}^\xi$, as

$$(\partial/\partial t + \mathbf{v} \bullet \nabla)[\mathbf{x} + \xi] = \mathbf{u}^\xi. \tag{2}$$

Further, provided $\langle\boldsymbol{\xi}(\mathbf{x}, t)\rangle = 0$ and $\langle\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}, t)\rangle = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}, t)$, then $\mathbf{v}$ is the Lagrangian-mean velocity, $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^L$, which is related to the Eulerian-mean velocity by the generalized Stokes drift $\bar{\mathbf{d}}$, as $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^L = \bar{\mathbf{u}} + \bar{\mathbf{d}}$. So, in terms of the Lagrangian-mean material derivative, $\bar{D}^L = \partial/\partial t + \bar{\mathbf{u}}^L \bullet \nabla$, equation (2) becomes

$$\bar{D}^L \boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbf{u}^\ell, \tag{3}$$

where the Lagrangian disturbance velocity $\mathbf{u}^\ell$ is given by $\mathbf{u}^\ell(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathbf{u}^\xi - \bar{\mathbf{u}}^L$, such that $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^\ell = 0$.

4

2.2 The generalized Lagrangian-mean equations

For homentropic flows of constant density in a non-rotating reference frame, the GLM momentum and continuity equations are:

$$\bar{D}^L(\bar{u}_i^L - \bar{p}_i) + \bar{u}_{k,i}^L(\bar{u}_k^L - \bar{p}_k) + \pi_{,i} = \mathcal{X}_i \quad , \tag{4}$$

$$\pi = \frac{\overline{\wp_{,i}}}{\rho} + \bar{\Phi}_i^L - \frac{1}{2}\overline{u_j^\xi u_j^\xi}$$

$$\text{and} \quad \bar{D}^L\tilde{\rho} + \tilde{\rho}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\bullet\bar{\mathbf{u}}^L = 0. \tag{5}$$

Here repeated indices imply summation and commas denote partial differentiation.

Observe that the non-linear forcing of the mean flow is expressed in terms of a vector wave property $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$, whose ith component is

$$\bar{p}_i = -\langle\xi_{j,i}u_j^\ell\rangle. \tag{6}$$

The vector $\bar{\mathbf{p}} = \bar{p}_i(\mathbf{x},t)$ is the pseudomentum per unit mass and should not be confused with the pressure $\wp$. Further, Φ is the force potential per unit mass and $\mathcal{X}$ is a function which allows for dissipative forces. In the present work Φ is zero and the contribution due to the viscous force $\nu\nabla^2\mathbf{u}$ is

$$\mathcal{X}_i = \nu[\bar{u}_{i,kk}^L + \langle\xi_{j,i}u_{j,kk}^\ell\rangle]. \tag{7}$$

The density $\varrho(\mathbf{x},t)$ of the GLM flow $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^L(\mathbf{x},t)$ is a mean quantity and is defined to satisfy (5); furthermore it is connected to the actual fluid density ρ^ξ by

$$\varrho = \rho^\xi J; \quad J = det\{\delta_{ij} + \xi_{i,j}\}$$

where J is the Jacobian of the mapping $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x} + \xi$ and δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta. Note that restricting attention to flows of constant density does not usually give rise to constant ϱ; it does, however, permit the mass conservation equation (5) to be written as

$$\bar{D}^L J + J\boldsymbol{\nabla}\bullet(\bar{\mathbf{q}} + \bar{\mathbf{p}}) = 0. \tag{8}$$

At this point it is helpful to write (4) in a form akin to Navier Stokes, and we do so by introducing the dependent variable $\bar{q}_i = \bar{u}_i^L - \bar{p}_i$ while noting that

$$\bar{q}_j(\bar{q}_j + \bar{p}_j)_{,i} + (\bar{q}_j + \bar{p}_j)\bar{q}_{i,j} = -(\bar{q}_j + \bar{p}_j)(\bar{q}_{j,i} - \bar{q}_{i,j}) + ((\bar{q}_j + \bar{p}_j)\bar{q}_j)_{,i}$$

to find

$$\bar{q}_{i,t} + \bar{q}_j\bar{q}_{i,j} - \bar{p}_j(\bar{q}_{j,i} - \bar{q}_{i,j}) + \Pi_{,i} = \mathcal{X}_i \quad , \tag{9}$$

where

$$\Pi = \frac{1}{2}\bar{q}_j\bar{q}_j + \bar{p}_j\bar{q}_j + \pi.$$

We shall also introduce the vorticity-associated vector field $\mho = \boldsymbol{\nabla}\times\bar{\mathbf{q}}$; then noting (5) and taking the curl of (9), yields

$$\mho_{i,t} + (\bar{q}_j + \bar{p}_j)\mho_{i,j} = \mho_j(\bar{q}_i + \bar{p}_i)_{,j} - \mho_i(\bar{q}_j + \bar{p}_j)_{,j} + \varepsilon_{ijk}\mathcal{X}_{k,j} \tag{10}$$

where ε_{ijk} is the alternating tensor.

5

2.3 Small amplitude waves

Various simplifications occur when dealing with incompressible, Boussinesq flows in which ϵ (see §3) is characteristic of the initial disturbance. First, the Jacobian takes the form [1]

$$J = 1 - \frac{1}{2}\langle \xi_j \xi_k \rangle_{,jk} + O(\epsilon^3) \tag{11}$$

while the Stokes drift

$$\bar{d}_i = \langle \xi_j \breve{u}_{i,j} \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle \xi_j \xi_k \rangle \bar{u}_{i,jk} + O(\epsilon^3). \tag{12}$$

Second because the Eulerian fluctuating velocity is $\breve{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \bar{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}, t)$, the small amplitude Lagrangian velocity perturbation follows as

$$u_j^\ell = \breve{u}_j + \xi_k \bar{u}_{j,k} + O(\epsilon^2); \tag{13}$$

and finally the viscous contribution (7) simplifies noticeably, as we shall see in §3.2.

3 Imposed shear of specified strength and $O(\epsilon)$ waves

We should like to apply the GLM formulation to a class of unidirectional shear flows that have imposed on them, or are unstable to, small amplitude waves that are independent of spanwise direction; and of particular interest is the instability of the ensuing wave-mean interaction to longitudinal vortex form. Our intent in the first instance is to restrict only the slope of the waves but remain as general as possible in regard to the level of the imposed shear. In consequence the ensuing equations are relevant to a range of bounded and unbounded flows, but it behoves us to discuss them with regard to a specific physical problems, viz Langmuir circulations beneath growing wind driven surface gravity waves and plane Poiseuille flow.

Consider then the interaction between a unidirectional shear flow with characteristic velocity $\mathcal{V}$ and two-dimensional straightcrested waves of wavelength λ that propagate in (or opposite to) the direction of the basic flow. The amplitude of the waves is assumed to grow from infinitesimal to finite, but we require their slope ϵ to satisfy $\epsilon < O(1)$ at all times. Orbital velocities are thus characterized by $\epsilon\mathcal{C}$, where $\mathcal{C}$ is a typical phase speed. Furthermore we can write $\mathcal{V}/\mathcal{C} = O(\epsilon^s)$ and $\mathcal{L}/\lambda = O(\epsilon^\beta)$, where $s \geq 0$ while β is real and of either sign. We next suppose that the characteristic thickness of the shear layer is $\mathcal{L}$ and make variables dimensionless with respect to $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{C}$. Then the level of shear is $O(\epsilon^s)$ and in the event viscosity plays a role, the Reynolds number $R \equiv \mathcal{L}\mathcal{C}/\nu$. Finally we invoke space coordinates (x, y, z) and choose a reference frame that moves in the x-direction with the phase speed of the waves c_r^w.

We use uppercase letters to denote quantities pertaining to the primary flow, which by design is devoid of spanwise (y) dependence, and lower case letters otherwise, while an overbar on the unscaled variable denotes a streamwise average. Our unperturbed Eulerian shear flow in $[z_1, z_2]$ is then $\bar{\mathbf{U}}(z, t) + \mathrm{i}c_r^w = \epsilon^s[U, 0, 0]$.

Envisage now an $O(\epsilon)$ wave field $\check{\mathbf{U}}$ that interacts with the primary shear flow to excite streamwise averaged spanwise varying Eulerian velocity perturbations $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$, whose strength relative to the primary shear flow is measured by the parameter Δ, and express the resulting flow field in GLM variables. The outcome is the velocity associated vector field $\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \bar{\mathbf{Q}} + \tilde{\mathbf{q}}$, which we expand as

$$\bar{\mathbf{q}}(y, z, t) = \epsilon^s \{ [Q_1, 0, \epsilon^{2-s} Q_3] + \Delta [q_1, \epsilon^n q_2, \epsilon^n q_3] + ... \} \quad (n \geq 0), \tag{14}$$

and an affiliated scalar field Π which includes the pressure as $\epsilon^s [\mathcal{P}(x, z, t) + \Delta \wp(x, y, z, t) + ...]$. Note that the power n can have values other than zero and that n is related to s as we shall see in §4.

In the first instance the waves produce $O(\epsilon^2)$ primary fields of pseudomomentum $\bar{\mathbf{P}}$ and Stokes drift $\bar{\mathbf{D}}$. So since the Eulerian and Lagrangian mean velocity fields are related through $\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \bar{\mathbf{u}} + \bar{\mathbf{d}} - \bar{\mathbf{p}}$, we see that $Q_3 = D_3 - P_3$, which explains the extra primary mean field component in (14) (in contrast to the primary Eulerian flow which by design has only one component). Moreover the $O(\epsilon^s \Delta)$ axial velocity perturbation (owing to the interaction between the waves and mean flow) may in turn act to distort the wave field and produce an $O(\epsilon^{s+2} \Delta)$ spanwise varying component of pseudomomentum [7]. So with no loss of generality we write $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$ or $\bar{\mathbf{d}}$ as $\bar{\mathbf{P}} + \tilde{\mathbf{p}}$, expand as

$$\bar{\mathbf{p}}(y, z, t) = \epsilon^2 \{ [P_1, 0, P_3] + \epsilon^s \Delta [p_1, \epsilon^n p_2, \epsilon^n p_3 + ...] \}, \tag{15}$$

and with (14) substitute into (8) and (9). But before doing so, it is instructive to first explore the kinematic limitations of GLM and determine how GLM is manifest in the presence of viscosity.

3.1   Conservation of mass

The validity and indeed strength of GLM stems from the mapping (1), but because (1) must remain invertible it is also, ironically, GLM's chief restriction; a second, less problematic occurrence with GLM is that GLM flows are usually divergent. Both difficulties are evident kinematically from (8): to wit

$$-\bar{\mathrm{D}}^L \ln J = \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial D_3}{\partial z} + \epsilon^{s+2+n} \Delta \left(\frac{\partial d_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial d_3}{\partial z} \right). \tag{16}$$

Observe that the mean field $\bar{\mathbf{q}} + \bar{\mathbf{p}}$ is divergence free to $O(\epsilon^2)$ only if $D_3 = 0$, which necessitates neutral waves, i.e. waves with a steady amplitude field ([20, 21]; see also §5). It also requires the absence of critical layers, where D_3 (for monochromatic neutral waves) is unbounded [see (45) and (47)]. Of course singularities do not exist within the flow field at the critical layer; rather the Jacobian J is zero there, indicating the mapping (1) is no longer invertible. Physically, critical layers are thin layers of fluid centered on levels at which the phase velocity of the disturbance is equal to the basic flow; and the fact that $J = 0$ at critical layers means the averaging procedure breaks down there. Of course neutral waves give rise to streamlines that form closed 'cats eyes' near critical layers, while streamlines due to marginally stable waves roll up

[34]. In consequence $J = 0$ means that the averaging procedure gives simple results only for open nonfolded streamlines. Of course such restrictions need not negate the usefulness of GLM; but they do mean we must restrict attention to flows, or at least regions of the flow, in which the streamlines are not folded.

Lastly (16) notwithstanding, we are at liberty to write $\nabla \bullet \bar{\mathbf{u}} = \nabla \bullet (\bar{\mathbf{q}} + \bar{\mathbf{p}} - \bar{\mathbf{d}}) = 0$, and introduce the perturbation Stream function ψ as

$$q_2 = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} + \epsilon^2 (d_2 - p_2) \quad \text{and} \quad q_3 = -\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} + \epsilon^2 (d_3 - p_3). \tag{17}$$

Thus for calculation purposes, at least for the class of problems under consideration, the effect of a divergent mean flow field is minor.

3.2   The viscous contribution

Potentially daunting is the calculation of the Lagrangian-mean contribution to the viscous force. Leibovich [19] has considered this in the context of $O(\epsilon^2)$ shear in the presence of a wave field that is irrotational to $O(\epsilon)$, and found that $\mathcal{X}_i$ reduces to $R^{-1}\{\nabla^2 \bar{\mathbf{u}} + O(\epsilon^4 \mathcal{L}^2/\lambda^2)\}$. Here we should like to allow for rotational waves and all levels of shear with R constant. As it happens, again for the class of problems under consideration, the determination of $\mathcal{X}_i$ is usually, but by no means always, straightforward.

We begin with a Taylor expansion of the bracketed portion of (7), to wit

$$\nabla^2 \bar{u}_i + \langle \xi_j \nabla^2 u_{i,j} \rangle + \langle \xi_{j,i} \nabla^2 \breve{u}_j \rangle + \langle \xi_{j,i} \nabla^2 (\xi_k \bar{u}_{j,k}) \rangle + O(\epsilon^{2+s+\beta}); \tag{18}$$

then on replacing $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ with $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$ (which we can do formally because $\bar{\mathbf{q}} = \bar{\mathbf{u}} + O(\epsilon^2)$), it is evident that the first - and usually dominant - term in (18) becomes

$$\nabla^2 \bar{\mathbf{q}} = O\left(\epsilon^s [1, \Delta, \epsilon^{2-s}]\right).$$

Now although the second term reduces (since $\mathbf{u} = \bar{\mathbf{u}} + \breve{\mathbf{u}}$ and because $\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = 0$) to $\langle \xi_j (\nabla^2 \breve{u}_i)_{,j} \rangle$, the order of $\nabla^2 \breve{\mathbf{u}}$ is determined by the rotational level of the waves, as

$$\nabla^2 \breve{\mathbf{u}} = O(\epsilon^{1+m+2\beta});$$

here we have set m = 0 if the waves are rotational and m = 1 if they are irrotational to $O(\epsilon)$. In consequence the second and third terms in (18) are both $O(\epsilon^{2+m+2\beta})$ and are negligible relative to the first whenever $2 + m + 2\beta > s$. Lastly, the fourth term in (18) is

$$\langle \xi_{j,i} \nabla^2 \xi_k \bar{u}_{j,k} \rangle = O(\epsilon^{2+s}[\frac{\mathcal{L}}{\lambda}, 1, \frac{\lambda}{\mathcal{L}}])$$

and is also negligible relative to the first term provided $\epsilon^2 < \mathcal{L}/\lambda < \epsilon^{-2}$. Indeed terms three and four may be ignored when the waves are irrotational for all admissible s, and for $s \leq 1$ when the waves are rotational, provided $-\frac{1}{2} < \beta < 1$. But both terms must be retained when the waves are rotational and $s = 2$, assuming of course

8

rotational waves exist at $s = 2$. Thus for completeness we write, for both rotational and irrotational waves, that

$$\mathcal{X}_i = R^{-1}[\nabla^2 \bar{q}_i + \bar{F}_i + \bar{G}_i + O(\epsilon^{2+s+2\beta})], \tag{19}$$

where

$$\bar{F}_i = \nabla^2(\bar{p}_i - \bar{d}_i) = \epsilon^2(F_i + \epsilon^{s+\delta n}\Delta\mathcal{F}_i + ...)$$

say, and

$$\bar{G}_i = \langle \xi_j \nabla^2 \breve{u}_{i,j} \rangle + \langle \xi_{j,i} \nabla^2 \breve{u}_j \rangle = \epsilon^{2+m+2\beta}(G_i + +\epsilon^{s+\delta n}\Delta\mathcal{G}_i + ...),$$

where $\delta = 0$ for $i = 1$ and unity otherwise.

Of course (19) recovers Leibovich's result for irrotational waves with $s = 2$, because then $\bar{p}_i = \bar{d}_i + O(\epsilon^4)$ and $\bar{F}_i + \bar{G}_i = O(\epsilon^4 \mathcal{L}^2/\lambda^2)$, but leads to a far more complicated result when $s = 2$ and the waves are rotational.

3.3 The primary flow field

It has long been known that finite amplitude waves act to distort the mean flow from its unperturbed state [25] and we term the unperturbed flow plus this $O(\epsilon^2)$ spanwise independent correction the primary flow field. We determine it by substituting (14) and (15) into (9). Then, on noting that the primary flow field must identically satisfy (9) and because Π_1 is here equal to the mean streamwise pressure gradient, the x-momentum equation takes the form

$$\frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial t} + \epsilon^2 D_3 \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{P}}{\partial x} = R^{-1}[\frac{\partial^2 Q_1}{\partial z^2} + \epsilon^{2-s}F_1 + \epsilon^{2-s+m+2\beta}G_1], \tag{20}$$

while the z-momentum equation becomes

$$\frac{\partial Q_3}{\partial t} + \epsilon^2 \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial Q_3^2}{\partial z} - \epsilon^s P_1 \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial z} + \epsilon^{s-2}\frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial z} = R^{-1}[\frac{\partial^2 Q_3}{\partial z^2} + F_3 + \epsilon^{m+2\beta}G_3]. \tag{21}$$

Observe that although the Stokes drift does not explicitly appear in (9), it is evident from (16) and (20) that D_3, at least, plays an important role. To wit, it is D_3 that acts to distort the mean flow from its unperturbed viscous form, a role associated in Eulerian formulations with the more familiar Reynolds stress.

Of course in the absence of waves and with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions, (20) describes plane Poiseuille flow; alternatively, in the absence of a pressure gradient and with Neumann boundary conditions (20) reduces to a stress Rayleigh problem with relevance to wind driven mean flows. Furthermore, because the wavespeed can exceed $U_{\max}$ in both Poiseuille flow [17] and (in the water) in wind driven flows [24], critical layers can be avoided.

9

3.4 The secondary flow field

Although by definition the secondary flow field varies in the spanwise direction, it is unwise to assume the total contribution of this component is spanwise dependent. Indeed, a consequence of the nonlinear term in (22) is that the spanwise dependent portion can act to support a spanwise independent flow which well exceeds the $O(\epsilon^2)$ modification discussed in §3.3, and thus vastly alter the base flow defined by (20) [14, 15, 16].

To determine the secondary flow we again substitute (14) and (15) into (9), but this time subtract (20), which leads to the $O(\epsilon^s\Delta)$ streamwise evolution equation for q_1:

$$
\frac{\partial q_1}{\partial t} + \epsilon^{s+n}\Delta\left(q_2\frac{\partial q_1}{\partial y} + q_3\frac{\partial q_1}{\partial z}\right) + \epsilon^2 D_3\frac{\partial q_1}{\partial z} + \epsilon^{s+2+n}\Delta\left(p_2\frac{\partial q_1}{\partial y} + p_3\frac{\partial q_1}{\partial z}\right)
$$

$$
+ \epsilon^{s+n}q_3\frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial z} + \epsilon^{s+2+n}p_3\frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial z} = R^{-1}(\nabla^2 q_1 + \epsilon^2\mathcal{F}_1 + \epsilon^{2+m+2\beta}\mathcal{G}_1) \tag{22}
$$

while the same expansions and (10) yield the $O(\epsilon^{s+n}\Delta)$ streamwise component of the vorticity associated vector field:

$$
\frac{\partial \mho_1}{\partial t} + \epsilon^{s+n}\Delta\left(\frac{\partial \mho_1 q_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \mho_1 q_3}{\partial z}\right) + \epsilon^{s+2+n}\Delta\left(\frac{\partial \mho_1 p_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \mho_1 p_3}{\partial z}\right) + \epsilon^2\frac{\partial}{\partial z}(\mho_1 D_3)
$$

$$
+ \epsilon^{2-n}\frac{\partial q_1}{\partial y}\frac{\partial P_1}{\partial z} - \epsilon^{s+2-n}\frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial z}\frac{\partial p_1}{\partial y} + \epsilon^{s+2-n}\Delta\{\frac{\partial q_1}{\partial y}\frac{\partial p_1}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial q_1}{\partial z}\frac{\partial p_1}{\partial y}\}
$$

$$
= R^{-1}(\nabla^2\mho_1 + \epsilon^2\mathcal{H}_1 + \epsilon^{2+m+2\beta}\mathcal{I}_1) \tag{23}
$$

where

$$
\mho_1 = \frac{\partial q_3}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial q_2}{\partial z}, \quad \mathcal{H}_1 = \varepsilon_{1jk}\mathcal{F}_{k,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}_1 = \varepsilon_{1jk}\mathcal{G}_{k,j}.
$$

Finally in terms of more familiar Eulerian variables, the streamwise velocity perturbation is $u_1 = q_1 + \epsilon^2(p_1 - d_1)$, while the streamwise component of vorticity is

$$
\Omega_1 = \mho_1 + \epsilon^2\frac{\partial(d_2 - p_2)}{\partial z} - \epsilon^2\frac{\partial(d_3 - p_3)}{\partial y} = -\nabla^2\psi + O(\epsilon^2). \tag{24}
$$

These indicate that we may identify q_1 with u_1, and $\mho_1$ with Ω_1, only if the appropriate components of wave distortion are negligible.

But the set (22), (23) and (24) is incomplete without knowledge of the pseudo-momentum and thus the wavefield; we shall determine the former in §5, but first it behoves us to discuss situations in which q_1 and $\mho_1$ grow with time.

4 Secondary nonlinear instabilities

Our object is to elicit secondary instabilities which lead to the growth of q_1 and $\mho_1$ with time and we begin with the premise that likely instabilities occur when (22) and

(23) are coupled. Two scenarios, those for which $\partial P_1/\partial z$ is generally non-zero and for which $\partial P_1/\partial z \approx 0$, are evident. Crucial in both instances are nonlinearities owing to the waves interacting both with themselves and the shear flow; measures of these nonlinearities are given by the generalized Stokes drift and the pseudomomentum.

4.1 Case (i): $\frac{\partial P_1}{\partial z} \neq 0$.

When $\partial P_1/\partial z \neq 0$, equations (22) and (23) are coupled via $q_3 \partial Q_1/\partial z$ and $\partial q_1/\partial y \partial P_1/\partial z$, so to explore such coupling we require $n = (2-s)/2$ and rescale time as $\tau = \epsilon^{\frac{s+2}{2}} t$. Then provided $\mathcal{L}/\lambda > O(\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}})$

$$\frac{\partial q_1}{\partial \tau} + \Delta\left(q_2 \frac{\partial q_1}{\partial y} + q_3 \frac{\partial q_1}{\partial z}\right) + \epsilon^{\frac{2-s}{2}} D_3 \frac{\partial q_1}{\partial z} + q_3 \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial z} = \epsilon^{-\frac{s+2}{2}} R^{-1} \nabla^2 q_1 + O(\epsilon^{\frac{2-s}{2}} R^{-1}) \quad (25)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \mho_1}{\partial \tau} + \Delta\left(\frac{\partial \mho_1 q_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \mho_1 q_3}{\partial z}\right) + \epsilon^{\frac{2-s}{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z}(\mho_1 D_3) + \frac{\partial q_1}{\partial y} \frac{\partial P_1}{\partial z} - \epsilon^s \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial z} \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial y}$$

$$+ \epsilon^s \Delta\{\frac{\partial q_1}{\partial y} \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial q_1}{\partial z} \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial y}\} = \epsilon^{-\frac{s+2}{2}} R^{-1} \nabla^2 \mho_1 + O(\epsilon^{\frac{2-s}{2}} R^{-1}) \quad (26)$$

Note that because n varies with s it is evident from (14) that transverse and axial velocity perturbations may differ in order. Accordingly, wave distortion may be ignored for shear of $O(\epsilon)$ or less but plays an important role through p_1 at $O(1)$, where a further equation (see §5) must enter to complete the set (25), (26). That notwithstanding, wave distortion in the y and z directions is $O(\epsilon^{3+\frac{s}{2}}\Delta)$ and may be neglected for all $s \in [0,2]$, allowing us to write

$$\frac{\partial q_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial q_3}{\partial z} = 0 \quad \text{and thus} \quad \mho_1 = -\nabla^2 \psi. \quad (27)$$

In the presence of irrotational neutral ($D_3 = 0$) waves and $O(\epsilon^2)$ shear, P_1 reduces to D_1 and (25, 26) reduce to the set of equations studied by Craik [5] and Leibovich [18], who determined that, subject to homogeneous Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions, q_1 and $\mho_1$ can grow exponentially fast. The resulting instability is known as Craik-Leibovich type 2 or CL2, to which, for reasons discussed in §1, we usually append the level of shear. To occur, CL2-$O(\epsilon^2)$ requires the presence of a wavy disturbance having a sheared pseudomomentum, together with pre-existing vorticity imparting an Eulerian-mean shear in the same sense as the pseudomomentum. Here a kinematic description of (an inviscid flow subject to) the instability is possible: viz, that the Stokes drift gradient causes vortex lines (which move with the fluid) to tilt streamwise wherever the Eulerian-mean shear is laterally distorted, giving rise to a longitudinal component of vorticity and ultimately vortices that grow exponentially fast.

CL2 is thus an inviscid instability, although the $O(\epsilon^{\frac{s+2}{2}})$ growth rate predicted by inviscid theory will be annihilated by viscous damping unless $R \geq O(\epsilon^{-\frac{s+2}{2}})$. Craik

11

and Leibovich did not study growing waves, but as is evident from (25) such waves have the greatest influence on the instability in weak (i.e. $s = 2$) shear; of course CL2 remains the underlying instability mechanism, but because D_3 is a function of time, details of the secondary flow and its growth rate will doubtless be affected. It is shear currents of this order that most commonly occur in the open ocean and it would seem that growing waves, due perhaps to a freshening breeze, may play an important role in the formation of Langmuir circulations hitherto absent, as in the observations reported by Smith [32].

Exponential growth can also occur when $s = 1$ or $s = 0$ [7]. Requirements for instability are as above, although CL2-$O(1)$ further requires that the relative increase in mean flow must exceed the relative increase in wave amplitude in the direction of increasing mean flow [7, 29]. Phillips and Shen [29] have further shown that CL2-$O(1)$ is ubiquitous to a wide range of physically occurring bounded and unbounded flows, and by comparison with the data of Gong et al [13], Phillips et al [31] have determined that CL2-$O(1)$ is physically realizable. Such knowledge begs the question whether the CL2-$O(1)$ instability has a role in the well known secondary instability studied by Orszag & Patera [26]. Recall that both are catalyzed by two-dimensional finite amplitude waves; both require concurrent stretching and tilting of vortex lines that lead to longitudinal vortices which grow exponentially fast on a convective scale; and finally, both are ubiquitous. Indeed, we might well infer that CL2-$O(1)$ and Orszag-Patera are identical instabilities viewed from different reference frames. But not quite yet: Orszag & Patera determine that centrifugal effects play little role in their instability, whereas CL2-$O(\epsilon^2)$, for example, is formally equivalent - albiet in an averaged sense for an $O(\epsilon^2)$ mean curvature, not for an $O(\epsilon)$ local curvature - to the Taylor-Görtler instability [7]. So before making the above inference we must first dispel the notion that CL2-$O(1)$ too is centrifugal.

This we do by considering the root mean square kinetic energy K of each of the Fourier modes in the expansion

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sum_m \sum_n e^{i(m\alpha^* x + nl^* y)} \mathbf{U}_{m,n}(m\alpha^*, nl^*, z, t)$$

so that

$$K(m\alpha^*, nl^*) = \left\{ \int_{z_1}^{z_2} [U_{m,n}^2 + V_{m,n}^2 + W_{m,n}^2] dz \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where α^* and l^* are the fundamental wavenumbers in the x and y directions respectively. Then in view of (30) and (31) it follows that because, for example $\mathbf{U}_{0,1} = O(\epsilon^s \Delta, \epsilon^{s+1} \Delta)$, then

$$K(0, l^*) = O(\epsilon^s \Delta, \epsilon^{s+1} \Delta), \quad K(\alpha^*, 0) = O(\epsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad K(\alpha^*, l^*) = O(\epsilon^{s+1} \Delta).$$

Thus, in $O(\epsilon^2)$ shear, the greatest kinetic energy is to be found in the α^* and higher order modes, as would be expected with a centrifugal instability. But because the extent of the mean flow modification in CL2 is bound by the level of shear and not by the strength of the waves, the measure Δ may exceed ϵ; indeed a useful estimate in the fully nonlinear state is that $\Delta \equiv \epsilon^{s+\frac{1}{2}}$. In consequence $K(0, l^*)$ dominates when

$s = 0$; and because $K(0, l^*)$ comprises modes that are streamwise independent, this form of the instability is not likely to be centrifugal. Thus the Orszag-Patera and CL2-$O(1)$ instabilities have much in common and may well be related.

Hence we may conclude that CL2 is a robust, physically realizable instability whose details vary according to the level of shear and type (i.e. growing or neutral) of waves; and finally that CL2-$O(1)$ and the Orszag-Patera instability have much in common.

4.2 Case (ii): $\frac{\partial P_1}{\partial z} \approx 0$.

Consider now the case for which $\partial P_1/\partial z$ is in general zero. Here (22) and (23) are indirectly coupled through $q_3 \partial Q_1/\partial z$ and $\partial Q_1/\partial z \partial p_1/\partial y$, via the distortion of pseudomomentum by q_1. We thus set $n = 1$ for all s and $\tau = \epsilon^{s+1}t$ giving, for $\mathcal{L}/\lambda > O(\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}})$,

$$\frac{\partial q_1}{\partial \tau} + \Delta \left(q_2 \frac{\partial q_1}{\partial y} + q_3 \frac{\partial q_1}{\partial z} \right) + \epsilon^{1-s} D_3 \frac{\partial q_1}{\partial z} + q_3 \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial z} = \epsilon^{-s-1} R^{-1} \nabla^2 q_1 + O(\epsilon^{1-s} R^{-1}) \quad (28)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mho_1}{\partial \tau} + \Delta \left(\frac{\partial \mho_1 q_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \mho_1 q_3}{\partial z} \right) + \epsilon^{1-s} \frac{\partial}{\partial z}(\mho_1 D_3) - \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial z} \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial y}$$

$$+ \Delta \{ \frac{\partial q_1}{\partial y} \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial q_1}{\partial z} \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial y} \} = \epsilon^{-s-1} R^{-1} \nabla^2 \mho_1 + O(\epsilon^{1-s} R^{-1}) \quad (29)$$

along with (27). The set (28, 29) is reminiscent of equations describing the Benney-Lin [2] instability and for that matter Craik-Leibovich type-1 (see [8]), but these instabilities are fundamentally different, because each assumes an imposed spanwise periodic wave field and initially grow algebraically in time. Here, the imposed wave field is two-dimensional and the equations are coupled not through the dependent variables but rather through wave distortion: that is the velocity field and wave field distort in concert. In the process, vortex lines associated with the primary flow are distorted spanwise and produce streamwise vorticity which may grow, at least initially (provided $D_3 = 0$), exponentially fast. Moreover the instability can occur for all s if $D_3 = 0$, but is restricted to moderate $O(\epsilon)$ or strong $O(1)$ shear if $D_3 \neq 0$. Finally although the instability is inviscid it is subject to annihilation by viscosity unless $R \geq O(\epsilon^{-s-1})$. Of course (as with the $s = 0$ case in §4.1) a further equation must enter to complete the set (28, 29) and we shall proceed to derive such in §5.

But we have as yet no proof that this instability exists: scenarios in which $\partial P_1/\partial z \simeq 0$ require a unique relationship between the wave field and the mean flow. In the case of monochromatic waves, for example, that relationship must not only (in the case of inviscid flow) satisfy the Rayleigh equation but must also ensure the right-hand-side of (46) is constant. In short, admissible wave and mean fields must first be determined as eigensolutions of (33) and (46). This is a nontrivial but tractable problem numerically, although of course the existence of such eigensolutions is no guarantee that all, or indeed any, are unstable to longitudinal vortex form.

13

5 Monochromatic wave fields

In order to close (25, 26) or (28, 29), we must specify the wave field and determine the degree to which it distorts. To help fix ideas we shall consider monochromatic waves that if distorted do so in a spanwise periodic manner as, in Eulerian variables,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\breve{\mathbf{u}} = {}& \epsilon \mathrm{Re}\{g_w(t)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\alpha x}[\phi'(z), 0, -\mathrm{i}\alpha\phi(z)]\} \\
& + \epsilon^{s+1}\Delta\mathrm{Re}\{g_w(t)g_v(t)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\alpha x}[\mathcal{U}_1(z)\cos ly, \mathcal{U}_2(z)\sin ly, \mathcal{U}_3(z)\cos ly]\} \\
& + O(\epsilon^{s+2}, \epsilon^s\Delta^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{30}
$$

During the initial stage of the instability, and so long as Δ is small enough that linearization with respect to it yields a good approximation of the quations governing the spanwise instability, it follows that $g_v(t) \sim \mathrm{e}^{\sigma^v t}$; accordingly $g_w(t) \sim \mathrm{e}^{\sigma^w t}$. More specifically, while the $O(\epsilon)$ waves are allowed to grow or decay as αc_i^w, the $O(\epsilon^s\Delta)$ axial velocity perturbation grows (or decays) as αc_i^v with phase speed c_r^v; so

$$
\sigma^w = \alpha(c_i^w - \mathrm{i}c_r^w) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^v = \alpha(c_i^v - \mathrm{i}c_r^v).
$$

Then $\phi(z)$, c_i^w and α in (30) denote the eigenfunction, eigenvalue and wavenumber of the primary wave field which satisfy the Orr-Sommerfeld equation (33).

In due course the interaction of this x-periodic wave field with the mean shear gives rise to streamwise averaged perturbations (to the mean flow) having both spanwise independent and spanwise periodic perturbations. The latter take the form [cf (3.1)],

$$
\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \epsilon^s\Delta\mathrm{Re}\{\mathrm{e}^{\sigma^v t}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ly}[\hat{u}(z), -\epsilon^n\mathrm{e}^{c_i^w}\mathrm{i}\hat{v}(z), \epsilon^n\mathrm{e}^{c_i^w}\hat{w}(z)]\} \tag{31}
$$

(such that $l\hat{v} + \hat{w}' = 0$ to satisfy continuity); observe that while the axial flow grows as $\mathrm{e}^{c_i^v t}$, the transverse flow grows as $\mathrm{e}^{(c_i^v + c_i^w)t}$.

Finally, the $\mathcal{U}_j$ components in (30) derive from modifications to the $O(\epsilon)$ wave field by the $O(\epsilon^s\Delta)$ spanwise-periodic component of $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$, giving rise to a spanwise periodic variation in pseudomomentum, $\tilde{p}_1$. While in principle this can occur for all s (see §4.2), it is of major importance when $s = 0$. But because the GLM-formulation provides no direct means of evaluating wave distortion a separate examination of the wave field is necessary; we do so in §5.3 and then determine $\tilde{p}_1$ in §5.4.

5.1 The primary instability initially

The primary velocity associated field Q_1 is described by (20) with (30) and (45). Then with the base flow U, be it Poiseuille flow or say a wind driven boundary layer of finite extent [28], assumed known in the absence of waves, we decompose Q_1 as $\epsilon^s Q_1 = \epsilon^s U + \epsilon^2 Q_1^P$, and seek the spanwise independent perturbation $Q_1^P(z,t)$. The $O(\epsilon^2)$ correction to the base flow is then given by (c.f. Craik [8], §9.1)

$$
\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} - R^{-1}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2}\right)Q_1^P = -\epsilon^s\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{e}^{2\alpha c_i^w t}\left(\frac{\alpha c_i^w|\phi|^2}{U^2 + c_i^{w2}}\right)' U' + R^{-1}\left(F_1 + \epsilon^{m+2\beta}G_1\right) \tag{32}
$$

where prime denotes d/dz and the eigenfunction $\phi(z)$ is a solution to the Orr-Sommerfeld equation

$$(U - \mathrm{i}c_i^w)(\phi'' - \alpha^2\phi) - U''\phi = \frac{1}{\mathrm{i}\alpha R}(\phi^{iv} - 2\alpha^2\phi'' + \alpha^4\phi), \qquad (33)$$

which follows by eliminating pressure from the $O(\epsilon)$ x- and z-momentum equations. Note that although the calculation of (32) is straightforward provided $\beta \geq \frac{1}{2}$, that is not the case for other β where computation of G_1 cannot be avoided. Indeed, in such instances it is easier to calculate the $O(\epsilon^2)$ Eulerian correction, U^P say, and deduce Q_1^P as $Q_1^P = U^P + D_1 - P_1$.

5.2 The secondary instability initially

In the presence of neutral or almost neutral waves, and on noting (44), both (25, 26) and (28, 29) take the generic form

$$[\mathrm{D}^2 - l^2 - \sigma_1^v]\hat{u} = R^v Q_1'\hat{w}, \qquad (34)$$

$$[\mathrm{D}^2 - l^2 - \sigma_1^v][\mathrm{D}^2 - l^2]\hat{w} = \begin{cases} -R^v l^2[P_1^{0'}\hat{u} - \epsilon^s Q_1'\hat{p}_1] & \text{for case (i)} \\ R^v l^2 Q_1'\hat{p}_1 & \text{for case (ii)} \end{cases}. \qquad (35)$$

Here $\mathrm{D} = d/dz$ and we have introduced the vortex Reynolds number $R^v = \epsilon^{\frac{s+2}{2}}R$ for case (i) and $R^v = \epsilon^{s+1}R$ for case (ii) with the requirement that $R^v \geq O(1)$ in each case; accordingly $\sigma_1^v = R^v \sigma^v$.

With $s = 2$, (34, 35) recover (for case (i)) equations given by Craik [5] to describe the initial growth of Langmuir circulations; while with $s = 0$, (34, 35) recover equations given by Phillips [27] to describe an evolving secondary instability on a two dimensional nonlinear equilibrium solution in plane Poiseuille flow.

5.3 Wave field modification for $O(1)$ shear flows

Secondary velocity components of all orders affect the wave field, but because (26) and (29) require only the $O(\epsilon^{s+2}\Delta)$ component of $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$, to wit p_1, it is evident that distortion is caused predominantly by the $O(\epsilon^s\Delta)$ component of $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$; in consequence $O(\epsilon^{s+n}\Delta)$ and higher order components of velocity may be ignored. Thus, in calculating $\tilde{p}_1$, we need consider only the linear theory of wave motion in the presence of an Eulerian mean flow $\bar{U} + \tilde{u}$, assuming $\tilde{u}$ is sufficiently small [7]. Moreover, bearing in mind that the back effect of the secondary flow on the wave field plays a role only when $s = 0$ in case (i) and that the analysis is easily rescaled for $s > 0$ [as may be necessary for case (ii)], we shall, in this and the following section, confine attention to the case of strong shear, viz $s = 0$.

Prior to calculating p_1, however, we require the modification to the wave field by u_1. We begin by noting that continuity is maintained provided $\mathrm{i}\alpha\mathcal{U}_1 + l\mathcal{U}_2 + \mathcal{U}_3' = 0$. Then on defining $\hat{\phi}(z) = \mathrm{i}k^{-1}\mathcal{U}_3(z)$, where $\hat{\phi}(z)$ is the $O(\epsilon\Delta)$ spanwise periodic wave field modification, we have

$$\mathcal{U}_1 - \frac{\mathrm{i}l}{\alpha}\mathcal{U}_2 = \hat{\phi}'. \qquad (36)$$

In order to construct an equation for $\hat{\phi}$ in the vein of Orr-Sommerfeld, we turn to the $O(\epsilon\Delta)$ component of the Navier Stokes equation:

$$-\mathrm{L}\mathcal{U}_1 + \hat{u}\phi' - \hat{u}'\phi + \frac{\bar{u}'}{i\alpha}\mathcal{U}_3 = -\wp, \tag{37}$$

$$-i\alpha\mathrm{L}\mathcal{U}_2 = l\wp, \tag{38}$$

$$\text{and} \quad -i\alpha\mathrm{L}\mathcal{U}_3 + \alpha^2\hat{u}\phi = -\wp', \tag{39}$$

in which $\epsilon\Delta\rho\mathrm{Re}\{e^{(\alpha c_i^w + \sigma^v)t}e^{i\alpha x^*}\cos ly\}\wp(z)$ is the $O(\epsilon\Delta)$ pressure component and the operators are

$$\mathrm{L} = (i\alpha R)^{-1}\mathrm{M} - (U - ic_i^w) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{M} = \mathrm{D}^2 - (\alpha^2 + l^2).$$

Eliminating $\wp$, $\mathcal{U}_1$ and $\mathcal{U}_2$ from (39) and employing (36) then yields,

$$(U - ic_i^w)\mathrm{M}\hat{\phi} - U''\hat{\phi} + \hat{u}\mathrm{M}\phi - \hat{u}''\phi = (i\alpha R)^{-1}\mathrm{M}^2\hat{\phi} \tag{40}$$

which is devoid of the eigenvalue σ^v and which, in the inviscid limit and for neutral waves, recovers the Rayleigh-Craik equation of [7].

5.4   Stokes drift and pseudomomentum

Measures of the nonlinear rectification of oscillatory disturbances are given by the Stokes drift and pseudomomentum. Thus having determined the $O(\epsilon\Delta)$ distortion to the primary wave field due to the secondary flow, we may now calculate the $O(\epsilon^2\Delta)$ correction to, and $O(\epsilon^2)$ components of, the pseudomomentum. In doing so it transpires that although viscosity plays a role at $O(\epsilon^2\Delta)$, it plays none at $O(\epsilon^2)$, so that $\bar{\mathrm{D}}$ and $\bar{\mathrm{P}}$ are as given by Craik [6].

$\bar{\mathrm{d}}$ and $\bar{\mathrm{p}}$ follow from (6) and (12) after first obtaining the particle displacements. To wit, on noting that $\bar{D}^L\xi_j = d\xi_j/dt$ and employing (3) and (13), we see that $\xi_j(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is given by integration of

$$\frac{d\xi_j}{dt} = \breve{u}_j + \xi_k\bar{u}_{j,k} \tag{41}$$

along mean trajectories

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = \bar{\mathbf{u}}^L(\mathbf{x}, t). \tag{42}$$

Of course the displacement field must conform with [1] postulate (viii), that ξ_j be zero at some time t_0 and position $\mathbf{x}_0$. But if ξ_j takes the form $f(z)e^{i\alpha x^*}e^{\sigma^w t}$, then if $t = t_0$ is finite so too is the wave amplitude; and this means that different particles in an averaged ensemble are located on different streamlines, causing $\bar{\mathrm{d}}$ and $\bar{\mathrm{p}}$ to oscillate. To circumvent such behaviour we shall follow [6] and allow $t_0 \to -\infty$, at which point the wave amplitude is essentially zero and the particles to be averaged are equally spaced along the same stream line. One further point: when integrating (41) along mean trajectories (42) to determine ξ_j, we shall assume ξ_j is small compared with the radius of curvature of $\bar{u}_j$, and thus treat $\bar{u}_j$ constant with respect to time, i.e. we assume $x^* = x_0 + Ut$.

So on writing

$$\xi_j = \epsilon \mathrm{Re}\{\Xi_j^0 e^{\alpha c_i^w t + i\alpha x^*}\} + \epsilon \Delta \mathrm{Re}\{\hat{\xi}_j e^{\alpha c_i^w t + i\alpha x^*} e^{\sigma^v t} \cos ly\} \qquad (j = 1, 3), \qquad (43)$$

where ξ_j is displacement from the *average* position, then Craik [6] finds at $O(\epsilon)$ that

$$\Xi_1^0 = \left(\frac{\phi}{i\alpha(U - ic_i^w)}\right)', \quad \Xi_2^0 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Xi_3^0 = \frac{-\phi}{U - ic_i^w},$$

while we find at $O(\epsilon\Delta)$ that

$$\hat{\xi}_1 = \left(\frac{-\phi\hat{u}}{i\alpha(U - ic_i^w)^2}\right)' - \frac{U'\mathcal{U}_3 + i\alpha(U - ic_i^w)\mathcal{U}_1}{\alpha^2(U - ic_i^w)^2},$$

$$\hat{\xi}_3 = \frac{\phi\hat{u}}{(U - ic_i^w)^2} + \frac{\mathcal{U}_3}{i\alpha(U - ic_i^w)}.$$

Note that although $\hat{\xi}_2$ is non-zero at this order, it is not required to determine $\hat{p}_1$.

Likewise, writing the Stokes drift and pseudomomentum as (*c.f.* §3.2)

$$(d_j, p_j) = \epsilon^2 \mathrm{Re}\{(D_j^0, P_j^0)e^{2\alpha c_i^w t}\} + \epsilon^{3-\Delta_{j1}} \Delta \mathrm{Re}\{(\hat{d}_j, \hat{p}_j)e^{2\alpha c_i^w t} e^{\sigma^v t} \cos ly\}$$
$$(j = 1, 3), \qquad (44)$$

then at $O(\epsilon^2)$ and on assuming a streamwise average [6],

$$D_3^0 = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\alpha c_i^w |\phi|^2}{U^2 + c_i^{w2}}\right)' \qquad (45)$$

$$\text{and} \quad P_1^0 = -\frac{1}{2}U\left\{\left|\left(\frac{\phi}{U - ic_i^w}\right)'\right|^2 + \alpha^2\left|\frac{\phi}{U - ic_i^w}\right|^2\right\}. \qquad (46)$$

In consequence the Jacobian (11) becomes

$$J = 1 - \frac{\epsilon^2}{4}\left(\frac{|\phi|^2}{U^2 + c_i^{w2}}\right)'' e^{2\alpha c_i^w t}, \qquad (47)$$

indicating that provided ϕ and U are analytic, difficulties with the mapping (1) are to be expected only if $U^2 + c_i^{w2} \le O(\epsilon^2)$.

Looking now to the $O(\epsilon^2\Delta)$ correction to pseudomomentum, we find after some lengthly algebra, that

$$\hat{p}_1 = \mathcal{A}_1(z)\hat{u}(z) + \mathcal{A}_2(z)\hat{u}'(z) + \mathrm{Re}\{\mathcal{A}_3(z)\hat{\phi}(z) + \mathcal{A}_4(z)\mathcal{U}_1\}, \qquad (48)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_3$ and $\mathcal{A}_4$ are functions which are independent of σ^v; to wit

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \frac{1}{2}\left\{\frac{U^2 - c_i^{w2}}{U^2 + c_i^{w2}}\left[\alpha^2\left|\frac{\phi}{U - ic_i^w}\right|^2 + \left|\left(\frac{\phi}{U - ic_i^w}\right)'\right|^2\right]\right.$$

17

$$-UU'\left[\frac{\phi}{(U-ic_i^w)^3}\left(\frac{\phi^*}{U+ic_i^w}\right)' + \frac{\phi^*}{(U+ic_i^w)^3}\left(\frac{\phi}{U-ic_i^w}\right)'\right]\right\},$$

$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \frac{1}{4}\left[\frac{(U+ic_i^w)\phi}{(U-ic_i^w)^2}\left(\frac{\phi^*}{U+ic_i^w}\right)' + \frac{(U-ic_i^w)\phi^*}{(U+ic_i^w)^2}\left(\frac{\phi}{U-ic_i^w}\right)' + \left(\left|\frac{\phi}{U-ic_i^w}\right|^2\right)'\right],$$

$$\mathcal{A}_3 = \frac{1}{(U-ic_i^w)}\left[\frac{UU'}{U-ic_i^w}\left(\frac{\phi^*}{U+ic_i^w}\right)' - \frac{\alpha^2 U\phi^*}{U+ic_i^w}\right],$$

$$\mathcal{A}_4 = -\frac{U}{U-ic_i^w}\left(\frac{\phi^*}{U+ic_i^w}\right)'.$$

Also required in (48) is $\mathcal{U}_1$ which follows from (36) and (39), as

$$\mathrm{L}\mathcal{U}_1 = \frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha^2+l^2}\mathrm{L}\,\hat{\phi}' + \frac{l^2}{\alpha^2+l^2}(\hat{u}\phi' - \hat{u}'\phi - U'\hat{\phi}). \tag{49}$$

Note that in contrast to its inviscid counterpart which is algebraic, (49) is an ordinary differential equation. For that reason our $\mathcal{A}_i$'s ($i = 1, 4$) should not be confused with Craik's [7] $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, although of course (48) recovers Craik's form in the appropriate limit.

Thus given U for the problem at hand, ϕ and the primary flow field are determined by (32) and (33), while the eigenvalue problem for σ_1^v is completely specified by appropriate boundary conditions and the coupled system (34), (35), (40), (48) and (49) together with (46) and, if needed, (45). Finally, although the viscous eigenvalue problem is significantly more complex than its inviscid counterpart, it is nevertheless suitable for numerical treatment by methods similar to those employed by Phillips and coworkers [30, 31].

6 Recapitulation and concluding remarks

This paper has been concerned with growing finite-amplitude waves and their nonlinear interaction with unidirectional viscous shear flows. The shear may take any of a range of strengths and the wave field is initially independent of the spanwise coordinate. The analysis largely employs the generalized Lagrangian-mean formulation of Andrews & McIntyre [1] and is in part a generalization of a theory developed by Craik [7], who dealt with secondary instabilities owing to neutral waves in inviscid shear flows.

Once the waves are other than infinitesimal, the primary instability acts as a catalyst for, and is thus subject to, secondary instabilities. These instabilities manifest as structures of longitudinal vortex form and arise through the stretching and rotation of vorticity, events concealed by the Eulerian equations of mean motion, but not by GLM which describes mean vorticity kinematics in a manner akin to the description of instantaneous vorticity kinematics.

Two instability mechanisms to longitudinal vortex form were observed, both inviscid: The first has as its basis the Craik-Leibovich type-2 mechanism, which was

18

originally conceived as an explanation for Langmuir circulations. Unfortunately the physical basis for the mechanism in strong $O(1)$ shear lacks the clarity of its forebear at $O(\epsilon^2)$, in part because the Stokes drift, which has clear physical interpretation, is replaced by the physically nebulous pseudomomentum. The kinematics are further confused by wave distortion which, while negligible in $O(\epsilon^2)$ shear, plays an increasingly important role as the level of shear increases. But the mechanism remains inviscid, wave catalyzed and has a growth rate very much higher than the diffusive growth rate of the primary instability.

The distinctive feature of the second instability mechanism is that the wave- and primary flow-field distort in concert at all levels of shear. This mechanism would occur in regions of the flow where the vertical gradient of the streamwise component of pseudomomentum is zero (or almost zero) and in consequence requires a unique relationship between the wave field and the mean flow field. The equations describing the instability bear similarity to those describing the Benney Lin [2] and CL1 [9] instabilities, but these mechanisms are fundamentally different. Indeed this apparently new and still unproven mechanism assumes a primary wave field that is initially independent of the spanwise coordinate, while Benney-Lin and CL1 require a wave field with spanwise structure. Moreover Benney-Lin and CL1 grow algebraically in time, while this mechanism can initially grow exponentially fast.

GLM does not directly account for wave distortion and to determine it requires a separate examination of the wave field. This examination was carried out for monochromatic waves and indicates that distortion is described by two ordinary differential equations, one of fourth-order, the other of second; this pair replace Craik's [7] second-order Rayleigh-Craik equation and its algebraic companion. Of course as Craik notes, viscosity plays a role only at rigid boundaries and critical layers, thereby simplifying the analysis over much of the domain. Nevertheless, the calculation of wave-mean interactions that contain regions where viscous effects are important, will require significant computational effort. The methods used, however, need not be greatly different from those employed by Phillips and coworkers [30, 31].

Finally, the ostensibly formidable viscous contribution to GLM turns out to be difficult to calculate only in the case of very weak shear in the presence of rotational waves.

References

[1] ANDREWS, D. G. & McINTYRE, M. E. An exact theory of nonlinear waves on a Lagrangian-mean flow. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **89**, 609–646 (1978).

[2] BENNEY, D. J. & LIN, C. C. On the secondary motion induced by oscillations in a shear flow. *Phys. Fluids*, **3**, 656-657 (1960).

[3] BRETHERTON, F.P The general linearised theory of wave propagation *Lectures Appl. Math.* **13**, 61-102 (1971).

[4] CHARNEY, J.G. & DRAZIN, P.G. Propagation of planetary-scale disturbances from the lower into the upper atmosphere *J. Geophys. Res.* **66**, 83-109 (1961).

[5] CRAIK, A. D. D. The generation of Langmuir circulations by an instability mechanism, *J. Fluid Mech.*, **81**, 209–223 (1977).

[6] CRAIK, A. D. D. The generalized Lagrangian-mean equations and hydrodynamic stability. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **125**, 27–35 (1982).

[7] CRAIK, A. D. D. Wave-induced longitudinal-vortex instability in shear layers. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **125**, 37–52 (1982).

[8] CRAIK, A. D. D. *Wave interactions and fluid flows*, Cambridge University Press (1985).

[9] CRAIK, A. D. D., AND LEIBOVICH, S. A rational model for Langmuir circulations, *J. Fluid Mech.*, **73** 401-426 (1976).

[10] DEWAR, R.L. Interaction between hydromagnetic waves and a time dependent inhomogeneous medium *Phys. Fluids* **13** 2710-2720 (1970).

[11] ECKART, C. Some transformations of the hydrodynamics equations *Phys. Fluids*, **6**, 1037-1041 (1963).

[12] ELIASSEN, A & PALM, E. On the transfer of energy in stationary mountain waves *Geofys. Publ.*, **22**, 1-23 (1961).

[13] GONG, W., TAYLOR, P.A. & DÖRNBRACK, A. Turbulent boundary-layer flow over fixed, aerodynamically rough two-dimensional sinusoidal waves. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **312**, 1-37 (1996).

[14] HALL, P. & SMITH, F.T. The nonlinear interaction of Tollmien-Schlichting waves and Taylor-Gortler vortices in curved channel flows. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.* A **417**, 255-282 (1988).

[15] HALL, P. & SMITH, F.T. On strongly nonlinear vortex/wave interactions in boundary layer transition *J. Fluid Mech.*, **227**, 641-666 (1991).

[16] JAHNKE, C.C. & PHILLIPS, W.R.C. On the dynamics of wave catalysed longitudinal vortices in strong shear. (1997) (to be submitted).

[17] JOSEPH, D.D. Eigenvalue bounds for the Orr-Sommerfeld equation *J. Fluid Mech.*, **33**, 617-621 (1968).

[18] LEIBOVICH, S. Convective instability of stably stratified water in the ocean. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **82**, 561–585 (1977).

[19] LEIBOVICH, S. On wave-current interaction theories of Langmuir circulations. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **99**, 715-724 (1980).

[20] LONGUET-HIGGINS, M.S. Mass transport in water waves. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond.* A, **245**, 535–581 (1953).

[21] MCINTYRE, M. E. A note on the divergence effect and the Lagrangian-mean surface elevation in periodic water waves. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **189**, 235–242 (1988).

[22] MCINTYRE, M. E. & NORTON, W. A. Dissipative wave-mean interactions and the transport of vorticity or potential vorticity. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **212**, 403–435 (1990).

[23] MELVILLE, W.K., SHEAR, R.M., HAUβECKER, H. & JÄHNE, B. Measurements of the generation and evolution of Langmuir circulations *Science* (1997)(to appear).

[24] MILES, J.W. On the generation of surface waves by shear flows, *J. Fluid Mech.*, **3**, 185-204 (1957).

[25] NÖTHER, F. Das Turbulenaproblem *ZAMM*, **1**, 125 (1921).

[26] ORSZAG, S.A. AND PATERA, A. Secondary instability of wall bounded shear flows, *J. Fluid Mech.*, **128**, 347-385 (1983).

[27] PHILLIPS, W.R.C. On the etiology of shear layer vortices *Theoret. Comput. Fluid Dynamics*, **2**, 329-338 (1991).

[28] PHILLIPS, W.R.C. On a class of unsteady boundary layers of finite extent *J. Fluid Mech.*, **319**, 151-170 (1996).

[29] PHILLIPS, W.R.C. & SHEN, Q. On a family of wave-mean shear interactions and their instability to longitudinal vortex form *Stud. Appl. Math*, **96**, 143-161 (1996).

[30] PHILLIPS, W.R.C. & WU. Z. On the instability of wave-catalysed longitudinal vortices in strong shear *J. Fluid Mech.* **272**, 235-254 (1994).

[31] PHILLIPS, W.R.C. WU. Z. & LUMLEY, J. L. On the formation of longitudinal vortices in a turbulent boundary layer over wavy terrain. *J. Fluid Mech.* **326**, 321-341 (1996).

[32] SMITH, J.A. Observed growth of Langmuir circulation *J. Geophys. Res.* **97**, 5651-5664 (1992).

[33] SOWARD, A.M. A kinematic theory of large magnetic Reynolds number dynamos *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc.* A **272**, 431-462 (1972).

[34] WARN, T. & WARN, H. The evolution of a nonlinear critical layer *Stud. Appl. Math*, **59**, 37-71 (1978).

List of Recent TAM Reports

No.	Authors	Title	Date
753	Thoroddsen, S. T.	The failure of the Kolmogorov refined similarity hypothesis in fluid turbulence—*Physics of Fluids* **7**, 691–693 (1995)	May 1994
754	Turner, J. A., and R. L. Weaver	Time dependence of multiply scattered diffuse ultrasound in polycrystalline media—*Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* **97**, 2639–2644 (1995)	June 1994
755	Riahi, D. N.	Finite-amplitude thermal convection with spatially modulated boundary temperatures—*Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A* **449**, 459–478 (1995)	June 1994
756	Riahi, D. N.	Renormalization group analysis for stratified turbulence—*International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, in press (1996)	June 1994
757	Riahi, D. N.	Wave-packet convection in a porous layer with boundary imperfections—*Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **318**, 107-128 (1996)	June 1994
758	Jog, C. S., and R. B. Haber	Stability of finite element models for distributed-parameter optimization and topology design—*Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, in press (1996).	July 1994
759	Qi, Q., and G. J. Brereton	Mechanisms of removal of micron-sized particles by high-frequency ultrasonic waves—*IEEE Transactions on Ultrasonics, Ferroelectrics and Frequency Control* **42**, 619–629 (1995)	July 1994
760	Shawki, T. G.	On shear flow localization with traction-controlled boundaries—*International Journal of Solids and Structures* **32**, 2751–2778 (1995)	July 1994
761	Balachandar, S., D. A. Yuen, and D. M. Reuteler	High Rayleigh number convection at infinite Prandtl number with temperature-dependent viscosity	July 1994
762	Phillips, J. W.	Arthur Newell Talbot—Proceedings of a conference to honor TAM's first department head and his family	Aug. 1994
763	Man., C. S., and D. E. Carlson	On the traction problem of dead loading in linear elasticity with initial stress—*Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* **128**, 223–247 (1994)	Aug. 1994
764	Zhang, Y., and R. L. Weaver	Leaky Rayleigh wave scattering from elastic media with random microstructures—*Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* **99**, 88-99 (1996)	Aug. 1994
765	Cortese, T. A., and S. Balachandar	High-performance spectral simulation of turbulent flows in massively parallel machines with distributed memory—*International Journal of Supercomputer Applications* **9**, 185–202 (1995)	Aug. 1994
766	Balachandar, S.	Signature of the transition zone in the tomographic results extracted through the eigenfunctions of the two-point correlation—*Geophysical Research Letters* **22**, 1941–1944 (1995)	Sept. 1994
767	Piomelli, U.	Large-eddy simulation of turbulent flows	Sept. 1994
768	Harris, J. G., D. A. Rebinsky, and G. R. Wickham	An integrated model of scattering from an imperfect interface—*Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* **99**, 1315-1325 (1996)	Sept. 1994
769	Hsia, K. J., and Z.-Q. Xu	The mathematical framework and an approximate solution of surface crack propagation under hydraulic pressure loading—*International Journal of Fracture*, in press (1996)	Sept. 1994
770	Balachandar, S.	Two-point correlation and its eigen-decomposition for optimal characterization of mantle convection	Oct. 1994
771	Lufrano, J. M., and P. Sofronis	Numerical analysis of the interaction of solute hydrogen atoms with the stress field of a crack—*International Journal of Solids and Structures*, in press (1996)	Oct. 1994
772	Aref, H., and S. W. Jones	Motion of a solid body through ideal fluid—*Proceedings of the DCAMM 25th Anniversary Volume*, 55-68 (1994)	Oct. 1994
773	Stewart, D. S., T. D. Aslam, J. Yao, and J. B. Bdzil	Level-set techniques applied to unsteady detonation propagation—In "Modeling in Combustion Science," *Lecture Notes in Physics* (1995)	Oct. 1994

No.	Authors	Title	Date
774	Mittal, R., and S. Balachandar	Effect of three-dimensionality on the lift and drag of circular and elliptic cylinders—*Physics of Fluids* **7**, 1841–1865 (1995)	Oct. 1994
775	Stewart, D. S., T. D. Aslam, and J. Yao	On the evolution of cellular detonation	Nov. 1994 *Revised* Jan. 1996
776	Aref, H.	On the equilibrium and stability of a row of point vortices—*Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **290**, 167–181 (1995)	Nov. 1994
777	Cherukuri, H. P., T. G. Shawki, and M. El-Raheb	An accurate finite-difference scheme for elastic wave propagation in a circular disk—*Journal of the Acoustical Society of America,* in press (1996)	Nov. 1994
778	Li, L., and N. R. Sottos	Improving hydrostatic performance of 1–3 piezocomposites—*Journal of Applied Physics* **77**, 4595–4603 (1995)	Dec. 1994
779	Phillips, J. W., D. L. de Camara, M. D. Lockwood, and W. C. C. Grebner	Strength of silicone breast implants—*Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery* **97**, 1215-1225 (1996)	Jan. 1995
780	Xin, Y.-B., K. J. Hsia, and D. A. Lange	Quantitative characterization of the fracture surface of silicon single crystals by confocal microscopy—*Journal of the American Ceramics Society* **78**, 3201-3208 (1995)	Jan. 1995
781	Yao, J., and D. S. Stewart	On the dynamics of multi-dimensional detonation—*Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **309**, 225-275 (1996)	Jan. 1995
782	Riahi, D. N., and T. L. Sayre	Effect of rotation on the structure of a convecting mushy layer—*Acta Mechanica* **118**, 109-120 (1996)	Feb. 1995
783	Batchelor, G. K., and TAM faculty and students	A conversation with Professor George K. Batchelor	Feb. 1995
784	Sayre, T. L., and D. N. Riahi	Effect of rotation on flow instabilities during solidification of a binary alloy—*International Journal of Engineering Science* **34**, 1631-1645 (1996)	Feb. 1995
785	Xin, Y.-B., and K. J. Hsia	A technique to generate straight surface cracks for studying the dislocation nucleation condition in brittle materials —*Acta Metallurgica et Materialia* **44**, 845-853 (1996)	Mar. 1995
786	Riahi, D. N.	Finite bandwidth, long wavelength convection with boundary imperfections: Near-resonant wavelength excitation—*International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences,* in press (1996)	Mar. 1995
787	Turner, J. A., and R. L. Weaver	Average response of an infinite plate on a random foundation—*Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* **99**, 2167-2175 (1996)	Mar. 1995
788	Weaver, R. L., and D. Sornette	The range of spectral correlations in pseudointegrable systems: GOE statistics in a rectangular membrane with a point scatterer—*Physical Review E* **52**, 341 (1995)	Apr. 1995
789	Students in TAM 293–294	Thirty-second student symposium on engineering mechanics, J. W. Phillips, coordinator: Selected senior projects by K. F. Anderson, M. B. Bishop, B. C. Case, S. R. McFarlin, J. M. Nowakowski, D. W. Peterson, C. V. Robertson, and C. E. Tsoukatos	Apr. 1995
790	Figa, J., and C. J. Lawrence	Linear stability analysis of a gravity-driven Newtonian coating flow on a planar incline	May 1995
791	Figa, J., and C. J. Lawrence	Linear stability analysis of a gravity-driven viscosity-stratified Newtonian coating flow on a planar incline	May 1995
792	Cherukuri, H. P., and T. G. Shawki	On shear band nucleation and the finite propagation speed of thermal disturbances—*International Journal of Solids and Structures,* in press (1996)	May 1995
793	Harris, J. G.	Modeling scanned acoustic imaging of defects at solid interfaces—Chapter in *IMA Workshop on Inverse Problems in Wave Propagation,* Springer-Verlag, in press (1996)	May 1995

No.	Authors	Title	Date
794	Sottos, N. R., J. M. Ockers, and M. J. Swindeman	Thermoelastic properties of plain weave composites for multilayer circuit board applications	May 1995
795	Aref, H., and M. A. Stremler	On the motion of three point vortices in a periodic strip—*Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 314, 1-25 (1996)	June 1995
796	Barenblatt, G. I., and N. Goldenfeld	Does fully-developed turbulence exist? Reynolds number independence versus asymptotic covariance—*Physics of Fluids* 7, 3078–3082 (1995)	June 1995
797	Aslam, T. D., J. B. Bdzil, and D. S. Stewart	Level set methods applied to modeling detonation shock dynamics—*Journal of Computational Physics,* in press (1996)	June 1995
798	Nimmagadda, P. B. R., and P. Sofronis	The effect of interface slip and diffusion on the creep strength of fiber and particulate composite materials—*Mechanics of Materials,* in press (1996)	July 1995
799	Hsia, K. J., T.-L. Zhang, and D. F. Socie	Effect of crack surface morphology on the fracture behavior under mixed mode loading —*ASTM Special Technical Publication* 1296, in press (1996)	July 1995
800	Adrian, R. J.	Stochastic estimation of the structure of turbulent fields	Aug. 1995
801	Riahi, D. N.	Perturbation analysis and modeling for stratified turbulence	Aug. 1995
802	Thoroddsen, S. T.	Conditional sampling of dissipation in high Reynolds number turbulence—*Physics of Fluids* 8, 1333-1335	Aug. 1995
803	Riahi, D. N.	On the structure of an unsteady convecting mushy layer—*Acta Mechanica,* in press (1996)	Aug. 1995
804	Meleshko, V. V.	Equilibrium of an elastic rectangle: The Mathieu–Inglis–Pickett solution revisited—*Journal of Elasticity* 40, 207-238 (1995)	Aug. 1995
805	Jonnalagadda, K., G. E. Kline, and N. R. Sottos	Local displacements and load transfer in shape memory alloy composites	Aug. 1995
806	Nimmagadda, P. B. R., and P. Sofronis	On the calculation of the matrix–reinforcement interface diffusion coefficient in composite materials at high temperatures—*Acta Metallurgica et Materialia,* in press (1996)	Aug. 1995
807	Carlson, D. E., and D. A. Tortorelli	On hyperelasticity with internal constraints—*Journal of Elasticity* 42, 91-98 (1966)	Aug. 1995
808	Sayre, T. L., and D. N. Riahi	Oscillatory instabilities of the liquid and mushy layers during solidification of alloys under rotational constraint—*Acta Mechanica,* in press (1996)	Sept. 1995
809	Xin, Y.-B., and K. J. Hsia	Simulation of the brittle-ductile transition in silicon single crystals using dislocation mechanics	Oct. 1995
810	Ulysse, P., and R. E. Johnson	A plane-strain upper-bound analysis of unsymmetrical single-hole and multi-hole extrusion processes	Oct. 1995
811	Fried, E.	Continua described by a microstructural field—*Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik,* in press (1996)	Nov. 1995
812	Mittal, R., and S. Balachandar	Autogeneration of three-dimensional vortical structures in the near wake of a circular cylinder	Nov. 1995
813	Segev, R., E. Fried, and G. de Botton	Force theory for multiphase bodies—*Journal of Geometry and Physics,* in press (1996)	Dec. 1995
814	Weaver, R. L.	The effect of an undamped finite-degree-of-freedom "fuzzy" substructure: Numerical solutions and theoretical discussion	Jan. 1996
815	Haber, R. B., C. S. Jog, and M. P. Bendsøe	A new approach to variable-topology shape design using a constraint on perimeter—*Structural Optimization* 11, 1-12 (1996)	Feb. 1996
816	Xu, Z.-Q., and K. J. Hsia	A numerical solution of a surface crack under cyclic hydraulic pressure loading	Mar. 1996
817	Adrian, R. J.	Bibliography of particle velocimetry using imaging methods: 1917–1995—*Produced and distributed in cooperation with TSI, Inc., St. Paul, Minn.*	Mar. 1996

List of Recent TAM Reports (cont'd)

No.	Authors	Title	Date
818	Fried, E., and G. Grach	An order-parameter based theory as a regularization of a sharp-interface theory for solid–solid phase transitions—*Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis,* in press (1996)	Mar. 1996
819	Vonderwell, M. P., and D. N. Riahi	Resonant instability mode triads in the compressible boundary-layer flow over a swept wing	Mar. 1996
820	Short, M., and D. S. Stewart	Low-frequency two-dimensional linear instability of plane detonation	Mar. 1996
821	Casagranda, A., and P. Sofronis	On the scaling laws for the consolidation of nanocrystalline powder compacts	Apr. 1996
822	Xu, S., and D. S. Stewart	Deflagration-to-detonation transition in porous energetic materials: A comparative model study	Apr. 1996
823	Weaver, R. L.	Mean and mean-square responses of a prototypical master/fuzzy structure	Apr. 1996
824	Fried, E.	Correspondence between a phase-field theory and a sharp-interface theory for crystal growth—*Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics,* in press (1997)	Apr. 1996
825	Students in TAM 293–294	Thirty-third student symposium on engineering mechanics, J. W. Phillips, coordinator: Selected senior projects by W. J. Fortino II, A. A. Mordock, and M. R. Sawicki	May 1995
826	Riahi, D. N.	Effects of roughness on nonlinear stationary vortices in rotating disk flows—*Mathematical and Computer Modeling,* in press (1996)	June 1996
827	Riahi, D. N.	Nonlinear instabilities of shear flows over rough walls	June 1996
828	Weaver, R. L.	Multiple scattering theory for a plate with sprung masses: Mean and mean-square responses	July 1996
829	Moser, R. D., M. M. Rogers, and D. W. Ewing	Self-similarity of time-evolving plane wakes	July 1996
830	Lufrano, J. M., and P. Sofronis	Enhanced hydrogen concentrations ahead of rounded notches and cracks—Competition between plastic strain and hydrostatic constraint	July 1996
831	Riahi, D. N.	Effects of surface corrugation on primary instability modes in wall-bounded shear flows	Aug. 1996
832	Bechel, V. T., and N. R. Sottos	Measuring debond length in the fiber pushout test	Aug. 1996
833	Riahi, D. N.	Effect of centrifugal and Coriolis forces on chimney convection during alloy solidification	Sept. 1996
834	Cermelli, P., and E. Fried	The influence of inertia on configurational forces in a deformable solid—*Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A,* in press (1996)	Oct. 1996
835	Riahi, D. N.	On the stability of shear flows with combined temporal and spatial imperfections	Oct. 1996
836	Carranza, F. L., B. Fang, and R. B. Haber	An adaptive space–time finite element model for oxidation-driven fracture	Nov. 1996
837	Carranza, F. L., B. Fang, and R. B. Haber	A moving cohesive interface model for fracture in creeping materials	Nov. 1996
838	Balachandar, S., R. Mittal, and F. M. Najjar	Properties of the mean wake recirculation region in two-dimensional bluff body wakes	Dec. 1996
839	Ti, B. W., W. D. O'Brien, Jr., and J. G. Harris	Measurements of coupled Rayleigh wave propagation in an elastic plate	Dec. 1996
840	Phillips, W. R. C.	On finite-amplitude rotational waves in viscous shear flows	Jan. 1997
841	Riahi, D. N.	Direct resonance analysis and modeling for a turbulent boundary layer over a corrugated surface	Jan. 1997