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This paper elaborates on the assertion that energy methods provide an always mathematically rigorous and a sometimes physically precise theory of subcritical convective instability. The general theory, without explicit solutions, is used to deduce that the critical Rayleigh number is a monotonically decreasing function of the Nusselt number, that this decrease is very slow if the Nusselt number is large, and that a fluid layer heated from below and internally is definitely stable when \( RA < \tilde{R}A(N_s) > 1708/(N_s + 1) \) where \( N_s \) is a heat source parameter and \( \tilde{R}A \) is a critical Rayleigh number. This last problem is also solved numerically and the result compared with linear theory. The critical Rayleigh numbers given by energy theory are slightly less than those given by linear theory, this difference increasing from zero with the magnitude of the heat-source intensity. To previous results proving the non-existence of subcritical instabilities in the absence of heat sources is appended this result giving a narrow band of Rayleigh numbers as possibilities for subcritical instabilities.

1. Introduction

The energy method judges stability or instability of a given fluid motion by whether the energy of a disturbance of the given motion grows or decays. If the values of certain stability parameters are below critical values, the energy decreases and the hydrodynamic system is called stable. Reynolds (1895) used an equation for the global kinetic energy of simple perturbation flows to estimate values of the critical Reynolds number. Orr (1907) used the same equation to formulate a variational problem for finding the critical Reynolds number. The calculation procedures and the results associated with this older use of the energy method are summarized by Bateman, Dryden & Murnaghan (1932). These early results of the energy method gave such conservative estimates for the critical Reynolds number, that the method was neglected for many years.

The modern theory of energy dates from the work of Thomas (1942) and Serrin (1959). In the modern theory one considers the global energy of a difference motion. The global energy, kinematic conditions and boundary constraints are used in two lines of deduction. The first of these leads to a universal stability criterion, universal in the sense that specific details of the basic motion and details of the flow geometry need not be completely specified. A second line of deduction leads to the formulation of a maximum problem and achieves a sharper
result by making more efficient use of known details of the basic flow. The procedure is elegantly developed in Serrin's (1959) paper. The results are valuable because they apply to a difference motion and, therefore, guarantee stability to finite disturbances. It is of importance that the method can give results which are not too conservative, as is obvious from Serrin's (1959) calculation of the stability limits for Couette flow between rotating cylinders. That even stronger results are possible was demonstrated in Joseph's (1966, 1966; hereafter referred to as I and II) extension of the method to accommodate convective motions governed by the non-linear equations of Boussinesq. It is with these convective motions, particularly with those which start from rest, that the most powerful and physically meaningful results of the energy method can be associated. These results are briefly listed below:

(i) There exists a neighbourhood of the origin of the Rayleigh–Reynolds number plane in which all Boussinesq flows which satisfy certain natural boundary conditions and which can be contained in a sphere of a diameter $d$ are universally stable. No matter how large the disturbance, it will eventually die away (see I).

(ii) A variational technique which uses the details of the basic motion to be studied can be defined and used to extend the region of certain stability. The object of these calculations is the specification of the largest region in the Rayleigh–Reynolds number plane in which the basic motion is certainly stable. The boundary of this largest region is called the optimum stability boundary. If $(Re, Ra)$ lie within the optimum boundary, then the energy of the difference motion decays to zero as time goes to infinity, and stability (in the mean) is rigorously guaranteed (see II).

(iii) A general description of the optimum stability boundary in terms of maximizing functions of the Euler–Lagrange equations can be constructed. This description leads to the result that the Reynolds number is a decreasing function of the Rayleigh number, for small Rayleigh numbers, on the optimum stability boundary. It also leads to a general a priori criterion for non-existence of subcritical instabilities (see II).

(iv) Rigid rotation cannot destabilize the class of flows which satisfy the criterion for non-existence of subcritical instabilities (see II).

(v) Plane Couette flow heated from below is stable to arbitrary disturbances when $Re^2 + Ra < 1708$. For $Ra = 0$ and $Re < 41.3$, the flow is stable, replacing the celebrated value $Re = 88.6$ given by Orr (1907) (see II).

It is our view that energy theory complements linear theory. Linear theory, roughly speaking, gives conditions under which hydrodynamic systems are definitely unstable. It cannot with certainty conclude stability. Energy theory gives conditions under which hydrodynamic systems are definitely stable. It cannot with certainty conclude instability. Comparison of the stability limits as given by energy and linear theory yields the range of values of relevant stability parameters in which subcritical instabilities of the hydrodynamic system are possible.

In the two parts of this paper we propose to elaborate on the assertion that energy methods provide an always mathematically rigorous and a sometimes
physically precise theory of subcritical convective instability. We shall restrict
our attention to those initially quiet motions for which the theory seems physi-
cally precise. The general formulation of the theory is given in I and II, but since
the method and associated criteria are neither conventional nor widely known,
we have included in part 1 a somewhat longer than usual review of previously
published work.

The principal result of part 1 is that a horizontal layer of fluid heated from
below and internally will not be unstable to arbitrary disturbances for Rayleigh
numbers which are only slightly less than those given by small perturbation
theory and which increase from zero with the heat-source intensity. That is, there
is only a narrow band of Rayleigh numbers for which subcritical instabilities are
possible. Similar results for convection in spherical shells are obtained in part 2.
It is shown that no subcritical instabilities are possible in spherical shells when
the gravity and temperature-gradient variations are identical. Even when sub-
critical instabilities are possible, they may, as in the cases treated by Chandra-
sekhar (1961), be confined to a narrow band of Rayleigh numbers. The important
implications of these facts and their relation to the often invoked principle of
exchange of stability are explored in the conclusion of part 2.

2. Energy identities for the difference motion

The essential elements of the energy method as this is applied to Boussinesq
fluids evolve from deductions made from the energy identities†

\[
\frac{dK}{dt} = \frac{d}{dt} \int \frac{1}{2} v^2
\]

\[
= -\int (Re \cdot \epsilon \cdot v + \sqrt{Ra} \cdot f \cdot v \theta + 2 e \cdot e),
\]

and

\[
Pr \frac{d\theta}{dt} = Pr \frac{d}{dt} \int \frac{1}{2} \theta^2
\]

\[
= -\int (\sqrt{Ra} \nabla \cdot v + \nabla \theta \cdot \nabla \theta) - \frac{1}{2} h \theta^2.
\]

Here \( \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}(\tau) \) is a region of space (which may change with time \( t = \rho / \nu \))
occupied by the basic fluid motion; \( u = V^* - \mathcal{V} = v \sqrt{\alpha g \kappa / \nu \beta} \) and \( \theta = T^* - T \)
are, respectively, the differences of velocity and temperature between the dis-
turbed (starred) and undisturbed (unstarred) motion;

\[
(D)_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} (V_{i,j} + V_{j,i}) = m(\epsilon)_{ij},
\]

\[
d = D^* - D = e \sqrt{\alpha g \kappa / d^2 \nu \beta}, \quad \nabla T = \beta \nabla \psi \quad \text{and} \quad g(r, \tau) = g f
\]

are, respectively, the strain-rate tensor of the basic and difference motions, the
gradient of the temperature of the basic fluid motion and the prescribed field
force (typically, gravity) vector. The constants \(-m, \beta \) and \(g \) are maximum
values of the characteristic values of \( D, \nabla T \) and \( g \) in the time interval \([0, \tau] \)
respectively. The constants \( \kappa, \alpha \) and \( \nu \) are, respectively, the thermometric coe-

† In writing integrals we shall omit infinitesimal volume elements; moreover, all
integrals are understood to be extended over the entire (dimensionless) region, except for
integrals over \( \mathcal{S} \), the boundary of \( \mathcal{V} \), which are indicated by a circle drawn through the
integral sign.
cient, the coefficient of thermal expansion and the kinematic viscosity. All lengths are measured in units of a fixed reference length $d$ and

$$Ra = \alpha \beta gd^4/\nu \kappa, \quad Re = d^2 m/\nu \quad \text{and} \quad Pr = \nu/\kappa.$$ 

Consistent with the requirement that the two flows satisfy the same conditions at the boundary $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{V}$ are

$$v = 0 \quad \text{(rigid surface, velocity $V$ prescribed),} \quad (3)$$

or

$$(\epsilon \cdot N) \times N = 0, \quad v \cdot N = 0 \quad \text{(free surface, normal velocity $V \cdot N$ prescribed),} \quad (4)$$

and a Robin condition

$$\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial N} + h\theta = 0 \quad (5)$$

for the temperature. Here $N$ is the outward normal to $\mathcal{S}$, $h(r, \tau) \geq 0$ is piecewise continuous function of position (Nusselt number), $\epsilon \cdot N$ is proportional to the viscous part of the surface tractions which are assumed entirely normal. A mixture of these conditions may prevail on subelements of $\mathcal{S}$.

(1) and (2) follow from the integration of suitably multiplied differential equations (made dimensionless) governing the difference motion over the volume $\mathcal{V}$. It is, of course, necessary that the boundary terms which arise from application of the divergence theorem vanish; a condition which is assured (see 1 and Serrin (1959)) when $\mathcal{S}$ is closed, when the geometry is such that disturbances are sufficiently spatially periodic or when the disturbances are sufficiently localized. The equations for the difference motion (in physical variables) are formed by subtracting the Boussinesq equations for the basic (unstarred) flow,

$$\frac{dV}{dt} = -\nabla P + \{1 - \alpha(T - T_0)\} \mathbf{g} + 2\nu \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D}, \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{dT}{dt} = \kappa \nabla^2 T + Q(x, t), \quad (7)$$

$$\nabla \cdot V = 0, \quad (8)$$

from the same equations for the disturbed (starred) flow. Here $T_0$ and $Q(x, t)$ are, respectively, a prescribed reference temperature and a prescribed heat-source function.

Subsequent deductions about the stability of the difference motion are extracted from the energy identities (1) and (2), the boundary constraints (3), (4) and (5) and kinematic constraint

$$\text{div } V = 0. \quad (9)$$

The local non-linear conservation equations do not play a direct role in further construction of the theory.

Two lines of deduction which start from the energy identities are possible. The first of these leads to a criterion for universal stability. The universal criterion does not depend on details of the motion or geometry of the basic flow. When satisfied, the criterion guarantees asymptotic stability in the sense of an
exponential decay of disturbances of any magnitude (see I for details). The region of certain stability can, however, be extended by a sharper criterion which makes more efficient use of details of the basic flow. This leads to a second line of deduction which we call ‘the problem of the optimum stability boundary’.

The problem of the optimum stability boundary as this is formulated in II consists of finding the largest region in Rayleigh–Reynolds number plane in which a given fluid motion is surely stable. In § 3 below we shall briefly review the structure of this problem. It should be stressed that this particular parameter emphasis is representative. In § 4 below a different parameter emphasis is considered and the stability boundary is defined in a heat-source parameter $N_s$, Rayleigh number plane.

3. The problem of the optimum stability boundary

To begin we introduce a coupling parameter and define an ‘energy’

$$E_\lambda = K + \lambda \text{Pr} \Theta.$$

The requirement that this energy be positive is equivalent to the restriction that $\lambda > 0$. We next simplify the problem by introducing another positive parameter $\mu (0 \leq \mu \leq \infty)$ by the relation $Re = \mu \sqrt{Ra}$. We regard $\mu$ as preassigned and use it to eliminate explicit dependence on the Reynolds number. Introduce the notation

$$I_1 = \int (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{v}) \, \mathbf{v}, \quad I_2 = \int \nabla \psi \cdot \mathbf{v},$$

$$D = 2 \int \mathbf{e} : \mathbf{e}, \quad \mathcal{D} = \int \nabla \Theta \cdot \nabla \Theta + \frac{\rho}{\theta} \Theta^2,$$

$$I_\lambda = I_1 + \lambda I_2, \quad D_\lambda = D + \lambda \mathcal{D},$$

and form the inequality

$$\frac{dE_\lambda}{d\tau} = -1 + \sqrt{Ra} |I_\lambda/D_\lambda| \leq -1 + \sqrt{Ra} \max (-I_\lambda/D_\lambda)$$

$$= -1 + \sqrt{Ra} \rho,$$

or

$$\frac{dE_\lambda}{d\tau} \leq - (1 - \sqrt{Ra} \rho) D_\lambda,$$

where

$$\rho^{-1} = \rho^{-1}(\lambda, \mu) = \max (-I_\lambda/D_\lambda).$$

From the inequality (10) one obtains the following result:

Let the inequalities

$$\frac{1}{2} a^2 \int v^2 \leq D(v, v),$$

$$\frac{1}{2} Pr b^2 \int \theta^2 \leq \mathcal{D}(\Theta, \Theta),$$

with $a^2 > 0$ and $b^2 > 0$, hold. Then, if for any fixed values $\lambda > 0$ and $\mu \geq 0$, $\sqrt{Ra} < \rho(\lambda, \mu)$ in the time interval $[0, T]$, we have

$$E_\lambda(\tau) \leq E_\lambda(0) \exp \{ -(1 - \sqrt{Ra}/\rho) \xi^2 \tau \},$$

where $E_\lambda(0)$ is the initial energy of the difference motion and $\xi^2 = \min (a^2, b^2)$. If $\sqrt{Ra} < \rho$ for all $\tau$ then $E_\lambda \to 0$, and the flow is asymptotically stable in the mean.†

† This result, which was derived jointly by Joseph and Serrin (see II), constitutes a firm basis for the maximum problem defining the numbers $\rho^{-1}(\lambda, \mu)$. It reduces the problem of finding limits sufficient for stability to a standard problem in the calculus of variations.
Proof. Let the assumed inequalities hold. Then

$$E_\lambda = \frac{1}{2}(v^2 + \lambda Pr \theta^2) \leq \alpha^{-2} D(v, v) + \lambda b^{-2} \mathcal{D}(\theta, \theta) \leq \xi^{-2} D_\lambda,$$

which may be combined with (10) to produce

$$\frac{dE_\lambda}{d\tau} \leq - (1 - \sqrt{Ra}/\rho) D_\lambda \leq - \xi^2 (1 - \sqrt{Ra}/\rho) E_\lambda.$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

This last inequality is then integrated on $[0, \tau]$, proving (11) and the theorem.

The hypotheses of the theorem are not very restrictive. It is clear that $\frac{1}{2}a^2$ is the smallest of the eigenvalues associated with the vector Helmholtz equation for $v$ and the conditions (3), (4) and (10). The quantity $\frac{1}{2}Pr b^2$ is similarly identified as the least eigenvalue of the scalar Helmholtz equation for $\theta$ and the condition (5). In nearly all situations encountered in applications, the existence of a positive, least-eigenvalue can be assumed and in many instances proved (see II for references).

Roughly speaking then, stability is guaranteed if $\sqrt{Ra} < \rho(\lambda, \mu)$. This leads naturally to the formulation of a maximum problem for the number $1/\rho$. This number is to be sought as the maximum value of the expression

$$\frac{-I_\lambda}{D_\lambda} = \frac{-I_2(v, \theta) - \lambda I_3(v, \theta)}{D(v, v) + \lambda \mathcal{D}(\theta, \theta)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

over a field of twice-continuously differentiable functions $\theta$ and $v$, satisfying (3), (4), (5) and (9).

This maximum problem generates a field of values $\rho(\lambda, \mu)$ for each $(\lambda, \mu)$ parameter pair. Since for each fixed value of $\mu$ the flow is stable provided only that $\sqrt{Ra} < \rho(\lambda, \mu)$, we may select $\lambda$ so as to give the best possible limit for stability. Since this best limit is clearly that for which $Ra$ is largest, we seek the largest of the values of $\rho(\lambda, \mu)$ over $\lambda$ for a fixed $\mu$, and define

$$R(\mu) = \max_{\lambda > 0} \rho(\lambda, \mu).$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

The locus of values $R(\mu)$ gives the optimum stability boundary, $F(\sqrt{Ra}, \tilde{\theta}) = 0$, parametrically through the equations $\sqrt{Ra} = R(\mu)$ and $\tilde{\theta} = \mu R(\mu)$. The value of $\lambda = \lambda(\mu)$, which is associated with the maximum $\rho$, i.e.

$$R(\mu) = \rho(\lambda(\mu), \mu)$$

is called the best value for the coupling parameter $\lambda$. If this best value is assumed finite, then it may be found as a root of the equation

$$\left( \frac{\partial \rho(\lambda, \mu)}{\partial \lambda} \right)_\mu = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

It follows that

$$\frac{dR}{d\rho} = \left( \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \mu} \right)_\lambda + \left( \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \lambda} \right)_\mu \frac{d\lambda}{d\mu} = \left( \frac{\partial \rho(\lambda, \mu)}{\partial \mu} \right)_\lambda,$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

and $R(\mu)$ is an envelope of the curves $\rho$ (const., $\mu$) depending on the parameter $\lambda = \text{const.}$.

A summary statement of the structure of the problem may be readily grasped from figure 1. In this figure, $I$ is the region of universal stability. The problem of
the optimum stability boundary is posed so as to delineate a larger region of certain stability (11) by using the details of the basic motion. The stability boundary $F(\sqrt{Ra}, \tilde{Re}) = 0$ is determined as follows: we first fix $\mu$. This determines a ray from the origin. A set of maximizing eigenvalues $1/\rho$ are then found for different $\lambda$ and the fixed $\mu$. The $\lambda$ which produces the maximum value of $\rho$ on the given ray determines the critical value $R(\mu)$. The corresponding critical Reynolds number is given parametrically by $\mu R(\mu)$. The stability boundary $F(\sqrt{Ra}, \tilde{Re}) = 0$ is generated as $\mu$ takes on allowed values in the first quadrant.
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**Figure 1.** Stability regions and stability boundary. All flows for which boundary temperatures and velocities are prescribed and which can be contained in a sphere of diameter $d$ are stable in I. By using known details of the basic motion this region is extended to the boundary of the largest region, that is, the optimum boundary $F(\sqrt{Ra}, \tilde{Re}) = 0$. Eigenvalues $\rho(\lambda, \mu)$ lie in the stable regions I and II; $R(\mu) = \max_{\lambda>0} \rho(\lambda, \mu)$.

It should be noted that in the preceding development we have chosen to suppress the possible dependence of the system on parameters other than $\mu$. This is not an essential feature of theory, and these and subsequent remarks apply when there are other parameters which characterize the basic state. It is precisely these other parameters with which we are concerned in the applications which follow.

4. Generalization and solution of the problem of the optimum stability boundary

The maximum problem (13) is easily formulated in the framework of variational calculus. We require that

$$-\{I_1(v, \theta) + \lambda I_2(v, \theta)\} = \max_{\lambda>0} 1/\rho(\lambda, \mu)$$

(17)

hold for a class of twice-continuously-differentiable functions $v$ and $\theta$ satisfying (3), (4), (5) and (9) and the normalizing condition

$$D(v, v) + \lambda \mathcal{D}(\theta, \theta) = 1.$$ 

(18)
Lagrange multipliers \( R_\lambda \) and \( P(x, y, z, t) \) are then introduced, and (17), (3), (4), (5), (9) and (18) are reformulated in a system of partial differential equations by requiring

\[
\delta \left( I_1(v, \theta) + \lambda I_2(v, \theta) - \frac{2p}{R_\lambda} \nabla \cdot v + \frac{1}{R_\lambda} (D(v, v) + \lambda \mathcal{D}(\theta, \theta)) \right) = 0. \tag{19}
\]

The Euler–Lagrange equations corresponding to (19) are

\[
\frac{1}{2} (R_\lambda / 4\lambda) (\lambda \nabla \psi + f) \cdot v = \nabla^2 \theta, \tag{20}
\]

\[
\mu R_\lambda v \cdot e + \frac{1}{2} R_\lambda (\lambda \nabla \psi + f) \theta = -\nabla p + \nabla^2 v, \tag{21}
\]

which are to be solved subject to (3), (4), (5) and (9). It is easy to establish that for any normalized solution of the Euler–Lagrange equations and side conditions

\[
-I_1(v, \theta) - \lambda I_2(v, \theta) = 1/R_\lambda. \tag{22}
\]

Hence it follows that the values

\[
\rho(\lambda, \mu) = \min R_\lambda(\mu) \tag{23}
\]

for any of the positive set of eigenvalues \( R_\lambda \). Also

\[
R(\mu) = \max_{\lambda > 0} \rho(\lambda, \mu) = \max_{\lambda > 0} (\min R_\lambda(\mu)). \tag{24}
\]

Given the solutions to the maximum problem, i.e. the numbers \( \rho^{-1}(\lambda, \mu) \) and the corresponding eigenfunctions \( v, \theta \), the problem of finding the best value for the coupling parameter \( \lambda \) and the associated stability boundary may be easily resolved (see II). The technique used to resolve this problem yields the result that

\[
\lambda = \frac{\int f \cdot \psi \theta}{\int \nabla \psi \cdot \nabla \theta}. \tag{25}
\]

This result is independent of the nature of the basic state, and applies not only when the system dependence on parameters other than the Rayleigh and Reynolds number is suppressed, that is, when \( \lambda = \lambda(\mu) \), but also generally.

(25) is a direct consequence of the following relation:

\[
\int \psi . \delta(\mu \sqrt{\lambda \epsilon}) \psi + \sqrt{\lambda} \int \delta G_\lambda \cdot \psi \theta = -\delta(\sqrt{\lambda}/\rho) - (\sqrt{\lambda^2}/\rho) \int \delta \theta \dd \theta^2, \tag{26}
\]

where \( G_\lambda = \lambda \nabla \psi + f \). For suppose that the \( \lambda \) which gives \( \rho \) its maximum value is finite, and the system depends on parameters \( \alpha_i \). Then the best values of \( \lambda \) will be found as a root of the equation

\[
\frac{\partial \rho(\lambda, \mu, \alpha_i)}{\partial \lambda} = 0, \tag{27}
\]

which implies, through (26), that

\[
\mu \int \psi . \epsilon . \psi + 2\lambda \int \nabla \psi . \nabla \psi \cdot \psi \theta = -1/R(\mu, \alpha_i).
\]

One compares this with the maximum problem (13) to produce (25).

(25) is particularly valuable for estimating the best value of \( \lambda \), when it is not possible to do this from a priori considerations. We shall demonstrate this
repeatedly in the applications which follow. When \( f = \nabla \psi \) then \( \lambda = 1 \), a fact which makes it possible to exclude the possibility of subcritical instabilities for a wide class of basic motions starting from rest (see II).

The solution of the problem of the best coupling parameter is but one application of (26). A number of interesting deductions, particularly how these bear upon the problem of finding the optimum stability boundary, may be made from (26). (See II and § 5.)

It remains then to establish (26). First change variables so that \( \vartheta = \phi / \sqrt[4]{\lambda} \), then consider two different solutions of the Euler–Lagrange equations and identify them with subscripts. Thus \( v_1 = \bar{v}_1 \) and \( \theta_1 = \bar{\theta}_1 \) satisfy the Euler–Lagrange equations for \( R_1, \lambda_1, e_1, \nabla \psi_1, f_1 \) and \( h_1 \). Equations (20) and (21) written for subscript one are multiplied by \( \phi_2 \) and \( v_2 \), respectively, and integrated over \( \mathcal{V} \). This procedure is repeated with the subscripts exchanged. In this way we are led to the four equations \( (j = 1, i = 2, \text{and } j = 2, i = 1) \)

\[
\frac{1}{2} \left( \lambda_j \nabla \psi + f \right) \cdot v_j \phi_j = - (\lambda_j/R_j) \Omega (\phi_1, \phi_2), \tag{28}
\]

\[
\mu_j \nabla \phi_j \cdot v_i + \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_j \nabla \psi + f) \cdot v_i \phi_j = - (\lambda_j/R_j) D(v_j, v_i), \tag{29}
\]

where \( R_i = \rho(\lambda_i, \mu_i, h_i, \ldots) \). A linear combination of the equations can then be made to produce

\[
\frac{1}{\lambda_2} (v_1, (\mu_2 \sqrt{\lambda_2} e_2 - \mu_1 \sqrt{\lambda_1} e_1) \cdot v_2 + \frac{1}{2} (G \lambda_2 - G \lambda_1) (v_2 \phi_1 + v \phi_2)
= - (\sqrt{\lambda_2/R_2} - \sqrt{\lambda_1/R_1}) (D(v_1, v_2) + D(\phi_1, \phi_2))
- \frac{1}{2} (h_2 \sqrt{\lambda_2/R_2} - h_1 \sqrt{\lambda_1/R_1}) \phi_1 \phi_2. \tag{30}
\]

Now let the solutions coalesce and use \( \phi = \theta / \sqrt[4]{\lambda} \) (18) and (27) to produce (26).

5. On the destabilizing effect of the Robin condition

As a first application of the general theory, we investigate the effect of the Nusselt number \( (h) \) on the stability limits. For simplicity we fix the distribution \( f(r) \) of \( h = Nu f(r) \) but allow the magnitude \( Nu \) to vary. It will be recalled that \( h \) enters the problem through the Robin condition

\[
\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial N} + Nu f(r) \theta = 0 \quad (0 \neq f(r) \geq 0),
\]

on the temperature of the difference motion. The limits \( N u \to 0, N u \to \infty \) imply, respectively, a prescribed heat flux or a prescribed temperature on the boundary \( \mathcal{S} \) of \( \mathcal{V} \). The prescribed temperature condition, like the prescribed displacement condition for vibrating systems, is most restrictive or, in other words, most stable. This fact has been abundantly verified by exact calculation from the linear equations (Sparrow, Goldstein & Jonsson 1964, Sani 1963) and is here recovered, for the non-linear case, as an easy application of (26).

Consider that all basic-state parameters except \( Nu \) are fixed and determine the effect of \( Nu \) on the stability limit \( R(Nu) \). The Nusselt number now plays a role analogous to the Reynolds number in § 2. In particular (25) for the best \( \lambda \) is valid as is found from the requirement that

\[
\left( \frac{\partial \rho(\lambda, Nu)}{\partial \lambda} \right)_{Nu} = 0 \tag{31}
\]
for the best $\lambda = \lambda(Nu)$. Using (31) we find that

$$\frac{dR(Nu)}{dNu} = \frac{\partial^2 (\lambda, Nu)}{\partial \lambda \partial Nu} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial Nu} + \frac{\partial \rho(\lambda, Nu)}{\partial Nu} = \left( \frac{\partial \rho(\lambda, Nu)}{\partial Nu} \right)_\lambda. \quad (32)$$

This last partial derivative is easily formed from (26) as

$$\frac{dR(Nu)}{dNu} = \lambda R f(x) \partial^2 > 0. \quad (33)$$

It follows that the stability limit $R(Nu)$ increases monotonically with the Nusselt number.

We observe that when $Nu$ is large, the Robin condition will ordinarily force a large normal derivative and a relatively small value of $\theta$ on $\mathcal{S}$. Then the equation

$$\frac{dR(Nu)}{dNu} = -\frac{\lambda R}{2Nu} \oint \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial N}$$

will imply very slow changes of stability limit as the Nusselt number is decreased through very large values.

We also note that in many cases this last conclusion is valid for local perturbations of steady solutions of the Boussinesq equations. When $\mu = 0$ and $f = \nabla \psi$, the Euler–Lagrange equations coincide with the linear perturbation equations with partial time derivatives set to zero (see II). This implies that no subcritical instabilities exist, and conclusions drawn from the energy method are sufficient for instability as well as stability. It follows, that for these cases less than perfect control of the thermal boundary condition will not introduce great error into experimental results which purport to verify stability limits for the prescribed temperature case (cf. Sani 1963).

Our next application of energy theory bears directly on the question of subcritical instabilities. It is to this question that we now turn.

6. Subcritical convective instability in fluid layers

In this section we apply the theory to obtain stability limits for transversally infinite fluid layers heated from below and internally. We shall assume that the initially quiet fluid layer is bounded above and below by rigid plates, and we locate the co-ordinate origin at the lower plate. The distance between plates is unity (measured in units of $d$). The unit vector $\mathbf{i}$ points in the direction of $z$ increasing, and $\nabla \psi = \mathbf{i} \partial \psi / \partial z$ and $f = -\mathbf{i}$. Under stated conditions (20) and (21) may be written as

$$\frac{\lambda}{\lambda} \left( \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} - 1 \right) \omega = \nabla^2 \theta, \quad (34)$$

$$\frac{\lambda}{\lambda} \left( \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} - 1 \right) \mathbf{i} \theta = -\nabla p + \nabla^2 v. \quad (35)$$

When $\partial \psi / \partial z = -1$, $\lambda = 1$ (equation (25)) then (34) and (35) coincide with the classical Rayleigh–Jeffrey’s problem. No subcritical instabilities exist even when the problem is generalized to include the Robin condition on the temperature (see II).
In the present application the distribution of temperature in the quiet state differs from linearity by virtue of a distribution of internal heat sources, which, for ease of comparison with known results of linear theory (Sparrow et al. 1964), is taken as uniform across the channel.

The temperature distribution corresponding to circumstances specified above is

\[ T = -\frac{1}{2}(s/\kappa)x_3^2 + Ax_3 + B, \]

where \( s \) is the internal heat-source intensity, and \( \kappa \) is the thermal conductivity.

This may be written in non-dimensional variables as

\[ \frac{T - T_2}{T_1 - T_2} = N_s(z - z_2) + (1 - z), \tag{36} \]

where \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) are the temperatures of the bottom and top plate respectively, \( z = x_3/d \) and \( N_s = \frac{1}{2}sd^3/\kappa(T_1 - T_2) \) is a heat-source parameter considered positive, i.e. restricted to cases for which \( T_1 > T_2 \). From (36)

\[ \frac{dT}{dx_3} = \frac{T_1 - T_2}{d} (N_s(1 - 2z) - 1), \]

and with \( \beta = \max |\frac{dT}{dx_3}| = \frac{T_1 - T_2}{d} (N_s + 1), \)

we obtain

\[ \frac{d\psi}{dz} = \frac{1}{\beta} \frac{dT}{dx_3} = \frac{2N_s(1 - z)}{N_s + 1} - 1. \tag{37} \]

For easy comparison with known results of linear theory, we have stated our results in terms of a Rayleigh number

\[ RA = \frac{\alpha gd^3 |T_1 - T_2|}{\kappa \gamma} = Ra \frac{|T_1 - T_2|}{\beta d} = \frac{Ra}{N_s + 1}. \tag{38} \]

Our critical value is designated as \( \tilde{RA} \). The critical value of linear theory is called \( RA_c \). We next use (37), (38) and the variable \( \phi = \sqrt{\lambda \theta} \) to rewrite (34) and (35) as

\[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left( \lambda \frac{\{N_s(1 - 2z) - 1\}}{N_s + 1} \right) \omega = \nabla^2 \phi, \tag{39} \]

\[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left( \lambda \frac{\{N_s(1 - 2z) - 1\}}{N_s + 1} \right) \mathbf{i} \phi = -\nabla p + \nabla^2 \mathbf{v}. \tag{40} \]

These are to be solved subject to a prescribed temperature condition

\[ \phi(0) = \phi(1) = 0 \]

and a solenoidal velocity vanishing at \( z = 0, 1 \).

We next assert that on the optimum stability boundary

\[ \tilde{RA} \geq \frac{1708}{N_s + 1}. \tag{41} \]

Stated in another way stability is guaranteed when

\[ RA \leq \frac{1708}{N_s + 1}. \tag{42} \]
The estimates (41) and (42) follow as a simple consequence of (26), which in the present context has the form

$$\int \left( \delta \lambda \nabla \psi + \lambda \nabla \frac{d \psi}{d N_s} \right) \cdot \psi \phi = - \delta \left( \frac{\lambda}{\rho} \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (43)

Also, when $\rho = R = \sqrt{Ra}$ and $\lambda = \lambda(N_s)$ (see (25)),

$$\int (\lambda \nabla \psi + f) \cdot \psi \phi = - \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{R(N_s)} = 2 \int f \cdot \psi \phi. \hspace{1cm} (44)$$

The condition for the best $\lambda = \lambda(N_s)$ implies that

$$\frac{d R(N_s)}{d N_s} = \left( \frac{\partial \rho(\lambda(N_s), N_s)}{\partial N_s} \right)_\lambda,$$

which is easily evaluated from (43) as

$$\frac{\sqrt{\lambda} d R}{R^2 d N_s} = \lambda \int \nabla \left( \frac{d \psi}{d N_s} \right) \cdot \psi \phi. \hspace{1cm} (45)$$

We next divide (45) by (44) and use $f = -i$ and

$$\nabla \frac{d \psi}{d N_s} = 2i \frac{(1 - z)}{(N_s + 1)^2}$$

to obtain

$$\frac{1}{R} \frac{d R}{d N_s} = \frac{\lambda}{(N_s + 1)^2} \frac{\int (1 - z) \phi}{\int \phi}. \hspace{1cm} (46)$$

The formula (25) for the best $\lambda$ has the form

$$\lambda \int \left( \frac{2N_s(1 - z)}{N_s + 1} - 1 \right) \check{\phi} = - \int \check{\phi},$$

implying that

$$\frac{\int (1 - z) \phi}{\int \phi} = \frac{(\lambda - 1)(N_s + 1)}{2\lambda N_s}. \hspace{1cm} (47)$$

Use (47) in (46) and multiply the resulting equation by $R^2 = \tilde{R}a$ to produce

$$\frac{d \tilde{R}a}{d N_s} = \frac{\tilde{R}a(\lambda - 1)}{(N_s + 1) N_s} = \frac{\lambda - 1}{N_s} \tilde{R}a,$$

or

$$\frac{d \tilde{R}a}{d N_s} = \frac{\tilde{R}a}{N_s + 1} \left( \frac{\lambda - 1}{N_s} - 1 \right). \hspace{1cm} (48)$$

Of course $\lambda = \lambda(N_s)$ and is not known explicitly. Nevertheless,

$$d \log \tilde{R}a = \frac{\lambda - 1}{N_s} d \log (N_s + 1) - d \log (N_s + 1)$$

may be integrated from the known point $(\tilde{R}a, N_s) = (1708, 0)$ to obtain

$$\log \left( \frac{\tilde{R}a(N_s + 1)}{1708} \right) = \int_0^{N_s} \frac{(\lambda - 1) d N_s}{N_s (N_s + 1)}. \hspace{1cm} (49)$$

Equation (41) follows easily from (49) under the assumption that $\lambda - 1 > 0$, as is strongly suggested by (47) and (44).
Equation (49) is an exact result. It implies not only the estimate (41) but also the exact limits
\[
\left(\frac{d \log \tilde{R}A}{d \log N_s}\right)_{N_s=0} = 0, \quad \left(\frac{d \log \tilde{R}A}{d \log N_s}\right)_{N_s \to \infty} = -1.
\]

In figure 2 we have compared the estimate (41) with the exact solution, obtained numerically by the Runge–Kutta–Gill method (Harris & Reid 1964, Sparrow 1964). This method is applied to the equations
\[
(D^2 - k^2) \phi - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left(\lambda \frac{d \psi}{dz} - 1\right) \omega = 0, \quad (50)
\]
\[
(D^2 - k^2) \omega + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left(\lambda \frac{d \psi}{dz} - 1\right) \phi = 0, \quad (51)
\]

![Figure 2. The optimum stability boundary compared with an a priori estimate.](image)

where \(\omega\) and \(\phi\) are amplitudes and \(k\) the overall wave-number of the (periodic) normal velocity and temperature disturbances. Equations (50) and (51) follow easily upon substitution of a normal mode proportional to \(\exp(ik_x x + ik_y y)\) into (39) and (40). They are to be solved for the conditions
\[
\omega = D\omega = \phi = 0 \quad \text{at} \quad z = 0, 1. \quad (52)
\]

The problem defined by (50), (51) and (52) is a classic eigenvalue problem. We here regard \(R_\lambda\) as the eigenvalue. In general, the values of \(R_\lambda\) for which non-trivial solutions exist depend on the other parameters so that
\[
R_\lambda = R_\lambda(\lambda, k, N_s).
\]
For a fixed value of $N_s$ and any fixed $\lambda > 0$, the flow is stable provided that
\[
\sqrt{Ra} < \tilde{R}_\lambda = \min_{\kappa > 0} R_\lambda.
\tag{53}
\]
The best value for $\lambda$ is that which gives the best stability limit, i.e. the largest $RA$. Hence,
\[
\sqrt{Ra} = \max_{\lambda > 0} \min_{\kappa > 0} R_\lambda.
\tag{54}
\]

The field of minimum values $\tilde{R}_\lambda$ is generated by the Runge-Kutta Gill method. This procedure is fairly standard and is briefly discussed in part 2 of this paper.
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**Figure 3.** The optimum stability boundary as the loci of the best value of the coupling parameter $\lambda$. ——. $\tilde{R}_\lambda(N_s, N_s)/(N_s + 1)$; ———. $RA(N_s, N_s)$, the locus of the maxima of the curves giving $\tilde{R}_\lambda/(N_s + 1)$.

and in the cited references. The critical Rayleigh number is extracted from this field by numerical searching for the maxima required by (54). Figures 3 and 4 give the result of this search.

Before turning to a description of the results, we should like to remark upon the usefulness of the equation for the best $\lambda$ in approximating the best value for an initial guess at a solution for (54). From (47) we find
\[
\frac{1}{\lambda} = 1 - \frac{N_s}{N_s + 1} (\omega \phi)^*,
\tag{55}
\]
where $(\omega \phi)^*$ and $(\omega \phi)^{\dagger}$ are mean values as defined by the first mean-value theorem of integral calculus. Alternately, if $\omega \phi$ is assumed to be one-signed on $(0, 1)$,
\[
\frac{1}{\lambda} = 1 - \frac{2N_s}{N_s + 1} \frac{\phi}{\lambda},
\tag{56}
\]
where $\tilde{z}$ is a mean value ($0 < \tilde{z} < 1$). When $N_s = 0$, $\lambda = 1$. As $N_s \to \infty$, $\lambda$ tends to a limiting value independent of $N_s$. The result, which is suggested by (55) and (50), is borne out by the numerical results. These show that for $N_s > 10$, $\tilde{z} \approx \frac{3}{8}$ and $\lambda \approx 4.2$.

![Definitely unstable](image)

**Figure 4.** Heated from below with internal heat sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$N_s$</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$RA_e$</th>
<th>$\tilde{RA}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>1708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td>1708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>1545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.** Values of parameters for critical Rayleigh numbers of linear and energy theory

In figure 3 we have sketched (solid line) the variation of $\tilde{RA}_e/(N_s + 1)$ with $\lambda$ as the variable and $N_s$ a parameter. The dotted line is the locus of the ‘best’ values of $\lambda$ over the range of $N_s$ values. This is the locus $\tilde{RA}(N_s)$ which defines the values of $RA$ below which arbitrary disturbances certainly decay.

In figure 4 and table 1 we have compared the locus $\tilde{RA}_e(N_s)$ (Sparrow et al. 1964), which defines a boundary above which the given flow is certainly unstable, with the locus $\tilde{RA}(N_s)$, which defines a boundary below which a given flow is certainly stable. The region between these boundaries is potentially open to sub-critical instabilities.
It will be observed that the difference between \( RA(N_s) \) and \( \widetilde{RA}(N_s) \) increases monotonically from zero, when \( N_s = 0 \), to a finite but not large difference, as \( N_s \to \infty \).
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