

**OCEAN STIRRING BY SWIMMING BODIES**

By


**Jean-Luc Thiffeault**

and

**Stephen Childress**

**IMA Preprint Series # 2301**

(March 2010)



**INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS AND ITS APPLICATIONS**

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
400 Lind Hall  
207 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455-0436

Phone: 612-624-6066 Fax: 612-626-7370

URL: <http://www.ima.umn.edu>

# Report Documentation Page

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE <b>MAR 2010</b>		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED <b>00-00-2010 to 00-00-2010</b>	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>Ocean Stirring by Swimming Bodies</b>				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>University of Minnesota, Institute for Mathematics and Its Applications, 207 Church Street SE, Minneapolis, MN, 55455-0436</b>				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>			

# Ocean stirring by swimming bodies

Jean-Luc Thiffeault<sup>1,2</sup> and Stephen Childress<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Mathematics, University of Wisconsin – Madison, 480 Lincoln Dr., Madison, WI 53706, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Institute for Mathematics and Applications, University of Minnesota – Twin Cities,  
207 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA\**

<sup>3</sup>*Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, 251 Mercer Street, New York, NY 10012, USA*

We consider the stirring of an inviscid fluid caused by the locomotion of bodies through it. The swimmers are approximated by non-interacting cylinders or spheres moving steadily along straight lines. We find the displacement of fluid particles caused by the nearby passage of a swimmer as a function of an impact parameter. We use this to compute the effective diffusion coefficient from the random walk of a fluid particle under the influence of a distribution of swimming bodies. We compare with the results of simulations. For typical sizes, densities and swimming velocities of krill, the effective diffusivity in this model is five times the thermal diffusivity. However, we estimate that viscosity increases this value by two orders of magnitude.

Munk [1] was the first to ask whether biology has an important impact on mixing in the oceans. Since mixing affects the global circulation and stratification of the oceans, it is of great interest to physical oceanographers to settle this question. Dewar et al. [2] have proposed that the mechanical energy delivered by the swimming motions of the marine biosphere could amount to almost  $10^{12}$  W, a figure comparable to the energy delivered by the winds and tides. This suggests a biological origin of about 33% of the mixing in the oceans, an enormous figure. By assuming that this energy is delivered to the top three kilometers of the oceans, they estimate an effective diffusivity produced by swimmers to be approximately  $.2 \text{ cm}^2/\text{sec}$ , or about 100 times the molecular value for heat. Kunze et al. [3] have measured elevated levels of ocean turbulence due to swimming krill, though some have questioned whether this turbulence can efficiently overturn a stratified medium [4, 5]. Katija and Dabiri [6] suggest that the displacement of fluid particles by swimming bodies, which viscous effects can lengthen, is more relevant to stirring than the scale of turbulence they produce. This is the viewpoint adopted in this Letter.

Huntley and Zhou [7] considered the energy produced by 11 representative species of schooling animals, from krill to whales, and found that regardless of size the energy input to the ocean per unit mass from the swimming of these animals was roughly a constant of order  $10^{-5}$  W/kg. If the average the biomass of the oceans has a volume density of  $c$  over a volume  $V$  in cubic meters, we can thus (assuming biological materials have the density of water) arrive at a total energy input of  $10^{-2}cV$  W. The area of the oceans is about  $3.6 \times 10^{14}$  m, and if we assume the biomass is evenly distributed to a depth  $D$  meters, we get an input of  $3.6Dc \times 10^{12}$  W. This suggests that for a typical depth of one kilometer the volume density of the biomass should be of order  $10^{-3}$ – $10^{-4}$ , and thus that the organisms form a dilute suspension, even if their distribution is patchy and organized into schools.

The object of the present paper is to determine the effective diffusivity and the statistics of the concentration

field of a passive scalar that can result from the fluid motions caused by such dilute arrangements of swimming animals. The scalar could be for example heat, salt, or nutrients, and is assumed to have negligible feedback on the flow (at least at small scales). The animals considered by Dewar et al. [2] and Huntley and Zhou [7] have large Reynolds number, typically  $10^2$ – $10^7$ . Our focus is therefore distinct from the mixing that can occur from dense, tightly interacting suspensions of Stokesian swimmers, as in [8], though it shares many common features such as linearity in the density of swimmers. Real swimmers presents a wide variety of motions and wakes, but these have generic forms in the far field [9]. For example, the far potential field of a neutrally buoyant fish in steady unaccelerated swimming decays at least like a quadrupole. Following [6], we will model the swimmers by identical cylinders or spheres moving in potential flow, but these are merely stand-in examples. We emphasize that though the motivating application comes from oceanography, the simple model we introduce can be applied to a range of systems, such as the mixing caused by vortices or suspensions of solid particles.

*Dilute suspensions of swimmers.* As an extremely simple model of stirring by swimmers, we consider a fluid particle, called the target particle, which is influenced by the occasional passing of swimming bodies. We assume that every swimmer moves at a fixed speed  $U$ , over distances  $O(L)$  large compared to the “range of influence.” This range will typically be a few body lengths normal to the swimming path, and represents the distance from a target particle where interaction with the swimmer becomes significant. We assume that encounters of our target particle with swimmers are occasional, in that at each encounter the particle moves by a distance  $\Delta(a)$ , where the impact parameter  $a$  is the perpendicular distance of the initially unperturbed particle from the extended line of motion of the approaching swimmer. Since we are assuming that  $L$  is large compared to the distance of significant interaction, we may assume that by an “encounter” we mean that the  $\Delta(a)$  may be computed from motion

of the swimmer along a doubly-infinite line. Each encounter, the  $k$ th say, moves the particle a distance  $\Delta(a_k)$ , in the direction of the unit vector  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k$ . Thus after  $M$  encounters the position of a target particle initially at  $\mathbf{x}_0$  is  $\mathbf{x}_M$  given by

$$\mathbf{x}_M = \mathbf{x}_0 + \sum_{k=1}^M \Delta(a_k) \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k. \quad (1)$$

Assuming infrequent encounters, we regard the  $a_k, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k$  as independent and identically distributed random variables. Then [10]

$$\langle |\mathbf{x}|^2 \rangle = M \langle \Delta^2(a) \rangle + \left\langle \sum_{j \neq k} \Delta(a_j) \Delta(a_k) \hat{\mathbf{r}}_j \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k \right\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where we assume spatial homogeneity to set  $\mathbf{x}_0 = 0$ , and the angle brackets denote ensemble averaging. The  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k$  are isotropically distributed, so the second term above vanishes.

To evaluate  $M \langle \Delta^2(a) \rangle$ , consider a swimmer at a large distance  $L$  from the target particle at the origin  $O$ . Imagine a ‘‘target disk’’ (or sphere in 3D) of radius  $R$ , with  $\ell \ll R \ll L$ , where  $\ell$  is a typical length scale for the swimmer. The fraction of swimmers that will hit the target disk (sphere) is  $2R/2\pi L$  ( $\pi R^2/4\pi L^2$  in 3D). We can use the number density and the volume of the ‘shell’ at a distance  $L$  to find that the number of swimmers hitting the target from a distance  $L$  is  $2Rn dL$  ( $\pi R^2 n dL$  in 3D), where  $n$  is the number density of swimmers. We now integrate from 0 to  $Ut$ , since swimmers further than  $Ut$  cannot hit the target, to find the number of swimmers  $M$  that will hit the interaction disk (sphere) in time  $t$ : we find  $M = 2RUnt$  ( $M = \pi R^2 Unt$  in 3D). The expression for the squared displacement (2) is now

$$\langle |\mathbf{x}|^2 \rangle = 2M \int_0^R \rho(a) \Delta^2(a) da$$

since the largest value of the impact parameter is  $R$ . Here  $\rho(a)$  is the probability distribution of impact parameters; since the swimmers are assumed to arrive from far away, this is  $\rho(a) = 1/R$  ( $\rho(a) = 2\pi a/\pi R^2$  in 3D). Combining these results and taking  $R \rightarrow \infty$ , we find

$$\langle |\mathbf{x}|^2 \rangle = \begin{cases} 2Unt \int_0^\infty \Delta^2(a) da & (2D); \\ 2\pi Unt \int_0^\infty a \Delta^2(a) da & (3D), \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

assuming that the integrals converge. Since the effective diffusivity  $\kappa$  is defined by  $\langle |\mathbf{x}|^2 \rangle = 2d\kappa t$ , with  $d$  the spatial dimension, Eq. (3) can be used to determine  $\kappa$ .

*Displacement due to a moving body.* To find the displacement  $\Delta(a)$  of a target particle due to a swimming body coming from infinitely far away and swimming in the  $z$  direction, we need to integrate the equations for the position of a target particle at  $\mathbf{x}(t)$ ,

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad \mathbf{x}(-\infty) = (a, 0, -\infty) \quad (4)$$




FIG. 1: Displacement  $\Delta(a)$  due to a cylinder, as a function of the impact parameter  $a$ . The dashed lines are the asymptotic forms for small and large  $a$  of Eq. (5). A few typical trajectories are overlaid: for large  $a$  the trajectory is almost circular, but is still ribbon-shaped.

for  $t$  ranging from  $-\infty$  to  $\infty$ . The impact parameter,  $a$ , appears as the initial vertical position of the target particle. This classical ‘drift’ problem has been treated in great detail by many authors; see for example [11, 12].

As a working example of the displacement due to a moving body, we shall first treat the cylinder. We consider the displacement in two-dimensional flow due to the passage of a cylinder of radius  $\ell$  moving at speed  $U$  in potential flow. Equation (4) can be integrated numerically for a given  $a$  to obtain  $\Delta(a)$ , plotted in Fig. 1. The characteristic ‘ribbon’ shape is evident. Also shown are the asymptotic forms [11]

$$\Delta(a)/\ell \sim \begin{cases} \log(\ell/a) + .0794, & a \ll \ell; \\ \pi(\ell/a)^3/2, & a \gg \ell. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

There is an integrable logarithmic singularity for small  $a$ . For large  $a$ , the trajectories are almost circles. By combining these asymptotic limits with numerical integration, we find the integral from Eq. (3) is  $\int_0^\infty \Delta^2(a) da \simeq 2.37\ell^3$ . But note that  $\int_0^\ell \Delta^2(a) da \simeq 2.31\ell^3$ : the integral is completely dominated by ‘‘head-on’’ collisions (97% of the integral).

For a sphere in three-dimensional potential flow, the displacement  $\Delta(a)$  appears superficially much as for the cylinder in Fig. 1, but drops off more rapidly for large  $a$ :

$$\Delta(a)/\ell \sim \begin{cases} \frac{4}{3} \log(\ell/a) - .582, & a \ll \ell; \\ 9\pi(\ell/a)^5/64, & a \gg \ell. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

As for the cylinder, there is an integrable logarithmic singularity for small  $a$ , and the integral in Eq. (3) is  $\int_0^\infty a \Delta^2(a) da \simeq .254\ell^4$ . The small  $a$  logarithmic singularity is mollified by the extra factor of  $a$  in the integral, but still  $\int_0^\ell a \Delta^2(a) da \simeq .250\ell^4$ : as it was for for the cylinder, the integral is completely dominated by ‘‘head-on’’ collisions (98% of the integral), due to the rapid decay of




FIG. 2: (a) Initial configuration of  $N = 100$  cylinders moving at constant speed  $U = 1$  in random directions. Each cylinder has radius  $\ell = 1$  and the periodic box size used in the simulation is  $L = 1000$  (cylinders not to scale). (b) Trajectory of target particle, initially at the origin, integrated for  $10^5$  time units.

the displacement with impact parameter. For both the cylinders and spheres, the logarithmic singularity is the dominant contribution to the integral. The coefficient of the logarithm in Eqs. (5) and (6) is given by the linearized flow near the stagnation points at the front and rear of the cylinder or sphere, suggesting that the integral is easy to approximate for more complicated swimmers. Putting all the numerical factors together, we find the effective diffusivity

$$\kappa = \begin{cases} 1.19 Un\ell^3 & (\text{cylinders}); \\ .266 Un\ell^4 & (\text{spheres}). \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

*Direct simulation of dilute suspensions.* To validate our theoretical predictions, we consider the encounters of 2D swimmers moving in straight lines within the square  $\mathcal{S}$ :  $-\frac{1}{2}L \leq x, y \leq \frac{1}{2}L$ . We assume each swimmer is a cylinder of radius  $\ell = 1$ , with  $L \gg \ell$ . We initially place  $N$  swimmers at random positions within  $\mathcal{S}$ , which subsequently move with unit speed in a random direction. (Figure 2(a) shows a typical initial configuration.) Positions are subsequently computed mod  $L$  in both directions, maintaining the number density  $n$  in  $\mathcal{S}$ . Diluteness requires that  $n\ell^2 \ll 1$ . A target particle initially at the origin moves under the potential flow created by all of the cylinders. Since the cylinders are typically well-separated, we compute their net velocity field by linear superposition. We show an example of this computation in figure 2(b), for the values  $L = 1000$ ,  $n = 10^{-4}$ . The larger “ribbons” caused by drift are easily identified, suggesting that in this dilute limit the approximation of encounters as being independent will hold.

Figure 3 shows the mean-squared displacement  $\langle |\mathbf{x}|^2 \rangle$  of a target particle over  $2 \times 10^6$  trials (realizations) for  $N = 10$  cylinders, again with unit radius and speed. The solid line confirms that  $\langle |\mathbf{x}|^2 \rangle$  grows linearly with time, and the dashed line shows the 2D theoretical prediction (7) for cylinders. The discrepancy is due to Eq. (7) only being valid in the limit of infinite dilution, i.e. as  $n\ell^2 \rightarrow 0$ . We have verified that as the dilution




FIG. 3: The mean-squared displacement (solid line) of a target particle for  $2 \times 10^6$  realizations of  $N = 10$  cylinders, with otherwise the same parameters as in the caption to Fig. 2(a). The dashed line shows the squared-displacement predicted by Eq. (3) and (7), using a number density  $n = 10^{-5}$ . The discrepancy between the two lines is due to (7) being valid in the limit of infinite dilution. The background shows a few individual trajectories: the mean is dominated by rare large events.

is increased the slope approaches the theoretical prediction. In the background of figure 3 we show the squared displacement for some individual trajectories: it is clear that the mean is dominated by a few trajectories with large displacements, corresponding to small impact parameter  $a$ . Analogous remarks apply to a suspension of spheres in three dimensions: the theoretical predictions are verified there as well.

*Typical numerical values.* We will use values for typical krill as in [4]. We consider spheres of radius  $\ell = 1$  cm, swimming speed  $U = 5$  cm/sec, and number density  $n = 5 \times 10^{-3}$  cm $^{-3}$ . Equation (7) then gives an effective diffusivity of  $7 \times 10^{-3}$  cm $^2$ /sec, about five times the thermal molecular value  $1.5 \times 10^{-3}$  cm $^2$ /sec, and five hundred times the molecular value  $1.6 \times 10^{-5}$  cm $^2$ /sec for salt. This implies a considerable enhancement to the molecular diffusion, but we emphasize that these values apply within a school of krill: the distribution and size of the schools themselves is a more complicated matter [7]. Note also that a small change in the swimmer size has a huge impact: for a radius of .5 cm, the effective diffusivity is  $4 \times 10^{-4}$  cm $^2$ /sec, an order of magnitude smaller than for 1 cm.

*Effect of viscosity.* We expect viscosity to greatly enhance  $\kappa$ . This will be the focus of future investigation, but for now we present a rough estimate of the impact of viscous no-slip boundary conditions at the surface of the swimmer. For inviscid flow, the displacement function  $\Delta(a)$  has a logarithmic singularity near the axis of swimming; for viscous flow near a no-slip boundary, the displacement function has the stronger singularity

$$\Delta(a) \sim C\ell^2/a, \quad a \ll \ell, \quad (8)$$

where  $C = \sqrt{2/3}\pi$  for a sphere of radius  $\ell$  [13]. This implies that the 3D squared-displacement integral in (3) di-

verges as  $a \rightarrow 0$ . This unphysical situation can be remedied by capping the displacement function at a maximum value  $\lambda$ , which is the path length of swimming. In other words, a particle which is directly in the path of the swimmer cannot travel further than the swimmer itself: this regularizes the integral (3) to give

$$\langle |\mathbf{x}|^2 \rangle \simeq 2\pi U n t \int_{C\ell^2/\lambda}^{\infty} a \Delta^2(a) da \quad (9)$$

where the lower bound of the integral is the value at which the displacement (8) achieves its maximum allowable value,  $\lambda$ . Assuming that most of the contribution to the integral arises from small  $a$ , as was the case for potential flow, we have

$$\kappa \simeq \frac{\pi}{3} U n \ell^4 C^2 \log(\lambda/\ell). \quad (10)$$

For spheres, this is  $\kappa \simeq (2\pi^3/9)U n \ell^4 \log(\lambda/\ell) = 6.89 U n \ell^4 \log(\lambda/\ell)$ . Inserting the same numerical values for krill as before, with a path length  $\lambda = 100$  cm, we find  $\kappa \simeq .8$  cm<sup>2</sup>/sec, about 500 times the molecular value. Thus, including the effect of viscosity and finite path length has increased the effective diffusivity by a factor of 100 over the inviscid flow case. We emphasize that this is a rough estimate. The path length (or swimming correlation length) is a measure of how much a swimmer tends to move in one direction before turning. Our chosen value of 1 m is not based on any evidence, but  $\kappa$  has only a weak logarithmic dependence on  $\lambda$ . Assuming a value  $\lambda = 10$  m only raises  $\kappa$  from .8 to 1.2 cm<sup>2</sup>/sec.

Conditions where the number density is higher, such as in aquaculture [14] or locally in the ocean [3], should also increase the effective diffusivity well above molecular values. The simplicity of our model means that prefactors and scalings can be computed accurately. The numerical constants we obtained depend mostly on the flow near the stagnation points around the swimming body. There are many effects that we neglected but must be incorporated in a more complete theory: viscosity, boundary layers, more realistic shape distributions for the swimming bodies, wakes, spatial correlations between the swimmers, patchiness and schooling, finite correlation length of swimming, distribution of velocities and, most importantly for oceanic applications, buoyancy and stratification effects. This last item is probably the most important: stratification can cause fluid parcels to return to their initial height after being displaced if they can't equilibrate their density with their surroundings. Our

simple model can serve as a platform on which to build complexity, or could be applied to other fluid-dynamical systems where a collection of objects causes mixing.

The authors are grateful to W. Dewar, R. Ferrari, M. Graham, Z. G. Lin, C. Ortiz-Duenas, Y.-K. Tsang, and W. Young for helpful discussions, as well as to the hospitality of the 2008 Summer Program in Geophysical Fluid Dynamics (supported by NSF and ONR) at WHOI, where this work began, and the Institute for Mathematics and its Applications (supported by NSF). SC was supported by NSF under grant DMS-0507615, J-LT under grant DMS-0806821.

---

\* Electronic address: [jeanluc@math.wisc.edu](mailto:jeanluc@math.wisc.edu)

- [1] W. H. Munk, *Deep-Sea Res.* **13**, 707 (1966).
- [2] W. K. Dewar, R. J. Bingham, R. L. Iverson, D. P. Nowacek, L. C. St. Laurent, and P. H. Wiebe, *J. Mar. Res.* **64**, 541 (2006).
- [3] E. Kunze, J. F. Dower, I. Beveridge, R. Dewey, and K. P. Bartlett, *Science* **313**, 1768 (2006).
- [4] A. W. Visser, *Science* **316**, 838 (2007).
- [5] M. C. Gregg and J. K. Horne, *J. Phys. Ocean.* **39**, 1097 (2009).
- [6] K. Katija and J. O. Dabiri, *Nature* **460**, 624 (2009).
- [7] M. E. Huntley and M. Zhou, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **273**, 65 (2004).
- [8] T. J. Pedley and J. O. Kessler, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **24**, 313 (1992); X.-L. Wu and A. Libchaber, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 3017 (2000); J. P. Hernandez-Ortiz, C. G. Dtolz, and M. D. Graham, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 204501 (2006); D. Saintillan and M. J. Shelley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 058102 (2007); P. T. Underhill, J. P. Hernandez-Ortiz, and M. D. Graham, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 248101 (2008); K. C. Leptos *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 198103 (2009).
- [9] M. J. Lighthill, in *Mathematical Approaches in Hydrodynamics*, edited by T. Miloh (SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1991), pp. 3–20.
- [10] A. Einstein, *Investigations on the Theory of the Brownian Movement* (Dover, New York, 1956).
- [11] C. G. Darwin, *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **49**, 342 (1953).
- [12] M. J. Lighthill, *J. Fluid Mech.* **1**, 31 (1956); I. Eames, S. E. Belcher, and J. C. R. Hunt, *J. Fluid Mech.* **275**, 201 (1994); I. Eames and J. W. M. Bush, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **455**, 3665 (1999).
- [13] I. Eames, D. Gobby, and S. B. Dalziel, *J. Fluid Mech.* **485**, 67 (2003);
- [14] M. R. Rasmussen, J. Laursena, S. R. Craig, and E. McLean, *Aquaculture* **250**, 162 (2005).