A model for eastward and westward jets in laboratory experiments and planetary atmospheres
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Flows in a rotating annular tank [J. Sommeria, S. D. Meyers, and H. L. Swinney, Nonlinear Topics in Ocean Physics, edited by A. Osborne (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1991); Nature (London) 337, 58 (1989); T. H. Solomon, W. J. Holloway, and H. L. Swinney, Phys. Fluids A 5, 1971 (1993); J. Sommeria, S. D. Meyers, and H. L. Swinney, Nature (London) 331, 689 (1989)] with a sloping bottom (that simulates a barotropic atmosphere’s Coriolis force with a topographic β-effect [J. Pedlosky, Geophysical Fluid Dynamics, 2nd ed. (Springer, Berlin, 1986)]) produce eastward and westward jets, i.e., azimuthal flows moving in the same or opposite direction as the annulus’ rotation. Flows are forced by pumping fluid in and out of two concentric slits in the bottom boundary, and the direction of the jets depends on the direction of the pumping. The eastward and westward jets differ, with the former narrow, strong, and wavy. The jets of Jupiter and Saturn have the same east–west asymmetry [P. S. Marcus, Ann. Rev. Astron. Astro. 431, 523 (1993)]. Numerical simulations show that the azimuthally-averaged flow differs substantially from the non-averaged flow which has sharp gradients in the potential vorticity q. They also show that the maxima of the eastward jets and Rossby waves are located where the gradients of q are large, and the maxima of the westward jets and vortex chains are located where they are weak. As the forcing is increased the drift velocities of the two chains of vortices of the eastward jet lock together; whereas the two chains of the westward jet do not. Inspired by a previously published, [P. S. Marcus, Ann. Rev. Astron. Astro. 431, 523 (1993)] piece-wise constant-q model of the Jovian jets and based on numerical simulations, a new model of the experimental flow that is characterized by regions of undisturbed flow and bands of nearly uniform q separated by sharp gradients is presented. It explains the asymmetry of the laboratory jets and quantitatively describes all of the wave and vortex behavior in the experiments including the locking of the vortex chains of the eastward jet. The simulations and new model contradict the predictions of a competing, older model of the laboratory flow that is based on a Bickley jet; this raises concerns about previous calculations of Lagrangian mixing in the laboratory experiments that used the Bickley model for the fluid velocity. The new model, simulations and laboratory experiments all show that jets can be formed by the mixing and homogenization of q. The relevance of this to the jets of Jupiter is discussed. © 1998 American Institute of Physics. [S1070-6631(98)01405-6]

I. INTRODUCTION

In laboratory flows in rotating annuli that were designed to simulate an atmosphere, eastward jets of fluid differed strikingly from westward jets.1–4 Here, eastward (westward) is defined as moving in the same (opposite) direction as the annulus’ rotation.7 The bottom boundary of the annulus was radially sloping with two concentric slits. The flow was forced by pumping fluid in one slit and withdrawing it from the other. A jet formed between the slits and its direction depended on the direction of the pumping. As the forcing increased, the jet’s two sides became wavy and each side spawned a chain of vortices. From a geophysical perspective the most significant asymmetry between the jets was that eastward jets were narrower, stronger, and more wavy; the same asymmetry occurs in planetary atmospheres, c.f., the nearly axisymmetric Jovian east–west winds where their direction alternates with latitude6,8,9 (fig. 1), and Saturn’s winds10 including its north polar jet.11 A similar asymmetry in the earth’s atmosphere is that strong jets are always eastward and wavy, c.f., the winter, polar, stratospheric jets and the mid-latitude, upper tropospheric jet streams. (The earth’s westward, return circulations are so broad and weak that they are not identified as jets.) Although east–west atmospheric asymmetries have been numerically simulated,6,8 their explanation remains controversial. In the laboratory the most obvious asymmetry of the jets is the dynamics of their vortex chains. As the flow’s forcing is increased, the drift speeds of the two chains of the eastward jet lock together; whereas the speeds of the two chains of the westward jet, though closer to each other than those of the eastward jet, remain different.

Our primary goal is to explain the laboratory experiment and our secondary goal is to determine what relevance, if any, its physics has to the geophysical flows that originally motivated the experiments. To do this, we first numerically...
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simulate the flows to obtain information not readily available from experiments, e.g., instantaneous flow velocities $U$ and potential vorticities $q$. (One point of this paper is that averaged values of $U$ and $q$ are misleading.) With this insight we construct a model that quantitatively reproduces the experiments. Most of this paper is devoted to validating our model and comparing it to a competing model based on the Bickley jet.\textsuperscript{2,3,12} Determining which model is correct is important for several reasons. These laboratory flows have been used as examples of the Hamiltonian dynamics of passive Lagrangian tracers.\textsuperscript{12} When seeded with tracers, the flows show regions of complete mixing as well as barriers through which the mixing cannot penetrate. Current theoretical analyses of the mixing in the experiment are based on model flows rather than the laboratory or numerically simulated velocities. The experiments, simulations, and our model all have sharp gradients in $q$, which are known to act as barriers to mixing; whereas the competing models, including the Bickley jet, have smooth $q$. For this reason and because the Bickley jet and other models fail to capture the vortex dynamics in the experiments, questions arise about the validity of the mixing analyses.

Our second goal is to relate the experiments and our model to planetary atmospheres. Although there are many important differences between these laboratory experiments and atmospheres, not the least of which is the forcing, there are fundamental issues such as vortex dynamics and mixing which the experiments address. The key idea of our model is that mixing “homogenizes” the $q$ into azimuthal bands with piece-wise constant $q$ that are separated by sharp gradients.\textsuperscript{13} As the forcing increases, the bands grow and merge and the model flow changes. Little work has been done previously on how (or if) $q$ is homogenized or how east–west jets are created and maintained in forced/dissipated systems (i.e., not run-down experiments that have no forcing). The laboratory experiments simulated here address both issues. Curiously, the first step in constructing our model for the laboratory flow came from jovian observations. (Because it is impossible to measure $q$ directly in the jovian atmosphere—and difficult in laboratory flows—we used \textit{indirect} methods based on the properties of the planetary vortices to find the $q$ and the jets—see section VII.) We developed a piece-wise constant-$q$ model for the jovian jets, which in terms of the more general model presented here corresponds to the case with large forcing (fig. 2). The model was inferred only from observations rather than from any consideration of dynamics or homogenization of $q$. It was our curiosity of how and why the empirically-derived model might form that led to our interest in these laboratory experiments and that provided the impetus for the dynamic model presented here. Thus, one goal of this paper is to show that the laboratory experiments and the simulations prove that east–west jets can be created by the homogenization of $q$ and thereby show that our jet model for Jupiter is plausible.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In section II we summarize the laboratory experiments. In section III we present the quasi-geostrophic (QG) equations that govern both the laboratory experiment and planetary atmospheres.
PIcewise analytic approximations to and numerical solutions of the primary flows are presented. Section IV contains our model of the east–west winds and its measurable consequences (wave speeds, vortex locations, etc.). In section V we compare our model with numerical solutions of the QG equations and with the laboratory experiments. A comparison with the Bickley jet model is given in section VI and our conclusions along with their relevance to planetary atmospheres is in section VII. Validation of our physical approximations appear in the Appendix.

II. SUMMARY OF LABORATORY EXPERIMENTS AND NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

The laboratory experiment\(^3\) used a constant-density fluid in a wide-gap annulus where the top, bottom, and sides all rotated at the same fast angular velocity \(f/2\). Flows were forced by pumping fluid through axisymmetric, concentric slits (see the Appendix) of thickness \(L_{\text{slit}}\) at radii \(R_{1,i}^{\text{slit}}\) and \(R_{2,i}^{\text{slit}}\) in the bottom boundary where \(R_{1,i}^{\text{slit}} < R_{2,i}^{\text{slit}}\). The bottom of the annulus had slope \(s\) so that the depth at the outer radius \(R_{\text{out}}\) was greater than at the inner radius \(R_{\text{in}}\). This produced a topographic \(\beta\)-effect\(^5\) to model the gradient of the atmosphere’s Coriolis force. The laboratory experiment was designed to be an analog of a one-layer, constant density atmosphere in which the pumping through the bottom boundary simulated the convective overshoot of plumes from an underlying unstable layer.

The laboratory experiments and our subsequent numerical calculations\(^1\)\(^4\) (carried out with the same geometry and other flow parameters\(^3\)\(^5\)) are in good agreement and summarized as follows: For low pumping rates \(P\), a vortex layer forms above each slit which in turn creates the primary flow: an axisymmetric, azimuthal jet at \(R_{1,i}^{\text{slit}} \leq r < R_{2,i}^{\text{slit}}\). When fluid is pumped into the tank at \(R_{2,i}^{\text{slit}}\) and removed at \(R_{1,i}^{\text{slit}}\), the jet travels in the same direction as the rotating tank and is defined to be eastward. When the direction of the pumping is reversed, the jet is westward. For \(P \gg P_{\text{crit}}\), the approximate discontinuity in the velocity \(U\) at the inner edge of the jet creates unstable, non-axisymmetric (Kelvin–Helmholtz-like and Rossby wave) eigenmodes, and the vortex layer at \(R_{1,i}^{\text{slit}}\) becomes wavy. As \(P\) is increased, nonlinearities roll up the vortex layer creating a vortex chain at \(R_{1,i}^{\text{slit}}\) (fig. 3a). For slightly greater \(P\), instabilities of the outer layer create a second vortex chain at \(R_{2,i}^{\text{slit}}\) (fig. 3b). Our numerical calculations show that the two chains travel azimuthally around the annulus with different speeds \(c_1\) and \(c_2\), and the flows are temporally quasi-periodic with form

\[
\begin{align*}
U &= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} a_{j,n}(r) \exp\left[i jm_1(\phi-c_1 t)\right] \\
&\quad + \left[imn_2(\phi-c_2 t)\right].
\end{align*}
\]

(1)

The subscript \(i\) refers to quantities associated with \(R_{1,i}^{\text{slit}}\), where \(i=1,2\).

The westward jet has a smaller \(P_{\text{crit}}\) than the eastward jet, and the nonlinear evolutions of the two jets differ greatly. As \(P\) is increased, the westward jet’s two vortex chains move closer together in radius, while the eastward jet’s chains move apart. At \(P/P_{\text{crit}} \approx 1.5\) the westward jet’s two vortex chains overlap radially. The \(c_i\) of the chains of the eastward jets are positive while those of the westward are negative. (Values of \(c_i\) are in the annular tank’s rotating frame. Without loss of generality, the tank’s angular velocity is positive.) For the eastward jet, as \(P\) is increased above \(P_{\text{lock}}\) the two vortex chains lock together, so \(c_1 = c_2\), and the numerical calculations show that the flow is temporally periodic (or steady to a viewer rotating with speed \(c_1\)). See fig. 4. The locking of the eastward jets is easy to identify in the laboratory because it is accompanied by an abrupt decrease in \(c_1\) of \(~50\%\). Our numerical calculations show the locking is robust; it occurs over a wide range in \(P\) and other parameters (such as the widths of the slits in the bottom). The laboratory experiments were unable to determine whether the westward jets’ two vortex chains locked. Our numerical calculations show that the westward chains lock only for a

![Fig. 3. Numerically computed potential vorticity \(q\) (using a grey scale with \(q > 0\) dark and \(q < 0\) light) of the unlocked eastward (counter-clockwise) flows with (a) \(P = 50\) and (b) \(P = 80\) cm\(^3\) s\(^{-1}\). The jet is between \(R_{1,i}^{\text{slit}}\) and \(R_{2,i}^{\text{slit}}\), which are coincident with the light and dark rings of \(q\). The vortices at \(R_{1,i}^{\text{slit}}\) have \(\omega > 0\) and those at \(R_{2,i}^{\text{slit}}\) have \(\omega < 0\). The parameters\(^15\) are \(R_{1,i}^{\text{slit}} = 18.9, n = 0.1, f = 4 \pi\) (All units CGS).](image-url)
In the numerical calculations, the bottom are carefully tuned. When westward jets’ chains lock large, positive vortices in the outer chain. Thus, the signs of the vortices are the same as that of the local shear of the jet. Since all of the vortices in the inner chain have \( \omega > 0 \), while those in the outer have \( \omega < 0 \).

Small range of \( P \) and only when the widths of the slits in the bottom are carefully tuned. When westward jets’ chains lock in the numerical calculations, the \( c_i \) do not change and the numbers of vortices in the two chains are very different. See fig. 5. In contrast, the numbers of vortices in the locked

eastward jet’s two chains are nearly the same, and they never overlap radially. See fig. 4. Thus, the locking of chains is qualitatively different for eastward and westward jets. For \( P > P_{\text{crit}} \), the eastward and westward jets differ greatly. The numerical calculations show that the time-averaged potential vorticity \( q \) of the westward jet is nearly uniform, and the jet nearly fills the annulus. Embedded within it are a few large, robust vortices with vorticity of the same sign as the shear of the ambient jet. As \( P \) is increased further, the vortices merge leaving a single vortex. (The laboratory experiment\(^4\) of the westward jet and vortex at large \( P \) were a test of theoretical and numerical predictions of Jupiter’s Great Red Spot.\(^6\)) In contrast, the eastward flow at large \( P \) evolves into a strong, narrow, wavy jet with a radial location approximately midway between the two slits. The large amplitude Rossby wave on the jet causes its radial location to meander in azimuthal angle \( \phi \). This flow has been used to model the Antarctic stratospheric polar vortex.\(^1\)

Although there is a strong asymmetry between the eastward and westward jets, it should be noted that in the QG limit (see section III), axisymmetric eastward and westward flows with the same \( P \) are mirror images, and their velocities \( |U| \) are independent of \( s \). So there is no east–west asymmetry for axisymmetric flows (though their non-axisymmetric eigenmodes and eigenvalues are east–west asymmetric).

With \( s = 0 \)—even when the flows are non-axisymmetric and non-linear—the eastward and westward jets and their vortex chains are mirror images of each other. It is the non-zero \( s \) (or \( \beta \) in the atmosphere) coupled with the loss of axisymmetry that breaks the east–west symmetry.

### III. Equations and the Primary Flow

Rather than solve the three-dimensional Navier–Stokes equation with boundary conditions for the inflow and outflow slits in the bottom of the annular tank, we use the first integral of the two-dimensional, quasi-geostrophic (QG) equation along with an Ekman boundary layer (or equivalently with Rayleigh friction):

\[
\frac{DU}{Dt} = - \nabla \Pi / \rho + \beta r U \times \hat{z} + \nu \nabla^2 U - U / \tau + \nabla p,
\]

where \( U(r, \phi, t) \) is the velocity, \( D/ Dt = (\partial / \partial t + U \cdot \nabla) \) is the advective derivative, \( \Pi \) is the pressure head that forces \( \nabla \cdot U = 0 \), \( \hat{z} \) is a unit vector, \( \nu \) is the kinematic viscosity, \( \beta = f / H \), \( H \) is the mean depth of the tank, \( f \) is the Coriolis parameter equal to twice the angular velocity of the tank, and \( \tau = H / \sqrt{2} \nu \) is the Ekman spin-down time (or Rayleigh damping time). The flow is 2-dimensional, such that \( \hat{z} \cdot U = 0 \) and \( \partial U / \partial z = 0 \). The forcing \( F \) of the quasi-geostrophic component of the flow due to pumping the fluid through the slits in the bottom boundary and creating a weak ageostrophic flow is\(^1\)

\[
F(r) = - \frac{\int_{R_{\text{in}}}^{r} w(r') r' dr'} {r R_{\text{in}}} \hat{\phi},
\]

where \( w(r) \) is the vertical velocity of the fluid entering through the slit and \( \hat{\phi} \) is a unit vector. Conservation of mass requires \( \int_{R_{\text{in}}}^{R_{\text{out}}} w(r') r' dr' = 0 \). The value of \( w(r) \) is zero ex-
except at the slits, and the total pumping rate \( P \) is defined as \( P = \pi f R_{\text{out}}^2 |w(r')| r' \, dr' \). The boundary condition for Eq. (2) is that \( U = 0 \) at \( R_{\text{in}} \) and \( R_{\text{out}} \). The curl of (2) gives the equation for the potential vorticity \( q = (\omega + \beta r) \) where \( \omega = \nabla \times U \):

\[
\frac{Dq}{Dt} = -\alpha \tau + \nu \nabla^2 \omega - f w(r)/H. 
\] (4)

For these QG equations to be valid, the Rossby number \( \epsilon = V/L \ll 1, f(T)/\ell \ll \epsilon, \) and \( w/H \ll \epsilon \), where \( V, T, \) and \( L \) are the characteristic velocity, time and length of the flow.\(^5\) The QG approximation is supported by the laboratory experiments which show that \( \partial U/\partial z \approx 0 \). When \( s = 0 \) equation (2) has a symmetry: The flow is invariant under \( w \rightarrow -w, \ u(r, \phi) \rightarrow -u(r, -\phi, t) \) and \( v(r, \phi) \rightarrow v(r, -\phi) \) (where \( u = \phi \cdot U \) and \( v = \hat{r} \cdot U \)), so eastward and westward jets are mirror images of each other. A finite \( s \) (or \( \beta \)) breaks the symmetry.

There is a steady, axisymmetric, primary flow for all \( P \) with \( \nu = 0 \) and

\[
u(r) = -\frac{f \pi}{r H} \int_{R_{\text{in}}}^{r} (r') (w(r') \, dr' + \tau \nu (\nabla^2 - 1/r^2) u \) \] (5)

and

\[
\omega(r) = -f \tau w(r)/H + \nu \nabla^2 \omega. \] (6)

In the limit of approximating the slits as delta functions, we obtain

\[
w(r) = \frac{P}{2 \pi} [\delta(r - R_{\text{in}}) - \delta(r - R_{\text{out}})] \] (7)

Assuming the dissipation due to \( \nu \) (but not due to \( \tau \)) is negligible and using equation (7) gives the model for the primary flow:

\[
\bar{\omega}(r) = \frac{P}{2 \pi H} [\delta(r - R_{\text{in}}) - \delta(r - R_{\text{out}})] \] (8)

\[
\bar{u}(r) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{for } r < R_{\text{in}}^\text{slit}, \\
\pm \frac{f \pi \tau}{2 \pi r H} & \text{for } R_{\text{in}}^\text{slit} \leq r \leq R_{\text{out}}^\text{slit}, \\
0 & \text{for } r > R_{\text{out}}^\text{slit}.
\end{cases} \] (9)

An overbar denotes the model, rather than exact or numerical solution. The upper signs in equations (7)–(9) are for \( w(R_{\text{in}}^\text{slit}) > 0 \), ie, for westward jets. The primary \( \bar{u}(r) \) is a top-hat. Figure 6 shows a comparison between \( \bar{u}(r) \) and the numerical solution of equation (5).

For simplicity, we use a Cartesian rather than annular geometry in modeling the flows in the laboratory annulus and in the numerical calculations. In Cartesian geometry, \( r \) in equation (2) is replaced with \( -y \) and \( r \phi \) with \( x \). We also replace \( R_{\text{in}}^\text{slit} \) with \( Y_{\text{in}}^\text{slit} \) and \( R_{\text{out}} \) with \( Y_{\text{out}}^\text{slit} \). With Cartesian coordinates, \( u = \hat{x} \cdot U \) and \( v = \hat{y} \cdot U \). Subscripts “1” and “2” are switched so that \( Y_{\text{in}}^\text{slit} < Y_{\text{out}}^\text{slit} < Y_{\text{out}}^\text{slit} < Y_{\text{out}}^\text{slit} \). In Cartesian geometry equation (3) is replaced with

\[
F(y) = \frac{f}{H} \int_{Y_{\text{in}}^\text{slit}}^{y} w(y') \, dy' \hat{x}. \] (10)

In Cartesian geometry the model primary flow in equation (9) becomes

\[
\bar{u}(y) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{for } y < Y_{\text{in}}^\text{slit}, \\
\pm V_0 & \text{for } Y_{\text{in}}^\text{slit} \leq y \leq Y_{\text{out}}^\text{slit}, \\
0 & \text{for } y > Y_{\text{out}}^\text{slit}
\end{cases} \] (11)

with

\[
\bar{\omega}(y) = \pm V_0 [\delta(y - Y_{\text{in}}^\text{slit}) - \delta(y - Y_{\text{out}}^\text{slit})]. \] (12)

where

\[
V_0 = f \pi \beta / H. \] (13)

\( \beta \) is the absolute value of the volume of fluid per unit time per unit length in \( y \) pumped through a slit and \( q = \omega + \beta y \).

The upper sign in equations (11) and (12) is for eastward jets. For the Cartesian model, the coordinate origin is chosen to be midway between the two slits, so \( Y_{\text{in}}^\text{slit} = -Y_{\text{out}}^\text{slit} \). Thus, the primary flow \( \bar{u}(y) \) is symmetric in \( y \) while \( \bar{\omega}(y) \) and \( \bar{q}(y) \) are anti-symmetric. Equations (5) and (11) show that the primary flow is independent of \( \beta \) and that \( \|u\| \) is the same for eastward and westward jets.
IV. FLOW MODEL

Figure 7 is the numerically calculated flow at \( P = 44 \approx 2P_{crit} \). (All units are CGS unless otherwise specified.) The \( u \) does not look like \( \bar{u} \) in equation (9), indicating vortex chains are present and the flow can no longer be approximated as a perturbation of the primary flow. Here we present our model of the mean secondary flow. The model is based on our experiences with high Reynolds number, barotropic flows on a \( \beta \)-plane,\(^{19,20} \) which show that: (1) regions where flows are well mixed tend to have nearly uniform values of \( q \); (2) discontinuities or rapid changes in \( q \) form at the interfaces of these regions, but discontinuities in \( \bar{U} \) are rare; and (3) vortices embedded in turbulent flows are most robust when the surrounding flow has nearly uniform \( q \) and always have the same sign of \( \omega \) as the shear of the local jet. In these cases the vortices have little interaction with the surrounding flow, and because \( Dq/Dr \approx 0 \), compact potential vortices advect with the local flow velocity. Incorporating these observations, the model has (1) a continuous \( \bar{U} \) and discontinuous \( \bar{q}(r) \), (2) Rossby waves that travel along discontinuities and make them wavy, and (3) vortices embedded in regions where \( \bar{q} \) is uniform. We note that flow models with piecewise constant \( q \) have been used previously. However, the motivation has usually been that the model permits the flow’s dynamics to be computed analytically or with contour dynamics.\(^{21,22} \) Here, our motivation is how the homogenization of \( q \) progresses as the forcing is increased, and the model consists of both homogenized and undisturbed regions of \( q \).

The component of our model flow written with the overbar represents the mean flow (averaged in \( \phi \) or \( t \)) with \( \bar{v} = 0 \). The \( \bar{q}(y) \) and \( \bar{u}(y) \) of the model are in figs. 8 and 9. In figs. 8b, 8e, 9b, and 9e the primary flow has become unstable and the flow contains waves and vortices. The mixing of \( q \) near the slits causes the delta functions in the primary flow’s \( \bar{q} \) in figs. 8a and 9a to broaden which smooths the discontinuities in \( \bar{u}(y) \). The model’s main feature and the reason that eastward and westward jets differ is this: As the delta functions broaden into smooth peaks, the sides of the peaks that are closer to \( y = 0 \) have larger (smaller) jumps in \( \bar{q} \) than the sides farther from \( y = 0 \) for eastward (westward) jets. Figures 8b and 9b accentuate this by representing the peaks as flat-topped functions so that \( \bar{q} \) is constant for \( (Y^{eff}_{2} - a) \leq |y| \leq (Y^{eff}_{2} + b) \). For the eastward jet there are jumps in \( \bar{q} \)

FIG. 7. (a) \( u(r, \phi, t) \) and (b) \( q(r, \phi, t) \) at fixed \( t \) for the numerically computed locked eastward jet in fig. 4. Each of the five curves is for a fixed \( \phi, \phi_{j} = j\pi/5, j = 1 \ldots 5 \). Vertical arrows near the axis are as in fig. 6. (c) and (d) are the same as (a) and (b) but for the westward jet in fig. 5. The \( u \) is plotted in units of \( \beta(R_{out} - R_{in}) \) and the \( q \) in \( \beta(R_{out} - R_{in}) \). The locked eastward jet has one sharp gradient in \( q \), and the linked westward jet has two with a flat region, indicating strong \( q \) mixing. Due to \( \nu \) and the vortices, the asymmetry between the eastward (a) and westward (c) jets are barely apparent. Contour plots of \( q \) or \( \psi \) in the \( (r, \phi) \) plane are much more useful for displaying the asymmetry and for distinguishing the locked from the unlocked eastward jets (c.f., figs. 11 and 12). Unfortunately contour plots of \( \psi \) and \( q \) are not readily available from laboratory or planetary data.

FIG. 8. Eastward jet model: (a) \( \bar{q}(y) \) for the primary flow, equations (11)–(12); (b) \( \bar{q}(y) \) at higher \( P \) for the unlocked jet, equations (16)–(17); (c) \( \bar{q}(y) \) at still higher \( P \) for the locked jet, equations (18)–(19); (d), (e), and (f) are the \( \bar{u}(y) \) corresponding to (a), (b), and (c), respectively. Vertical arrows are as in fig. 6.

FIG. 9. Westward jet model: (a) \( \bar{q}(y) \) for the primary flow, equations (11)–(12); (b) \( \bar{q}(y) \) at higher \( P \) where the two regions of uniform \( \bar{q} \) are not linked together, equations (20)–(21); (c) \( \bar{q}(y) \) at still higher \( P \) where the two regions of uniform \( \bar{q} \) are linked together, equations (22)–(24); (d), (e), and (f) are the \( \bar{u}(y) \) corresponding to (a), (b), and (c), respectively. Vertical arrows near the \( y \)-axis are as in fig. 8.
of $\Delta \bar{q} = \beta (a + b)$ at $y = \pm (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} - a)$, and elsewhere $\bar{q}$ is continuous. For the westward jet $\Delta \bar{q} = \beta (a + b)$, but the jumps are at $y = \pm (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} + b)$. Physically, this model corresponds to mixing with homogenization of $q$ for $(Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} - a) \leq |y| \leq (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} + b)$. In all other regions there are no waves or vortices, so $\bar{q}(y)$ is unchanged from its values in figs. 8a and 9a. The $\bar{u}(y)$, $a$, and $b$ are determined by noting that the integral of equation (2) (in Cartesian coordinates) over all $x$ and $t$ and over $- (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} + b^*) \leq |y| \leq (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} + b^*)$ (where $b^*$ is the limit of $y$ approaching $b$ from the positive direction) requires:

$$\int_{-Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} + b^*}^{Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} + b^*} \bar{u}(y')dy' = \pm 2V_0 Y_{22}^{\text{diff}},$$

where the upper (lower) sign is for the eastward (westward) jet. In addition, an integral of equation (4) gives

$$\int_0^{Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} + b^*} \bar{u}(y')dy' = \pm V_0,$$

where the sign convention in equation (14) is used. Equation (15) is valid only when there is no vorticity transport across the $y = 0$ as would be expected for the flows in figs. 8b and 9b.

A. Eastward jet model

For the eastward jet in figs. 8b and 8e equations (14) and (15) give:

$$a = \frac{1}{3} \sqrt{\frac{2V_0}{\beta}}, \quad b = 2a; \quad \Delta \bar{q} = \beta (a + b) = \sqrt{2}\beta V_0$$

$$\bar{u}(y) = \left\{\begin{array}{ll}
0 & \text{for } |y| > (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} + b), \\
\beta(|y| - (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} - b))/2 & \text{for } (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} + b) \geq |y| \geq (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} - a), \\
V_0 = \frac{\tau}{\beta} & \text{for } (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} - a) > |y|. 
\end{array}\right.$$

In figs. 8b and 8e in the regions $(Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} - a) > |y|$ and $|y| > (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} + b)$, neither $\bar{q}(y)$ nor $\bar{u}(y)$ are changed from their primary values. For $\mathcal{F}_\text{est} = 9\beta H(Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} - Y_{11}^{\text{diff}})^2/8f\tau$, the two mixed regions of uniform $\bar{q}$ become so large that they touch each other, and the flow looks like figs. 8c and 8f with $a = Y_{22}^{\text{diff}}$. The two jumps in $\bar{q}$ merge together, the value of $\Delta \bar{q}$ doubles, and $\bar{u}(y)$ develops a cusp at $y = 0$. After the merger the flow retains the appearance of figs. 8c and 8f with $\bar{u}(y)$ still given by (17) and

$$a = Y_{22}^{\text{diff}}, \quad b = (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} - Y_{11}^{\text{diff}})\left[\frac{3(\mathcal{F}_\text{est})}{\mathcal{F}_\text{west}} - 1\right]/2,$$

$$\Delta \bar{q} = 2\beta (b + a),$$

$$\bar{u}(0) = \frac{\beta(b + Y_{22}^{\text{diff}})^2}{2} - V_0(\mathcal{F}_\text{east} - \mathcal{F}_\text{west})^{1/3}.$$

Note that for $\mathcal{F}_\text{est} > 3\mathcal{F}_\text{west}$ equation (15) is not used because it is invalid; the flow in figs 8c and 8f transport vorticity across the $y = 0$ line, or in other words, the opposite-signed vortex layers at the two slits partially annihilate each other. (n.b., the momenta created by the forcing at the two slits have the same sign and do not annihilate each other.)

B. Westward jet model

At small $\mathcal{F}$ the westward jet changes from the primary flow in figs. 9a and 9d to the forms in figs. 9b and 9c with

$$a = \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{\frac{2V_0}{\beta}}, \quad b = a/2; \quad \Delta \bar{q} = \beta (a + b) = \sqrt{2}\beta V_0$$

$$\bar{u}(y) = \left\{\begin{array}{ll}
0 & \text{for } |y| > (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} + b), \\
\beta(|y| - (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} - b))/2 & \text{for } (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} + b) \geq |y| \geq (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} - a), \\
V_0 = -\frac{\tau}{\beta} & \text{for } (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} - a) > |y|. 
\end{array}\right.$$

For $\mathcal{F}_\text{est} > 9\beta H(Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} - Y_{11}^{\text{diff}})^2/32f\tau$, the two regions of uniform $\bar{q}$ are linked together, and the flow looks like figs. 9c and 9f with $a = Y_{22}^{\text{diff}}$. However, unlike the eastward jet, the two jumps in $\bar{q}$ do not merge together and there is never a cusp in $\bar{u}(y)$ at $y = 0$. In figs. 9c and 9f $\bar{u}(y)$ is given by (21), $a = Y_{22}^{\text{diff}}$ (equation (15) is not used because it is invalid), and

$$b = |Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} - Y_{11}^{\text{diff}}|\left[\frac{3(\mathcal{F}_\text{west})}{\mathcal{F}_\text{est}} - 1\right]/2, \quad \Delta \bar{q} = \beta (b + a), \quad \bar{u}(0) = \frac{\beta(b + Y_{22}^{\text{diff}})^2}{2} - V_0(\mathcal{F}_\text{east} - \mathcal{F}_\text{west})^{1/3}.$$

C. Rossby waves and vortices

We expect differences between $\bar{u}$ and the laboratory (or numerically computed) $U$ because the latter is filled with vortices and Rossby waves. Rossby waves require gradients in $q$, so the model Rossby waves are centered at the discontinuities of $\bar{q}$ and cause the locations of the discontinuities to meander in $y$ (or $r$) as a function of $x$ (or $\phi$). Eigenmodes of the Cartesian form of equation (2) are proportional to $e^{i(k(x - ct))}$ and obey the Rayleigh–Kuo equation with matching conditions at discontinuities. The eigenmodes (computed with $v = 1/r = 0$) of $\bar{u}(y)$ are neutrally stable, so $\mathcal{M} = 0$, (using the overbar on $c$ to denote that it is associated with our model) and for all of our model flows:

$$\bar{c} = \bar{u}(y_d) - \frac{\beta(b + a)}{2k},$$

where $y_d$ is the location of the discontinuity in $\bar{q}(y)$ (i.e., $y_d = \pm (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} - a)$ for the eastward, and $y_d = \pm (Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} + b)$ for the westward jets). The dimensionless number $\chi > 0$, is order unity, and easily found to be the solutions of transcendental equations. For eastward jets with one discontinuity (at $y_d = 0$), $\chi = 2$, so equation (25) becomes for eastward jets with one discontinuity:

$$\bar{c} = \bar{u}(0) - \frac{\Delta \bar{q}}{2k}.$$

For eastward jets with two discontinuities and all westward jets, $\Delta \bar{q} = \beta (a + b)$. In the limits that $2k(Y_{22}^{\text{diff}} - a) > 1$ and $2k(a + b) > 1$, $\chi = (1 - (1/2k(a + b))^{-1}$, so for these limits its for eastward jets with two discontinuities and all westward jets:
Because vortices embedded in east–west flows of uniform two jumps of potential vorticity. Thus, the two vortex chains ~q

\[ \bar{q} = \frac{1}{2k} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2k(a+b)} \right)^{-1}. \]  

Equation (25) shows why westward jets have c<0: u(y_d) = 0, \( \beta > 0 \) and \( \chi > 0 \). For eastward jets u(y_d) = V_0 > 0, so c can be (and is) positive. Another reason why the signs of \( c_i \) differ for eastward and westward jets is that the Rossby waves in these flows advect at the same speed as their accompanying vortex chains and vortices advect with the local velocity of the flow—see below—which is always positive (negative) for the eastward (westward) model flow.

To see qualitatively why the \( c_i \) decrease when the eastward jet’s discontinuities merge, compare equation (26) with (27), and note that when the discontinuities merge, \( \Delta \tilde{q} \) suddenly doubles, while \( y_d \) smoothly goes to zero and 1/2k(a + b) remains small. To understand the decrease in \( c_i \), quantitatively, use equation (25) and the fact that the governing equation for \( \chi \) along with equations (13) and (16) show that for 0≤(\( \chi \)) \( \tilde{q} \) \( \sim \) \( \chi \) = 1 + e^{-\((kL)^{2 m}((\chi) \tilde{q})_{\text{east}} - \tilde{q})^{2 m}((\chi) \tilde{q})_{\text{east}}}. \) (28)

Because \( kY_{l_{\text{eff}}}^2 \) is large, \( \chi \) rapidly changes from 1 to 2 as \( \rho \rightarrow \rho_{\text{link}} \) (east) (and the two discontinuities of the eastward jet merge into one). Note that \( \chi \) remains 2 for \( \rho > \rho_{\text{link}} \) east.

In our model the Rossby eigenmode is exponentially peaked at the discontinuity in \( \tilde{q} \) located at \( y = y_d + A e^{(kL)^{2 m}((\chi) \tilde{q})_{\text{east}} - \tilde{q})} \), where \( A \) is the Rossby wave amplitude. In our numerically calculated flows (cf., fig. 4), the Rossby wave is visible as a deformation of the contours of constant \( \bar{q} \) and in particular of the contour where \( |\nabla \bar{q}| \) is greatest. As the Rossby waves of the westward jets move closer to the annular boundaries, they become less pronounced. Each Rossby wave is also associated with an entrained vortex chain with the vortices riding along at the Rossby wave speed. Because vortices tend to lie in regions of nearly uniform \( \bar{q} \), their locations, \( y^* \), satisfy the inequality \( Y_{l_{\text{eff}}}^2 + b > |y^*| > Y_{l_{\text{eff}}}^2 - a \).

For westward jets in which the two regions of constant \( \tilde{q} \) are joined together (as in fig. 9f), the two chains of vortices often overlap in \( y \), so they can strongly interact with each other (fig. 5). However in the eastward jets, the two regions of uniform \( \bar{q} \) are physically separated from each other by one or two jumps of potential vorticity. Thus, the two vortex chains in the eastward flow only weakly interact with each other. Because vortices embedded in east–west flows of uniform \( \bar{q} \) advect approximately with the local velocity, and because the waves and vortices have the same speed, \( y^* \) satisfies \( \bar{u}(y^*) = \bar{c} \), where \( \bar{u}(y^*) \) is given by equation (17) or (21). This constrains the allowable values of \( k \) to:

\[ k \geq \chi \beta(a+b)/2|\bar{u}(0)|. \]  

V. TESTS OF THE MODEL

To compare directly the \( \bar{u} \) of the model with the laboratory experiment’s velocity is difficult because the model’s discontinuities in \( \bar{q} \) are smoothed by \( \bar{v} \) (which is not in the model). Moreover as we show below, the laboratory (and numerically computed) flows averaged over \( \bar{v} \) are deceptive in appearance. It is better to compare the locations and speeds of the vortices and waves, the locking of the Rossby waves, and the flow’s hysteresis. The difficulties in comparing the model and laboratory flows are illustrated in fig. 10 which shows a laboratory five-fold symmetric eastward jet similar to the numerically computed seven-fold flow (fig. 4).

The \( u(r) \) in fig. 10a has been averaged over \( \bar{v} \) (as was the planetary \( u \) in fig. 1). The averaged laboratory flow looks like a Bickley jet (i.e., proportional to sech^2(r/L_{Bick}) for some length \( L_{Bick} \)—see section VI) with no discontinuity in \( q(r) \) or in the slope of \( u(r) \). The meandering Rossby wave wipes out any signature of the discontinuity in the averaged flow. Figure 10b shows the \( u(r, \phi, t) \) of the same flow in fig. 10a at a fixed \( t \) and at two fixed values of \( \phi \). Figure 10b looks like the model in fig. 8f whose hallmark is the discontinuity in the slope of \( u \) at its peak with the modification that the Rossby wave makes the discontinuity (and location of the peak velocity) of the laboratory flow wavy in \( \phi \). Figure 10b quantitatively supports our model of a locked eastward jet which predicts that the width of the jet (the length in \( r \) in fig. 10b over which the \( u \) is non-zero) or \( (a_1 + a_2 + b_1 + b_2) \) is related to \( \Delta[\partial u/\partial \bar{r}] \) which is defined to be the value of the discontinuity in the slope of \( u \): \( -\Delta[\partial u/\partial \bar{r}] = \Delta \bar{q} = \beta(a_1 + a_2 + b_1 + b_2) \). Using \( (a_1 + a_2 + b_1 + b_2) = 20 \) cm from fig. 10b and the laboratory value of \( \beta = 0.135 \) cm^-1 s^-1 gives \( -\Delta[\partial u/\partial \bar{r}] = 2.7 \). The values of \( -\Delta[\partial u/\partial \bar{r}] \) in fig. 10b are \(-3 \) and \(-2 \) for the solid and dotted curves, respectively. Unfortunately, other than fig. 10b, there is little other laboratory data (and no reliable planetary data) for non-averaged values of \( u(r, \phi, t) \), so direct comparisons with the model are difficult.

The model, laboratory, and numerically computed flows all have hysteresis. For \( \rho = \rho_{\text{link}} \) east (or \( \rho \geq \rho_{\text{link}} \) west) the model flows must look like fig. 8f (or 9f). However, for smaller values of \( \rho \) the flows look either like fig. 8f (or 9f) or like fig. 8e (or 9e) subject to the constraint that \( \beta > 0 \). Thus there is a range of \( \rho \) where both model flows can exist. For the same \( \rho \), the energy of the flows in figs. 8f and 9f are greater than those of the flows in figs. 8e and 9e. To determine where the model eastward flow has hysteresis, let the distance between the two discontinuities in \( \tilde{q}(y) \) be \( L_{\text{sep}} \approx (Y_{l_{\text{eff}}}^2 - Y_1^2 - 2a). L_{\text{sep}} \) decreases with increasing \( \rho \) and is zero when \( \rho = \rho_{\text{link}} \) east. We expect the two Rossby waves, centered on the discontinuities, to merge and lock together due to non-linearities when \( kL_{\text{sep}} \leq 1 \) where \( k \) is the average Rossby wavenumber. This means that there should be hysteresis between locked and unlocked states when \( \rho < \rho_{\text{link}} \) east and \( kL_{\text{sep}} \leq 1 \). This has been verified by the numerical solutions of equations (2)–(3). For \( P \leq 28 \) the eastward flow is temporarily quasi-periodic, unlocked, and of the form of equation (1). For \( P \geq 36 \) flows are locked (although if \( P \) becomes too large, new instabilities occur). For a small range near \( P = 32 \) the flows are hysteretic with \( m_1 \approx m_2 \approx 9 \), so that \( kL_{\text{sep}} = 0.904 \), consistent with the model when we set \( k = m_1/R_{l_{\text{eff}}}^2 \). The laboratory eastward jets behave similarly to our numerical solutions except the range of \( P \) where the flow is hysteretic is \( \approx 22 \).

The main prediction of our model is that the eastward jet at low \( P \) (fig. 8b) and the westward jet at low and high \( P \) (in figs. 9b and 9c) have two discontinuities in \( \tilde{q} \), and each acts as a Rossby wave guide. Each discontinuity has an associ-
A. Eastward jets

Tables I and II compare the Cartesian model’s values of $c_1$ predicted by equation (25) with the wave speeds of the numerically computed solutions of equation (2) in annular geometry. Also shown are comparisons of $\Omega_1$ which is defined to be $\bar{u}(r)/r$ evaluated at the discontinuity associated with $R^{\text{lit}}_1$. Agreement is good. The tables were computed by imposing an $m$-fold symmetry so $m_1$ = $m_2$. With no imposed symmetry, the flow at $P = 28$ (fig. 11) was unlocked with $m_1$ = $m_2$ = 12 (as were flows at $P = 18$ and $P = 24$) independent of the initial conditions (that we tried). When no symmetry was imposed at $P = 44$, the final flow is locked and independent of initial conditions with $m_1$ = 7 and $7 \leq m_1 \approx 9$. The value of $m_1$ depended on $L^{\text{lit}}$ (see the Appendix) and decreases with increasing thickness. The most interesting feature of the eastward jet model is that $\bar{c}_1$ and $\bar{c}_2$ abruptly decrease when they lock. Equations (25) and (26) with $k_1(\bar{u}_i - \bar{c}_i)$ replaced with $m_1(\Omega_1 - \bar{c}_i)$ show that this decrease is $\sim \Delta \bar{q}_i/2m_1$. We have tested this prediction in two ways. When both locked and unlocked eastward jets exist at the same $P$, equation (13) with $\beta$ replaced with $P/2\pi R^{\text{lit}}_1$ and equations (16)–(18) show that this decrease is given by

$$\left[ m_1(\Omega_1 - \bar{c}_1) \right]_{\text{locked}} / \left[ m_1(\Omega_1 - \bar{c}_1) \right]_{\text{unlocked}} = 2 (P^{\text{split}}_{\text{east}}/P)^{1/6}/X_1.$$  

(30)

(For locked flows, we use the subscript 1 to mean 1 and 2.)

For $P = 32$ the right-side of equation (30) computed with the model at the parameter values used in Table II is 1.45, while the ratio on the left-hand side determined from the numerical solution of equations (2)–(3) with $m_1$ = $m_2$ = 9 is 1.56—a difference of only 7%. Because the model is Cartesian and the numerical calculation is annular, we cannot expect them to agree to much better than $(a_1 + b_1)/\pi R^{\text{lit}}_1$ or $\sim 10\%$ at $P = 32$, so an error of 7% is very good. The model predicts that locking is accompanied by the merger of two discontinuities in $q$, and we note that the numerical simulations show that $\Delta q_1$ of the locked flow is more than twice as big as that

FIG. 10. (a) Azimuthally averaged value (solid curve) and the fit to a sech$^2$ function (dotted curve) of $u(r,\phi,t)$ at fixed $t$ for an eastward jet at $P = 100$ and $f= 25.2$ (from Sommeria et al., fig. 4, with permission). (b) The same $u(r,\phi,t)$ at fixed $t$ and at two different values of $\phi$. The solid (dotted) curve is for the value of $\phi$ where the jet is closest to the outer (inner) boundary.

TABLE I. For an unlocked eastward jet at $P = 28$, the comparison between our model (quantities with overbar) and the numerically computed solutions with $m_1$ = $m_2$ (no overbar). We use $\nu = 0.033, f = 6\pi, L^{\text{lit}}_1 = 1.2$ (see the Appendix), and $R^{\text{lit}}_1 = 27.0$. The model has $(a_1 + b_1) = 7.44, \Omega_1 = 0.0947\beta(R_{\text{out}} - R_{\text{in}})$, and $\Delta \bar{q}_i = 0.750\beta(R_{\text{out}} - R_{\text{in}})$. (All dimensional numbers have CGS units.) In practice it is difficult to determine the value of $u$ at the “discontinuity” in the numerically computed flows—see fig. 7—so we define $\Omega_1$ to be the maximum value of the computed flow’s $u(r,\phi,t)/r$. Agreement in $c_1$ improves as $m_1$ increases because the differences between the Cartesian and annular geometry decrease. By setting $k = m_1/R^{\text{lit}}_1$, $P = 2\pi R^{\text{lit}}_1/\beta$ and replacing $u(r) \Omega_1$ with $\bar{u}(\phi)$, equation (25) in an annular geometry becomes $2m_1(\Omega_1 - \bar{c}_1) = \chi_1 \beta(\phi_1 + b_1)$. The computed flow’s values of $2m_1(\Omega_1 - \bar{c}_1)$ are only weakly dependent on $m_1$ because equation (25) shows that they are proportional to $\chi_1$ which only weakly depends on $m_1$. According to equation (35) the ratio in the last column would be unity if the flow were a Bickley jet. In equation (35) we set $R = (R^{\text{lit}}_1 + R^{\text{lit}}_2)/2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m_1$</th>
<th>$\Omega_1 / \Omega_1$</th>
<th>$(\Omega_1 - \bar{c}_1) / (\Omega_1 - \bar{c}_1)$</th>
<th>$c_1$</th>
<th>$2\Omega_1 / 3 - c_1$</th>
<th>$\beta R/m_1^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>0.0311</td>
<td>0.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.0327</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>0.0336</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>0.0350</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>0.0359</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II. Same as Table I but for the locked eastward jet at $P=44$ with $m_2=m_1$. For each $m_1$, the model gives $(a_1+b_1)=10.18$, $\Omega_i=0.168\beta (R_{2in} - R_{2out})$, $(a_2+b_2)=9.33$, and $\Delta q_i=2m_1(\Omega_i - c_i) = 1.97\beta(R_{2in} - R_{2out})$. (Because the flow is locked, the subscript $i$ means 1 and 2.) All dimensional numbers have CGS units. The model overestimates $\Omega_i$ and $\Delta q_i$ (although its prediction that $\Omega_i$ is independent of $m_1$ is consistent with the numerical calculations) because the model flow is not smoothed by $v$ or by vortices. The overestimates are worse when there is strong radial mixing, as is the case at $P=44$ for the low $m$ (large area) vortex chains. The values of $\Delta q_i$ (inferred from the values of $2m_1(\Omega_i - c_i)$ in Tables I and II) are approximately twice as large for the locked flows at $P=44$ as they are for the unlocked flows at $P=28$. For locked flows, equation (26) predicts that $2m_1(\Omega_i - c_i) = \Delta q_i$, and should therefore be independent of $m_1$. However, for the computed flows, this quantity slowly increases with $m_1$ because in real flows the largest diameter vortices (those with lowest $m$) spread the “discontinuity” over the largest radial distance. A large spread creates a small change in slope of the velocity across the “discontinuity” which in turn causes a small value of $\Delta q_i = 2m_1(\Omega_i - c_i)$. The last column shows that $(2\Omega_i/3 - c_i)$ does not scale as $m_1^{-2}$ as predicted by the Bickley jet model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m_1$</th>
<th>$\Omega_i/\Omega_1$</th>
<th>$(\Omega_i - c_i)$</th>
<th>$2m_1(\Omega_i - c_i)$</th>
<th>$c_i$</th>
<th>$2\Omega_i/3 - c_i$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.0080</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.0159</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.0224</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.0274</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.0308</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.0332</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the unlocked flow. (The locked jet’s larger value of $(a_1 + b_1)$ also contributes to the increase in $\Delta q_1$.) For the same control parameters as in Table II, there is also a stable, locked flow with $m_1=11$ and $m_2=9$ (fig. 12). This flow agrees with equation (30) to within 10%. Equation (30) is a good test of the model because $2(\Omega_i/3 - c_i)$ varies greatly with $m_1$ and $P$. We have also carried out initial-value calculations that mimic the laboratory experiments in which $P$ is abruptly increased: We start with an unlocked eastward jet in equilibrium at $P=28$ and use it to initialize a calculation with $P \geq 36$. In these initial-value calculations, as in the experiments, $c_1$ and $c_2$ decrease by $\sim 50\%$ at the same time that they lock together.

Another feature of our model of locked eastward jets is that equation (29) constrains $m_1$ to $m_1 \geq \Delta q_i/2\Omega_1$. At $P = 44$, this requires $m_1 \geq 5.9$. Our numerical calculations are consistent with this: We could compute locked flows with $m > 6$, but were unable to with $m \leq 6$. When 6-fold symmetry was imposed in our numerical calculation, the flow was quasi-periodic in time and oscillated between having 6 vortices and 12. Equation (29) is also consistent with laboratory experiments at $P=44$ where flows with different values of $m_1$ were stable, but none with $m_1 < 6$. Equation (29) shows that the smallest allowable $m_1$ decreases with increasing $P$, and this has also been confirmed numerically and experimentally. None of our initial-value calculations have created solutions that violate equation (29).

In summary it should be noted that the $q$, $U$, and stream functions of the eastward jets in figs. 4, 7, 11, and 12 show many of our model’s features. There are Rossby waves that peak in the layers where $q$ changes most rapidly (which for a locked flow is where the jet’s velocity peaks). The two vortex chains are radially separated from each other and from the peaks of the Rossby waves. As fig. 4 shows, the vortices that make up the chains are often nestled in the troughs of the Rossby waves, and in all cases they travel along with them. The chains are located in the two regions of nearly uniform $q$ at $r_i^*$ such that $u(r_i^*, \phi, t)/r_i^* = c_i$, and the chains are separated from each other by one (for the locked flow—figs. 4 and 12) or two (for the unlocked flow—fig. 11) approximate discontinuities in $q$.  

FIG. 12. Stream function of the numerically computed15 locked, eastward jet at $P=32$, $f=6\pi$, $\nu=0.033$, $R_{2in}=27.0$, $m_1=11$, and $m_2=9$. Vortices in the chain at small $r$ have $\omega>0$; those at greater $r$ have $\omega<0$. It is not necessary for $m_1=m_2$ for the flow to lock (and to be steady in some rotating frame).
B. Westward jets

Because our model predicts that westward jets do not lock, we have tried very hard to make them lock and disprove our model. Of all our westward-flow, numerical calculations, locking occurred only in a small window,15 near \( P = 44 \). Locking was obtained by adjusting \( L^{slit} \) (whose effective value in the laboratory experiments is uncertain—see the Appendix) which changes the flows’ \( m_i \). The locked flow has \( m_1 = 8 \) and \( m_2 = 4 \) (fig. 5 and Table III). Unlike locked eastward jets, where the two Rossby waves and two discontinuities in \( q \) merge into one, the locked westward jet still has two waves and two discontinuities. The \( U \) of the locked and unlocked westward jets look nearly the same; whereas, those of the locked and unlocked eastward jets differ. Unlike the initial-value calculations of the eastward jets, where \( c_i \) suddenly decreases when the flow locks, there is almost no change in \( c_i \) (or \( \Delta q_i \)) of the westward jet when it locks. Our explanation is that the locked westward jet is a fluke: near \( P = 44 \) the \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) of the two Rossby waves with \( m_1 = 8 \) and \( m_2 = 4 \) change slowly with \( P \) but not at the same rate. It appears that their locking is just a matter of tuning \( P \) until they are equal. For the flows in Table III, equations \( (22) \)–\( (25) \) give \( \bar{c}_i \propto (R^{slit}_i)^{-1/3} \chi_i / m_i \). Because \( \chi_1 \approx \chi_2 \), this suggests that in order for \( c_1 \approx c_2 \) and the westward flow to lock that \( m_1 > m_2 \) which is consistent27 with Table III. Currently, it is uncertain whether the laboratory experiments have westward jets with locked vortex chains.28

Another important result shown in Tables III and IV is that the westward jets have \( c_i < 0 \) (opposite in sign to the eastward jets) in accord with the model. Moreover, the model predicts that the characteristic difference in value between the \( c_i \) of the eastward and westward jets is the order of the characteristic value of the \( \Omega_i \) of an eastward jet. This is consistent with Tables I–IV. Figures 5 and 7 show the \( q, U \) and stream functions of westward jets. Like the model, they show that the westward jets are broader, less peaked, and less wavy than the eastward jets, and that the two vortex chains of the former are radially closer together than those of the latter. For \( P = 44 \) they are intertwined with each other.

VI. BICKLEY JET MODEL

We have shown how well our model, based on the homogenization of \( q \), agrees with the experiments and simulations. Here we review the Bickley jet model,3,12 and summarize its shortcomings. A Bickley jet has a velocity \( u(y) = U_0 \tanh(y/L_{Bick}) \) where \( U_0 \) and \( L_{Bick} \) are unknown parameters. The Bickley model was motivated by fig. 10a which shows that the azimuthal average of the laboratory flow’s \( u(r, \phi, t) \) at fixed \( t \) fits a \( \tanh \) moment. Balance (or integrating equation (2) in Cartesian coordinates as we did to obtain equation (14)) relates \( U_0 \) to the pumping rate \( P \):

\[
U_0 = f \tau / |Y_2^{slit} - Y_1^{slit}|/2HL_{Bick}.
\]  

Unlike the jets in our model which are always neutrally stable, the eastward Bickley jet is unstable when 0

---

**TABLE III.** Same as Table II but for the westward jet at \( P = 44 \). For each \( m_i \), \( \Delta \tilde{q}_1 = 0.815 \beta (R_{out} - R_{in}) \), \( \Delta \tilde{q}_2 = 0.747 \beta (R_{out} - R_{in}) \), \( (a_1 + b_1) = 8.08 \), and \( (a_2 + b_2) = 7.41 \). The value of \( q_1 \) does not change when the flow locks, as it does for the eastward jets. \( \Delta \tilde{q}_2 \) is lower than the values predicted by the model because the outer discontinuity has run into \( R_{out} \) (which makes \( \tilde{c}_2 \) uncomputable in our model). The last two columns show that the Bickley jet model in equation (35) does not work well either for \( c_1 \) or \( c_2 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( m_1 )</th>
<th>( m_2 )</th>
<th>( c_1/\ell c_1 )</th>
<th>( c_2/\ell c_2 )</th>
<th>( \Omega_1/3 - c_1 )</th>
<th>( \Omega_2/3 - c_2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unlocked</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-0.0918</td>
<td>-0.0748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlocked</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-0.0908</td>
<td>-0.0778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locked</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>-0.0846</td>
<td>-0.0846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TABLE IV.** Same as Table III but for \( P = 30 \) with \( m_2 = m_1 \). For each \( m \) the model gives \( \Delta q_1 = 0.717 \beta (R_{out} - R_{in}) \), \( \Delta q_2 = 0.657 \beta (R_{out} - R_{in}) \), \( (a_1 + b_1) = 7.12 \), and \( (a_2 + b_2) = 6.52 \). The differences between \( \bar{c}_i \) and \( c_i \) in Tables III and IV are mostly due to interactions between the two vortex chains which are much closer together for the westward than the eastward jets (especially for the locked westward jet).29 The westward jet’s outer vortex chain, centered at \( r = r_2^* \), has \( \omega > 0 \), while the inner chain has \( \omega < 0 \). Thus, the velocity created by vortices in the outer chain pushes fluid at \( r < r_2^* \) (as well as the inner vortex chain) in the \( -\phi \) direction. Similarly, the inner vortex chain pushes the outer chain in the \( +\phi \) direction. Because the \( c_i \) of the waves of the westward jet are also negative, \( |c_i| > |\bar{c}_i| \). Because \( r_2^* \) is close to \( R_{out} \), the outer chain’s image created by the outer boundary is strong. The image, which has \( \omega < 0 \), advects the outer chain in the \( +\phi \) direction which cancels, somewhat, the effects of the inner vortex chain. Thus \( c_2/\ell c_2 = 1 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( m )</th>
<th>( c_1/\ell c_1 )</th>
<th>( c_2/\ell c_2 )</th>
<th>( \Omega_1/3 - c_1 )</th>
<th>( \Omega_2/3 - c_2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>-0.0728</td>
<td>-0.0559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>-0.0689</td>
<td>-0.0536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>-0.0663</td>
<td>-0.0506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-0.0640</td>
<td>-0.0480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
<βL_{Bick}^2/U_0<2/3. At large P it was argued\(^1\)\(^2\) that instabilities would increase L_{Bick} until the jet is marginally stable (i.e., no growing modes for any azimuthal wavenumber), which for eastward jets requires

$$\beta L_{Bick}^2/U_0=2/3.$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)

This jet has one neutrally stable, non-singular eigenmode. It has wave speed\(^1\) and azimuthal wavenumber

$$c_{m,s}=\Omega_1/3, \quad m_{m,s}=\sqrt{2R/l_{Bick}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)

where R is the radius of the jet and where \(\Omega_1\) for this model is defined as \(U_0/R\). Sommeria et al.\(^2\) found experimental values of \(m_i\) that were similar to, but consistently smaller than \(m_{m,s}\). They also reported values of \(U_0\) and \(U_0^{\text{theory}}=[3(I/3\beta)^2\beta(R_{c}^{\text{crit}} - R_{c}^{\text{crit}}/4P)^2/2]^{1/2}\) as functions of \((Pf)\) in order to validate the Bickley jet model, where \(U_0^{\text{theory}}\) is the solution to equations (31) and (32). We can use this same data to test their assumption that the jet is marginally stable (without knowing \(L_{Bick}\) whose experimental values were not published). Define \(\alpha\) such that \(\alpha=3\beta L_{Bick}^2/2U_0\). Comparison of this definition with equation (32) shows that \(\alpha\) measures how close the jet is to marginally stable. By definition of \(\alpha\) and the assumption that the experimentally-obtained values of \(U_0\) and \(L_{Bick}\) satisfy equation (31) (whose validity relies only on the conservation of momentum) gives \(\alpha=(U_0^{\text{theory}}/U_0)^3\). For large values of \((Pf)\) (e.g., 8000, where the marginally stable assumption should work), the experimental values give \(\alpha=0.5\), so the jet is not marginal. The Bickley jet model’s prediction that \(c_i=c_{m,s}=\Omega_1/3\) cannot be tested experimentally at large \(P\) because the flow is chaotic and finding \(c_i\) is ambiguous. However, our numerical calculations at \(P=64\) give \(c_i=0.12\Omega_1\) (and shows that \(c_i\) decreases with increasing \(P\)) which disagrees with the Bickley model. For \(P<65\), Solomon et al.\(^3\) used the eastward Bickley jet model without the assumption of marginal stability, so \(0<\beta L_{Bick}^2/U_0<2/3\). For these non-marginal Bickley jets there are two neutral, regular, sinusoid Rossby waves with speeds \(c_{+}\) and wavenumbers \(m_{+}\); equation (31) still holds, but equations (32)–(33) are replaced with

$$c_{1}=L_{Bick}^2m_{2}^2/\Omega_1/6R^2=\frac{\Omega_1}{3} \left[1 \pm \sqrt{1 - \frac{3\beta L_{Bick}^2}{2\Omega_1/R}}\right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)

and

$$2\Omega_1/3-c_{1}=\beta R/l_{Bick}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (35)

Solomon et al. found that equation (35) was not accurate for westward jets but was within 30% for eastward jets. Our numerical results in Tables III and IV also show that equation (35) is not satisfied by westward jets. However, Tables I and II for the eastward jets also show that for many values of \(m_1\) equation (35) has \(O(1)\) errors and that the equation’s prediction that \(2\Omega_1/3-c\) is proportional to \(m^{-2}\) is not correct.

Besides being quantitatively incorrect for some parameters of the eastward jets, the Bickley jet model has two major shortcomings. Because it fails qualitatively for the westward jets, it cannot used to explain why the eastward and westward jets differ. Moreover it fails to describe correctly the qualitative features of locking. For low \(P\) the Bickley jet is not marginally stable and has two neutral, sinusoidal modes with independent frequencies \(c_\pm\) (i.e., the unlocked flow). With this model,\(^1\) as \(P\) increases so does \(L_{Bick}\) until \(P=P_{lock}\) and the jet is marginally stable. The two waves lock by having \(c_+\) slow down continuously to \(c_{m,s}\) and \(c_-\) increase continuously to \(c_{m,s}\). This is contrary to observations which show that both speeds decrease abruptly when they lock. Furthermore in the Bickley jet model, the unlocked flow has both Rossby waves centered at the same radial location—the peak of the Bickley jet—which is in contradiction to observations which show two distinct locations of the two waves (fig. 11) with neither at the velocity’s peak. Finally, Solomon et al. found that for \(25<P<65\), the locked eastward jets had \(c_i<c_{m,s}\) and therefore argued that if the locked flows were Bickley jets, they were not marginally stable (and that only the \(c_-\) mode was present). However, if the jet is a non-marginally stable Bickley jet, then it poses the question of why the unstable eigenmodes with azimuthal wavenumbers with \(m_-<m<<m_+\) are not present. (Typical values are \(m_- = 8\) and \(m_+ = 11\) for the parameter range where eastward jets are unlocked.)

### VII. Conclusion and Relevance to Planetary Jets

We have presented a model for the formation of eastward and westward jets on a \(\beta\)-plane. The underlying assumption is that stirring homogenizes \(q\) and that \(\beta\) aligns the large-scale velocity into the east–west direction. To test the model we have shown that it quantitatively reproduces laboratory experiments and explains asymmetries between the eastward and westward jets. At low pumping rates \(P\), there is one discontinuity in \(q\) for each slit. As \(P\) increases, \(\beta\) causes the westward jets’ two discontinuities to move away from each other while the eastward jets’ move closer together. Rossby waves travel along the discontinuities, and their speeds \(c_i\) differ due to the annular geometry. At \(P_{lock}\) the eastward jet’s two discontinuities merge causing the two Rossby waves to coalesce and lock with \(c_i = c_2\). Because \(c_i\) depends on \(\Delta q_1\) and because \(\Delta q_1 \approx \Delta q_2\) add together when they merge, the \(c_i\) decrease when the flow locks. The resulting eastward jet’s velocity has a cusp (discontinuity in slope) at its peak, so it is narrow, strong, and wavy (due to the Rossby wave centered at the cusp). Because the westward jet’s two discontinuities move apart, they do not, in general, merge together, and the speeds of the two vortex chains rarely lock. The westward jet is weak, has a smooth broad peak, fills most of the annulus, and is not wavy because the Rossby waves are far from the peak and are damped by the tank’s boundaries. Both the eastward and westward jets produce chains of vortices in regions where \(|\nabla q|\) is small, which for the westward jets is the region between the two discontinuities and for the eastward jets are the two regions that lie between the boundaries of the tank and the nearest Rossby wave. Thus the eastward jets’ chains are separated from each other by one (for the locked flow) or two (for the unlocked) discontinuities in \(q\), while the westward jets’ two chains are in close proximity to (and often
and never near the eastward jets. For the laboratory jets we
chains were located near the maxima of the westward jets
functional form of the flow’s sharp gradients. In both cases our main clue to the
different from the unaveraged values; averaging disguises a
measurements fails qualitatively for westward jets and therefore cannot be used to explain the asymmetries between the eastward and westward flows. Moreover, its predicted scalings for eastward flows are incorrect, and it cannot account for wave locking. Our main concern about the Bickley jet model is that it has been used as the starting point of analyses that purport to explain the mixing of tracers in the eastward-jet laboratory flows. Because it is known that large azimuthal wavenumbers of the Rossby wave is constrained. Note that the idealized model flow (which is not smoothed by \( \nu \)) can differ from the laboratory or numerically-computed flow, but the numbers, locations, speeds and general properties of the waves and vortices agree very well. This is consistent with earlier numerical calculations of the waves and vortices of the primary flow (equation (5)) which showed that the waves were sensitive to the values of \( U \) and \( q \) at the flow’s discontinuities but insensitive to their values elsewhere. Thus our model, which was designed to simulate the flow at the discontinuities, works very well.

The competing Bickley model for the laboratory experiments fails qualitatively for westward jets and therefore cannot be used to explain the asymmetries between the eastward and westward flows. Moreover, its predicted scalings for eastward flows are incorrect, and it cannot account for wave locking. Our main concern about the Bickley jet model is that it has been used as the starting point of analyses that purport to explain the mixing of tracers in the eastward-jet laboratory flows. Because it is known that large azimuthally-averaged values of \( q \) and velocity can be very different from the unaveraged values; averaging disguises a flow’s sharp gradients. In both cases our main clue to the functional form of \( q \) came from the fact that the vortex chains were located near the maxima of the westward jets and never near the eastward jets. For the laboratory jets we have shown here by direct numerical simulation that our model is accurate, but for Jupiter’s jets we still have no direct support of the model in fig. 2. One of the goals of this paper was to support it indirectly by showing that the laboratory experiment, although a crude model of the jovian atmosphere, unambiguously shows that the azimuthal jets in fig. 2 can be created from a flow at rest by forcing it so that its \( q \) is stirred and homogenized. Some of the deficiencies of the laboratory flow as a model of Jupiter are that the laboratory experiments produce a step-function \( q \) with only one or two steps (whereas the jovian flow has at least 12), the experiments have a highly artificial forcing, and they have an infinitesimal Rossby deformation radius. Although these drawbacks have yet to be overcome in laboratory experiments, they have been in numerical simulations which show that the formation of jets by the homogenization of \( q \) is a robust process. In numerical simulations with multiple slits in the bot-

![FIG. 13. (a) Numerically computed \( P_{crit} \) of the primary eastward jets as a function of \( f \) for \( v=0.1 \) and \( R_{in}^1=18.9 \) (thick curve for \( m=9 \), thin for \( m=8 \), and broken for \( m=7 \)) compared with the laboratory values (shown as squares with the value of \( m_{crit} \) written near them). If the numerical calculations and their underlying assumptions are correct, the laboratory value of \( P_{crit} \) should correspond to the smallest (as a function of \( m \) for fixed \( f \)) numerically computed value of \( P_{crit} \), and the laboratory value of \( m_{crit} \) should correspond to the computed curve with the lowest value of \( P_{crit} \). (b) Same for the westward jet (thick curve for \( m=8 \), thin for \( m=7 \), and broken for \( m=6 \)). The numerical eigenmodes were found by linearizing equations (2) and (3) about the primary \( U(r) \) computed from equation (5) with a parabolic \( U(r) \) and \( F_{crit}=1.2 \). Perturbations are of the form \( e^{i(m\phi-cf)} \). We used a spectral method with 257 radial collocation points. There were at least 9 points per slit, so the flows were well resolved. Initial-value calculations shows that the instabilities of the primary flow are supercritical.](image-url)
bottom boundary, where the pumping direction alternates from slit to slit, the \( q \) near each slit is homogenized, and as the pumping increases the homogenized regions grow in size until the discontinuities in \( q \) run into each other creating a flow with multiple eastward and westward jets that is well modeled by fig. 2. The model velocity is piecewise parabolic.\(^{32}\) The eastward jets alternate with the westward jets, with the former strong, narrow, and wavy (due to Rossby waves along the discontinuities) and the latter broad and smooth. Azimuthal flows with step-function \( q \) have also been created from a fluid initially at rest in our numerical simulations with a finite Rossby deformation radius,\(^8\) with a more realistic forcing,\(^8\) and with the shallow-water equations.\(^{33}\) Recent simulations with a realistic forcing (that would correspond to an oscillating grid in a laboratory experiment) show that azimuthal flows with multiple eastward and westward jets (from 4 to 26 of each) can be created where the width of the jets and the spacing between them are unrelated to the scale of the forcing or the boundaries (but is instead set by the strength of the forcing).\(^{34}\)

Prior to this study, there were few simulations that examined the formation of Jovian-like east–west jets.\(^{35–39}\) Due to limitations of resolution almost all were two—rather than three-dimensional. Moreover, most were run-down experiments, i.e., with no forcing but with dissipation of the potential enstrophy by a hyper-viscosity. Run-down experiments have severely constrained dynamics due to the fact that they conserve momentum, potential circulation and energy (the latter is due to the reverse cascade and is only approximate). Marcus and Lee\(^8\) showed that if one assumes that a run-down experiment on a \( \beta \)-plane creates a zonal flow made of axi-symmetric bands of uniform \( q \) separated by jumps, then the late-time flow has a simple, analytic form that is a function of the initial energy, momentum, circulation (and deformation radius). Thus for run-down experiments to create jovian-like flows, the initial values of these four quantities must be preset to agree with the planetary observations. In contrast, numerical simulations of forced/dissipated flows create zonal winds in which the final flow’s energy and strength depend on the balance between forcing and dissipation. We speculate that for the jovian jets to have been stable over hundreds of years of observation, they must also depend on the balance between forcing and dissipation and that the observed flow must be a stable attracting solution for a wide variety of initial conditions and robust with respect to large perturbations. We believe that the formation and maintenance of azimuthal jets by the homogenization of \( q \), as illustrated in the experiments and simulations presented here, is an example of how a flow comes to a robust equilibrium, balancing forcing and dissipation, and that this process occurs in a wide variety of laboratory and planetary flows.
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APPENDIX: APPROXIMATION OF A CIRCULAR ROW OF HOLES WITH AN AXISYMMETRIC SLIT

The pumping in the laboratory experiment is through two concentric rows of 120 holes in the bottom boundary of the annulus. In equation (3) the rows of holes are approximated as circular slits of effective width \( L_{\text{slit}} \). We have argued the reasonableness of this approximation and found the value of \( L_{\text{slit}} \) that corresponds to the experiment:\(^{30}\) \( L_{\text{slit}} \approx \sqrt{\lambda_{\text{in}}(P/8\pi N)^{1/4}(\nu f)^{-1/8}} \) where \( N \) is the number of holes in a row. For typical parameter values, this is \( \sim 1.5 \) times the Stewartson layer thickness \( \sqrt{\nu} \) and much larger than a hole diameter. The value of \( L_{\text{slit}} \) is determined by viscous diffusion (which increases it to Stewartson layer thickness) and also by the circumferential velocity about each hole. One test of the slit approximation, as well as the quasi-geostrophic approximation, is fig. 13 which compares the laboratory measurements of \( P_{\text{crit}} \) and \( m_{\text{crit}} \) (the \( m \) of the unstable eigenmode) to the values computed from the linearized form of equations (2) and (3)). The agreement is good. However, we caution the reader that the agreement depends upon the value of \( L_{\text{slit}} \) (fig. 14).\(^{40}\)

4. J. Sommeria, S. D. Meyers, and H. L. Swinney, “Laboratory simulation of


In the atmospheric literature eastward jets, which flow from west to east, are “westerlies.”


Numerical calculations are spectral with Fourier modes in the azimuthal and Chebyshev modes in the radial direction. The method has no splitting errors due to the fractional steps. Details are in Refs. 18 and 20.

For all laboratory experiments and numerical calculations, we have used the dimensional variables and parameter values given in Ref. 18.

For computations in a rotating frame, we have used the dimensional variables and parameter values given in Ref. 18.

The location of the outer discontinuity in the Rossby waves is determined by the Rossby number, which is the ratio of the Rossby wavelength to the Coriolis parameter. The value of the Rossby number is approximately 10. For eastward jets, the fractional errors in the Rossby number are typically less than 1%.

The location of the outer discontinuity in the Rossby waves is determined by the Rossby number, which is the ratio of the Rossby wavelength to the Coriolis parameter. The value of the Rossby number is approximately 10. For eastward jets, the fractional errors in the Rossby number are typically less than 1%.
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Computations with parabolic, Gaussian, and top-hat \( w(r) \) with the same \( L_{\text{full}} \) give the same \( P_{\text{crit}} \) to within 1%, where \( L_{\text{full}} \) is the full width at half maximum of \( w(r) \). Figures 13 and 14 used a parabolic \( w(r) \). In principle, one could use the experimental values of \( P_{\text{crit}} \) with fig. 14 to determine the best value of \( L_{\text{full}} \) to use in numerical computations. However, this method cannot be used at \( P > P_{\text{crit}} \) because the “best” value of \( L_{\text{full}} \) depends on \( P \): \( L_{\text{full}} \) controls the vortex layer’s thickness. As \( L_{\text{full}} \) increases, the \( \omega(r) \) at each slit goes from a delta function to a function with width approximately equal to \( L_{\text{full}} \). With \( \nu \to 0 \) equation (5) shows that \( u \) of the primary flow is approximately independent of \( L_{\text{full}} \), so at each layer

\[
q = \frac{\pi \rho P}{2\pi h R_i^2 L_{\text{full}}} + \beta R_i^2.
\]

As the layers roll-up into discrete vortices, the \( q \) of each vortex is approximately conserved at its initial value. Thus, \( L_{\text{full}} \) determines the strength of the vortices in the chains. With \( \nu \to 0 \) equation (5) also shows that the potential circulation of the layers and chains are nearly independent of \( L_{\text{full}} \); therefore, the areas of the vortices must depend on \( L_{\text{full}} \).