

Effect of Mean Flow Shear on Cross Phase and Transport, Reconsidered

Eun-jin Kim and P. H. Diamond

Department of Physics, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093-0319

Abstract

We reconsider the important question of the effect of a strong mean shear flow on the transport of a passive scalar field. By incorporating the effect of resonance, we show that the flux and cross phase scale with the mean shear Ω , as Ω^{-1} and $\Omega^{-1/6}$, respectively. These weak dependencies, in particular that of the cross phase, are in sharp contrast to other claims recently made in the literature, indicating that cross phase suppression does not always exceed that of the intensity of the turbulence. We also show that the scalings of flux and cross-phase with Ω depend on the statistics of the turbulent flow.

One of the most promising mechanisms for regulating anomalous turbulent transport in magnetically confined plasmas is the enhanced decorrelation of turbulence by a mean shear flow [1]. Indeed, mean $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ shearing plays a central role in the L→H transition and in the development of internal transport barriers, which are crucial to advanced tokamak concepts. Any predictive model of transport barrier formation requires a quantitative understanding of the effects of flow shear on turbulent transport. More generally, the addition of a mean shear flow also defines an interesting and broadly relevant generalization of the classic problem of passive scalar transport [2].

The basic concept concerning the effect of shear on turbulence originated in the study of galactic dynamics [3]. A mean shear flow $U(x)\hat{y}$ distorts turbulent eddies, generating smaller radial scales, until they are quenched by dissipation. Here, x and y represent local radial and poloidal directions. This process can reduce the radial transport $\Gamma = \langle \chi v_x \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} |\chi(\mathbf{k})| |v_x(-\mathbf{k})| \cos \delta_{\mathbf{k}}$ of a scalar field χ , via the reduction of the amplitude of the turbulence $|\chi(\mathbf{k})|$ and/or via reduction of the phase shift $\cos \delta_{\mathbf{k}}$ between the scalar field and the radial velocity. Since the work by Biglari *et al* [4] estimated the reduction in the amplitude of turbulence as $\langle \chi^2 \rangle \propto \Omega^{-2/3}$, several works [5–8] have been devoted to the determination of the dependence of cross phase $\cos \delta_{\mathbf{k}}$ on shear Ω . In particular, a recent work by Terry *et al* [7] argued that a radial flux of a (passive) scalar field, which is advected by a random flow and a linear mean shear flow, is significantly reduced ($\sim \Omega^{-4}$ in the strong shear limit), with the cross phase scaling with shear as Ω^{-3} , and claimed cross phase suppression is the dominant transport reduction mechanism. Ref. [7] also claimed agreements with several fluctuation measurements from experiments [1,9].

The purpose of this Letter is to revisit the important questions of cross-phase and flux scaling with Ω . While this subject is also very relevant in experiments, it is important to develop a self-consistent theory. We thus focus on the theoretical aspect in this Letter. The basic physics that leads to our conclusion can be understood by recalling that a radial flux of a scalar field, representing the transport of the scalar field between different scales, requires dissipative process such as (effective) diffusion or decorrelation of the scalar field, *or*

the presence of resonant absorption point in the system where the Doppler shift frequency vanishes $\omega = \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{U}_0 = xk_y(\partial_x U_0)$ (i.e., critical layer). Here $\mathbf{U}_0 = x(\partial_x U_0)\hat{y}$ is a linear mean (poloidal) shear flow, and x is the distance from a rational surface where a spectral intensity is localized. The result in [7] was obtained by incorporating diffusion only for the limit $\omega \rightarrow 0$, overlooking the important and ubiquitous effect of resonance between the shear flow and the fluctuations. This treatment is in serious error since for a low frequency mode ($\omega \sim \omega_*$), a resonant point $x = \omega/k_y(\partial_x U_0)$ resides close to the rational surface, thereby contributing to the flux by introducing irreversibility (and thus transport) for small fluctuation amplitude (so long as phase space islands overlap). In this Letter, we show that the resonant contribution to the flux leads to a much weaker dependence on the shear, namely $\Gamma \sim \Omega^{-1}$. Furthermore we demonstrate that the dependence of the flux on Ω can be even weakened in the extreme case of a random flow with a white-noise frequency spectrum (i.e., a delta-correlated flow).

Before presenting our formal analysis, we provide a simple, but transparent, calculation of the flux, which sheds much light on the physics of the problem. We consider the advection of a passive scalar field χ by a turbulent flow \mathbf{v} and a linear mean shear flow $U_0(x)\hat{y} = x(\partial_x U_0)\hat{y}$ in the local radial (x) and poloidal (y) plane, perpendicular to a magnetic field $\mathbf{B} = B_0\hat{z}$:

$$\partial_t \chi + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{u}\chi) = 0, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} + U_0(x)\hat{y}$ with $\mathbf{v} = -(c/B)\nabla\phi \times \hat{z}$. The renormalized equation for the flute-like fluctuations $\tilde{\chi}$ (with $k_{\parallel} = 0$) takes the following form:

$$[-i\omega + ik_y x \Omega - \partial_x D(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \partial_x + k_y^2 d(\mathbf{k}, \omega)] \tilde{\chi}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{c}{B} ik_y \phi(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \partial_x \chi_0. \quad (2)$$

Here, $\Omega = \partial_x U_0$, χ_0 is the mean component, and $D(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$ and $d(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$ are the renormalized radial and poloidal diffusivities, respectively [7]; x is the radial distance from the rational surface where the spectral intensity is localized, i.e., we assume that the fluctuation spectrum is localized at mode rational surfaces, where $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{B}_0 = 0$. Here, $\mathbf{k} = (m/r, n/R)$. Note that so long as the spectral width (in radius) W_k satisfies $W_k > |\omega_k/k_y U'_0|$, a resonance between

the flow and the fluctuation mode frequency ω_k is located *within* the spectral envelope (see Fig. 1).

In the limit of large shear (weak turbulence) such that $\omega, k_y W_k \Omega \gg \partial_x D(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \partial_x$, Eq. (2) is simply reduced to $\tilde{\chi}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \sim (c/B) k_y \phi(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \partial_x \chi_0 / (\omega - k_y x \Omega + i k_y^2 d(\mathbf{k}, \omega))$, as derived in [7], with the following flux

$$\Gamma = \text{Re} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} |\bar{v}_x(\mathbf{k}, x)|^2 \frac{i\pi \partial_x \chi_0}{\omega - k_y x \Omega + i k_y^2 d(\mathbf{k}, \omega)} \Big|_{\omega=\omega_k+i\gamma_k}. \quad (3)$$

Here, the integration over frequency was performed by using Lorentzian frequency spectrum $|v_x(\mathbf{k}, x, \omega)|^2 = |\bar{v}_x(\mathbf{k}, x)|^2 \gamma_k / ((\omega - \omega_k)^2 + \gamma_k^2)$. The scaling of $\Gamma \propto \Omega^{-4}$ in [7] follows if $\omega, k_y^2 d, \gamma_k \ll |k_y W_k \Omega|$ (ignoring the resonant response) and also if $\gamma_k \propto d(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \propto \Omega^{-2}$, by expanding the denominator of Eq. (3). However, an exception to the latter scaling can be easily found in the case of a delta correlated flow \mathbf{v} , which satisfies $\gamma_k \gg k_y^2 d, \omega_k, |k_y W_k \Omega|$. In this case, it is trivial to check that the flux becomes independent of Ω . That is, the alleged scaling of $\Gamma \propto \Omega^{-4}$ does not always hold, even in the non-resonant case! Furthermore, the contribution from the resonant response cannot be neglected, since resonance is bound to occur at $x = \omega_k / k_y \Omega$, which is very close to the rational surface for large Ω and small ω_k .

It is also appropriate to examine the basic time scales in the problem. Here, the dispersion rate for a fluid packet wave-form (i.e., the autocorrelation rate, in the language of quasilinear theory) is $|k_y W_k \Omega|$ with the corresponding nonlinear decay rate $k^2 d(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$. *Thus, it follows that the applicability of the ‘strong shear’ limit (i.e., $k_y \Delta x \Omega > k^2 d(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$) is precisely equivalent to the condition for the applicability of quasi-linear theory (i.e., $\tau_{ac} < (k^2 d)^{-1}$), with $\Delta x \sim W_k$ and $\tau_{ac} = (k_y \Delta x \Omega)^{-1}$.* Note that this is eminently consistent with the expectation that shear should reduce turbulence intensity, thus rendering weak turbulence approaches appropriate.

The flux from the resonant response is obtained by using $\text{Re}(i/(\omega - k_y x \Omega + i k_y^2 d(\mathbf{k}, \omega))) = \pi \delta(\omega - k_y x \Omega)$ in Eq. (3) as:

$$\Gamma = - \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\pi^2 |\bar{v}_x(\mathbf{k}, x)|^2}{|k_y \Omega|} \delta\left(x - \frac{\omega_k}{k_y \Omega}\right) \partial_x \chi_0. \quad (4)$$

Note also that the delta-function propagator renders concerns about regularization of the critical layer moot. Eq. (4) shows that the flux due to resonance is proportional to Ω^{-1} , with a much weaker dependence on Ω than Ω^{-4} reported in [7]. Note that the scaling of $D \sim 1/\Omega$ is precisely analogous to the well known scaling of $D \sim 1/U_0$ in the classic 1D Vlasov quasilinear diffusion problem. In each case, the scaling is due to the proportionality of D to a fluid element dispersion time (phase space fluid, for the Vlasov case). Also, the flux Γ in the above equations is local in the radial direction. Thus, one can take a spatial average over scale λ in the radial direction (which lies between the scale of Ω and that of fluctuations) to remove the delta function. This procedure is, in fact, equivalent to the summation over m and n , since $\sum_{m,n} = \sum_m \int dx |m\hat{s}/q|$.

In order to obtain the correct scaling of the cross phase (in particular, that of the amplitude of turbulence) with the shear, the effect of the shear on scalar fluctuation levels should be carefully taken into account. This is because the amplitude of turbulence crucially depends on the radial diffusion, whose effect is very sensitive to the shear. Namely, a shear flow $U_0(x)\hat{y}$ generates small scales in the x direction due to shearing, linearly increasing k_x in time. Thus, even if the radial diffusion at some time may be extremely small, its effect can be no longer neglected at later times on account of the reduction in the radial scale. This main effect of the shear, namely, the linear increase of wavenumber, can be nonperturbatively incorporated by following a particle trajectory in the extended phase space $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}, t)$, with the help of the Gabor transform [10], as shown below. The Gabor transform is a localized Fourier transform (i.e., a type of wavelet transform), defined by $GT[\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)] = \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x}, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^2x' f(|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'|) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}')} \psi(\mathbf{x}', t)$. Here, $f(x) = f(0) \exp(-x^2/\lambda^2)$ is a filter function at scale λ . λ can be chosen to be the scale of the localization of a mode near resonant surface (i.e., $\lambda \sim W_k$) to ensure a roughly homogeneous turbulence within the localized regime. By using this method, we now determine the flux, amplitude, and cross phase.

In terms of the Gabor transform, Eq. (1) is written as:

$$D_t \hat{\chi} = -\hat{v}_x \partial_x \chi_0 - D(k_x^2 + k_y^2) \hat{\chi}, \quad (5)$$

where $D_t = \partial_t + U_0 \partial_y + k_y \Omega \partial_{k_x}$ is the total time derivative in the extended phase space $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}, t)$, $\Omega = -\partial_x U_0$, which is assumed to be positive without a loss of generality, and D is a normalized diffusivity. Note that $D_t k_x = k_y \Omega$, by the eikonal equations. The main effect of shearing, namely, the linear increase/decrease of the wavenumber in time, can be explicitly incorporated by integrating Eq. (5) along a particle trajectory, for a given v_x , as:

$$\hat{\chi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}, t) = - \int d^2 k_1 d^2 x_1 dt_1 g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}, t : \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{k}_1, t_1) \hat{v}_x(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{k}_1, t_1) \partial_x \chi_0, \quad (6)$$

where g is the Green's function

$$g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}, t : \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{k}_1, t_1) = \delta(x - x_1) \delta(y - y_1 - U(t - t_1)) \delta(k_x - k_{1x} - k_y \Omega(t - t_1)) \delta(k_y - k_{1y}) \\ \times \exp \left\{ -D \left(k_y^2 t + \frac{k_x^3}{3\Omega k_y} \right) \right\} \exp \left\{ D \left(k_{1y}^2 t_1 + \frac{k_{1x}^3}{3\Omega k_{1y}} \right) \right\}. \quad (7)$$

In the long time limit, the flux then simply follows from Eq. (6) as

$$\langle \tilde{\chi}(\mathbf{x}, t) v_x(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle \simeq \frac{-\partial_x \chi_0}{(2\pi)^2 f^2(0)} \int d^2 k_1 d\omega \int_0^\infty d\tau e^{i(\omega - k_{1y} x \Omega)\tau - DQ(\mathbf{k}_1, \tau)} f^2 \left(\left| \frac{x\Omega\tau}{2} \right| \right) \psi(\mathbf{k}_1, \omega). \quad (8)$$

Here, $Q(\mathbf{k}, \tau) = \tau(k^2 + k_x k_y \Omega \tau + k_y^2 \Omega^2 \tau^2 / 3)$, and $\psi(\mathbf{k}_1, \omega)$ is the power spectrum of v_x in Fourier space, i.e., $\langle v_x^2(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle = \int d^2 k d\omega \psi(\mathbf{k}, \omega) / (2\pi)^2$. In the following, we focus on the strong shear limit such that $Dk_1^2 / \Omega \ll 1$, which corresponds to the weak turbulence case as previously discussed. Note that the condition $Dk_1^2 / \Omega \ll 1$ applies to the spectrum of the (prescribed) turbulent flow, and is thus satisfied in the long time limit despite the linear increase of k_x of the advected scalar field $\tilde{\chi}$. In this limit, Eq. (8) simplifies to

$$\langle \tilde{\chi}(\mathbf{x}, t) v_x(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle = \frac{-\partial_x \chi_0}{4\pi^{3/2}} \int d^2 k_1 d\omega \psi(\mathbf{k}_1, \omega) \frac{\lambda}{\Omega x} e^{-\lambda^2 (k_{1y} - \omega / \Omega x)^2} \\ = \frac{-\partial_x \chi_0}{4\pi^{3/2}} \left[1 + \left(\frac{\gamma_k \lambda}{x \Omega} \right)^2 \right]^{-1/2} \frac{\lambda}{x \Omega} \int d^2 k_1 \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{k}_1) \exp \left[-\frac{(\omega_k - k_{1y} x \Omega)^2}{\gamma_k^2 + (x \Omega / \lambda)^2} \right], \quad (9)$$

for $x/\lambda > Dk_1^2 / \Omega$. The integration over frequency was performed to obtain the last line, for simplicity, by assuming a Gaussian frequency spectrum $\psi(\mathbf{k}, \omega) =$

$\bar{\psi}(\mathbf{k}) \exp\{-(\omega - \omega_k)^2/\gamma_k^2\}/\sqrt{\pi}\gamma_k$. One can immediately check that the flux becomes independent of the shear in the case of a delta correlated flow with $\lambda\gamma_k/x\Omega \gg 1$, as $\langle \tilde{\chi}(\mathbf{x}, t)v_x(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle = \frac{-\partial_x \chi_0}{4\gamma_k \pi^{3/2}} \int d^2 k_1 \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{k}_1)$. This is consistent with the result obtained previously. In a physically more relevant case of a localized frequency spectrum with $\lambda\gamma_k/x\Omega \ll 1$, Eq. (9) may be approximated as

$$\langle \tilde{\chi}(\mathbf{x}, t)v_x(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle \sim -\frac{\partial_x \chi_0}{4\pi^{3/2}} \frac{\lambda}{x\Omega} \int d^2 k_1 \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{k}_1) \exp\{-\lambda^2[k_{1y} - (\omega_k/x\Omega)]^2\}, \quad (10)$$

The argument of the exponential function takes on its maximum value at the resonant point where $\omega_k = k_{1y}x\Omega$. At that point the flux becomes proportional to Ω^{-1} , which is a *much weaker* scaling than Ω^{-4} , as reported in [7]. As one moves away from the resonance point towards larger x ($\omega_k \ll k_{1y}x\Omega$), the exponential function becomes $\propto \exp\{-\lambda^2 k_{1y}^2\}$, independent of Ω , again leaving the flux $\propto \Omega^{-1}$. This can also be viewed as the low frequency limit $\omega_k \rightarrow 0$ for a fixed x , which is the very limit that was considered in [7]. Thus, the scaling of Ω^{-4} in [7] cannot be reproduced, even in the low frequency limit. On the other hand, as one moves away from the resonance point towards smaller x ($\omega_k \gg k_{1y}x\Omega$ – i.e., the high frequency limit), the exponential becomes $\propto \exp\{-(\lambda\omega/x\Omega)^2\}$ (which increases with Ω), thereby making the overall suppression factor of the flux $\propto \Omega^{-1} \exp\{-(\lambda\omega/x\Omega)^2\}$ in the high frequency case, compared to Ω^{-1} in the resonant case. Note that the flux in Eq. (10) decreases with x because the amplitude of the mode decreases far from the rational surface.

To determine the cross phase which convolves both the effective auto-correlation time and the scalar response function, we now compute the amplitude of the turbulence $\langle \tilde{\chi}^2 \rangle$ by using Eq. (6) in the long time limit:

$$\langle \tilde{\chi}^2(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle = \frac{(\partial_x \chi_0)^2}{(2\pi)^2 f^2(0)} \int d^2 k_1 d\omega \int_0^\infty d\tau_1 \int_0^\infty d\tau_2 e^h f^2 \left(\left| \frac{x\Omega(\tau_2 - \tau_1)}{2} \right| \right) \psi(\mathbf{k}_1, \omega), \quad (11)$$

where $h = i(\omega - k_{1y}x\Omega)(\tau_1 - \tau_2) - D[Q(\mathbf{k}_1, \tau_1) + Q(-\mathbf{k}_1, \tau_2)]$, and $Q(\mathbf{k}, \tau) = \tau(k^2 + k_x k_y \Omega \tau + k_y^2 \Omega^2 \tau^2/3)$. For a sufficiently strong shear, satisfying $Dk_1^2 \ll \Omega x/\lambda \lesssim \Omega$, Eq. (11) becomes

$$\langle \tilde{\chi}^2(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle \simeq \frac{(\partial_x \chi_0)^2}{6\pi^{3/2}} \frac{\lambda}{x\Omega^2} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{3}\right) \left[1 + \left(\frac{\gamma_k \lambda}{x\Omega} \right)^2 \right]^{-1/2}$$

$$\times \int d^2 k_1 \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{k}_1) \left(\frac{3\Omega}{2Dk_1^2} \right)^{1/3} \exp \left[-\frac{(\omega_k - k_{1y}x\Omega)^2}{\gamma_k^2 + (x\Omega/\lambda)^2} \right], \quad (12)$$

for $x/\lambda > Dk_1^2/\Omega$. Here, again the integration over frequency was performed by using Gaussian frequency spectrum. For a delta correlated flow with $\lambda\gamma_k/x\Omega \gg 1$, Eq. (12) can be simplified to $\langle \tilde{\chi}^2(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle \sim \frac{(\partial_x \chi_0)^2}{6\gamma_k \pi^{3/2} \Omega} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{3}\right) \int d^2 k_1 \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{k}_1) \left(\frac{3\Omega}{2Dk_1^2} \right)^{1/3}$. Since the flux is independent of the shear for a delta correlated flow (as previously shown), the cross phase $\propto \frac{\langle v_x \tilde{\chi} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{\chi}^2 \rangle^{1/2} \langle v^2 \rangle^{1/2}} \propto \Omega^{1/3}$, which increases with shear! It can be easily shown that without shear, $\langle \tilde{\chi}^2 \rangle \propto (\partial_x \chi_0)^2 \int d^2 k_1 \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{k}_1) (\Omega/Dk_1^2) \Omega^{-1}$. Thus, a shear reduces $\langle \tilde{\chi}^2 \rangle$ by a factor of $(Dk_0^2/\Omega)^{2/3}$, in agreement with the estimate given in [4]. Here, k_0 is the characteristic scale of fluctuations.

In a physically more relevant case of a localized frequency spectrum with $\lambda\gamma_k/x\Omega \ll 1$, Eq. (12) is approximated to

$$\langle \tilde{\chi}^2(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle \sim \frac{(\partial_x \chi_0)^2}{6\gamma_k \pi^{3/2} \Omega^2} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{3}\right) \frac{\lambda}{x} \int d^2 k_1 \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{k}_1) \left(\frac{3\Omega}{2Dk_1^2} \right)^{1/3} \exp \{ -\lambda^2 [k_{1y} - (\omega_k/x\Omega)]^2 \}. \quad (13)$$

That is, in this limit, $\langle \tilde{\chi}^2 \rangle$ is proportional to $(\Omega/Dk_1^2)^{1/3} \Omega^{-2} \propto \Omega^{-5/3}$. Therefore, Eqs. (10) and (13) give us the cross phase $\cos \delta_{\mathbf{k}} \sim (\lambda/x)^{1/2} (Dk^2/\Omega)^{1/6}$. Interestingly, the suppression factor $\Omega^{-1/6}$ for the cross phase is much weaker than that $\Omega^{-5/3}$ for the mean square amplitude. This result clearly indicates that it is not universally true, as claimed by previous studies, that the cross phase is more heavily suppressed than the amplitude of the turbulence is. Note that $\langle \tilde{\chi}^2 \rangle \propto \Omega^{-5/3}$ in Eq. (13) for a localized frequency spectrum is different from the estimate $\langle \tilde{\chi}^2 \rangle \propto \Omega^{-2/3}$ given in [4]. It is because [4] considered the evolution of two particles with a small initial separation while the result (13) is valid in the long time limit, for which the spatial separation is much larger than the correlation length. In the long time limit, the evolution of two particles with a small separation can, however, be isolated by considering a delta correlated flow since the latter quickly randomizes particle trajectories to compensate for the linear increase of the separation between two particles due to the shear. This is why the estimate in [4] is recovered for a delta-correlated flow, but not in general.

In conclusion, we have re-examined the important issue of how a mean shear flow affects

the transport of a passive scalar field, which is advected by a random flow together with a mean linear shear flow. By incorporating the resonant response, we demonstrate that in the strong shear limit, (1) for a random flow with a localized frequency spectrum, the flux decreases as Ω^{-1} while the square amplitude of the turbulence scales with $\Omega^{-5/3}$, with the cross phase $\propto \Omega^{-1/6}$; (2) for a random flow with a white noise frequency spectrum, the flux becomes independent of Ω while the mean square amplitude of turbulence is $\propto \Omega^{-2/3}$, with the cross phase $\propto \Omega^{1/3}$. These results are in sharp contrast to those reported in [7], based on only the non-resonant response to the flux, which predicted the scaling of Ω^{-4} for the flux and Ω^{-3} for the cross phase. That is, the suppression factor for the flux due to a shear is much weaker than predicted in [7]. Furthermore, it is not always the case that the cross phase is more vulnerable than the intensity of turbulence to shear suppression [11].

These results imply that the scaling of transport of a scalar field with the shear is unlikely to be universal. For instance, in a self-consistent model where the turbulence arises due to the instability of the system (e.g., resistive ballooning mode, etc), the scalings of flux and cross phase with a shear are likely to be different from those in the case of a passive scalar field considered in this Letter. Furthermore, the flux of particle and that of heat may respond differently to the effect of the shear flow. This is a particularly interesting issue in view of the fact that barriers for heat and particle do not always form simultaneously [6,11]. Another interesting problem is the effect of zonal flows on the transport and cross phase. Unlike a mean shear flow, zonal flows exhibit detailed, spectral structure in space. Moreover, in contrast to mean flows, zonal flows are not slowly evolving in time, but rather have a finite lifetime, roughly comparable to characteristic turbulence intensity time scales. These issues are currently under investigation.

Acknowledgments We thank T.S. Hahm and C. Holland for useful discussions and critical reading of the manuscript. This research was supported by U.S. DOE FG03-88ER 53275.

REFERENCES

- [1] K.H. Burrell, *Phys. Plasmas* **4**, 1499 (1997).
- [2] R.H. Kraichnan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 1016 (1994); B. Shraiman and E. Siggia, *Nature* **405**, 639 (2000); H.-B. Park, *et al*, *Phys. Plasmas* **4**, 3273 (1997).
- [3] P. Goldreich and D. Lynden-Bell, *MNRAS* **130**, 125 (1965).
- [4] H. Biglari, P.H. Diamond, and P.W. Terry, *Phys. Fluids B* **2**, 1 (1990).
- [5] A.S. Ware, *et al*, *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **38**, 1343 (1996).
- [6] A.S. Ware, *et al*, *Phys. Plasmas* **5**, 173 (1998).
- [7] P.W. Terry, D.E. Newman, and A.S. Ware, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 185001 (2001).
- [8] C.F. Figarella, *et al*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 015002 (2003); J. Boedo, *et al*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2630 (2000); J. Boedo, *et al*, *Nucler Fusion* **42**, 117 (2002).
- [9] G.R. Tynan, *et al*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 3032 (1992); M.G. Shats *et al*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 6042 (2000).
- [10] E. Kim and B. Dubrulle, *Phys. Plasmas* **8**, 813 (2001); E. Kim and B. Dubrulle, *Physica D* **165**, 213 (2002); S. Nazarenko, *et al*, *Physica D* **139**, 158 (2000).
- [11] Z. Lin, *et al*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3645 (1999).

FIGURES




FIG. 1. Spectral intensity is localized within width W_k around rational surface $x = 0$. The maximum of the intensity is slightly shifted from $x = 0$ by Δ due to the shear. This shift Δ is exaggerated for clarity.