Prandtl number dependence of the viscous boundary layer and the Reynolds numbers in Rayleigh-Bénard convection
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We report results from high Prandtl number turbulent thermal convection experiments. The viscous boundary layer and the Reynolds number are measured in four different fluids over wide ranges of the Prandtl number Pr and the Rayleigh number Ra, all in a single convection cell of unity aspect ratio. We find that the normalized viscous layer thickness may be represented as \( \delta_v/L = 0.32 \text{Pr}^{0.24} \text{Ra}^{-0.16} \). The Reynolds number based on the oscillation frequency of the large-scale flow is found as \( \text{Re}_o(\text{Ra}, \text{Pr}) = 1.1 \text{Ra}^{0.33} \text{Pr}^{-0.76} \) and that based on the rms velocity \( \text{Re}_{\text{rms}}(\text{Ra}, \text{Pr}) = 0.84 \text{Ra}^{0.40} \text{Pr}^{-0.86} \). Both the Ra and the Pr exponents of \( \text{Re}_o(\text{Ra}, \text{Pr}) \) based on the maximum velocity of the circulating wind appear to vary across the range of Pr covered, changing from 0.5 to 0.68 and from 0.86 to 0.95, respectively, as Pr is increased from 6 to 1027.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The complex nature of the Rayleigh-Bénard convection problem often means that theoretical models that are able to produce experimentally observed scaling laws for a few global and local quantities do not necessarily provide the right mechanism for turbulent motion in the system. It is thus important that a comprehensive approach be taken which considers how the system’s response parameters (i.e., Nu and Re) are dependent on its control parameters (i.e., Ra and Pr) in a systematic way [1]. In contrast to the Nusselt number Nu, which has been measured over wide ranges of the Rayleigh number Ra [2] and the Prandtl number Pr [3], the experimentally measured Reynolds numbers generally span rather narrow ranges of the control parameters. This is especially true with regard to the Prandtl number. Because any Prandtl number dependence of Nu is likely to be weak and that of Re has been predicted to be strong by many theories, measurement of the Reynolds number may provide a more sensitive test for the various models. Another quantity of importance is the viscous boundary layer. Because the various models all make specific assumptions about the viscous boundary layer \( \delta_v \), determination of \( \delta_v \) may allow us to better discriminate the different methods proposed. Here again, experiment appears to lag behind. To our knowledge, directly measured \( \delta_v \) exist only for a single Pr (water) [4,5]. For other values of Pr, there are results obtained with the indirect “power spectra” method [6,7], but there have been questions about the validity of this method [8]. Thus, measuring the viscous boundary layer and the Reynolds number over a wide range of Pr and Ra should provide us the much-needed information.

In this paper, we report an experimental study of high-Prandtl-number turbulent Rayleigh-Bénard convection in which both the viscous boundary layer \( \delta_v(Ra, Pr) \) and the Reynolds number \( Re(Ra, Pr) \) are measured as functions of Ra and Pr. The paper is organized as follows. Section II contains a brief description of the working fluids, the convection cell, and the velocity measurements. Section III is divided into four parts: (a) Velocity profiles at various values of Ra and Pr, the measured viscous boundary layer, and its comparison with indirectly measured results for low-Pr fluids. (b) The Reynolds number based on the maximum values of vertical profiles of the horizontal velocity component; previously obtained results from water in several cells of various aspect ratios are also reanalyzed here. (c) The Reynolds number based on the oscillation frequency of the large-scale mean flow. (d) The Reynolds number based on the rms values of local velocity. We summarize our findings in Sec. IV.

II. EXPERIMENT

Three alcohol-type organic liquids, 1-pentanol, triethylene glycol, and dipropylene glycol [9], plus water are used as convecting fluids. The Rayleigh and Prandtl numbers are calculated based on temperatures measured at the center of the convection cell [10] and using recently published properties of the fluids [11]. With these fluids, we achieve a combined range of Ra from \( 1 \times 10^8 \) to \( 3 \times 10^{10} \) and of Pr from 3 to 1205, all in a single convection cell of unity aspect ratio. The convection cell has been described in detail elsewhere [12] and only its key features will be mentioned. Briefly, it is a vertical cylinder with diameter \( D \) and height \( L \) both equal to 19 cm, with gold-plated copper conducting plates, and a Pyrex glass tube as sidewall. Local velocities in the bulk region are measured using the laser Doppler velocimetry (LDV) technique. In the present work, a commercial LDV (Dentac Ltd.) is used to measure the local vertical velocity near sidewall. The LDV has a measuring volume of about 75 \( \mu \)m and continuous acquisition of the local fluctuating velocity can be made for many hours. Near the bottom plate where the viscous boundary layer is to be measured, strong temperature fluctuations cause strong fluctuations of the refractive index, which significantly reduce the signal to noise ratio of the LDV and thus limit its use in that region. To overcome this, we used dual-beam incoherent cross-correlation spectroscopy [13] to determine \( \delta_v \). This technique has been shown to be effective for boundary layer
measurement in thermal convection and its application in turbulent convection has been well documented \cite{4,5,14}. To scatter light, we seeded water with neutrally buoyant latex spheres and the three organic liquids with hollow glass spheres that are density matched for each of the fluids \cite{15}.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. The viscous boundary layer

Figure 1 shows a profile of the horizontal velocity $v_h$ measured from the lower plate along the central axis at $Ra = 4.1 \times 10^6$ and $Pr=298$ (dipropylene glycol). The profile, if extrapolated to $z=0$, would be downward concave \cite{16} and this may be understood in terms of a constant viscous stress (rather than constant shear) boundary condition for non-Boussinesq convection \cite{17,18}. Thus convection at some of the large $Pr$ values may be non-Boussinesq; nonetheless we shall see below that certain features appear to be “universal” across the wide range of $Pr$ covered in our experiment. Because of the lack of a linear region in the velocity profile, we adopt an operational definition for the viscous layer thickness $\delta_v$, different from the one previously used in water \cite{4}. We take the position of the maximum velocity as $\delta_v$. In Fig. 1, the solid curve is a polynomial fit to the data, which yields $\delta_v$. Another interesting thing to note is that profiles for different values of $Ra$ but the same $Pr$ appear to have an invariant form, whereas those of different $Pr$ but of approximately the same $Ra$ do not seem to have the same shape. These are shown, respectively, in Figs. 2(a) and 2(b) in scaled form. As will be seen below, horizontal profiles of the vertical velocity component measured near the sidewall also show $Pr$-dependent shapes. Note that a universal form for velocity profiles having different $Ra$ and approximately the same $Pr$ has been observed previously \cite{4}, but, to our knowledge, no information is available on the Prandtl number properties of the velocity profiles.

In Fig. 3(a) we plot the measured viscous boundary layer thickness $\delta_v$ vs $Ra$ for three values of the Prandtl number: 51 (triangles, 1-pentanol), 298 (inverted triangles), and 1030 (squares) (both dipropylene glycol); the circles are a previous result \cite{4} measured in water with $Pr=6$ (for consistency, reanalyzed using the new definition, which resulted in a roughly factor of 2 increase in the magnitude of $\delta_v$ for all values of $Ra$). All the data may be described by the power-law fit $Ra^{0.16}$, which is represented by the lines in the figure. This result is consistent with the previous findings in water using the “old” definition \cite{4,5}. With the $Ra$ dependence determined, we examine the $Pr$-dependent amplitude $A(Pr) = \delta_v Ra^{0.16}$. The result is plotted as a function of $Pr$ in Fig. 3(b) where the line is a power-law fit:

$$\frac{\delta_v}{L} = 0.65 Ra^{-0.16 \pm 0.02} Pr^{0.24 \pm 0.01}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)$$

With both the Prandtl number and Rayleigh number dependences of the viscous boundary layer established over a wide range, we examine the possibility of applying it to systems of very different $Pr$ values such as those of gas and mercury, where direct measurements are not yet possible but indirect measurements have been made \cite{6,7}. The indirect technique is based on a coincidence between the peak positions of the spatial profile of the cutoff frequency of the temperature power spectrum and the profile of the velocity \cite{6}. Because the coincidence was observed at a single value of $Ra$ and of $Pr$ (water), the generalization of this method contains two assumptions: (1) the coincidence will hold for other values of $Ra$, and (2) it will hold for other values of $Pr$. Furthermore,
whether this method really measures $\delta_v$ has also been questioned [8]. Recently, Xia and Zhou have tested the “power spectra” method in water for two decades of Ra and the result is in good agreement with that from direct measurements [19]. But as far as Pr is concerned the test is inconclusive. We now compare $\delta_v$ given by Eq. (1) and those measured by the power spectra method. Figure 4 shows the viscous boundary layers (circles) and thermal boundary layers (triangles) measured in (a) high-pressure gas (Pr=0.7) [6] and (b) mercury (Pr=0.024) [7]. The solid lines in the figure are our result extrapolated to the corresponding values of Pr and Ra. For the Ra dependence, the data are too scattered for a quantitative comparison, and as an extrapolation our result is not able to say anything about the apparent transitions shown in the gas data. Nevertheless, the figure appears to show approximate agreement in the overall magnitude between the indirect results and extrapolated ones for two systems with very different values of Pr from ours. In our view, the fact that Eq. (1) is able to connect results from systems with widely separated Pr lends mutual support to the indirect technique and to the extrapolation. Thus our data appear to support the conclusions that the thermal and viscous layers have crossed in mercury [7] but not yet in gas [6]. Note that the boundary layer crossing in mercury was one of the arguments used in Ref. [20] to rule out the existence of the asymptotic, or ultrahard, regime in turbulent convection. However, one should use caution in interpreting the above result. For example, Grossmann and Lohse’s recent theoretical result on the properties of the Nusselt number suggests that there may be a transition in the Pr dependence of Nu around $Pr \approx 1$ [21] and there appears to be experimental evidence to support it [22]. Since the lowest Pr for our measured $\delta_v$ is 6, we do not know whether a similar transition exists for the viscous boundary layer. Clearly, further investigations are needed and the above extrapolation results should be viewed more as a way to stimulate such efforts.

B. Reynolds number $Re_m$ based on the maximum velocity

The Reynolds number $Re_m = V_{max}/L/\nu$ is based on the maximum velocity $V_{max}$ of the horizontal velocity profiles near the bottom plate, as measured by the two-beam technique. Because $Re_m$ for the low- and high-Pr fluids appear to have different behavior, we examine first the results from water that had been published previously but were presented in terms of the Peclet number $Pe (=RePr)$ [5]. The water data were measured in four cells of varying aspect ratio $G = D/L$, where $D$ is the cell diameter and $L$ its height. Since the values of Pr for these data varied from 4.3 to 7, a plot of $Re_m$ against Ra would be quite scattered. So we first determined the Pr dependence of these data by minimizing their scatter around straight lines (for each $\Gamma$ in a log-log plot; the

![FIG. 3. (a) Viscous boundary layer $\delta_v$ vs Ra for four values of Pr. (b) Pr dependence of the viscous boundary layer; the fitting line represents $\delta_v/L = 0.65Ra^{-0.16}Pe^{-0.24}$](image)

![FIG. 4. Viscous boundary layer $\delta_v$ measured using the “power spectra” method and those extrapolated from Eq. (1) to the corresponding values of Pr and Ra: (a) gas data with Pr = 0.7 (Ref. [6]); (b) mercury data with Pr = 0.024 (Ref. [7]). In both cases, the solid lines are the extrapolations and circles are measured $\delta_v$. The corresponding thermal layer thicknesses $\delta_{th}$ (inverted triangles) are also shown.](image)
results show that $\text{Re}_V \sim \text{Pr}^{-0.88}$ for each set. We then normalized all the data to a constant $\text{Pr} = 6.0$. In the figure, all solid lines have a slope of 0.495 and the dashed lines 0.70.

With the water data reanalyzed in terms of Re and their Pr dependence properly normalized, we compare them with data measured in this work from high-Pr fluids. These are shown in Fig. 6(a), where the solid lines represent the best power-law fit to the respective data and the obtained Ra exponents $\gamma$ are indicated nearby. Although the ranges of Ra are small for the high-Pr data, there appears to be a trend of $\gamma$ increasing with Pr. For Pr = 297, the difference between 0.65 and 0.5 appears to be beyond the uncertainties of the data. But for Pr = 1027, the data scatter is sufficiently large that we cannot rule out $\gamma = 0.5$. In Fig. 6(a), the two solid symbols represent Re based on the maximum of the vertical velocity profiles near the sidewall as measured by the LDV (see Fig. 7). Because of the apparent lack of consistent Ra dependence for low- and high-Pr data, strictly speaking it is not meaningful to have a uniform Pr dependence for these data. But if we nonetheless want to check such a trend across a wide range of Pr, we need to use a single value of $\gamma$ to
extract the trend (due to the sensitive dependence of amplitudes on exponents). This is done by fitting all the data with $\gamma = 0.5$ and the amplitudes (which are essentially $Re_{v_m} Ra^{-0.5}$) are plotted against $Pr$ in Fig. 6(b), where the solid line has a slope of $-0.95$. Recall that the $Pr$ exponent is $-0.88$ for water, so this exponent seems to increase in absolute value with increasing $Pr$. A similar trend has been observed in numerical simulations by Verzicco and Camussi [25], who found that the $Pr$ exponent of $Re$ crosses over from $-0.73$ to $-0.94$ when $Pr$ is increased. Interestingly, in a numerical study of convection in self-gravitating spherical shells, Tillman also found [26] a similar crossover from $-0.73$ to $-0.92$. But in both cases, the crossover occurred around $Pr=1$. In a recent theory, Grossmann and Lohse proposed to separate the energy and thermal dissipation into contributions from boundary layers and the bulk, and obtained a multitude of convection regimes in the $Ra-Pr$ plane according to the relative weights of these components [1]. A specific prediction of the theory in the very large $Pr$ regime [21] is a $Nu$ independent of $Pr$ and a $Re$ strongly dependent on both $Ra$ and $Pr$, i.e., $Nu \sim Ra^{1.0} Pr^{-0.5}$ and $Re \sim Ra^{0.3} Pr^{-1}$. Our $Re_{v_m}$ for the high-$Pr$ data in Fig. 6 are seen to showing a similar trend. In our view, the scaling result ($\gamma = 0.7$) for the “soft” turbulence region in Fig. 5 may also belong to this regime, i.e., either high $Pr$ or low $Ra$ (see the “phase diagram” in Ref. [21]). But because of the small $Ra$ range and somewhat noisy data from the high-$Pr$ fluids, we would put this as tentative at best.

C. Reynolds number $Re_v$ based on the oscillation frequency of the large-scale circulation

We now present results from LDV measurements. Profiles of the average and rms values of the vertical velocity from the sidewall to the interior of the cell (at midheight) were measured for a few values of $Ra$ and $Pr$ (but not systematically). Figure 7 shows two such profiles: (a) $Pr=6.97$, $Ra = 6.7 \times 10^8$ and (b) $Pr=705$, $Ra = 1.0 \times 10^9$. Note that (a) reaches only to the cell center whereas (b) is an almost complete profile. Similar to the horizontal velocity profiles near the bottom plate, the shapes of these profiles clearly change with $Pr$, which may be due to the non-Bousinesq nature of the high-$Pr$ convection. Nevertheless, two features that were previously observed in water [27] are present in both cases: (i) the mean velocity $v$ reaches a maximum near the sidewall and develops into a linear profile when it is less than $v_{rms}$; and (ii) $v_{rms}$ is approximately constant in most parts of the cell. Using the maximum velocities in Fig. 7 we calculate the corresponding Reynolds numbers, which are shown as solid symbols in Fig. 6(a). It shows agreement for the measured magnitude of the large-scale circulation (LSC) using two techniques, albeit at only one point.

From flow visualizations, we found that the large-scale mean flow does not circulate constantly but goes through acceleration/deceleration cycles, which can also be seen from velocity time series [28]. The period $f_o^{-1}$ of this oscillatory motion of the large-scale circulation can be obtained from the autocorrelation function of velocity fluctuations $C(\tau) = (\delta v(t+\tau) \delta v(t))/(\langle \delta v^2 \rangle)$ ($\delta v = v - \bar{v}$). We find that $f_o$ corresponds to the peak in the velocity power spectra but it can be more accurately determined from $C(\tau)$ (due to the former’s uneven spectral point distribution on a logarithmic scale) [28]. Obviously, $f_o$ is not the circulation frequency of LSC but the largest period of its coherent oscillations. We have previously found that $f_o$ measured at various places in the cell is the same (except possibly in the boundary layers and cell center) [28] and thus provides a characteristic time scale of the system. We call it the global oscillation frequency of the LSC or the wind. Because of the apparent positional independence of both $f_o$ and $v_{rms}$, the LDV measurements in which systematic variations of $Ra$ and $Pr$ are made did not take place at a fixed position but at positions about several centimeters from the sidewall (midheight) where $\bar{v} > v_{rms}$. Each measurement lasted for two hours; the mean and the rms velocities and the correlation functions are then calculated from the time series.

The inset of Fig. 8(a) shows an example of $C(\tau)$ for $Ra = 1.2 \times 10^{10}$ and $Pr=37.8$ where the position of the first peak gives the value of $f_o^{-1}$. Using $f_o$ one can define a Reynolds
number $Re_o = 4L^2 f_o / \nu$. Figure 8(a) shows $Re_o Ra^{-0.43}$ measured from the four fluids and plotted against $Pr$ on a log-log scale [see Fig. 8(b) for symbol legends, which also apply to Fig. 9 below]. The varying range of $Ra$ for these data is between $1.1 \times 10^8$ and $2.6 \times 10^{10}$ and that of $Pr$ is between 3.06 and 1.205, with the corresponding $Re_o$ varying from 23.5 to 14 049. The exponent of 0.43 is determined by minimizing data scatter around a straight line; a power-law fit then gives $Re_o Ra^{-0.43} \sim Pr^{-0.76}$. Likewise, when $Re_o$ is plotted against $Ra$ on a log-log scale and data scatter is then minimized by multiplying $Pr^6$ by $Re_o$, we obtain $\alpha = 0.76$. This is shown in Fig. 8(b), where $Re_o Pr^{0.76}$ is plotted against $Ra$ (open symbols); a power-law fit then gives $\sim Ra^{0.43}$ (solid line). Note that these two procedures are independent of each other and thus they showed a certain self-consistency. Combining the two results, we obtain $Re_o = 1.09Ra^{0.43\pm0.01}Pr^{-0.76\pm0.01}$. (See below for a discussion on the dashed line.) Note that a similar result for $Re_o$ was obtained previously over narrower ranges of $Pr$ [29], where $f_o$ was determined from the velocity power spectra.

D. Reynolds number $Re_{rms}$ based on the local rms velocity

As mentioned above, our $u_{rms}$ are not measured at the same position but nonetheless should be fairly representative of typical local velocity fluctuations for the entire system. Figure 9 shows the Reynolds number $Re_{rms} = u_{rms} L / \nu$ based on the local rms velocity as a function of Ra and Pr. In contrast to $Re_o$, $Re_{rms}$ exhibits considerable scatter, although they come from the same set of data. This is probably due to a weak positional dependence of $u_{rms}$ (from Fig. 7, we see that $u_{rms}$ is only approximately constant with respect to position). It may also imply that while a two-hour averaging may have been sufficient for global quantities such as $f_o$ it may not be enough for local quantities like $u_{rms}$. In Fig. 9, the power-law fitting $Re_{rms} = 0.84Ra^{0.40\pm0.03}Pr^{-0.86\pm0.01}$ is deduced similarly as in Fig. 8. Because of the large data scatter, the Ra exponent has a large error bar, which leaves us unable to differentiate it from that for $Re_o$. On the other hand, the strong Pr dependence of $Re_{rms}$ combined with a wide parameter range produces a smaller error bar for its Pr exponent, which appears to differ a lot from that of $Re_o$. While the Ra dependences of $Re_{rms}$ and $Re_o$ appear to be indistinguishable for the present data, the difference in their Pr dependence seems to be real (0.86 vs 0.76). It should also be noted that the strong Pr dependence of our measured $Re_{rms}$ is in marked contrast to the findings from gas convection near the critical point [30], where $Re_{rms}$ was found to be independent of Pr.

IV. SUMMARY

With $\delta_o(Ra,Pr)$ and the several Re(Ra,Pr) determined over a wide range of the control parameters, we now discuss...
the implications of these results and make preliminary comparisons with some theoretical work. An important ingredient in the model by Grossmann and Lohse (GL) [1] is the assumption of a Blasius type laminar viscous layer $\delta_v/L = 1/[4(\sqrt{Re})]$ which is used to model the energy dissipation rate of the system. Using either $Re_{\nu_m}$ or $Re_o$ or even $Re_{rms}$ and comparing it with Eq. (1), we find the above assumption is not supported by our data for either magnitude or the Ra or Pr dependence. This is so even though our viscous layer remains laminar for the highest Ra reached [31]. We note that the large mismatch in magnitudes (e.g., at $Pr=7$ and $Ra=1 \times 10^7$, $0.25Re^{-1/2}$ is about seven times smaller than $\delta_v/L$, for either $Re_o$ or $Re_{\nu_m}$) will lead to an underestimate of the energy dissipation in the boundary layer region. Note that, however, in the GL theory, the same viscous layer is assumed for both the sidewall and the conducting plates [1].

In a previous experiment [14], Qiu and Xia measured the Ra dependence of the viscous layer at the sidewall and found $\delta_v = Ra^{-0.26 \pm 0.03}$ which is consistent with the Blasius boundary layer assumption, at least for the Ra dependence, if the wind-based Reynolds number $Re_{\nu_m}$ is used. No experimental result for the Pr dependence of $\delta_v$ at the sidewall is available at present. But, based on the Ra property of $\delta_v$, it is reasonable to argue that it is probably different from that at the conducting plates. Thus, one may need to use two viscous boundary layers, one at the sidewall and one at the conducting plates, to model kinetic energy dissipation in a GL type theory in the future.

We now compare $Re_{\nu_m}$ with $Re_o$ and $Re_{rms}$. Since $Re_{\nu_m}$ from the high-Pr fluids do not have enough precision, we use only the water data which, as mentioned above, can be represented as $Re_{\nu_m} = 0.335Ra^{0.495}Pr^{-0.88}$. This result is shown as the dashed line in Fig. 8(b) (i.e., $Re_{\nu_m}Pr^{0.88}$ vs Ra) along with $Re_o$. It is seen that for the given precision of the data (see Fig. 4 for the quality of $Re_{\nu_m}$), there appears to be a real difference between the two quantities and this difference should become more pronounced with increasing Ra. Another thing to be noted is that $Re_o$ appears to have a more uniform behavior across the wide range of Pr than $Re_{\nu_m}$ does, which can be taken as another sign that the two are different quantities. One is based on “true velocity” and the other is based on a certain time scale of the fluctuating velocity and appears to be related more to the rms velocity. We note that the prediction $Re \sim Ra^{3/7}Pr^{-5/7}$ from an earlier scaling theory of Shraiman and Siggia [32] (the same Ra exponent was also obtained by Castaing et al. [33]) appears to be in excellent agreement with our measured $Re_o$, and to a lesser extent, $Re_{rms}$, as far as the Ra dependence is concerned. For the Pr dependence, the agreement is less good and more so for $Re_{rms}$. It is interesting that in Ref. [32], the Steve is based on the large-scale velocity, whereas in Ref. [33] it is based on the fluctuating velocity at the cell center. Our results for $Re_o$ and $Re_{rms}$ are also consistent with Kraichnan’s prediction $Re \sim Ra^{2/3}Pr^{-1/3}$, based on the rms velocity at the cell center [34], for the Ra part, although the Pr exponent has a larger deviation than in the more recent theories. As for $Re_{\nu_m}$, which is based on the maximum value of the wind, we are not aware of any theory that predicts a 1/2 exponent besides the “free-fall” type argument. One exception is the Kraichnan prediction $Re = Ra^{0.7}Pr^{-1/2}$ for the ultrahard regime, which is clearly not the present case. We note that there is a current debate on what should be the true value of $\gamma$ (i.e., 0.43–0.46 or 0.5), or perhaps what should be the representative Re in Rayleigh-Bénard convection. For example, Qiu and Tong recently found $\gamma=0.45$ for a Peclet number based on the mean rotation rate of the wind [35], which is close to our $Re_o$, but in principle should be closer to $Re_{\nu_m}$ since, presumably, similar quantities are measured.

Since a recent paper by Chavanne et al. [36] contains a fairly complete compilation of the various results, we will not attempt to cite all of them here. It is also not our intention to resolve this issue here, simply because more experiments are needed. In our view, measurements such as those shown in Fig. 7 need to be done in a systematic way (i.e., across a wide range of Ra at fixed Pr); such measurements should produce quantities like $Re_{\nu_m}$ and $Re_o$ simultaneously and under the same conditions, which will then allow us to make a more meaningful comparison. To conclude, we have measured the profiles of the time-averaged horizontal velocity along the central vertical axis of the convection cell for values of Pr from 6 to 1027 and of Ra between $2 \times 10^8$ and $2 \times 10^{10}$. We find that the profiles measured at the same value of Pr but varying Ra appear to have an invariant shape. On the other hand, profiles measured at varying Pr but approximately the same Ra do not seem to have an invariant form (Figs. 2 and 7). From these profiles, we deduce the viscous boundary layer thickness $\delta_v(Ra,Pr)$ and the Reynolds number $Re_{\nu_m}(Ra,Pr)$ based on the maximum value of the wind $V_{max}$ in the convection cell. The viscous layer can be described by $\delta_v/L = 0.65Ra^{-0.16 \pm 0.02}Pr^{0.24 \pm 0.01}$. To our knowledge, there is no previous result for the Prandtl number dependence of the viscous layer, either experimental or theoretical. When this measured viscous layer thickness is extrapolated to the Pr values of gas and mercury, we find surprisingly good agreement, in terms of overall magnitude, with those obtained from the indirect temperature power spectra method. The Ra dependence of $Re_{\nu_m}(Ra,Pr)$ appears to vary across the range of Pr covered, with the exponent $\gamma$ changing from 0.5 to 0.68 as Pr increases from 6 to 1027 (Fig. 6). The Pr exponent of $Re_{\nu_m}$ for the whole data set has a value of $-0.94$ but is $-0.88$ if only the lower-Pr (water) data are used for the fitting, again showing a trend of increasing (in absolute value) with increasing Pr. In contrast to $Re_{\nu_m}$, the global oscillation frequency based $Re_o(Ra,Pr)$ shows a “uniform” dependence on both Ra and Pr across the parameter space spanned in the experiment (Pr from 3 to 1200 and Ra from $1.1 \times 10^8$ to $2.6 \times 10^{10}$, Fig. 8), i.e., $Re_o = 1.09Ra^{0.43 \pm 0.01}Pr^{-0.76 \pm 0.01}$. We find that the Reynolds number $Re_{rms}(Ra,Pr)$ based on the rms values of local velocity may be described as $Re_{rms} = 0.84Ra^{0.4 \pm 0.03}Pr^{-0.86 \pm 0.03}$ (Fig. 9). While the noisy data produce a large uncertainty in the Ra exponent of $Re_{rms}$, its strong Pr dependence is unmistakable, which appears to con-
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