Dear Reviewer:

We thank you for providing us the opportunity for explaining further the progress we have made. In the attached manuscript, we have

- provided one section entitled ``Nonlinearity and Diverged trajectories,'' which includes numerical results of the 3D-NLM and calculations of the ensemble Lyapunov exponents with five additional figures (i.e., Figures 7-11);
- 2. provided Appendix A to discuss the derivations of Eq. (3) that includes the σY term;
- 3. provided Appendix B and Figure B1 to discuss the closed-form solution with elliptic functions and compare it with the closed-form solution represented by the elementary trigonometric functions in section 3;
- 4. provided Figure 5d to show the solutions near stable critical points (with different initial conditions for Xo) in the 3D-NLM with $r \neq 0$.

Our specific responses to your comments are provided below. We really appreciate your comments which have greatly improved the quality of the study and hope that our responses are acceptable.

Best Regards,

Dr. Bo-Wen Shen

Associate Professor Department of Mathematics and Statistics San Diego State University 5500 Campanile Drive San Diego, CA 92182-7720 Tel: 619-594-5962 Email: <u>bshen@mail.sdsu.edu</u>

<u>Reviewer #2 (Comments to Author):</u> Review comments:

General Comments

This is generally a pedagogic contribution elucidating the dynamics and energetics of the cyclic behavior of the Lorenz '63 (L63) system of equations. Starting from the full 3 component system the author makes the ad hoc simplification of dropping the terms accounting for fluid viscosity and and thermal diffusivity leading to the 3D nondissipative Lorenz model (3D-NLM). This allows the energy cycle to be analyzed using straightforward, elementary mathematical techniques. The paper is not particularly novel but does present a useful perspective on the mechanisms that drive the 'quasicyclic' trajectories in the full L63.

Thanks for your comments. In addition to the closed-form solution using trigonometric functions, we presented another closed-form solution using elliptic functions in Appendix B in the attached file. We also added one section to discuss the role of nonlinearity (i.e., nonlinear feedback loop) in producing diverged trajectories, showing dependence of solutions on initial conditions.

Specific Comments

Since the L63 has been extensively studied and is such a restricted model of the physics of two-dimensional dry convection does its dynamics truly warrant yet another publication? It is hoped this question will stimulate some discussion in addition to comments from the author.

The author states that the solution to equation (18) has not appeared in the published literature. This may or not be true but is hardly noteworthy since the equation is an energy conservative system with a gradient potential. The solution could be inferred from many texts on classical dynamical systems and appears in at least one compendium of solutions to ordinary differential equations; i.e. the text by Murphy.

Thanks for your comments and questions. Although the Lorenz'63 model, which has been studied widely, is a simplified model with limited physical processes (e.g., limited degree of nonlinearity), further analysis on the Lorenz model with or without dissipative terms can help understand the fundamental role of nonlinearity in the chaotic solutions and impact of increased nonlinearity (i.e., an extension of the nonlinear feedback loop in Shen 2014ab) on solutions' stability. Note that the nonlinearity is from the horizontal advection of temperature term, which appears in all of climate and weather models. Therefore, improving the understanding of the (thermodynamic) feedback by the nonlinearity may help improve the representation of the thermodynamic feedback in numerical models, which remains big uncertainties in climate model simulations. The related studies were performed with an ultimate goal of addressing the question of under which conditions the increased degree of nonlinearity associated with increased

resolutions may help improve the predictability of the real-world climate/weather models (e.g., Shen et al., 2012; 2013a,b).

In the attached manuscript, we provided one section to discuss how the solution with trigonometric functions may help understand the role of nonlinearity in producing diverged trajectories over a long but finite-time period.

References:

- Shen, B.-W. W.-K. Tao, Y.-L. Lin, A. Laing, 2012: Genesis of Twin Tropical Cyclones as Revealed by a Global Mesoscale Model: The Role of Mixed Rossby Gravity Waves. J. Geophys. Res., 117, D13114, doi:10.1029/2012JD017450.
- Shen, B.-W., B. Nelson, S. Cheung, and W.-K. Tao, 2013a: Improving the NASA Multiscale Modeling Framework's Performance for Tropical Cyclone Climate Study. *Computing in Science and Engineering*, IEEE computer Society Digital Library. IEEE Computer Society, no. 5, pp. 56-67, Sep./Oct. 2013.
- Shen, B.-W., M. DeMaria, J.-L. F. Li, and S. Cheung, 2013b: Genesis of Hurricane Sandy (2012) Simulated with a Global Mesoscale Model. *Geophys.*" *Res. Lett.* 40. 2013, DOI: 10.1002/grl.50934.

Manuscript prepared for Nonlin. Processes Geophys. with version 2014/05/22 6.83 Copernicus papers of the LATEX class copernicus.cls. Date: 11 September 2014

On the nonlinear feedback loop and energy cycle of the non-dissipative Lorenz model

B.-W. Shen

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, San Diego State University, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, CA, 92182, USA

Correspondence to: B.-W. Shen (bshen@mail.sdsu.edu; bowen.shen@gmail.com)

Abstract.

1 Introduction

This file provides responses to reviewers' comments. We thank the reviewers and Editor for providing us the opportunity for explaining further the progress we have made. In the manuscript,

- 5 we have (1) provided one section entitled "Nonlinearity and Diverged trajectories", which includes numerical results of the 3D-NLM and calculations of the ensemble Lyapunov exponents with five additional figures (i.e., Figures 7-11); (2) provided Appendix A to discuss the derivations of Eq. (3) that includes the σ Y term; (3) provided Appendix B and Figure B1 to discuss the closed-form solution with elliptic functions and compare it with the closed-form solution represented by the 10 elementary trigonometric functions in section 3; (4) provided Figure 5d to show the solutions near

15

stable critical points (with different initial conditions for X_o) in the 3D-NLM with $r \neq 0$.

Nonlinearity and Diverged trajectories 2

Sensitive dependence of solutions on initial perturbations may also appear in conservative systems. This is called Hamiltonian chaos. To understand whether the 3D-NLM is chaotic or not, we first perform analytical analysis and then calculate and analyze ensemble Lyapunov exponents. As $dX/d\tau = \sigma Y$ in Eq. (3), Eq. (15) can be rewritten as: $dY/d\tau = -\frac{M^2}{\sigma}X$. The two equations with an

initial condition $(X,Y) = (X_0,0)$ lead to three critical points (X_c, Y_c) at (0,0) and $(\pm \sqrt{2\sigma r + X_0^2})$ 0). The first one (0,0) is unstable (as a saddle point), while the other two are stable. These critical points appear in association with the inclusion of the heating term, as the 3D-NLM with r = 0 20 only contains a trivial stable critical point at (0,0). More importantly, the reduced system is two dimensional, and thus is not chaotic. In the following, we calculate the ensemble Lyapunov exponent (eLE) to check if and how it can reveal the stability of solutions in the 3D NLM assuming that we don't have prior knowledge of whether the system can be reduced to become two dimensional. [Through the processes, we may better understand the conditions under which the calculation of eLE may be applied to complicated weather and climate models.]

The Lyapunov exponent (LE) has been used to measure the average separation speed of nearby trajectories on the critical point (e.g., Froyland and Alfsen, 1984; Wolf et al., 1985; Nese, 1989; Zeng et al. 1991; Eckhardr and Yao, 1993; Christiansen and Rugh, 1997; Kazantsev 1999; Sprott, 2003; Ding and Li, 2007; Li and Ding, 2011). In Shen (2014a), the following two methods were

- implemented and tested: the trajectory separation (TS) method (e.g., Sprott, 2003) and the Gram-Schmidt reorthonormalization (GSR) procedure (e.g., Christiansen and Rugh, 1997). In this study, we only discuss the results from the second method. Calculations are conducted with a time interval $(\Delta \tau)$ of 0.0001, and a total number of iterations, N = 10,000,000, yielding a total dimensionless time (τ) of 1,000. To minimize the dependence on the ICs, 10,000 ensemble (*En*=10,000) runs
- 35 with the same model's parameters but different ICs are performed, and an ensemble-averaged LE is obtained from the average of the 10,000 LEs. Figure 7 shows the initial conditions for the ensemble runs, which represent white Gaussian noises. Figures 8a-c show the three LEs with r = 0 from the ensemble runs. The summation of the three LEs, shown in Fig. 8d, is very close to zero, suggesting that the system is conservative. The first leading LEs from the ensemble runs (Fig. 8a) show a
- 40 Gaussian distribution with a mean of 0.004836 and median of 0.004853. With the long but still finite time period and the very large number ICs, the first ensemble LE (eLE) with a small but positive value may suggest the appearance of diverged trajectories.

The solutions in the 3D-NLM with $r \neq 0$ also give a small but positive eLE, as shown in Fig. 9. While diverged trajectories may appear in presence of a positive eLE (Fig. 9a), the system is conservative because the summation of the three LEs is zero (Fig. 9d). In comparison between the first LEs of the ensemble runs from the 3D-NLM with r = 0 and r = 5, the first LEs with r = 5 are larger, which may indicate the role of the heating term in destabilizing the solutions. Note that X-Y section of the solutions with r = 5 display a comparable pattern to that of the solution in Fig 5 where r = 25.

- The impact of different ICs (i.e., X_o in Fig. 7) on the calculation of eLE is briefly discussed with the following analysis of the critical points in the X-Y section. As discussed in Fig. 5a, a solution may move "around" the saddle point and the two stable critical points, and its trajectory defines the big cycle. With a different initial condition, a solution may go around one of the non-trivial stable points ($\pm \sqrt{2\sigma r + X_0^2}$, 0) and its trajectory forms a small cycle. For example, Fig. 5d, displays results
- 55 with three different ICs, including $X_0 = \sqrt{2\sigma r}$, $\sqrt{2\sigma r} + 15$ and $\sqrt{2\sigma r} + 30$ in black, blue and red lines, respectively. Three vertical green lines show the locations of the corresponding stable critical

points at $X_c = \sqrt{2\sigma r + X_0^2}$. Solutions in Figures 5a and 5d suggest that the larger initial X_o is, the further the trajectory is away from the saddle point. Thus, the ensemble LE obtained with different ICs represents the average stability of solutions, some of which may have trajectories similar to that

- 60 in Fig. 5d (under small or no significant influence of the saddle point), and the others are close to those in Fig. 5a (under the influence of the saddle point). For the former, with an initial condition away from the saddle point, the nonlinearity may become dominant, as compared to the (linear) heating term. The corresponding solutions (e.g., the blue curve in Fig. 5d) become more symmetric with respect to the green line that passes through the nontrivial stable critical point. For the latter,
- 65 two trajectories that move toward the saddle point may experience different growth rates. They may form a big or small cycle.

Numerical solutions of the 3D-NLM with r = 0 are analyzed to study the role of nonlinearity (i.e., nonlinear feedback loop) in producing diverged trajectories, leading to a small but positive eLE (over a long but finite time period). Using the initial conditions (ICs) of $(X, Y, Z) = (0, Y_{ic}, 0)$, we

70 consider the control run with $Y_{ic} = 1$ and the parallel run with $Y_{ic} = 1 + \epsilon$, here ϵ indicates an initial perturbation. Therefore, Eq. (21) is generalized as:

$$Y^2 + \left(\frac{X^2}{2\sigma}\right)^2 = Y_{ic}^2,\tag{1}$$

which has the following solutions:

75
$$Y = Y_{ic}\cos(\phi),$$
 (2a)

$$\phi = \int \int Y \mathrm{d}\tau_1 \tau_2. \tag{2b}$$

 Y_{ic} and ϕ represent the amplitude and phase of the solution, respectively. For both of the control and parallel runs, the solution in Eq. 27a suggests that the amplitude of the solution remains unchanged

- 80 during the entire period. While the instantaneous value of the solution at a given time step is determined by its phase (e.g., Eq. 27a), the phase is a function of the instantaneous value of the solution at the previous time step (e.g., Eq. 27b). The mutual dependence between the instantaneous value and phase, which is a result of the nonlinearity, may lead to the divergence of two trajectories (over a long but finite-time period) between the control and parallel runs, illustrated below.
- In general, the time change of the phase $(d\phi/d\tau = X \text{ in Eq. 23a})$ is not a constant but is a function of the solution's value. When ϵ is tiny, the amplitudes of the solutions for the control and parallel runs are very close. However, as a result of the nonlinear characteristic (as shown with Eqs. 27a-b), the tiny difference in the initial conditions for the two runs may lead to significant differences in their phases. Figure 10 show the time evolution of the numerical solutions from the 3D-NLM with r = 0
- 90 for the control and parallel runs (with $\epsilon = 0.001$) and their differences. A very large time period of $\tau = 6000$ is used. The shift of the phases between the two runs is clearly shown in Figs. 10a-10b, while the amplitudes of both solutions (i.e., maxima) remain unchanged during the integration. As a result of the phase shift, the differences between the two solutions appear, growing initially and

then decaying. The former leads to the divergence of two trajectories over a finite-time period (e.g,

- 95 Figs. 10c-d). The differences of two runs are oscillatory and have a period showing dependence on solutions (Y or Z) and initial conditions. The long period (e.g., ~ 4,600 in Fig. 10c and ~ 2,300 in Fig. 10d), which cannot be determined in advance, makes it challenging to choose a total integration time (or a sampling time interval) for the calculations of an global (or finite-time) eLE that can accurately describe the global (local) stability of the 3D NLM. Therefore, although a fixed total time
- 100 of τ =1000 is sufficiently large to obtain the eLE in the original Lorenz model (e.g., Shen 2014a), it is still too short for the conservative 3D NLM. This may suggest that with no prior knowledge of the period which may depend on the the fields and initial conditions, it is challenging to apply the current method to calculate the eLE in a conservative system such as he 3D NLM.
- This phenomenon, which is associated with the dependence of phases on the amplitude, may be
 simply illustrated in Fig. 11 by observing the the different "phase" speeds of short and long hands of "clock," which conceptually represent the solutions of the control and parallel runs, respectively. Initially, both hands are at the same position (i.e., the same phase in dashed lines with arrows in Fig. 11), but gradually depart as a result of different moving speeds (in solid lines with arrows in Fig. 11). Note that the moving speed for each hand of the clock is a constant but not a function of time, which is fundamentally different from the (nonlinear) solutions of the 3D-NLM.

In a brief summary, for trajectories near a stable critical point, e.g., (X,Y) = (0,0) for r = 0 or $(X,Y) = (\sqrt{2\sigma r + X_0^2}, 0)$ for $r \neq 0$ and a large X_o , the nonlinearity may act as a forcing term in producing diverged trajectories, because nonlinearity alone may continuously change the phase of the solution. When the heating term becomes important to change the amplitude of the solution, its interaction with the perlinearity are glap lead to diverged trajectories.

115 interaction with the nonlinearity can also lead to diverged trajectories.

Acknowledgements. We thank Prof. Zdzisław Musielak, Dr. Tzi-Cheng Lai, Profs. Xubin Zeng, Ricardo Carretero, and Juan Serna, and one anonymous reviewer for valuable comments and/or discussions, and Jill Dunbar for proofreading this manuscript. We are grateful for support from the NASA Advanced Information System Technology (AIST) program of the Earth Science Technology Office (ESTO) and from the NASA
120 Computational Modeling Algorithms and Cyberinfrastructure (CMAC) program. Resources supporting this work were provided by the NASA High-End Computing (HEC) Program through the NASA Advanced Supercomputing (NAS) Division at Ames Research Center.

Appendix A: Derivations of Eq. (3)

In this section, we describe the procedures to derive Eq. (3). As discussed in Shen (2014a), the nonlinear advection term in Eq. (1) does not appear explicitly in the Lorenz model. Therefore, Eq. (1) can be written as follows:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\nabla^2 \psi = g\alpha \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x}.\tag{A1}$$

With the $M_1 - M_3$ of Shen (2014a), ψ and θ can be represented as

$$\psi = C_1 X M_1, \tag{A2}$$

$$\theta = C_2 \left(Y M_2 - Z M_3 \right). \tag{A3}$$

Here, C_1 and C_2 are defined in Eq. (9) of Shen (2014a). Next, we express the left- and right-hand side terms of Eq. A1 using $M_1 - M_3$, respectively, as follows:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\nabla^2 \psi = -C_1 \left(l^2 + m^2\right) \frac{dX}{dt} M_1,\tag{A4}$$

$$g\alpha \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x} = C_2 Y g\alpha (-\sqrt{2}) lsin(lx) sin(mz) = -C_2 Y g\alpha l M_1.$$
(A5)

Here l and m, defined in Shen (2014a), represent the horizontal and vertical wavenumbers, respectively. Substituting Eqs. A4 and A5 into Eq. A1, we have:

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = \frac{g\alpha l}{l^2 + m^2} \frac{C_2}{C_1} Y. \tag{A6}$$

We define a time scale (T_o) as

$$T_o = (1+a^2)\frac{\pi^2}{H^2},\tag{A7}$$

and obtain

$$l^{2} + m^{2} = (1 + a^{2})\frac{\pi^{2}}{H^{2}} = T_{o}.$$
 (A8)

Here, the term H is the domain height, and a is a ratio of the vertical scale of the convection cell to its horizontal scale, (i.e., a = l/m). With Eq (9) in Shen (2014a), the right-hand side of Eq. A6 becomes

$$\frac{g\alpha l}{l^2 + m^2} \frac{C_2}{C_1} Y = \frac{H^2}{\pi^2 (1+a^2)} \frac{g\alpha \pi a}{H} \frac{a}{\kappa (1+a^2)} \frac{\Delta T}{\pi} \frac{R_c}{R_a} Y = \nu (1+a^2) \frac{\pi^2}{H^2} = \nu T_o Y.$$
(A9)

With Eq. A9, Eq. A6 becomes

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = \nu T_o Y. \tag{A10}$$

The above equation turns into Eq. (3), $dX/d\tau = \sigma Y$, when $\tau = \kappa T_o t$ is assumed.

125 Appendix B: A closed-form solution using elliptic functions

Nonlinear dynamics have been widely studied using the solutions to the nonlinear Duffing equation. The Duffing equation that governs certain damped and driven (i.e., dissipative and forced) oscillatory motions (Bender and Orszag, 1978; Wikipedia) is given by

$$\frac{d^2X}{d\tau^2} + \delta \frac{dX}{d\tau} + \alpha X + \beta X^3 = \gamma \cos(\omega\tau), \tag{B1}$$

here δ , α , β , γ , and ω are constants. When $\delta = \gamma = 0$ and $\alpha = -\sigma r$ and $\beta = 1/2$, Eq. B1 appears in the form of the 3D-NLM (Eq. 15). While an exact solution to the general form of the

Duffing equation may not been found, closed-form, approximated or numerical solutions have been documented in the literature. In this section, we discuss how a closed-form solutions to the special

130 case of the non-dissipative and unforced Duffing equation (i.e., $\delta = \alpha = \gamma = 0$ and $\beta = 1/2$) can be obtained and expressed in terms of elliptic functions (Davis, 1960).

The incomplete elliptic integral of the first kind, $F(\phi, k)$, is written as

$$u = F(\phi, k) = \int_{0}^{\phi} \frac{d\theta}{\sqrt{1 - k^2 sin^2 \theta}}. \quad 0 < k^2 < 1.$$
 (B2)

The elliptic functions of Jacobi are defined as inverse of the elliptic integral as follows:

$$sn(u,k) = sin\phi, \quad cn(u,k) = cos\phi.$$
 (B3)

The elliptic functions have the following properties

$$sn(0) = 0, \quad cn(0) = 1, \quad sn^2u + cn^2 = 1,$$
 (B4)

and their derivatives can be obtained as follows:

$$\frac{d^2}{du^2}sn(u) = 2k^2sn^3(u) - (1+k^2)sn(u), \tag{B5}$$

and

$$\frac{d^2}{du^2}cn(u) = (2k^2 - 1)cn(u) - 2k^2cn^3(u).$$
(B6)

Equations B4 and B5 can help obtain the solution to the equation $d^2X/d\tau^2 + X^3/2 = 0$ (i.e., Eq. 18). With Eq. B5 and $k^2 = -1$, the solution can be written as

$$X = D_1 sn(\frac{D_1}{2}\tau + \theta_1, k^2 = -1).$$
(B7)

With Eq. B6 and $k^2 = 1/2$, the solution becomes

$$X = D_2 cn(\frac{D_2}{\sqrt{2}}\tau + \theta_2, k^2 = 1/2).$$
(B8)

Here, D_1 , D_2 , θ_1 or θ_2 are constants and determined by the initial conditions. θ_1 or θ_2 can be expressed in terms of the complete elliptic integrals of the first kind $K(k) = F(\pi/2, k^2 = 1/2) \sim 1.8541$, which is calculated with Matlab (http://www.mathworks.com/help/matlab/ref/ellipke.html). In addition, as a result of the definition of the elliptic integral (e.g., Eq. B2) and/or the validity of the numerical algorithms for the elliptic functions, k^2 may not be equal to -1. Therefore, only Eq. B8 is discussed below. In this study, the IC with X(0) = 0 and Y(0) = 1 (i.e., $\frac{d}{d\tau}X(0) = \sigma$)) leads to the following solution with $\theta_2 = 3K$ and $D_2 = \sqrt{2\sigma}$:

$$X = \sqrt{2\sigma}cn(\sqrt{\sigma}\tau + 3K, k^2 = 1/2). \tag{B9}$$

Figure B1 displays the solutions from Eqs. 22a (Fig. B1-a) and Eq. B9 (Fig. B1-b) and their differences (Fig. B1-d), showing very close results. This comparison confirms the validity of

the method for obtaining the closed-form solutions to the 3D-NLM with r = 0 using elementary

135 trigonometric functions (Fig. 2), which are used to illustrate the impact of nonlinearity on the changes of the solution's phase in section 3.4. For the case with $\alpha \neq 0$ (i.e., $r \neq 0$), similar procedures can be applied using Eq. B5 or B6 to obtain closed-form solutions, which is beyond the scope of this study.

References

140 Bender, C. M. and Orszag, S. A.: Advanced Mathematical Methods for Scientists and Engineers, McGraw-Hill, New York, 593 pp., 1978.

Christiansen, F., and H. Rugh, 1997: Computing Lyapunov Spectra with Continuous Gram-Schmid Orthonormalization. *Nonlinearity* 10, 1063-1072.

Davis, H. T., 1960: Introduction to Nonlinear Differential and Integral Equations. U.S. Atomic Energy145 Commission, September, 1960. 566pp.

Ding, R. O., and J. P. Li, 2007: Nonlinear finite-time Lyapunov exponent and predictability. *Phys. Lett.*, **354A**, 396-400.

Eckhardt, B. and D. Yao, 1993. Local Lyapunov exponents in chaotic systems. Physica D, 65, 100-108.

Froyland, J. and K. H. Alfsen, 1984: Lyapunov-exponent spectra for the Lorenz model.

150 Kazantsev, E., 1999: Local Lyapunov exponents of the quasi-geostrophic ocean dynamics, *Applied Mathematics* and Computation, **104**, 217-257.

Li, J. and R. Ding, 2011: Temporal-Spatial Distribution of Atmospheric Predictability Limit by Local Dynamical Analogs. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 139, 3265-3283.

Nese, J. M., 1989: Quantifying local predictability in phase space. Physica. 35D, 237-250.

155 Sprott, J. C., 2003: Chaos and Time-Series Analysis. Oxford University Press. 528pp. The numerical method is briefly discussed on http://sprott.physics.wisc.edu/chaos/lyapexp.htm.

Thiffeault, J.-L. and Horton, W.: Energy-conserving truncations for convection with shear flow, Phys. Fluids, 8, 1715–1719, 1996.

Wolf, A., J. B. Swift, H. L. Swinney, and J. A. Vastano, 1985: Determining Lyapunov Exponents from a Time

160 Series. *Physica*, **16D**, 285-317.

Zeng, X., R. Eykholt, and R.A. Pielke, 1991: Estimating the Lyapunov-exponent spectrum from short time series of low precision. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **66**, 3229-3232.



Figure B1: A comparison of the solutions in Eqs. (22a) and (B9), which are expressed using an elementary trigonometric function and an elliptic function, respectively. (a) the solution of Eq. (22a) in red. (b) the solution of Eq. (B9) in blue. (c) both of the solutions in (a) and (b). (d) differences of the two solutions.



Figure 5. Solutions from the 3D-NLM (Eqs. 3–5). (a) X-Y plot. (b) X-Z plot. (c) X-APE plot. The black, red, and blue lines show normalized -KE, APE_Y and APE_Z , respectively. Green lines are plotted at $X = \pm X_t = \pm \sqrt{2\sigma r}$ where $Y^2 = Z^2$. (d) X-Y plot with different initial conditions, $(X, Y, Z) = (X_0, 0, 0)$. The black, red and blue curves represent results with $X_0 = \sqrt{2\sigma r}, \sqrt{2\sigma r} + 15$ and $\sqrt{2\sigma r} + 30$, respectively. Three green lines pass through the corresponding critical points at $(X_c, Y_c) = (\sqrt{2\sigma r + X_0^2}, 0)$.



Figure 7. 10,000 initial conditions for the calculation of the ensemble Lyapunov exponent. (a) The distribution of X as a function of the ensemble members. (b) The distributions of X and Y. (c) The distributions of X and Z.



Figure 8. The Lyapunov exponents and their summation for the 3D-NLM with r = 0. Panels a-c show the histograms of the first, second, and third LEs from the ensemble runs, respectively. (d) Summation of the three LEs.



3D-NLM wirh r=5 (CNTL)

Figure 9. As in Figure 8, but for r = 5.



Figure 10. Time evolution of numerical results for the control run (black) and parallel run (red) using the 3D-NLM with r = 0. A tiny initial perturbation ($\epsilon = 0.001$) is used. (a) Y plot. (b) Z plot. (c-d) Differences of Y and Z between the control and parallel runs.



Figure 11. A X-Y plot for the control run (black) and parallel run (red). The initial conditions, $(X, Y, Z) = (0, Y_{ic}, 0)$, include $Y_{ic} = 1$ for the control run and $Y_{ic} = 1 + \epsilon$ for the parallel run. A large ϵ (= 0.2) is used for better illustration. [In Fig. 10, $\epsilon = 0.001$ is used.] At a given time, the position in each of the trajectories is indicated by the location of an arrow. As a result of the nonlinearity and the initial perturbation, the arrows of the two runs move at different speeds, leading to the divergence of two trajectories.