A Relation (or not) between Ro & ROGER \$ 07/19/2003 ROBER = WITE TO = (W, Up, UZ) (1) Up (3) (K.Da) 1 = M 24 + Mb 2M + M5 3M (12.00) = W 34 + 40 34 + 42 042 (3) write \( \mathbb{T} = \( \overline{\tau} + 4x', \overline{\tap} + 4p', \overline{\taz} + 4z') WITH Up = AST\* Overbor -> Foral + temporal mean + THE DUA + UE' DUX - JUB - UB' (7) + UZ 24 + UZ 24 (8) Now, (W, UZ) (=> mortdonus creulation (9) {--} = "+1pscul (W, Up', UZ') ( Convection + waves (10) Might suspect { | mil, | mil} << { | mil, | mil} (11) (7), (8) -) (R. DR) = - 154 + R'. DUI - 44'2/4 (13) (13)

Dewine U = { | Wil, | Wil} = { | The - Anx eq |} 3 H = "scale of variation in th" Might susped H >> d (ignore up 2/d in (13)) (15) Then: (\$\overline{\pi'.\piuz')\hat{\end{a}}\_1 + (\$\overline{\pi'.\piuz')\hat{\end{a}}\_2} + (\$\overline{\pi'.\piuz')\hat{\end{a}}\_2} "m" = "mendonal part": Am = AHêH + Azêz (17) so detire  $Ro_{6PR} \equiv \frac{U^2}{AH N_*^2}$  (18) Ro: prok rotating frame (No). Ignore continuous force Then "all Trential terms" = - V. VV + 220 êx XV (19) where  $\vec{V} \equiv \vec{R} - 1 R_0 \hat{e}_{\phi}$  (20) Note:  $(\overline{V_A}, \overline{V_R}) = (\overline{U_A}, \overline{U_R}) = \text{wendown} \text{ Orculation}$   $\overline{S} \text{ sume in both frames} (21)$   $\overline{S} \text{ compute:} \left[ \overline{S} \mathcal{N}_0 \hat{e}_R^2 \times \overline{V} \right]_m = - \left[ \overline{S} \mathcal{N}_0 \left( \overline{V_A} \hat{e}_A + \overline{V_A} \hat{e}_A + \overline{V_A} \hat{e}_R^2 \right) \times \hat{e}_R^2 \right]$ êi×êi L m = -21. Va ên =-2110/12-10 ên (55) (STACE Top = Tup - No. = A (N\*-Ne)) (53) \* This term must be evaluated in co-rotating frame. N.e. the oldp in V-VV is w.r.t. \$ in rotating frame.

Ignoring [uneridonal circulation] terms at outset: 3 (N.D)4 = M 34 + M 3M + M 3M - MA = 4 201 + (12-12) 20/1 + 40 0H, + 1/2 1/2 = 1 - 1 (1x-12) - (Vp)3 = - 1 (Nx-N) + V'. DV/ - V4'2/1 (24)  $(\nabla^2 \cdot \nabla \nabla^2)_{\xi} = \nabla^2' \cdot \nabla V_{\xi'}$  (convince Yourself!) (25) I can convince wiself: アン・マグ = マン・マス・ Thus, in rotating frame, (who assume H << 1) [all Trenticul terms] in = [-21/20(1x-12) - 1 (1x-10) | ex ZASOISX-SOI "EXTING OF A MAX-SOIS mag-Itades: + (R'-74) ei + R'. 742' ez mag Itudes: V3/H (27) A conalis fore dominates, everything (wow DR), detine: RODR = IN-NoI = 1/2 RoDR << 1 ZAHNON#-201 << 1 (28)

\* As deplied in The paper: ROOR = 15-50/15

4 A furtlermore (30) U = |Vpl = d |Sa-Sol (technically a separate assumption), then RODR = JAR. It contacts is comparable to "extra" contrary al, Alen: (i.e., the Sun, strong DR) -21 No (N\*-No) - 1 (N\*-No)2 - 4 [ SNON - SN: + Nx - ZNON\* +N: ] - 1 (Nx2 - No) This is obvious: we must get back everything we had in the invital frame, except the ignored "frame" centralyal force. But should we now downe ROBPR = THING-No! seems weird. Showda't have ignored frome contatugul force to begin with. Note: In Dutting (ase (weat DR + V= A/S+-S6)):  $\frac{V^2}{1 + N \delta^2} = \left(\frac{4H}{A}\right) R \delta^2 \qquad (35).$ So under no circumstances does Roope = Ro. ROCCI (geostroPH) -> ROGPR (1 (6PR balance) but not VICE VERSA.