Dynamo bifurcations and saturations mechanisms in global geodynamo simulations

Ludovic Petitdemange

Iudovic@Ira.ens.fr Laboratoire de RadioAstronomie LRA-ENS LERMA Paris



Collaborators : Martin Schrinner Emmanuel Dormy Raphael Raynaud

Stellar and Planetary dynamos Göttingen 2015

contents

- Introduction and motivations
- Standard geodynamo model
- Dynamo bifurcations in the parameter space
- Saturation mechanism for subcritical dynamos
- Attempts to deduce scaling laws



Dynamo Models

- Conducting Boussinesq fluid in a rotating spherical shell.
- Convection driven by fixed temperature gradient between inner and outer shell
- •Systematic parameters survey:
- Different initial conditions - Dimensionless parameters - B.C. : Stress-Free or Rigid • MHD-code: PaRoDy (Dormy et al. 1998) with homogenous mass distribution $g \propto r$ Schrinner, Petitdemange, Dormy (2011,2012)

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{MHD \ equations} \\ (\mathrm{E/Pm}) \ [\partial_t \mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla}) \mathbf{u}] &= -\boldsymbol{\nabla}\pi + \mathrm{E} \, \Delta \mathbf{u} - 2 \mathbf{e}_z \times \mathbf{u} \\ &+ \mathrm{Ra} \, T \, \mathbf{r} + (\boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{B}) \times \mathbf{B} \,, \end{array} \\ \partial_t \mathbf{B} &= \boldsymbol{\nabla} \times (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B}) + \Delta \mathbf{B} \,, \\ \partial_t T + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla}) T &= \mathrm{q} \Delta T \,, \\ \boldsymbol{\nabla} \cdot \mathbf{u} &= \boldsymbol{\nabla} \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0 \,. \end{array} \\ \mathbf{E} / \mathbf{Pm} = \mathbf{E}_{\eta} = \frac{\eta}{\Omega \mathcal{L}^2} \,, \ \mathbf{E} &= \frac{\nu}{\Omega \mathcal{L}^2} \,, \ \mathbf{q} = \frac{\kappa}{\eta} \,. \\ \mathbf{\sim} 10^{-9} \quad \mathbf{\sim} 10^{-15} \quad \mathbf{\sim} 10^{-6} \\ &\geq 10^{-6} \quad \geq 10^{-6} \quad \geq 0.1 \end{array}$$

Dynamo regimes in geodynamo simulations



Christensen & Aubert 2006

Two distinct regimes in geodynamo simulations



Dipole field strenght f_{dip} : time-average ratio on the outer shell boudary of the mean dipole field strength to the field strength in harmonic degrees I=1-12.

Test-field method

- Perform MHD-simulation.
- « Measure » the mean electromotive force ${\cal E}$ generated by the action of the velocity field on certain test-fields.
- Extract coefficients out of expansion of ${m {\cal E}}$,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\kappa}^{(i)} = \alpha_{\kappa\lambda} B_{T\lambda} + \beta_{\kappa\lambda\mu} \frac{\partial B_{T\lambda}}{\partial x_{\mu}}$$

Schrinner et al. 2005, 2007 Brandenburg, Rädler, Schrinner 2008 Tilgner, Brandenburg 2008 Rädler, Brandenburg 2009

. . .

Eigenvalue Problem

$$\lambda \boldsymbol{B} = \nabla \times D\boldsymbol{B}$$

 $D\boldsymbol{B} = \boldsymbol{u} \times \boldsymbol{B} - \eta \nabla \times \boldsymbol{B}$

Averaging in azimuth:

$$D\boldsymbol{B} = \boldsymbol{V} \times \boldsymbol{B} + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \boldsymbol{B} - \boldsymbol{\beta} : \nabla(\boldsymbol{B}) - \eta \nabla \times \boldsymbol{B}$$

 α,β : Tensors of second and third rank respectively, depending on the velocity field.

They are determined with the help of the test-field method.

(e.g. Schrinner et al. 2005, 2007, Schrinner et al. 2010)



Time-average magnetic components from DNS

Eigen mode from mean-field simulation with dynamo coefficient obtained using the test-field method.

Mean-field calculation without Y effect



Time-average magnetic components from DNS

Eigen mode from mean-field simulation with dynamo coefficient obtained using the test-field method.

Mean-field calculation without Y effect

Relaxing the cylindrical constraint in a spherical shell Dipole collapse induced by inertia



Schrinner, Petitdemange, Dormy, ApJ 2012.



Effects of relaxing the cylindrical constraint on dynamo coefficients by increasing Rol

$\alpha_{_{\phi\phi}}$ is unchanger

The Y effect is important for α^2 dynamo (dipolar branch) and it is present only if the cylindrical constraint of the flow is efficient.

In square box dynamo simulations : No axial dipole field and no Y effect Because no symmetry constraint. Tilgner 2012, Guervilly's talk.

Dynamo bifurcations



Control parameter : Ra

Supercritical dynamo bifurcation



E=3.10⁻⁴; Pr=1; Pm=6

Morin & Dormy 2009

Subcritical dynamo bifurcation



E=3.10⁻⁴; Pr=1; Pm=3

Morin & Dormy 2009

Dynamo bifurcations with changing Ek



E=1.10⁻⁴; Pr=1; Pm=3 and Pm=0.67

Morin & Dormy 2009

Kinematic study in ignoring Lorentz force



Subcritical dynamo : magnetic field effect



Subcritical dynamo : magnetic field effect



Weak and Strong field branches



Supercritical dynamo bifurcation



E=3.10⁻⁴; Pr=1; Pm=6

Morin & Dormy 2009

Control parameter : Pm



Data from Christensen & Aubert 2006, Schrinner et al (2012) and King 2010



 V_{ϕ}

Max : 26.01 Min : -36.55







Max : 241.85 Min : -241.86



 B_{ϕ}

0.56

-0.56

Max :

Min :





Bistability SF/SF B.C.

multipolar field branch

Oscillatory dynamos

Dipolar field branch

Dipolar and stationary

Schrinner, Petitdemange, Dormy (2012) ApJ

Bistability induced by large-scale differential rotation



Boundary conditions

- Δ Rigid/Stress-Free
- □ Stress-Free/Stress-Free (SF/SF)

◊ Rigid/Rigid

See Appendix for a discussi

See Appendix for a discussion On the Rol definition !

Dynamo branches with SF-SF boundary conditions



Dynamo branches with SF-SF boundary conditions



Conclusion

- Dynamo mechanism has been highlighted using testfield method (Schrinner et al 2012) and it is useful to understand dynamo bifurcation.
- Subcritical bifurcation obtained for all Ekman numbers.
 - Long period geomag. Evolution.
 - Important resit for theoretical aspects.
- Distinction between weak and strong field branches is not clear in geodynamo models. Likely different dynamical regimes according to dimensionless numbers and E/Pm and E/Pr
- Scaling laws...

Boussinesq DNSs with rigid B.C. And scaling laws



Boussinesq simulations are relevant for low mass stars

