Global, fully multi-fluid simulations of radially stratified protoplanetary disks

Turlough P. Downes

School of Mathematical Sciences & National Centre for Plasma Science & Technology, Dublin City University

28th October, 2015

T.P. Downes (DCU)

Multifluid Accretion Disks

28th October, 2015 1 / 21

< ロト < 同ト < ヨト < ヨト

Acknowledgements

The People

- Donna Lee (DIAS/TCD) (grad student)
- Dr Wayne O'Keeffe (former grad student)

The Organisations

- Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies
- PRACE
- Irish Centre for High End Computing

< ロト < 同ト < ヨト < ヨト

Accretion Disks are Awkward



Credit: J. Bally (University of Colorado) and H. Throop (SWRI)

• Accretion disks:

- Small
- Weakly ionized
- Possibly turbulent

T.P. Downes (DCU)

Multifluid Accretion Disks

28th October, 2015 3 / 21

< ロト < 団ト < 団ト < 団ト</p>

Weakly ionized systems

Initial considerations:

- Want to use the continuum approximation
- Take account of differing motions between neutrals and charged species
- On't want to solve the Poisson equation

Approximations:

- The velocity of the fluid as a whole is the velocity of the neutrals
- For charged species, collisions with neutrals dominate
- Inertia of the charged species is negligible

3

Generalised Ohm's Law

- Generalised Ohm's law (in principle) removes requirement for Poisson equation
- Derive this from the N momentum equations for charged species

$$\alpha_i \rho_i (\mathbf{E} + \frac{1}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \times \mathbf{B}) + \mathbf{f}_{i1} = 0, \tag{1}$$

$$f_{ij} = \rho_i \rho_j \mathbf{K}_{ij} (\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i).$$
⁽²⁾

Image: Image:

★ ∃ > < ∃ >

The multifluid MHD equations

The equations for our (isothermal) weakly ionized system are then

$$\frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho_i \mathbf{v}_i) = \mathbf{0}, \qquad (3)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho_1 \mathbf{v}_1}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \left(\rho_1 \mathbf{v}_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + a^2 \rho_1 \mathbf{I} \right) = \mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B}, \tag{4}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v}_1 \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B} \mathbf{v}_1) = \nabla \times \left(r_0 \frac{(\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{B}) \mathbf{B}}{B^2} - r_1 \frac{\mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B}}{B} \right) (5) + r_2 \frac{\mathbf{B} \times (\mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B})}{B^2} , \qquad (6)$$
$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0, \qquad (7)$$

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{J}. \tag{8}$$

< ロト < 同ト < ヨト < ヨト

Numerical set-up

Aim

- O'Keeffe & Downes (2014) published first fully multifluid sims
- Extend this study to investigate impact of radially varying parameters
- Investigate appropriate canonical time-scales of the problem
 - Is the orbital time, or growth time of the MRI, always appropriate?
 - What are turbulent time-scales?

Focus here on time-scales

Numerical set-up

- (Quasi-)Global simulations
- Cartesian grid
- Weakly ionised multifluid approximation (3 fluids)
- Wavekilling boundaries
- Radially stratified ionisation and density

3

Density distribution

• Neutral Density:

$$ho_{\mathrm{n}}(r) = \left\{ egin{array}{c} rac{
ho_{\mathrm{0}}}{(\mathrm{0.8}r_{\mathrm{in}})^3} & \mathrm{if} \ r \leq \mathrm{0.8}r_{\mathrm{in}}, \ rac{
ho_{\mathrm{0}}}{r^3} & \mathrm{otherwise} \end{array}
ight.$$

where $\rho_0 = 2.33 \times 10^{-10} \, \text{g cm}^{-3}$.

 Ionisation fraction quadratic in *r*, fitted to match Salmeron & Wardle (2003)

3

The other stuff

- Initial temperature 280 K
- Net initial magnetic flux of 100 mG
- Radial range: 1 AU 6 AU
- Resolution $512 \times 512 \times 64$
- Well resolved for MRI (Hawley 2013).

3

Schematic of set-up



E

590

< ロト < 団ト < 団ト < 団ト</p>

Multifluid effects



1

590

Neutral Density evolution



Initial and final neutral densities

T.P.	Downes	(DCU))
		(/	

Э

.

∃ ⊳.

Image: Image:

Ionisation fraction evolution



E

DQC

< ロ ト < 回 ト < 回 ト < 回 ト</p>

Relevant Time-scales

- Typically take the orbital period as representative time-scale
- Often combine with Alfvén speed to get length-scale
- Ignores turbulent cascade, Whistler waves

3

Two other possibilities

Eddy turn-over time

•
$$t_l \sim \frac{l}{v(l)} \sim l^{(3-\alpha)/2}$$

- Mean/median turbulent speed with ionisation profile length-scale
 - $\bullet~$ Typical MRI velocity $\sim 10^4\,cm\,s^{-1}$
 - At 2 AU equilibrium ionisation length-scale \leq 1 AU (Salmeron & Wardle 2003)
 - Time-scale: $t_R \sim 10^9$ s, $t_z \ll t_R$ (e.g. Lesur et al 2014)
 - If ionisation varies rapidly then time-scale can be less than orbital period

Results

Resistivities



Evidence of strongly varying resistivities

T.P. Downes (DCU)

Multifluid Accretion Disks

590

Magnetic field evolution



Multifluid effects particularly significant at low r

T.P. Downes (DCU)	ownes (DCU)
-------------------	-------------

Э

590

∃ ► < ∃ ►</p>

Image: Image:

Results

Anomalous viscosity



Э

590

Conclusions

- Resistivities can be strongly varying
- Hall dominated region can be large (no need to dominate induction term to have impact)
- Magnetic field in ideal MHD does not approximate multifluid structure well
- Correct time-scale for modelling may not be the orbital one
 - Radial time-scale may be short
 - Vertical time-scale may be much shorter

Conclusions



Turbulence is hard

T.P. Downes (DCU)

Multifluid Accretion Disks

28th October, 2015 21 / 21

999

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Conclusions



Turbulence is hard.

T.P. Downes (DCU)

Multifluid Accretion Disks

28th October, 2015 21 / 21

1

590

< ロト < 団ト < 団ト < 団ト</p>