2D Plasma Simulation via Discrete Exterior Calculus

Mark Gillespie, Arthur R. Adams SURF Fellow Mentor: Peter Schröder

October 21, 2017

Caltech



1. Background

2. Goals

3. My Contributions

Background

Motivation



Figure 1: Coronal mass ejection photographed by NASA [1]

Simplifying assumptions:

• Incompressible

Simplifying assumptions:

- Incompressible
- No viscosity

We represent the state of the fluid by a velocity vector field v.



Divergence-free vector field ($\delta v = 0$).

No regions like this:



Little particles in the fluid move with the flow. This drags our velocties along the velocity field.

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} = -\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{v}^{\sharp}}\mathbf{v}$$

But this dragging can violate incompressibility. So we introduce pressure.

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} = -\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{v}^{\sharp}}\mathbf{v} - d\mathbf{p}$$

Euler Equation for incompressible fluids

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} = -\mathcal{L}_{v^{\sharp}}v - dp$$

Euler Equation for incompressible fluids

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} = -\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{v}^{\sharp}}\mathbf{v} - d\mathbf{p}$$

Change in velocity over time

$$rac{\partial v}{\partial t} = -\mathcal{L}_{v^{\sharp}} v - dp$$

Change in velocity over time Fluid pulling along velocity field

$$rac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} = -\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{v}^{\sharp}}\mathbf{v} - d\mathbf{p}$$

Change in velocity over time Fluid pulling along velocity field Pressure to maintain incompressibility

Euler Equation for incompressible fluids

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L}_{v^{\sharp}} v + dp = 0$$
$$\delta v = 0$$

• Again, a simplified model.

- Again, a simplified model.
- Velocity vector field v and a magnetic 'vector field' β .

- Again, a simplified model.
- Velocity vector field v and a magnetic 'vector field' β .
- Fluid is incompressible ($\delta v = 0$).

- Again, a simplified model.
- Velocity vector field v and a magnetic 'vector field' β .
- Fluid is incompressible ($\delta v = 0$).
- Fluid has no viscosity

- Again, a simplified model.
- Velocity vector field v and a magnetic 'vector field' β .
- Fluid is incompressible ($\delta v = 0$).
- Fluid has no viscosity
- No magnetic monopoles $(d\beta = 0)$.

- Again, a simplified model.
- Velocity vector field v and a magnetic 'vector field' β .
- Fluid is incompressible ($\delta v = 0$).
- Fluid has no viscosity
- No magnetic monopoles $(d\beta = 0)$.
- Fluid has no resistance

Velocity equation: very similar to Euler equation

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{v}^{\sharp}}\mathbf{v} - \mathcal{L}_{(\star\beta)^{\sharp}}(\star\beta) + dp = 0$$

Force of magnetic field on charged particles (Lorentz force law)

Magnetic field equation: just carried by velocity field

$$\frac{\partial\beta}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L}_{v^{\sharp}}\beta = 0$$

Change in magnetic field over time Fluid pulling along magnetic field Four equations total

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{v}^{\sharp}}\mathbf{v} - \mathcal{L}_{(\star\beta)^{\sharp}}(\star\beta) + dp = 0 \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{\partial\beta}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L}_{\nu^{\sharp}}\beta = 0 \tag{2}$$

$$\delta v = 0 \tag{3}$$

$$d\beta = 0 \tag{4}$$

Conservation Laws

• Energy (*E*)

- Energy (E)
 - Kinetic energy $=\frac{1}{2}\int v^2$

- Energy (E)
 - Kinetic energy $=\frac{1}{2}\int v^2$
 - Potential energy $= \frac{1}{2} \int \beta^2$ (field strength)

- Energy (E)
 - Kinetic energy $=\frac{1}{2}\int v^2$
 - Potential energy $= \frac{1}{2} \int \beta^2$ (field strength)
 - Total energy $= \frac{1}{2} \int v^2 + \beta^2$

- Energy (E)
 - Kinetic energy $=\frac{1}{2}\int v^2$
 - Potential energy $= \frac{1}{2} \int \beta^2$ (field strength)
 - Total energy $= \frac{1}{2} \int v^2 + \beta^2$
- Cross-helicity (*H*)

- Energy (E)
 - Kinetic energy $= \frac{1}{2} \int v^2$
 - Potential energy $= \frac{1}{2} \int \beta^2$ (field strength)
 - Total energy $= \frac{1}{2} \int v^2 + \beta^2$
- Cross-helicity (H)
 - A measure of how linked v and β are

Goals

• There are already nice, energy-preserving MHD integrators, e.g. Gawlik et al (2011) [2].

- There are already nice, energy-preserving MHD integrators, e.g. Gawlik et al (2011) [2].
- But this is still an active research area. Kraus and Maj [3] published a paper about a new approach in July.

- There are already nice, energy-preserving MHD integrators, e.g. Gawlik et al (2011) [2].
- But this is still an active research area. Kraus and Maj [3] published a paper about a new approach in July.
 - New integrator

- There are already nice, energy-preserving MHD integrators, e.g. Gawlik et al (2011) [2].
- But this is still an active research area. Kraus and Maj [3] published a paper about a new approach in July.
 - New integrator
 - Treats v and β on equal footing

- There are already nice, energy-preserving MHD integrators, e.g. Gawlik et al (2011) [2].
- But this is still an active research area. Kraus and Maj [3] published a paper about a new approach in July.
 - New integrator
 - Treats v and β on equal footing
 - Good numerical behavior and solid justification

- There are already nice, energy-preserving MHD integrators, e.g. Gawlik et al (2011) [2].
- But this is still an active research area. Kraus and Maj [3] published a paper about a new approach in July.
 - New integrator
 - Treats v and β on equal footing
 - Good numerical behavior and solid justification
 - No proof of conservation laws

- There are already nice, energy-preserving MHD integrators, e.g. Gawlik et al (2011) [2].
- But this is still an active research area. Kraus and Maj [3] published a paper about a new approach in July.
 - New integrator
 - Treats v and β on equal footing
 - Good numerical behavior and solid justification
 - No proof of conservation laws
 - Only worked out in periodic domains

1. Prove conservation laws

- 1. Prove conservation laws
- 2. Implement simulation with boundaries

- 1. Prove conservation laws
- 2. Implement simulation with boundaries
- 3. Extend to 3D

My Contributions

- I proved conservation of energy and cross-helicity, but not in way we expected.
- Noether's theorem only predicts that energy changes at a constant rate in this case.
- Further investigation is needed to understand why the standard technique didn't work, and what that means about this representation of the system.

The new perspective that I developed on the algorithm while proving the conservation laws made it simple to implement fixed boundary conditions.

Implementation of Boundaries



Experimental Test of Conservation (Energy)



Figure 2: Energy drift of the Alfvén wave simulation

Experimental Test of Conservation (Cross-helicity)



Figure 3: Cross-helicity drift of the Alfvén wave simulation

I did not have time to work on the algorithm in 3D. Conceptually, it should not be very different from 2D. But there may be subtle differences that prove tricky to handle.

• Is the integrator symplectic?

- Is the integrator symplectic?
- Investigate topological properties of the magnetic field

- Is the integrator symplectic?
- Investigate topological properties of the magnetic field
- Extend to 3D

My work was funded in part by the Arthur R Adams $\ensuremath{\mathsf{SURF}}$ fellowship

References I

📔 K. C. Fox.

Giant prominence erupts, 2012.

E. S. Gawlik, P. Mullen, D. Pavlov, J. E. Marsden, and M. Desbrun.

Geometric, variational discretization of continuum theories.

Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 240(21):1724–1760, Oct. 2011.

M. Kraus and O. Maj.

Variational Integrators for Ideal Magnetohydrodynamics, July 2017.