

## General Introduction to MHD models of

## JETS

## What is MHD? Why do we need MHD?

## MAGNETO-HYDRO-DYNAMICS

MAGNETO $\Longrightarrow$ magnetic field involved
HYDRO $\Longrightarrow$ electrically conductive fluid, e.g. plasmas
DYNAMICS $\Longrightarrow$ study of the forces and torques determining the motion

With the exception of planet's atmosphere, plasmas and magnetic fields are common ingredients of each and every astrophysical system!

## MHD and Jets

Where do we find plasma and magnetic fields in astrophysical systems?

- Accretion
- Wind
- Jets

Each of these phenomena can be described by a system of MHD non-linear equations.

## MHD approximation

MHD approximation = simplified fluid mechanics + Maxwell's equations
ASSUMPTIONS:
■ Fluid approximation: local thermodynamic quantities can be meaningfully defined in the plasma, and variations in these quantities are slow compared with the timescale of the microscopic processes in the plasma.
■ In the plasma there is a local, instantaneous relation between electric field and current density (Ohm's law).
■ The plasma is electrically neutral.

GOAL:
Solution of equilibrium of forces perpendicular (Grad-Shafranov eq/TORAMAK) and parallel (Bernoulli eq for polytropic EoS) to the magnetic surfaces.

MAIN ISSUE:
3 critical surfaces, from which constants of motion (CoM) are derived.

## Ideal MHD

Ideal MHD: perfectly conductive fluid, i.e. infinite magnetic Reynolds number ( $R_{m} \sim \sigma_{0}$ ), therefore $\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{field}=0$, but only in the fluid/comoving frame ( $\mathrm{K}^{\prime}$ )! MAXWELL EQNS:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} & =-\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B} / c \\
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} & =4 \pi \sigma \\
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} & =0 \\
4 \pi \mathbf{j}+\partial \mathbf{E} / \partial t & =c \nabla \times \mathbf{B} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \partial \sigma / \partial t+\nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}=0 \quad \stackrel{N R}{\Longrightarrow} \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}=0 \\
\partial \mathbf{B} / \partial t & =c \nabla \times \mathbf{E} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \partial \mathbf{B} / \partial t=\nabla \times(\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B})
\end{aligned}
$$

FLUID DYNAMICS EQNS:

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{L} & =\frac{1}{c} \mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B}=\frac{1}{4 \pi}(\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \times \mathbf{B} \\
\varrho \frac{d \mathbf{v}}{d t} & =-\nabla p+\frac{1}{4 \pi}(\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \times \mathbf{B}-\varrho \nabla \phi \\
\frac{\partial \varrho}{\partial t}+\varrho \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} & =0 \\
P & =Q \varrho^{\gamma}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Bernoulli and Grad-Shafranov equations

$\mathrm{EoM}_{p}$ : Integrating the projection, we get the energy or Bernoulli equation

$$
\frac{1}{2} v_{p, A}^{2}=\binom{\text { kinetic }}{\text { flux }}+\binom{\text { entalphy }}{\text { flux }}+\binom{\text { gravtnl }}{\text { flux }}+\binom{\text { Poynting }}{\text { flux }}
$$

$\mathrm{EoM}_{\perp}\left(\perp S_{B}\right)$ : Grad-Schlüther-Shafranov or Transfield equation

$$
\text { quasi - linear PDE for } \psi(\varpi, z)
$$

CoMs : Field line constants: $\Omega, \Psi_{A}, L, \mu c^{2}, Q$
: Highest order derivative terms vanish at AP in GSS eqn!
The Alfvén regularity condition: solved for the slope of the solution of the Bernoulli equation at AP, $p_{A}$.
:8: In the Bernoulli eqn, two more critical points: when $v_{p, A}=v_{s}$ (slow) and $v_{p, A}=v_{f}$ (fast).
ANY REGULAR SOLUTION OF BERNOULLI EQN MUST PASS BOTH MSP, MFP!

## Approach: I (Weber \& Davis, 1967)

MAIN ASSUMPTIONS: fixed shape for magnetic field, i.e. non GS eq.!
SYSTEM: ■ only $\perp$ forces, i.e. Bernoulli equation

- from slow and fast magnetosonic critical surfaces we get 2 CoM:

■ CoM 1: mass-to-magnetic-flux ratio, $\Psi_{A}$

- CoM 2: total energy $E(\psi)$

PROS: determination of asymptotic speeds
CONS: no info on collimation

## Approach: II (Suess \& Nerney, 1973)

MAIN ASSUMPTIONS: none, but only numerical. Perturbation of a spherically symmetric, iterative methods, etc.
SYSTEM: full system
PROS: true shape of the field lines
CONS: only numerical

## Approach: III (Blandford \& Payne (1982), Vlahakis \& Konigl (2000,2003), etc.)

MAIN ASSUMPTIONS: specific dependence of the flow variables on the independent variable (self-similarity assumption)

SYSTEM: full system, but reduced number of independent variables, in most of the cases to just one.

PROS: accounts for the force balance
CONS: ■ not regular/valid in the whole parameter space

- not properly accounting for MFP (?)
- singularity for electrical current along the axis of symmetry


## Other approaches

IV: Variational approach (Rosso \& Pelletier, 1994)
V: Slender jet approximation (Koupelis \& van Horn (1989), Koupelis (1990))
... ...
...and this is only until 1999 (Lery at al, 1999)!

## Magnetic force and curvature force

Lorentz force is perpendicular to the B -field. Along magnetic field lines, only hydrodynamic forces act.

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{L} & =\frac{1}{4 \pi}(\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \times \mathbf{B} \\
& =-\frac{1}{8 \pi} \nabla B^{2}+\frac{1}{4 \pi}(\mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{B}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Magnetic force and curvature force

Lorentz force is perpendicular to the B-field. Along magnetic field lines, only hydrodynamic forces act.

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{L} & =\frac{1}{4 \pi}(\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \times \mathbf{B} \\
& =-\frac{1}{8 \pi} \nabla B^{2}+\frac{1}{4 \pi}(\mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{B}
\end{aligned}
$$

The curvature force term for an axisymmetric azimuthally directed field ( $=B \hat{\phi}$ ) in cylindrical coordinates ( $\varpi, \phi, z$ ), considering that $\hat{\phi} \cdot \nabla \hat{\phi}=-\hat{\varpi} / \varpi$, looks like

$$
\frac{1}{4 \pi}(\mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{B}=-\frac{B^{2}}{4 \pi} \frac{\hat{\varpi}}{\varpi}
$$

The curvature is directed toward the centre of curvature: HOOP STRESS!

## Stream function

In cylindrical coordinates, an axisymmetric field is constant wrt the azimuthal coordinate, i.e. $\partial \mathbf{B} / \partial \phi=0$ and we can decompose the field as

$$
\mathbf{B}=\mathbf{B}_{p}(\varpi, z)+\mathbf{B}_{t}(\varpi, z)
$$

in particular

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{B}_{p}=\left(B_{\varpi}, 0, B_{z}\right)=-\frac{1}{\varpi} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \varpi} \hat{\varpi}+\frac{1}{\varpi} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} \hat{\mathbf{z}} \\
& \mathbf{B}_{t}=B_{\phi} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where the flux/stream function $\psi$ is defined as

$$
\psi(\varpi, z)=\int_{0}^{\varpi} \varpi B_{z} d \varpi
$$

and it equals, apart for a factor $2 \pi$ the magnetic flux contained in a circle of radius $\varpi$.

## Alfvén \& Magnetosonic waves

## (2D-)Problem

homogeneous B-field in a uniform fluid initially at rest
$+$
small perturbations in $\mathbf{B}, p, \varrho$ at later times

Alfvén waves

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}+\delta \mathbf{B} \\
\delta p=\delta \varrho=0
\end{gathered}
$$

Ion waves

$$
\begin{gathered}
p \rightarrow p+\delta p \\
\varrho \rightarrow \varrho+\delta \varrho \\
\delta \mathbf{B}=0
\end{gathered}
$$




Magnetosonic waves

$$
\begin{gathered}
p \rightarrow p+\delta p \\
\varrho \rightarrow \varrho+\delta \varrho \\
\delta \mathbf{B}=0
\end{gathered}
$$




## Waves' Properties

## ALFVÉN WAVE

- Incompressional, i.e. $\delta p=0$
- Torsional/Transversal/Shear, i.e. $\delta \mathbf{B}(\| \mathbf{v}) \perp \mathbf{B}(\| \mathbf{k})$

SLOW/FAST MAGNETOSONIC WAVE

- Compressional, i.e. $\delta p=0$
- Longitudinal, i.e. $(\delta \mathbf{B}\|\mathbf{v}\| \mathbf{k}) \perp \mathbf{B}$



## (Radial) Self-similar models

Starting from Blandford \& Payne (1982), several self-similar models for accretion/wind/jet have been developed, with common characteristics.

| Paper | Gravity | Warm | Relativistic | MSP | AP | MFP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blandford \& Payne (1982) | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Li et al. (1992) |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Vlahakis et al. (2000) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Vlahakis \& Königl (2003a) |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Polko et al. (2010) |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Polko et al. (2013a) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |

- Assumptions:

■ ideal, time-independent MHD

- axisymmetry

■ zero azimuthal E-field

- no external forces (self-similarity)
- Uknown functions:
- $M(\theta)$
- $G(\theta)$
- $\psi(\theta)$
- $\xi(\theta)$



## Determinant Method

By writing the transfield equation and the derivative wrt $\theta$ of the energy equation as follows

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
A_{1} \frac{d M^{2}}{d \theta}+B_{1} \frac{d \psi}{d \theta}=C_{1} & \text { Energy eqn } \\
A_{2} \frac{d M^{2}}{d \theta}+B_{2} \frac{d \psi}{d \theta}=C_{2} & \text { Transfield eqn }
\end{array}
$$

where $A \mathrm{~s}, B \mathrm{~s}$ and $C \mathrm{~s}$ are functions of $\theta$ and all the unknown functions $M, \psi, G, \xi$. Combining them with the determinant method, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d M^{2}}{d \theta} & =\frac{C_{1} B_{2}-C_{2} B_{1}}{A_{1} B_{2}-A_{2} B_{1}} \quad \text { Wind eqn } \\
\frac{d \psi}{d \theta} & =\frac{A_{1} C_{2}-A_{2} C_{1}}{A_{1} B_{2}-A_{2} B_{1}} \quad \psi \text { eqn }
\end{aligned}
$$

: If gravity is accounted for, gravity terms are included in $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$.

## Solution's properties

- Complete regular solutions are crossing smoothly each of the singular point, MSP, AP, MFP.
■ Numerator and denominator of the wind equation cross zero in the same point at the same time.
■ When a solution crosses one of the point of interest, we can extrapolate information about the system (the velocity of the wave, the radius of the jet/wind, the position of the
shock/acceleration/recollimation region, etc.)



## Alfvén surface problem

The coefficients $A \mathrm{~s}, B \mathrm{~s}$ and $C \mathrm{~s}$ at the AS have singularities of the kind $0 / 0$, that can be eliminated applying de l'Hôpital rule. Unfortunately there are some problems left...

Simply by multiplying the eqns by the factor $f_{M x}=\left(1-M^{2}-x^{2}\right)$, we can easily demonstrate that the system collapse into a single eqn on AS

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \varnothing \frac{d M^{2}}{d \theta}+0 \frac{d \psi}{d \theta}=\varnothing \\
& \varnothing \frac{d M^{2}}{d \theta}+0 \frac{d \psi}{d \theta}=\varnothing
\end{aligned}
$$

therefore the determinant method doesn't hold on AS and the derivative of $\psi$ is not determined.

## Isolating the infinities

By noticing that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(A_{1, \infty}+A_{1, \varnothing}\right) \frac{d M^{2}}{d \theta}+B_{1} \frac{d \psi}{d \theta}=\left(C_{1, \infty}+C_{1, \varnothing}\right) \\
& \left(A_{2, \infty}+A_{2, \varnothing}\right) \frac{d M^{2}}{d \theta}+B_{2} \frac{d \psi}{d \theta}=\left(C_{2, \infty}+C_{2, \varnothing}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and, that after rearranging terms, we have

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left(A_{1, \infty} \frac{d M^{2}}{d \theta}-C_{1, \infty}\right)+A_{1, \nsim} \frac{d M^{2}}{d \theta}+B_{1} \frac{d \psi}{d \theta}=C_{1, \varnothing} \\
\left(A_{2, \infty} \frac{d M^{2}}{d \theta}-C_{2, \infty}\right)+A_{2, \nsim} \frac{d M^{2}}{d \theta}+B_{2} \frac{d \psi}{d \theta}=C_{2, \varnothing} \\
\Downarrow \\
\Downarrow \\
\left.\frac{d M^{2}}{d \theta}\right|_{A}=\left.\frac{C_{1, \infty}}{A_{1, \infty}}\right|_{A}=\left.\frac{C_{2, \infty}}{A_{2, \infty}}\right|_{A}=p_{A} \quad \text { ARC } \\
A_{1, \nsim} \frac{d M^{2}}{d \theta}+B_{1} \frac{d \psi}{d \theta}=C_{1, \varnothing} \\
A_{2, \nsim} \frac{d M^{2}}{d \theta}+B_{2} \frac{d \psi}{d \theta}=C_{2, \varnothing}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Currents status of the new solutions



## Conclusions

■ In most of the astrophysical systems we observe evidence of magnetized outflows/inflows of plasma
■ We study the phenomenon using the MHD approximation formalism.
■ Several approaches can be adopted to solve the MHD system of equation.
■ Self-similar model have some disadvantages amongst which the fuzzy parameter space seems to be the most difficult to overcome.

- Using the determinant method, removing by hand the singularity at the AP, gives us a few solutions, all of them in the same narrow region of the parameter space.
■ The new formulation of the equations that tries to handle the singularity at the AP and avoid using the determinant method, hopefully will provide a much larger number of solutions by allowing us to explore a wider region of the parameter space.

