

# Thesis

Lia Hankla

Advisor: James Stone. Co-advisor: Frans Pretorius

March 5, 2017

## Abstract

(what is accretion) When matter falls into black hole.. Accretion is efficient source of energy...would release XXX ergs of energy...so why don't we see this from black hole at center of galaxy? Such flows are called LLAGNs, ongoing theory. Typical calculations assume plasma is fluid model, But this type of accretion is hot, plasma is almost collisionless, so kinetic theory more appropriate. can we approximate the computationally-expensive kinetic theory with a fluid closure? We simulate using shearing box and find effective viscosity/resistivity....and find that [results]

# Contents

|          |                                                            |           |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>                                        | <b>3</b>  |
| 1.1      | AGN and Accretion Disk Observations . . . . .              | 3         |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Classification and Basic Physics of Accretion Disks</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| 2.1      | Mechanics . . . . .                                        | 4         |
| 2.2      | Angular Momentum Conservation in Ideal MHD . . . . .       | 4         |
| <b>3</b> | <b>History and Simulation of Accretion Disks</b>           | <b>8</b>  |
| 3.1      | Early Thoughts on Accretion . . . . .                      | 8         |
| 3.2      | Potential Sources of Turbulence . . . . .                  | 10        |
| 3.2.1    | Large Reynolds Number . . . . .                            | 10        |
| 3.2.2    | Convective and Self-gravitating Instabilities . . . . .    | 10        |
| 3.2.3    | Nonlocal Effects . . . . .                                 | 11        |
| 3.2.4    | Magnetic Fields . . . . .                                  | 11        |
| 3.3      | Post-MRI Discovery Developments . . . . .                  | 12        |
| 3.3.1    | Past Numerical Simulations . . . . .                       | 12        |
| 3.4      | Current Research . . . . .                                 | 12        |
| <b>A</b> | <b>Identities and Derivations?</b>                         | <b>13</b> |
| A.1      | Vector Identities . . . . .                                | 13        |
| A.2      | Cylindrical Coordinates . . . . .                          | 13        |

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

Black holes are now a popular fixture in science fiction books and movies. From tiny primordial black holes (XXXXXX) to

but things rarely fall radially inward. Usually the matter has some angular momentum. Since angular momentum is conserved, a disk usually forms around the black hole as a repository for rotating matter. Processes within the disk then lead to turbulence and an effective friction that results in an outward transport of angular momentum and hence the falling in, or “accretion”, of matter. For reasons discussed in Chapter ??, the infalling matter (mostly hydrogen) heats up past the ionization threshold. We shall thus refer to the matter as a plasma; different types of plasma and the effect on accretion flows will be discussed in Chapter ?. For now, we motivate this paper by noting that gravitational binding energy is released as matter falls into a black hole, a process that is among the most efficient energy sources in the universe (several hundred times more efficient than fusion [?]). This energy presumably goes into radiation and thus

These processes and the debate surrounding them are discussed throughout the paper, particularly

accretion=falling in. But how does accretion work?

Yay introduction.

### 1.1 AGN and Accretion Disk Observations

How explain low luminosity from AGN (Sgr A\*), x-ray binaries in quiescence  
\*rotation measure stability in Sgr A\* (Sharma, Quataert, Stone 2008)

## Chapter 2

# Classification and Basic Physics of Accretion Disks

### 2.1 Mechanics

### 2.2 Angular Momentum Conservation in Ideal MHD

\*\*\*\*\*STANDARDIZE NOTATION\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*adding 2.12 and 2.8 factor of 2??\*\*\*\*\*

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \vec{v}) = 0 \quad (2.1)$$

$$\rho \frac{\partial \vec{v}}{\partial t} + (\rho \vec{v} \cdot \nabla) \vec{v} = -\nabla \left( P + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right) - \rho \nabla \Phi + \left( \frac{\vec{B}}{4\pi} \cdot \nabla \right) \vec{B} \quad (2.2)$$

$$\frac{\partial \vec{B}}{\partial t} = \nabla \times (\vec{v} \times \vec{B}) \quad (2.3)$$

Although it can be re-distributed, angular momentum is ultimately conserved in ideal MHD systems. Since conservation of angular momentum is a central idea to the rest of this paper, this section will show how to achieve it from Eq. 2.2 (neglecting gravity). The basic idea is to multiply the  $\phi$ -component by  $R$  and re-arrange terms into conservative form, as per [?]. Before re-arranging, the full equation is

$$R \left[ \rho \frac{\partial \vec{v}}{\partial t} + (\rho \vec{v} \cdot \nabla) \vec{v} = -\nabla \left( P + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right) - \rho \nabla \Phi + \left( \frac{\vec{B}}{4\pi} \cdot \nabla \right) \vec{B} \right]_{\phi} \quad (2.4)$$

where the notation of  $[ ]_\phi$  indicates the  $\phi$ -component of the expression in square brackets. It is best to continue term-by-term.

The density terms are rather straightforward:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[ R\rho \frac{\partial \vec{v}}{\partial t} \right]_\phi &= R\rho \frac{\partial v_\phi}{\partial t} \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (R\rho v_\phi) - v_\phi R \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (R\rho v_\phi) + v_\phi R \nabla \cdot (\rho \vec{v}) \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (R\rho v_\phi) + \nabla \cdot (R\rho v_\phi \vec{v}) - \rho \vec{v} \cdot \nabla (v_\phi R) \quad (2.5)
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second line, the continuity equation 2.1 was used and in the fourth, the identity A.1 was used. Now we look more closely at the last term on the right:

$$\rho \vec{v} \cdot \nabla (v_\phi R) = \rho \left( v_R v_\phi + R v_R \frac{\partial v_\phi}{\partial R} + v_\phi \frac{\partial v_\phi}{\partial \phi} + R v_z \frac{\partial v_\phi}{\partial z} \right) \quad (2.6)$$

However, this is exactly the  $\phi$ -component of  $(R\rho \vec{v} \cdot \nabla) \vec{v}$ , as can be seen by Eq. A.3. Adding Eqns. 2.5 and 2.6, we have:

$$R\rho \frac{\partial v_\phi}{\partial t} + [R(\rho \vec{v} \cdot \nabla) \vec{v}]_\phi = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (R\rho v_\phi) + \nabla \cdot (R\rho v_\phi \vec{v}) \quad (2.7)$$

which is in conservative form.

The pressure term is straightforward:

The magnetic terms require more insight. Here we introduce the poloidal magnetic field; that is, the components of the magnetic field in the  $R$ - and  $z$ -directions. Thus  $B^2 = B_p^2 + B_\phi^2$  and  $B_p^2 = B_R^2 + B_z^2$ . Beginning with the magnetic pressure term,

$$\begin{aligned}
[R\nabla B^2]_\phi &= \hat{e}_\phi \cdot [R\nabla B^2] \\
&= \hat{e}_\phi \cdot [R\nabla B_p^2 + R\nabla B_\phi^2] \\
&= \hat{e}_\phi \cdot [R\nabla B_p^2] + \frac{1}{R} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} (R B_\phi^2) \\
&= \hat{e}_\phi \cdot [\nabla (R B_p^2)] + 2 B_\phi \frac{\partial B_\phi}{\partial \phi}
\end{aligned}$$

where we can move  $R$  into the derivative because  $\partial R/\partial\phi = 0$ . Now, we add zero via the term  $\nabla \cdot \hat{e}_\phi$ :

$$\begin{aligned} [R\nabla B^2]_\phi &= \hat{e}_\phi \cdot \left[ RB_p^2 \nabla \cdot \hat{e}_\phi + \hat{e}_\phi \cdot \nabla (RB_p^2) + 2B_\phi \frac{\partial B_\phi}{\partial\phi} \right] \\ &= \nabla \cdot (RB_p^2 \hat{e}_\phi) + 2B_\phi \frac{\partial B_\phi}{\partial\phi} \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

where Eq. A.1 was used in the last line. We have thus achieved part of the conservative form, but with an extra  $\partial B_\phi^2/\partial\phi$  term. We now turn to the magnetic tension term in hopes that it will cancel this extra term. First, however, we note using  $\nabla \cdot \vec{B} = 0$  and the definition of  $\vec{B}_p$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot \vec{B}_p &= \nabla \cdot (\vec{B} - B_\phi \hat{e}_\phi) \\ &= -\nabla \cdot (B_\phi \hat{e}_\phi) \\ &= -\frac{1}{R} \frac{\partial B_\phi}{\partial\phi} \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

The magnetic tension term becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ R(\vec{B} \cdot \nabla \vec{B}) \right]_\phi &= RB_R \frac{\partial B_\phi}{\partial R} + B_\phi \frac{\partial B_\phi}{\partial\phi} + RB_z \frac{\partial B_\phi}{\partial z} + B_R B_\phi \\ &= \left[ B_R \left( R \frac{\partial B_\phi}{\partial R} + B_\phi \right) + B_z R \frac{\partial B_\phi}{\partial z} \right] + B_\phi \frac{\partial B_\phi}{\partial\phi} \\ &= (B_R, 0, B_z) \cdot \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial R}(RB_\phi), 0, \frac{\partial}{\partial z}(RB_\phi) \right) + B_\phi \frac{\partial B_\phi}{\partial\phi} \\ &= \vec{B}_p \cdot \nabla (RB_\phi) + B_\phi \frac{\partial B_\phi}{\partial\phi} \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Using Eq. 2.9, we add zero and draw out a total divergence:

$$\left[ R(\vec{B} \cdot \nabla \vec{B}) \right]_\phi = \vec{B}_p \cdot \nabla (RB_\phi) - RB_\phi \nabla \cdot \vec{B}_p + 2B_\phi \frac{\partial B_\phi}{\partial\phi} \quad (2.11)$$

$$= \nabla \cdot (RB_\phi \vec{B}_p) + 2B_\phi \frac{\partial B_\phi}{\partial\phi} \quad (2.12)$$

where Eq. A.1 was used in the last line. Armed with each individual term, we combine them (Eqs. 2.7, 2.8, and 2.12) to find the conservative form of

the angular momentum equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[ R\rho \frac{\partial \vec{v}}{\partial t} + R(\rho \vec{v} \cdot \nabla) \vec{v} + R \nabla P + R \nabla \frac{B^2}{8\pi} - R \left( \frac{\vec{B}}{4\pi} \cdot \nabla \right) \vec{B} \right]_{\phi} = \\
& \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (R\rho v_{\phi}) + \nabla \cdot (R\rho v_{\phi} \vec{v}) + PRESSURE \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{8\pi} \left[ \nabla \cdot (RB_p^2 \hat{e}_{\phi}) + 2B_{\phi} \frac{\partial B_{\phi}}{\partial \phi} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - 2\nabla \cdot (RB_{\phi} \vec{B}_p) - 2B_{\phi} \frac{\partial B_{\phi}}{\partial \phi} \right] \\
& = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (R\rho v_{\phi}) + \nabla \cdot R \left[ \rho v_{\phi} \vec{v} + PRESSURE + \frac{B_p^2}{8\pi} \hat{e}_{\phi} - \left( \frac{B_{\phi} \vec{B}_p}{4\pi} \right) \right] \\
& \hspace{25em} (2.13)
\end{aligned}$$

## Chapter 3

# History and Simulation of Accretion Disks

This chapter examines the development of the theory behind accretion disks, with the ultimate goal of framing the past and current research on accretion disks. Due to the complexity of the equations involved (see Chapter ??), numerical simulations play an integral role in understanding accretion flows. However, said complexity also means that the power of numerical simulations to resolve interesting features has been and is limited by the computational ability and algorithms utilized. The theory and numerical simulations of accretion disks have thus evolved in step, with new insights coming from both sides. As such, it is difficult to disentangle the pure theory from the numerical simulations and the following chapter does not attempt to do so. It is instead an intertwined, mostly chronological account that showcases the thought processes and impetus behind new developments.

We first trace back to some of the early ideas of accretion disks and how they were formed (Section 3.1), leading into Section ??’s discussion of possible sources of turbulence and then Section ??’s modern hypotheses and what this means for the original research of this paper (e.g. Chapter ??).

### 3.1 Early Thoughts on Accretion

The study of accretion in the modern era emerged from simpler questions than that of AGN luminosity. In 1941, Kuiper [?] recognized the formation of a disk during mass transfer in a binary-star system, while Hoyle and Lyttleton [?] attributed the climatic variation on Earth to the accretion of



interstellar matter around the sun. Once compact x-ray sources such as AGNs were actually observed, the role of disks in the production of radiation was explored more thoroughly [?]. At first, however, the basic physics of accretion disks was under discussion.

As mentioned in Section ??, accretion involves the outward transport of angular momentum, which means the slowing down of particles as they drop into closer orbits (Section ??). It seems natural to explain this slowing down via friction; in an accretion disk (or torus), the matter at different radii are not moving at the same velocity (i.e. there is a shear) and hence one might think that there is a sort of coefficient of kinetic friction between particles that slows down their movement and causes them to accrete. The idea that this “molecular” or “shear” viscosity could explain accretion rates was tempting, but not supported by simulations. Early simulations solving the MHD equations for a disk showed accretion rates on the order of XXXXXXXXXX (CITE: XXXXXXXXSTILL need some simulations showing molecular rates!!XXXXXXXXXXxx), XXXXXXXxalso observations!XXXXXXXXx; however, according to the standard values of molecular viscosity (in, for example, [?]XXXXXXXX make sure cite format right), the standard values of molecular viscosity are around XXXXXXXx. This fantastic difference between theory and simulations resulted in several new ideas for explaining the transport of angular momentum and led to the formulation of one of the most well-known models for thin disks—the  $\alpha$ -disk.

The seminal paper of [?] Xmake sure format right!!!XXXXXx explores accretion disks in the context of a binary star system. It essentially characterizes ignorance in the accretion rate via the parameter  $\alpha$ , defining the tangential stress  $w_{r\phi} = \alpha \rho v_s^2$ , where  $v_s$  is the sound speed such that  $\rho v_s^2/2$  is the disk matter’s thermal energy density, although definitions vary to order unity across sources [?]. This formulation temporarily removed the need to explain the source of the viscosity and provides a parameter that is easy to tweak in numerical simulations. Although the original paper takes  $\alpha$  as a constant for simplicity, it is generally a function of radius. The relevance of the  $\alpha$  parameter is apparent even today, as it is a simple way to gain intuition in accretion problems despite its debated value [?].

Despite its intuitive usefulness, the  $\alpha$  prescription offers no mechanism for the transport of angular momentum. XXXXXXXXXX proposed that, while pure molecular viscosity could not explain the observed accretion rates, an “effective” viscosity due to eddy interaction could do the job [?]. In other

words, turbulence would generate eddies whose interactions would manifest similar to a viscosity. The problem became to find the source of the turbulence that would lead to outward angular momentum transport. This question is the subject of the next section.

## 3.2 Potential Sources of Turbulence

Supposing that an effective viscosity generated by turbulence can explain observed and simulated accretion rates, the question becomes: what causes this turbulence?

### 3.2.1 Large Reynolds Number

Some, influenced by laboratory fluid mechanics, believed that the sheer property of having a high Reynolds number (the product of a characteristic velocity and length scale divided by the viscosity; huge in astrophysical flows due to the large length scales involved) satisfactorily accounted for the needed turbulence. The mechanism at hand is called “vortex stretching”: due to vortex conservation, the stretching of vortices in a shear flow increases the circulation velocity around the vortex tube. This allows for free energy to be extracted from the shear flow [?].

Others, however, suspected that, at least in accretion disks, the flow was fundamentally different than those shear flows explored in the aforementioned fluid mechanics labs. Indeed, as demonstrated nicely in [?] and reproduced in Section ??, Keplerian flows are stable against perturbations (i.e. experience no turbulence) where shear flows are not (given the Rayleigh stability criterion is satisfied). The difference is due to epicycles in Keplerian flows, which sink the energy that would otherwise devolve into prominent disturbances. A high Reynolds number is not enough to explain the necessary turbulence.

### 3.2.2 Convective and Self-gravitating Instabilities

Convective instabilities were long considered as possibly leading to turbulence in accretion disks. After all, the Schwarzschild condition...

### 3.2.3 Nonlocal Effects

If the mechanism for producing turbulence were global, its effect would not be captured by a local viscosity parameter. [?] mentions several possibilities for generating turbulence this way, including waves and shocks created by tidal forces. These effects can produce accretion at rates up to  $\alpha = .01$ , but only in hot disks. Global disk winds, of the type suggested by [?]XXformat?XX, could also transport angular momentum. These magnetically-driven winds could theoretically sweep matter around in such a way as to account for the high accretion rates without a viscosity while also helping account for AGN jets [?]; however, the presence of these winds in all accretion disks is debated. A more universal and fundamental explanation seems more likely.

### 3.2.4 Magnetic Fields

Magnetic fields were thought to serve an amplifying role in turbulence transport. That is, with pre-existing turbulence, magnetic fields would tangle and speed along the transportation of magnetic fields [?]. It was thought that the magnetic pressure and pressure due to turbulence were distinct, and that magnetic pressure would be insignificant in disk situations [?], or would require large magnetic fields on the order of  $10^7 - 10^8$  G to balance the gravitational pressure of infalling gas [?]. The magnetic field was mainly considered to be important due to consequences of cyclotron radiation as a cooling mechanism [?]. It was not until the early 1990s that the full significance of magnetic fields was appreciated.

In 1991, Balbus and Hawley [?, ?] closed the conceptual circle by showing that turbulence resulted directly from a weak magnetic field. Pre-existing turbulence was not needed; the entire sequence of generating turbulence and transporting turbulence and angular momentum could be derived as a result of a linear instability in the MHD equations (see Section ??). Numerous numerical simulations have since confirmed the important role of magnetic fields in accretion processes. The next section will give an overview of these numerical simulations and thereby place the simulations in section ?? in context.

### 3.3 Post-MRI Discovery Developments

#### 3.3.1 Past Numerical Simulations

shearing box artificial viscosity numerical viscosity/resistivity

why reproduce stone pringle2001...

\*\*lead into accretion theory? then MRI?

### 3.4 Current Research

GR simulations Foucart et al 2016 Still 2D! Including 2-temperature model, as discussed inXXx. Sadowski et al 2016 Outflows and jets (Bu, Wu, Yuan 2016) still no 3d mti rotating? parrish stone=nonrotating?

## Chapter 4

# Plasma Astrophysics Theory

Distribution function, MHD equations, kinetic, vlasov eq.

### 4.1 MRI Basics

The magnetorotational instability (MRI) is a linear instability of the ideal magnetohydrodynamic equations that leads to increased outward angular momentum transport, hence providing the driving mechanism for accretion. In section ?? the linear analysis itself will be provided; section ?? will discuss a more physical picture.

#### 4.1.1 MRI Derivation

The MRI arises out of a simple linear analysis of the ideal MHD equations as outlined in section ??.

#### 4.1.2 MRI Spring Analogy

#### 4.1.3 MRI in Shear and Keplerian Flows

## Appendix A

# Identities and Derivations?

There is lots of appendices.

### A.1 Vector Identities

This section is just for useful identities. A good reference is the NRL Plasma Formulary [?].

$$\nabla \left( f \vec{A} \right) = f \nabla \cdot \vec{A} + \vec{A} \cdot \nabla f \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\nabla \quad (\text{A.2})$$

### A.2 Cylindrical Coordinates

Components of

$$\left[ \left( \vec{A} \cdot \nabla \right) \vec{B} \right]_{\phi} = \quad (\text{A.3})$$