Can Hall Magnetohydrodynamics explain plasma turbulence at sub-ion scales?
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ABSTRACT

We investigate the properties of plasma turbulence by means of two-dimensional (2D) Hall-magnetohydrodynamic (HMHD) and hybrid particle-in-cell (HPIC) numerical simulations. We find that HMHD simulations exhibit spectral properties that are in most cases in agreement with the results of the HPIC simulations and with solar wind observations. Once turbulence is fully developed, the energy spectra of magnetic fluctuations exhibit a Kolmogorov cascade of spectral index $-5/3$ at MHD scales and a power-law with a spectral index of $-3$ at kinetic scales, while velocity fluctuations exhibit a power-law spectrum of slope $-3/2$ at MHD scales. The spectral break between the MHD and the kinetic scales is located at the same scale in both simulations. In the MHD range the residual energy has a steeper spectrum than that one of the total energy. Their slopes satisfy the fast Alfvén-dynamo balance in both simulations. The development of a turbulent cascade is concurrently characterized by magnetic reconnection events taking place in thin current sheets that form between large eddies. A statistical analysis reveals that reconnection is qualitatively the same and fast in both the HMHD and HPIC models, characterized by inverse reconnection rates much smaller than the characteristic nonlinear time associated to the large eddies. The agreement extends to other statistical properties, such as the kurtosis of the magnetic field. Moreover, the observation of a direct energy transfer from the large vortices to the small sub-ion scales triggered by magnetic reconnection, further supports the existence of a reconnection-mediated turbulent regime at kinetic scales. We conclude that the Hall-MHD fluid description captures to a large extent the transition of the turbulent cascade between the large MHD scales and the sub-ion scales.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Understanding the mechanisms responsible for transferring magnetic and kinetic energy from large to small scales in weakly collisional plasmas is of great interest in space, astrophysical, and laboratory plasmas, since such mechanisms are relevant in many fundamental processes: the formation of hot coronae, the heating and acceleration of stellar winds and their interaction with planetary magnetospheres, the acceleration of particles, and explosive phenomena such as solar flares and coronal mass ejections, to name a few. Indeed, in hot rarefied plasmas collisions between particles are not efficient in dissipating energy at scales above the particle’s characteristic kinetic scale, namely the ion (electron) Larmor and demagnetisation scales. This is the case of, e.g., the solar wind and the Earth’s magnetosheath. In-situ spacecraft observations with high spatial and temporal resolution (see, e.g., Chen et al. 2013b; Chen & Boldyrev 2017) have shown that the magnetic energy spectrum follows a Kolmogorov’s power-law cascade at scales larger than the ion kinetic length scales. As the cascade approaches these scales, namely the ion inertial length $d_i$ or the ion gyroradius, the one-fluid magnetohydrodynamic description breaks and nonlinear interac-
turbulent cascade in the sub-ion range is associated to the formation of small-scale reconnecting current sheets, which rapidly transfer the magnetofluid energy at small scales thus speeding up the nonlinear coupling (Franci et al. 2017). Finally, analyses of HPIC simulations based on the von Karman-Howarth equations indicate that, to some extent, the MHD cascade continues at sub-ion scales via the Hall term (Hellinger et al. 2018).

The main goal of this work is to check whether a fluid model that allows for the formation of small scales coherent structures, such as current sheets, can reproduce spectra steeper than what expected by simpler phenomenological models, without the need to include purely kinetic effects. To that purpose, we performed a 2D high resolution Hall-MHD (HMHD) simulation for a warm polytropic plasma and compared the outcome with analogous results obtained from a HPIC simulation.

Our results suggest that the main processes for the formation of steeper spectra involve the formation of coherent small-scales structures and are consistent with reconnection-mediated intermittent models of turbulence, such as that proposed by Mallet et al. (2017), Loureiro & Boldyrev (2017), and Boldyrev & Perez (2012).

2. HALL-MHD SIMULATIONS: NUMERICAL SETUP

Our model integrates the viscous-resistive MHD equations but retaining the Hall term in the induction equation, that is, by substituting the fluid velocity \( \mathbf{v} \) with the electron velocity \( \mathbf{v}_e = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{J}/en_e \). In their adimensionalized form, the HMHD equations read

\[
\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) = 0, \\
\rho (\partial_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v} = -\nabla P + (\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \times \mathbf{B} \\
+ \nu \left[ \Delta \mathbf{v} + \frac{1}{3} \nabla (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \right], \\
(\partial_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) T = (\Gamma - 1) \left\{ - (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) T + \eta \frac{\nabla \times \mathbf{B}}{\rho} \right\}^2 \\
+ \frac{\nu}{\rho} \left[ (\nabla \times \mathbf{v})^2 + \frac{4}{3} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla)^2 \right], \\
\partial_t \mathbf{B} = \nabla \times (\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}) + \eta \nabla^2 \mathbf{B} \\
- \frac{\eta T}{\rho} \nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\nabla \times \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}}{\rho} \right),
\]

where \( \Gamma = 5/3 \) is the adiabatic index and the variables retain their usual meaning. All quantities are renormalized using \( L = d_i \) as characteristic length and with respect to a field amplitude \( B_0 \), a density \( \rho_0 \), an Alfvén speed \( c_A = B_0/\sqrt{4\pi\rho_0} = \Omega_i d_i \), a pressure \( P_0 = \rho_0 c_A^2 \), and a temperature \( T_0 = (k_B/m_i)P_0/\rho_0 \).
Here, the adimensional magnetic resistivity \( \eta \) is in units of \( d_i c_A \) and the Hall coefficient \( \eta_H = d_i/L \) is equal to 1. \( \Omega_i = e B_0 / m_i c \) is the ion-cyclotron angular frequency and \( m_i \) is the mass of the ions.

The equations (1-4) are numerically solved by using the code we employed for studies of magnetic reconnection (Landi et al. 2015; Papini et al. 2018), modified to include periodic boundaries in all directions. We consider a 2D \((x,y)\) periodic domain and use Fourier decomposition to calculate the spatial derivatives. In Fourier space we also filter according to the 2/3 Orszag rule, to avoid aliasing of the nonlinear terms. Time integration is performed via a 3rd-order Runge-Kutta scheme. The other code employed in this work is the Lagrangian hybrid particle-in-cell (HPIC) code CAMELIA (Matthews 1994; Franci et al. 2018a), which has been successfully used for numerical studies of plasma turbulence (Franci et al. 2015b,a, 2016b,a, 2017), and it reproduced many of the spectral properties observed in the solar wind (Franci et al. 2018a).

The numerical setup used in this work is the same as in the HPIC simulation of Franci et al. (2017), in order to allow a straightforward comparison between HMHD and HPIC results. We consider a 2D box of size \( L_x \times L_y = 256 d_i \times 256 d_i \) and a grid resolution of \( \Delta x = \Delta y = d_i/8 \), corresponding to 2048\(^2\) points. Out of the plane, along the \( z \) direction (identified as the parallel direction), we set a background constant magnetic field \( B_0 \), which we refer to as the mean field. The initial state is populated by freely-decaying large-amplitude Alfvénic fluctuations in the \( xy \)-plane perpendicular to the mean field and up to the injection scale \( \ell_{\text{inj}} = 2 \pi d_i / \ell_{\text{inj}} \), with \( k_{\perp} \ell_{\text{inj}} \simeq 0.2 \), where \( k_{\perp} = \sqrt{k_x^2 + k_y^2} \). The root-mean-square (rms) amplitude of these fluctuations is set to \( b_{\text{rms}} = B_{\text{rms}} / B_0 \simeq 0.24 \). In the HPIC reference simulation, the plasma beta for ions and electrons and the magnetic resistivity were set to the values \( \beta_i = \beta_e = 1 \) and \( \eta = 5 \times 10^{-4} \) respectively. In HMHD we set the plasma beta \( \beta = \beta_i + \beta_e = 2 \) accordingly. Instead, for the resistivity, we employ \( \eta = 10^{-3} \), i.e., twice the value of the hybrid simulation. We also set the viscosity to the same value.

3. ROLE OF MAGNETIC RECONNECTION IN DEVELOPING TURBULENCE

The initial Alfvénic fluctuations quickly evolve to form vortices and localized current sheets, which then shrink down to a critical width of the order of \( d_i \) in about 30 Alfvén times \( \tau_A = d_i/c_A = \Omega_i^{-1} \). These current sheets quickly disrupt, due to the onset of fast magnetic reconnection processes, generating a variety of small scale magnetic islands and fluctuations that are fed back into the turbulent surrounding. As an example, Figure 1 shows a contour plot of the out-of-plane current density, \( J_z \), at \( t = 45 \tau_A \), right after the first reconnection events have been observed, for both the HPIC and the HMHD runs. In particular, a zoom on two current sheets (small panels) reveal a plasmoid-chain structure, a characteristic footprint of the tearing instability (see, e.g., Loureiro et al. 2007; Papini et al. 2018). As the system evolves, other reconnection events take place in newly formed current sheets, until turbulence is fully developed.

To quantitatively support the above description, we analyzed in detail the reconnection events in both simulations. A reconnection event is identified by a magnetic X-point and its nearest O-point in a current sheet. For each event we calculated the reconnection rate

\[
\gamma_{\text{rec}} = \frac{1}{\Phi_{\text{rec}} X} \frac{\partial \Phi_{\text{rec}} X}{\partial t},
\]

that is, the logarithmic derivative of the reconnected magnetic flux density \( \Phi_{\text{rec}} X \) between the X-point and the O-point, i.e., the difference in the out-of-plane vector potential between those points, \( \Phi_{\text{rec}} X = A_{\perp}^X - A_{\perp}^X \). Figure 2 shows the temporal evolution of the distribution of reconnection rates for the HMHD run (a) and the HPIC run (b), together with the maximum of \( |J| \) (c) and the root-mean-square (rms) of the current density \( J \) (d). For the HMHD run, the first reconnection events are detected at \( t \approx 30 \tau_A \) and concurrently with the first maximum of \( |J| \) (marked by a vertical dashed line), which is a proxy for reconnection events (Franci et al. 2017). The reconnection rates follow a lognormal distribution, with a mean value of \( \langle \gamma_{\text{rec}} \rangle = 0.08 \Omega_i \) (red solid line). As the system evolves, this value remains roughly constant and correspond to an average reconnection time \( \langle \tau_{\text{rec}} \rangle = 1/\langle \gamma_{\text{rec}} \rangle \approx 12.8 \tau_A \). We note however that a significant fraction (roughly 22\%) of the reconnection events has a reconnection time smaller than the average, and 10\% of the reconnection events are very fast, with \( \tau_{\text{rec}} < 6 \tau_A \). After the maximum of turbulent activity is reached, i.e., after the maximum of rms\(|J|\) (Mininni & Pouquet 2009) at \( t \approx 165 \tau_A \), the number of reconnection events decreases.

Magnetic reconnection modifies the turbulent properties at kinetic scales soon after the first reconnection events are detected. This is made evident by looking at the nonlinear time associated to turbulence, that is the eddy turnover time. Such a characteristic time at a given scale is estimated as \( \tau_{\text{eddy}}(k_\perp) = (k_\perp v_e(k_\perp))^{-1} \), where \( v_e(k_\perp) \) is the electron velocity at the scale \( k_\perp \). The use of this definition unifies the classic definition at MHD scales (where the electron velocity equals the fluid velocity) and the definition of the nonlinear time
Figure 1. Coloured contours of the out-of-plane current density $J_\parallel$, for the HMHD and the HPIC simulations at $t = 45 \tau_A$, in the whole grid (big panels on the left) and in a subgrid containing one reconnecting current sheet (small panels on the right). Color scales are saturated to ±0.5 for easy visualization of the structures.

Figure 2. Time evolution of the reconnection rates $\gamma_{\text{rec}}/\Omega_i$ for the HMHD (a) and the HPIC run (b): coloured contours indicate the distribution of reconnection events, horizontal solid red lines denote the average reconnection rate, and the dashed red lines denote 10th and 90th percentiles respectively. Time evolution of the maximum of $|J|$ (c), and of the rms value of $J$ (d). In all plots, the vertical dashed and dot dashed lines mark the first maximum in $|J|$ of the HMHD run and the HPIC run respectively.

Figure 3. Coloured contours of the characteristic nonlinear time $\tau_{nl}(k_\perp)$ as a function of wavenumber $k_\perp$ (scale $\ell$) and time $t$. The right axis denotes the corresponding scale $\ell = 2\pi/k_\perp$. The red contour line highlights the scale at which the nonlinear time equals the average reconnection time. The white area denotes the region where the nonlinear time exceeds 1000$\tau_A$. The horizontal dotted line indicates the injection scale.

at kinetic scales. Figure 3 shows a contour plot of the nonlinear time as a function of time and wavenumber. Here one can identify three distinct phases: an early evolutionary phase ($0 \leq t\Omega_i \lesssim 30$) in which the initial configuration relaxes and the first vortices and current sheets are formed, a transient phase ($30 \lesssim t\Omega_i \lesssim 50$) triggered by the first reconnection events, and a third phase ($50 \lesssim t\Omega_i$) characterized by slowly evolving values of $\tau_{nl}(k_\perp)$ that lasts until the end of the simulation. In the first phase, at the beginning, the scale with the smallest value of $\tau_{nl}(k_\perp)$ is the injection scale $\ell_{\text{inj}}$.
(marked by the horizontal dotted line). As the system evolves and the energy gets redistributed, the nonlinear time at scales above the injection scale increases, while at the scales right below the injection scale the nonlinear time slightly decreases, due to the development of a direct cascade. At small scales and before the first reconnection events are detected \( t \lesssim 30 \tau_A \), the nonlinear time is very large, since there is no relevant amount of energy at those scales yet. As soon as reconnection is triggered, the second phase begins. The energy is directly transferred to the smallest scales accessible (the 2/3 cutoff scale), where \( \tau_{nl}(k_L) \) suddenly decreases. Then, during a transient phase that last between \( t \Omega_i \simeq 30 \) and \( t \Omega_i \simeq 50 \) (characterized by almost vertical isocontour lines of \( \tau_{nl}(k_L) \)). See, e.g., the red contour line, the energy is fed to larger and larger scales. We interpret this as an “inverse cascade” due to coalescence of magnetic islands (Finn & Kaw 1977), which we also observe in the real space at the reconnection sites. During this transient, the number of reconnection events increases very rapidly and reaches a statistically stationary value at about \( t \Omega_i = 50 \). After this transient, the nonlinear time \( \tau_{nl}(k_L) \) changes only slightly and then becomes roughly constant at \( t \Omega_i \gtrsim 150 \), indicating that a stationary turbulent state has been reached (see Section 4). Figure 3 provides a direct quantitative evidence of the ability of magnetic reconnection to influence the dynamics of turbulence at kinetic scales.

The evolution in the HPIC simulation is qualitatively the same, though the first reconnection events are triggered at a slightly later time \( t \simeq 40 \tau_A \) and the distribution of the reconnection rates is broader, with an average reconnection rate \( \langle \gamma_{rec} \rangle = 0.22 \Omega_i \), roughly three times the one of the HMHD run. We believe that nongyrotrropic ion effects decrease the amplitude of the out-of-plane ion velocity \( \mathbf{v}_{i,\parallel} \) at the reconnection sites in the HPIC simulation, thus increasing the reconnection rate, as demonstrated by Yin et al. (2002). Indeed, in the current sheets of Fig.1 we measured an amplitude of \( \mathbf{v}_{i,\parallel} \) at the X-points in the HPIC run that is roughly 1/3 of that in the HMHD run.

Note that the maximum of turbulent activity in the HPIC run is reached later, at about \( t \simeq 200 \tau_A \), due to the smaller value of the resistivity employed, which sets a dissipation scale smaller than the one in the HMHD run, thus increasing the time needed to fully develop a turbulent cascade.

4. INTERMITTENCY AND SPECTRAL PROPERTIES IN FULLY DEVELOPED TURBULENCE

From the previous section we conclude that, despite the differences in the numerical approaches and the theoretical models, the HMHD and the HPIC simulations have remarkable similarities. The most interesting agreement is found in the spectral properties.

Figure 4 shows the omnidirectional power spectra of magnetic and velocity fluctuations of both the HPIC and the HMHD run, at the time when turbulence has fully developed and the rms of \( \mathbf{J} \) reached its maximum. We remind that the fluid velocity \( \mathbf{v} \) in the HMHD description corresponds to the ion bulk velocity \( \mathbf{v}_i \) of the HPIC model. After the maximum, the spectra remain quite stable. At MHD scales, we observe a Kolmogorov-like cascade with slope \(-5/3\) in the magnetic field fluctuations [Fig. 4(a)], while the power spectrum of the fluid (ion) velocity field fluctuations is flatter, with a spectral index of about \(-3/2\) [Fig. 4(b)]. This is in agreement with solar wind observations (Chen et al. 2011).

A transition occurs at ion kinetic scales, where the magnetic field steepens following a power-law of \(-3\). The HPIC and HMHD power spectra of total magnetic field fluctuations [Fig. 4(a)] almost perfectly match at all scales, from the injection scale (vertical dotted line) down to the scale where the HMHD spectrum has the filter’s cutoff at 2/3 of the Nyquist frequency (vertical dashed line) and the HPIC spectrum rises due to numerical noise. The location of the spectral break at \( k_L d_i \simeq 2 \) also matches. The agreement extends to the spectra of the parallel magnetic fluctuations (not shown here).

For the spectra of parallel magnetic fluctuations [Fig. 4(c)] we find some compelling differences. At kinetic scales, the parallel magnetic field spectra have the same quantitative and qualitative behavior, though the HPIC spectrum of \( \mathbf{B}_|| \) is compatible with a power law of spectral index \(-2.8\), while the HMHD spectrum of \( \mathbf{B}_\parallel \) is more compatible with a value of \(-3\). At MHD scales the two spectra are different. There the HMHD spectrum of \( \mathbf{B}_|| \) is coupled to the spectrum of parallel velocity fluctuations (blue solid curve), thus suggesting that parallel Alfvénic fluctuations give the dominant contribution. In the HPIC case (dashed curves) such a coupling is not present. This picture is reversed in the spectra of the perpendicular velocity fluctuations [Fig. 4(b)]; at MHD scales and for both the HMHD and the HPIC simulations we recover a power law cascade of spectral index \(-3/2\). At kinetic scales \( (k_L d_i > 1) \) the two spectra diverge, due to the lacking ability of Hall-MHD to model ion kinetic effects.

In the MHD range of the HMHD run \((0.3 \lesssim k_L d_i \lesssim 1)\) we obtain a residual energy spectrum \( E_R = P_{\mathbf{B}} - P_v \) consistent with a slope of \(-2\) [Fig. 4(d)] and a total energy
Grappin et al. (2016) proposed that the residual energy to be flatter than found in the HMHD run causes its total energy spectrum in the parallel component of velocity fluctuations the former agrees with the HPIC results [15], the higher $k$ of $= 165$ Isotropized power spectra Figure 4. Isotropized power spectra $P(k_{\perp})$ as a function of $k_{\perp} = \sqrt{k_{x}^2 + k_{y}^2}$ from the HMHD run (solid curves) at $t = 165 \, \tau_A$ and from the HPIC run (dashed curves) at $t = 200 \, \tau_A$, of total magnetic field (a) and perpendicular ion velocity (b) fluctuations, and of parallel magnetic field and parallel velocity fluctuations (c). The vertical dotted, dashed, and dot-dashed lines denote the injection scale $k_{inj} \cdot d_i \approx 0.2$, the 2/3 filter’s cutoff of the HMHD model, and the Nyquist wavenumber respectively. Black dashed lines denote Reference slopes. Panel (d) shows the residual energy spectrum $E_{R} = P_{B} - P_{v_{||}}$, compensated by $k_{\perp}^2$, from the HMHD simulation.

spectrum $E_{T} = P_{B} + P_{v} \propto k_{\perp}^{-3/2}$ [Fig. 4(e)]. While the former agrees with the HPIC results [15], the higher energy in the parallel component of velocity fluctuations found in the HMHD run causes its total energy spectrum to be flatter than $-5/3$. Müller & Grappin (2005) and Grappin et al. (2016) proposed that the residual energy spectrum and the total energy spectrum are related by a balance between a local dynamo effect and an Alfvénic coupling. Their relation reads:

$$E_{R}/E_{T} \approx A (t_{A}/t_{nl})^{\alpha}$$

where the Alfvén time $t_{A} = 1/(k_{\perp} b_{rms})$ is built on the large-scale magnetic fluctuations, $t_{nl} = 1/(k_{\perp} \sqrt{k_{\perp} E_{T}})$ is calculated using the total energy spectrum, the exponent on the r.h.s indicates a fast ($\alpha = 1$) or slow ($\alpha = 2$) Alfvénic coupling, and $A$ is a constant of order 1. The above spectral slopes at the peak of the turbulent activity suggest a different scenario for the HPIC ($\alpha = 1$) and for the HMHD ($\alpha = 2$) runs. By comparing the l.h.s. and the r.h.s. of Eq. (6) at different times, we found that in HPIC the exponent $\alpha = 1$ reproduces the slope of the ratio $E_{R}/E_{T}$ at all times past the peak of turbulent activity. On the contrary, in HMHD, the exponent increases steadily from 2 to 3. This is due to the behavior of the parallel components in HMHD. Infact, the exponent matching the slope of the ratio $E_{R}/E_{T}$ is stable also in HMHD when only the perpendicular components of magnetic and velocity fluctuations are used, and in the following we will restrict our analysis to those components (i.e., we redefine $E_{R} = P_{B_{\perp}} - P_{v_{\perp}}$ and $E_{T} = P_{B_{\perp}} + P_{v_{\perp}}$). In Fig. 5, the l.h.s. of eq. (6), averaged for about $1.5$ large-eddy turnover times, is shown for the HPIC (top) and the HMHD (bottom) in thick solid lines, along with the average of the r.h.s. with $\alpha = 1, 2$ (thin solid and dashed lines, respectively). The thick and thin solid lines are parallel in the MHD range ($0.3 \lesssim k_{\perp} d_{i} \lesssim 1$) for both simulations, thus supporting a fast scenario ($\alpha = 1$), while the slow scenario ($\alpha = 2$, dashed lines) has a steeper power law. Note that although the ratio $E_{R}/E_{T}$ has a different power-law index (the ratio is compensated with different indexes in the two figures), the coefficients $A \approx 3$ and $\alpha = 1$ are the same in both simulations.

Finally, we focus on the intermittent properties of the two simulations. Localized current sheets and other coherent structures are intimately related to intermittency, that is the departure from Kolmogorov self-similarity law (Kolmogorov 1941). Among other properties, intermittency manifests itself with a non-gaussian behavior in the probability distribution functions (PDFs) of the increments of any field at a given scale $\ell$. In Fig. 6(abc) we report the PDFs of the increments $\Delta B_{y}(x, y) = B_{y}(x+\ell, y) - \Delta B_{y}(x, y)$ of the y component of the magnetic field fluctuations along the x direction and at three different spatial separations $\ell/d_{i} = 5\pi, \pi$, and $\pi/4$, i.e., in the inertial range (a), at the spectral break (b), and at kinetic scales (c) respectively. The PDFs are calculated at the same time $t = 200 \, \tau_A$ in
Figure 5. Ratio of the residual energy to the total energy (thick solid lines) in the perpendicular (2D) components for the HPIC (top panel) and HMHD (bottom panel) simulations, averaged over 60 times after the peak of current density. The ratio of the characteristic Alfvén time and dynamo time, \((t_A/t_d)^\alpha\) is plotted in thin solid and dashed lines for the fast and slow scenario, respectively \([\alpha = 1 \text{ and } \alpha = 2, \text{ see eq. (6)}]\).

Both simulations. Indeed, the PDFs from the two models are comparable to each other at all scales. They are consistent with a Gaussian function at large scales in the inertial range \((\ell \gg d_i)\), but as scales get smaller [e.g., already at \(\ell = \pi d_i\) in Fig. 6(b)], they depart from gaussian behavior and develop fatter and fatter tails. To better quantify the level of intermittency, we calculated the scale dependent excess kurtosis, shown in Fig. 6 for the increments of the magnetic field (d) and of the velocity fields (e). The results for the magnetic field kurtosis are in remarkable agreement, being close to zero at large scales down to \(2\pi d_i/\ell \approx 0.8\) and then increasing linearly down to the smallest scales where HPIC has a slightly larger kurtosis. The excess kurtosis of the velocity field increments are also similar at large scales, but the HPIC kurtosis becomes slightly larger at intermediate scales, \(2\pi d_i/\ell \gtrsim 0.3\), well before the velocity spectra start to diverge \([k_\perp d_i \gtrsim 2, \text{ see Fig. 4(b)}]\).

Figure 6. Top panels: PDFs of the increments \(\Delta B_y = B_y(x + \ell, y) - \Delta B_y(x, y)\) at three different scales \(\ell\): in the inertial range (a), at the spectral break (b), and at sub-ion scales (c). The dotted lines drawing a triangle correspond to a Gaussian function. The PDFs are plotted against \(\Delta B_y|\Delta B_y|/\sigma^2\), with \(\sigma^2\) being the variance of each PDF. Bottom panels: excess kurtosis \(K - 3\) for the magnetic field (d) and the velocity field (e), at \(t = 200\tau_A\) for both the HPIC run (dashed lines) and for the HMHD run (solid lines). The horizontal dotted line denotes the zero excess kurtosis of a Gaussian function.
5. DISCUSSION

In this work, we provided numerical evidence that many of the statistical and spectral properties of plasma turbulence at sub-ion scales can be explained within the framework of Hall Magnetohydrodynamics. The results have been obtained by performing a study of turbulence generated by freely decaying Alfvénic fluctuations using both a full viscous resistive fluid Hall-MHD model and a Vlasov-Maxwell hybrid particle-in-cell model coupling fully kinetic ions to fluid and massless electrons, which was able to correctly reproduce in situ observations (Franci et al. 2018a). In the plasma regime we investigated, the Hall-MHD and the hybrid model showed a remarkable agreement.

In the early evolution of our simulations and long before the formation of a power-law direct cascade at fluid scales, we observed a transfer of energy triggered by magnetic reconnection from the large-scale vortices directly to small kinetic scales. In a short phase after the first reconnection events are detected, energy is fed into the whole kinetic range, in what appear to be an inverse cascade generated by the coalescence of magnetic islands and the disruption of the first current sheets. Although impossible to observe at later times with our method, it is likely that such a reconnection-mediated energy transfer occurs whenever a current sheet reconnects, as suggested by Franci et al. (2017) and corroborated by recent studies that employ advanced techniques to measure the scale-to-scale energy transfer in localized coherent structures (Camporeale et al. 2018). Our findings further strengthen the view that magnetic reconnection provides a direct channel to drive turbulence at kinetic scales (Franci et al. 2017), and thus supports theoretical models of reconnection-mediated turbulence (Mallet et al. 2017; Loureiro & Boldyrev 2017).

Once turbulence has fully developed, both the Hall-MHD and the hybrid model reproduce a Kolmogorov-like cascade of spectral index $-5/3$ at fluid scales and a kinetic cascade of spectral index $-3$ in the total magnetic field spectra. The location of the spectral break is also recovered. A flatter power-law spectrum of slope $-3/2$ is observed in the velocity spectra at fluid scales, which is also responsible for the different slope in the total energy spectrum ($-5/3$ and $-3/2$ in HPIC and HMHD, respectively). We also obtain a residual energy spectrum of slope $\approx -2$. These indexes are not consistent with the same Alfvén-dynamo balance regulating the ratio of residual and total energy at inertial range scales (Müller & Grappin 2005; Grappin et al. 2016). However, when only perpendicular component are retained (i.e. 2D wavevectors and components are analysed), both HPIC and HMHD display properties consistent with a fast Alfvén-dynamo balance scenario ($\alpha = 1$).

HPIC and HMHD simulations show a different behavior of the velocity field spectrum at ion-scales the latter being flatter, and with a stronger Alfvénic coupling in the transition from MHD to ion scales. The overall agreement extends to other statistical properties, related to intermittency, and further confirms that the Hall-MHD model may be accurate enough to describe the dynamics of magnetic fields fluctuations in a turbulent plasma.

Results of this work suggest that the Hall term is the dominant term shaping the turbulent properties and dynamics of the magnetic fields at sub-ion scales. That rules out other mechanisms not described by our Hall-MHD model, for instance gyrotropic effects, temperature anisotropies, particle-wave interaction effects such as Landau damping, cyclotron resonance, and linear Vlasov instabilities. Some of these effects are likely responsible for the differences arising between the HMHD and the HPIC model in the power spectra of the velocity fluctuations at kinetic scales. In particular, at large scales, the difference between the HMHD and HPIC power spectra of parallel magnetic field and velocity fluctuations may be due to nonzero off-diagonal terms in the ion pressure tensor generated by non-gyrotropic effects at the reconnection sites (Yin et al. 2002), which may also be responsible for the differences between the reconnection rates of the Hall and the hybrid model.

The ability of Hall-MHD of describing the plasma dynamics at sub-ion scales needs to be further investigated in other plasma regimes. A more detailed analysis highlighting the differences between HMHD and HPIC simulations may provide further constraints on additional phenomena beyond the Hall physics relevant for plasma turbulence at sub-ion scales.
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