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Abstract

Recently, a new magnetofluid dynamics, Relaxed MHD (RxMHD), was constructed using Hamilton’s Principle with a phase-space Lagrangian incorporating constraints of magnetic and cross helicity. A key difference between RxMHD and Ideal Magnetohydrodynamics (IMHD) is that IMHD implicitly constrains the magnetofluid to obey the zero-resistivity “Ideal” Ohm’s Law (IOL) pointwise whereas RxMHD discards the IOL constraint completely, which can violate the desideratum that all equilibrium solutions of RxMHD form a subset of all IMHD equilibria. The present paper lays the formal groundwork for rectifying this deficiency. In order to impose a weak form of the IOL constraint on RxMHD two forms of the iterative augmented Lagrangian penalty function method are proposed and discussed. It is conjectured this weak-form regularization will allow reconnection and thus avoid the formation of the singularities that plague three-dimensional IMHD equilibria. A unified dynamical formalism is developed that can treat a number of MHD versions. Euler-Lagrange equations and a gauge-invariant momentum equation in conservation form are derived, in which the IOL constraint contributes an external force and internal stress terms until convergence is achieved.

1 Introduction

1.1 Basics

In this paper choosing constraint equations is central to our approach to developing new fluid models. The concept of a constraint equation occurs in both the variational approach to classical mechanics [see e.g. Goldstein [1980]] and optimization theory [see e.g. Nocedal & Wright [2006]]. While both traditionally treat finite-dimensional systems the language and techniques of these fields can also help in understanding the infinite-dimensional dynamics of non-dissipative continuous media. In the following we shall distinguish between a hard constraint, i.e. one that is enforced exactly, a soft constraint, one that is enforced only approximately, and a weak version of a hard constraint, one that is enforced as the limiting case of a sequence of soft constraints (formulating such
a method being the goal of this work, which it is hoped will lead to a physical regularization of MHD that allows reconnection.

We also distinguish between *microscopic*, i.e. acting within each *fluid element* or infinitesimal parcel of fluid, and *macroscopic* constraints, i.e. *global* within a spatial domain $\Omega$ of the fluid (or subdomain if the system is partitioned into multiple regions).

The mathematical model we seek to regularize is *Ideal magnetohydrodynamics* (IMHD), a special case of resistive inviscid MHD, in which Ohm’s Law is

$$E' = \eta j, \quad \text{where}$$

$$E'[u] \equiv E + u \times B$$

(1)

is the electric field observed in the local frame of each fluid element, $E$ being the electric field in the lab frame. These elements are advected in the fluid velocity field $u(x,t)$ (i.e. $\dot{x} = u$ at each spatial point $x$ and time $t$). Also $B(x,t)$ is the magnetic field, $\eta$ is the local resistivity and $j(x,t)$ is the electric current density (N.B. $j = \nabla \times B/\mu_0$ in MHD, where $\mu_0$ is the vacuum permeability constant used in SI electromagnetic units). We have exhibited $u$ as an explicit argument for use later in the paper, while leaving dependencies on $x, t, E,$ and $B$ implicit.

To get IMHD, set $\eta = 0$ so that $E' = 0$, giving what is often called the *Ideal Ohm’s Law* (IOL):

$$E + u \times B = 0 . \quad (2)$$

In optimization theory Nocedal & Wright (2006) the IOL constraint $E' = 0$ is classified as an *equality constraint* (as distinct from an inequality constraint). When deriving magnetofluid equations variationally, it is this constraint that most characterizes ideal versions of MHD.

While $E$ is not usually explicit in the IMHD equations, this is only because it is eliminated between (2), after taking the curl of both sides, and the equation

$$\nabla \times E = -\epsilon_F \partial_t B , \quad (3)$$

In writing these equations we have introduced a “Faraday parameter”, $\epsilon_F$. This could be used as a slow-timescale expansion parameter to represent the magnitude of the RHS of (3), compared with the LHS. (Here and elsewhere LHS denotes “left-hand side” and RHS “right-hand side”.)

However we shall simply use it as a *switch* with values 0 and 1, so that (3) and (4) become, in the two cases:

$$\epsilon_F = \begin{cases} 1 : & \nabla \times E = -\partial_t B ; \quad \partial_t B = \nabla \times (u \times B) \\ 0 : & \nabla \times E = 0 ; \quad \nabla \times (u \times B) = 0 \end{cases} . \quad (5)$$

When $\epsilon_F = 1$ (3) and (4) are, respectively, the *Maxwell–Faraday equation* and the standard IMHD magnetic-field advection equation; when $\epsilon_F = 0$ the two equations specify the electrostatic approximation [see (7) below], producing

---

1 We use *regularization* in the physics sense — adjusting for incipient singular behaviour in a way that is consistent with physics on scales outside the strict domain of applicability of a mathematical model. This goes somewhat beyond the mathematical sense of adjusting a problem to avoid ill-posedness.
what we shall term IOL-constrained Electrostatic (ES) RxMHD. When $\epsilon_F = 1$ we shall derive Electromagnetic RxMHD equations. Both will be relaxed as in the RxMHD of [Dewar et al. (2020)] but with a constraint term in the Lagrangian to improve compatibility with IMHD in both equilibrium and dynamical evolution.

Equation (3) can be viewed as a holonomic constraint on $E$, and likewise $\nabla \cdot B = 0$ is a holonomic constraint on $B$, i.e. we can remove these constraints from consideration by expressing the constrained variables in terms of fewer unconstrained variables. Here these are the vector and scalar potentials $A$ and $\Phi$, respectively, in terms of which

$$B = \nabla \times A,$$

$$E = -\epsilon_F \partial_t A - \nabla \Phi.$$  

These imply $\nabla \cdot B = 0$ and also (3), as is easily seen by calculating $\nabla \times E$. When $\epsilon_F = 1$ we have the Maxwell–Faraday equation in vector and scalar potential form and when $\epsilon_F = 0$ we have the electrostatic approximation, $E \approx E_{es} \equiv -\nabla \Phi$. We restrict the choice of gauge to be such that $\Phi$ is a spatially single-valued potential and such that $\partial_t A = 0$ in equilibrium, when $\partial_t \cdot = 0$, so $A$ has no effect on $E$ in that static case. Thus, in equilibrium $E'[u] = -\nabla \phi + u \times B$ is exact for both $\epsilon_F = 0$ and 1, and the electrostatic approximation is a good one for slowly varying displacements of the plasma. For the purposes of this paper we shall take (7) as the formal definition of $E$ in the IOL for both values of $\epsilon_F$. Unless stated otherwise, in the following we shall carry $\epsilon_F$ along as an implicit, unspecified parameter so the formal development can cover both electromagnetic (EM) and electrostatic (ES) MHD.

Of course the vector potential still does play a role in describing plasma equilibria because the magnetic flux threading a loop is $\oint A \cdot dl$. Dynamically, only $\partial_t A$ contributes to inductive e.m.f.s $\oint E \cdot dl$ around closed loops. In our case, we assume e.m.f.s are zero around any loop on the boundary $\partial \Omega$ — the trapped-flux boundary condition of RxMHD [see Appendix B of [Dewar et al. (2015)]]]. Aside from this restriction, there is still considerable gauge freedom in $A$. If we choose Coulomb gauge, $\nabla \cdot A = 0$, the potential representation is an example of the Helmholtz decomposition of an arbitrary vector field into the sum of curl-free and divergence-free vector fields.

### 1.2 Methodology: Variational principles and Euler–Lagrange equations

In mechanics and optimization theory there are objective functions whose extrema — maxima, minima and saddle points — are given by Euler–Lagrange (EL) equations, which are found by setting first derivatives of these functions to zero. In mechanics such functions are Hamiltonians whose extrema give stable or unstable equilibria, or actions, time integrals of Lagrangians, whose extrema give physical time evolution equations (Hamilton’s Principle).

The main aim of this paper is to use an infinite dimensional generalization of Hamilton’s Principle in which partial derivatives are replaced by functional derivatives [see e.g. [Morrison (1993)]] of action integrals incorporating the IOL constraint, and also global entropy, magnetic-helicity and cross-helicity constraints. These functional derivatives are with respect to the basic physical...
fields, e.g. $\Phi$, $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{u}$, etc., describing the state of the system and are set to zero to find a set of Euler–Lagrange equations which together are sufficient to describe the dynamics of the system. For brevity we shall refer e.g. to the equation found by setting the functional derivative with respect to $\Phi$ as the "$\delta \Phi$-EL equation". We shall leave comparison of the different dynamics in the electrostatic approximation case $\epsilon_F = 0$, the electromagnetic case $\epsilon_F = 1$, and comparison with ideal MHD, to a future publication with examples of the application of these EL equations and the iterative method we conjecture will act as a regularizing method in circumstances where ideal MHD develops singularities.

1.3 Relaxation

See Appendix A for a brief history of the variational approach to finding relaxed plasma equilibrium states by minimizing the IMHD energy functional using one or more IMHD invariants as global constraints. This construction implies immediately that such relaxed magnetostatic states are a special subset of all possible IMHD equilibria, most of which, being of higher energy, are likely to be more unstable than relaxed states.

In this paper we instead seek to find a time-dependent variational formulation for relaxed plasma systems going through a dynamical phase as they transition from one equilibrium state to another (e.g. due to boundary deformations). Thus, instead of minimizing energy, we use Hamilton’s variational Principle, widely regarded as the most fundamental principal in all mathematical physics, from general relativity through classical mechanics to quantum field theories (for instance connecting symmetries and conservation laws by Noether’s theorem). As we are attempting to establish a new classical field theory related to, but different from, ideal magnetohydrodynamics (IMHD), it is appropriate to seek new magnetofluid models by modifying the IMHD Hamilton’s Principle.

Following this precept, [Dewar et al. (2020)] derived a new dynamical magnetofluid model, Relaxed MagnetohydroDynamics (RxMHD), from Hamilton’s Action Principle using a phase-space version of the magnetofluid Lagrangian with a noncanonical momentum field $\mathbf{u}$, physically identified as the lab-frame mass-flow velocity, and a kinematically constrained velocity field $\mathbf{v}$ (the fluid velocity relative to a magnetic-field-aligned flow). The resulting Euler–Lagrange equations generalize from statics to dynamics the usual relaxation-by-energy-minimization concept developed by Taylor (1986) for flowless plasma equilibria, and its generalization to equilibria with steady flow by various authors: Finn & Antonsen (1983); Hameiri (1998); Vladimirov et al. (1999); Hameiri (2014); Dennis et al. (2014). These generalized Taylor equilibria were shown by Dewar et al. (2020) to be consistent with RxMHD when time derivatives are set to zero. However, specific cases have been limited to axisymmetric equilibria whereas in this paper we aim to treat more general, non-axisymmetric equilibria with flow, as well as time-dependent problems.

The advection equation for $\mathbf{B}$, (4), implies the “frozen-in flux constraint”, which, as discussed by Newcomb (1958), preserves the topology of magnetic field lines. This prevents field-line breaking and reconnection from forming new structures, such as magnetic islands, and this frustration of topological changes leads to singularities developing as time tends toward infinity.

The heuristic assumption motivating relaxation theory is that, if it would be energetically favourable to do so, and on a long enough timescale, “nature will
find a way" for reconnection to occur, either due to the magnifying effect of large gradients on small but finite resistivity at singularities, or through "anomalous" phenomena such as turbulence. Thus in RxMHD the continuum of local frozen-in flux constraints is replaced by only two constraints involving $B$, the two global IMHD invariants magnetic helicity and cross helicity.

As seen from the derivation of (1) above, breaking the frozen-in flux constraint requires violating the IOL constraint and/or the Maxwell–Faraday equation during dynamic evolution. IMHD already departs from the standard Maxwell equations in neglecting the displacement current $\partial_t D$ in the Maxwell-Ampère equation, so it is reasonable in constructing a slow, IOL-constrained form of RxMHD (ES RxMHD) to likewise drop the $-\partial_t A$ term by setting $\epsilon_F = 0$ in the potential representation of $E$, (7), making $E$ represent the "electrostatic" electric field $E_{es} \equiv -\nabla \Phi$ and (2) represent the electrostatic IOL constraint $E_{es} + u \times B = 0$.

The electrostatic ansatz in ES RxMHD is trivial in equilibrium where $\partial_t A = 0$ and $E_{es} \equiv E$, but it greatly affects the dynamics because the removal of the inductive term from the Maxwell–Faraday equation (3) makes $B$ a relaxed quantity, as in RxMHD, so the hyperbolic IMHD time evolution equation for $B$ given by (3) is lost.

However, as will be argued in Subsection 3.2, there is reason to believe that, for general three-dimensional equilibria with non-integrable magnetic field dynamics, imposing (2) as a hard constraint would lead to an ill-posed variational principle with no smooth extremum. In this case we regularize the problem by approaching an IOL-constrained state through a sequence of softly constrained states where the IOL constraint is not exactly satisfied.

For a dynamical relaxed MHD theory to be fully satisfactory we require it to be well-posed mathematically and desire it to agree with ideal MHD in two cases: (i) on the boundary $\partial \Omega(t)$, because MRxMHD interfaces are regarded as arbitrarily thin sheets of IMHD fluid; and (ii) in an equilibrium state with steady flow, when one imagines any transient non-ideal behaviour to have died away, justifying the Principle of IMHD-Equilibrium Consistency [Dewar et al. (2020)].

This Consistency Principle was satisfied by the one equilibrium test case [Dewar et al. (2020)] looked at using their RxMHD formulation, the rigidly rotating axisymmetric steady-flow equilibrium. However RxMHD does not enforce the IOL constraint (2), so there is no reason to believe that ideal consistency would necessarily apply to more general equilibria. [Indeed, Dewar et al. (2020) showed that small dynamical perturbations about an equilibrium exhibited no tendency to preserve the IOL constraint.]

Specifically, we are interested in non-axisymmetric relaxed steady-flow toroidal equilibria such as may occur in stellarators. The elliptic nature of RxMHD (when flows are small) makes it reasonable to assume that smooth solutions of the RxMHD equations exist for such equilibria. However, we argue in Subsection 3.2 that, generically, if non-axisymmetric IMHD equilibria with flow exist they are not generically smooth and therefore smooth RxMHD equilibria cannot in general be expected to satisfy the Consistency Principle in hard form. Hence the present aim is to develop a modified version of RxMHD that enforces (i) and at least approximates (ii) by building them both into the formalism.
1.4 Background flow

We define a fully relaxed RxMHD equilibrium as one where the electrostatic potential $\Phi$ has relaxed to a constant value throughout a volume $\Omega$, so $E = 0$. As Finn & Antonsen (1983) recognized, this would occur in the extreme case where magnetic field lines fill $\Omega$ ergodically, because dotting both sides of (2) with $B$ gives the derivative along $B$ as $B \cdot \nabla \Phi = 0$. As we shall see, constant $\Phi$ implies purely parallel flow, $u = u_\parallel$, whose magnitude is constrained by the steady-flow continuity equation $\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\rho}{B} B u_\parallel \right) = B \cdot \nabla (\rho u_\parallel / B) = 0$, where $\rho$ is mass density. For consistency again with the (unachievable) fully ergodic limit, we define fully relaxed parallel flow as such that $\rho u_\parallel / B =$ const. We denote this special parallel flow velocity as $u_{\text{Rx}} \equiv \nu_\Omega B \mu_0 \rho$, (8)

where $\nu_\Omega$ is a constant throughout $\Omega$ — its significance in the RxMHD formalism is explained below:

In the variational $u, v$ dynamical relaxation formalism of Dewar et al. (2020), EL equations for $u, v, B$ and pressure $p$ are derived variationally from Hamilton’s Principle, while the mass continuity equation is built in as a holonomic constraint. The fully relaxed flow $u_{\text{Rx}}$ occurs in these EL equations, with $\nu_\Omega$ arising as the Lagrange multiplier for the magnetic-helicity constraint in the phase-space Lagrangian. Specifically, the EL equation arising from free variations of $u$ is $u = u_{\text{Rx}} + v$, (9)

so $v$ is the relative flow, the fluid velocity relative to the fully relaxed relaxed flow velocity $u_{\text{Rx}}$.

Noting from (3) that $\nabla \cdot (\rho u_{\text{Rx}}) = 0$, we see that $\nabla \cdot (\rho u) = \nabla \cdot (\rho v)$. Thus the continuity equation holds for both $u$ and $v$, i.e. both flows are microscopically mass-conserving. Also, $u \times B = v \times B$, so $E'[u] = E'[v]$. In order to preserve (9) in the variational formulation (see later), the version of the IOL constraint we shall be using in the body of this paper is $E'[v] = 0$, which becomes equivalent to $E'[u] = 0$ only after the Euler–Lagrange equations are derived.

1.5 Domains and boundaries

For most purposes in this paper it is sufficient to restrict attention to plasma within a single domain $\Omega(t)$ that is closed, of genus at least 1, and whose boundary $\partial \Omega(t)$ is smooth, gapless, perfectly conducting and time-dependent. However we note this is part of a larger project, the development of Multiregion Relaxed MHD (MRxMHD) Dewar et al. (2015), in which $\Omega$ is but a subregion of a larger plasma region, partitioned into multiple relaxation domains physically separated by moving interfaces. As $\partial \Omega(t)$ is the union of the inward-facing sides of the interfaces $\Omega(t)$ shares with its neighbours, it transmits external forcing to the restricted subsystem within $\Omega(t)$ and imparts equal and opposite reaction forces on the neighbouring subdomains.

We take the interfaces to be perfectly flexible and impervious to mass and heat transport. We also take them to be impervious to magnetic flux like a superconductor, implying the tangentiality condition

$$n \cdot B = 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega ,$$

(10)
where \( \mathbf{B} \equiv \nabla \times \mathbf{A} \) is the magnetic field and \( \mathbf{n} \) is a unit normal at each point on \( \partial \Omega \) (here and henceforth leaving the argument \( t \) implicit in \( \Omega, \mathbf{n} \) etc.). Also, to conserve magnetic fluxes trapped within \( \Omega \), loop integrals of the vector potential \( \mathbf{A} \) within the interfaces must be conserved [see e.g. Dewar et al. (2015)].

1.6 Layout of this paper

The phase-space Lagrangian variational approach to deriving ideal MHD equations is briefly reviewed in Section 2, then some general implications of the Ideal Ohm’s Law (IOL), when it is exactly satisfied, are discussed in Section 3, including speculations in Subsection 3.2 on the implications of chaos and ergodic theory on flows in three-dimensional systems, in Subsection 3.1 the \( \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B} \) drift is derived, and the implications of taking the divergence and curl of the IOL are discussed in Subsection 3.3.

In Section 4, the proposed adaptation of the augmented Lagrangian penalty function method from optimization theory to the physical purpose of imposing the IOL constraint in a soft form that can iteratively be made more stringent is proposed, and the specific Lagrangian density constraint term for this method is given in Subsection 4.1. The entropy, magnetic helicity and cross-helicity conservation constraints used in Relaxed MHD theory are discussed in Subsection 4.2, and the complete phase space Lagrangian to be used in this paper is constructed in Subsection 4.3.

In Section 5, the Euler–Lagrange equations are derived in general form in Subsection 5.1, and in specific forms in Subsections 5.2–5.7 where the IOL constraint term provides new contributions that vanish only when the constraint is satisfied. A slight modification of the augmented Lagrange multiplier method to make it more physically transparent is proposed in Subsection 6.1, and a brief examination of our assumption that EM RxMHD is equivalent to IMHD in situations where the IOL can be enforced as a hard constraint is given in Subsection 6.2. Detailed examination of these two issues is left for further work.

Section 7, Conclusion, briefly summarizes what has been achieved in this paper and what more needs to be done.

A brief historical overview of MHD relaxation theory is given in Appendix A, and some useful vector and dyadic calculus identities are derived in Appendix B, in particular the little-known identity (87), which is crucial for getting the general form of the momentum equation (52) into a general conservation form, (55).

2 Ideal MHD in phase space

The mathematical foundation on which our dynamical relaxation formalism is built is a noncanonical form (which we call the \( \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \) picture) of the canonical MHD Hamiltonian, and a Phase-Space Lagrangian (PSL). Here we review how Hamilton’s action principle leads to IMHD when microscopic constraints on entropy and magnetic flux are applied. Later we show how RxMHD arises when these are replaced by global constraints using the same PSL formalism.

Both ideal and relaxed MHD starts from the canonical MHD Hamiltonian
\[ H_{\text{MHD}}[x, \pi, t] = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{H}_{\text{MHD}} \, dV , \]

with \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{MHD}}(x, \pi, t) \equiv \frac{\pi^2}{2 \rho} + \frac{p}{\gamma - 1} + \frac{B^2}{2 \mu_0} , \) (11)

where \( \pi(x, t) \) is the canonical momentum density, the analogue of \( p \) in finite-dimensional classical dynamics.

The analogue of \( q \) is not \( x \) the Eulerian independent variable but \( r \), the Lagrangian position with respect to a given reference frame. We do not make this explicit as we shall always work in the Eulerian picture, but the Lagrangian picture in the background does manifest in interpreting variations. [This is discussed in more detail by Dewar et al. (2020).] For instance, the analogue of the variation \( \delta q \) at fixed \( t \) is \( \Delta x = \xi(x, t) \), the Lagrangian fluid displacement in Eulerian representation, and the analogue of the variation \( \dot{q} \, \delta t \) is \( v(x, t) \, \delta t \), which we shall refer to as the Lagrangian velocity field (not always the same as the Eulerian velocity \( u \)). Both ideal and RxMHD also use the constrained kinematic variation Newcomb (1962),

\[ \delta v = \partial_t \xi + v \cdot \nabla \xi - \xi \cdot \nabla v . \] (12)

They also use the mass density variation

\[ \delta \rho = - \nabla \cdot (\rho \xi) = - \rho \nabla \cdot \xi - \xi \cdot \nabla \rho , \] (13)

which is an expression of the microscopic conservation of mass and can be found by integrating the perturbed continuity equation

\[ \partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho v) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \frac{d\rho}{dt} = -\rho \nabla \cdot v \] (14)

along varied Lagrangian trajectories \( r(t|x_0) \) Frieman & Rotenberg (1960) and expressing this Lagrangian variation in the Eulerian picture Newcomb (1962).

Instead of seeking a Poisson bracket to get phase-space dynamics from \( H \) see e.g. Morrison (1998), we instead work directly with the canonical phase-space Lagrangian (PSL) density \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{MHD}} \),

\[ L_{\text{MHD}}^{\text{PSL}}[x, v, \pi] = \int_{\Omega} \left[ \pi \cdot v - \mathcal{H}_{\text{MHD}}(x, \pi, t) \right] \, dV , \]

\[ \equiv \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{L}_{\text{MHD}}(x, \pi, t) \, dV \]

\[ = \int_{\Omega} \left( \pi \cdot v - \frac{\pi^2}{2 \rho} + \frac{p}{\gamma - 1} - \frac{B^2}{2 \mu_0} \right) \, dV , \] (15)

and the corresponding canonical phase-space action,

\[ S_{\text{MHD}}^{\text{PSL}} \equiv \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{L}_{\text{MHD}} \, dV \, dt \] (16)

as the primary tools, deriving Euler–Lagrange (EL) equations from Hamilton’s
principle of stationary action, varying phase space paths under appropriate constraints.

We have used the subscript notation on the Lagrangian and the action to make it clear the PSL defined in is fundamentally different from the more usual configuration space Lagrangian and action. This is because, in \( \pi \) is now regarded as freely variable, so the dimensionality of the space of allowed variations is doubled in the phase-space action principle.

For instance, varying \( \pi \) in gives the \( \delta \pi - \text{EL equation} \)
\[
\delta S_{\text{ph}} / \delta \pi = v - \pi / \rho = 0, \tag{17}
\]

as expected. Likewise, using the microscopic holonomic constraints of entropy and flux,
\[
\delta p = -\gamma p \nabla \cdot \xi - \xi \cdot \nabla p \quad \text{and} \quad \delta B = \nabla \times (\xi \times B),
\]
respectively, one can verify that the Euler–Lagrange equation arising from Lagrange-varying \( x \) (i.e. varying \( \xi \)) is just the IMHD equation of motion.

However, as it is not customary in fluid mechanics to work with canonical momenta, we follow in exploiting the freedom afforded by the PSL to work with a velocity-like phase-space variable \( u \), obtained by the noncanonical change of variable \( \pi = \rho u \). Then the canonical Hamiltonian density becomes the noncanonical Hamiltonian density
\[
H_{\text{MHD}}^{\text{nc}}(x, u, t) = \frac{\rho u^2}{2} + \frac{p}{\gamma - 1} + \frac{B^2}{2 \mu_0}, \tag{18}
\]
and the PSL density in noncanonical form becomes, from \( \delta \)
\[
L_{\text{MHD}}^{\text{nc}}(x, u, v, t) = \rho u \cdot v - H_{\text{MHD}}^{\text{nc}}(x, u, t)
= \rho u \cdot v - \frac{\rho u^2}{2} - \frac{p}{\gamma - 1} - \frac{B^2}{2 \mu_0}. \tag{19}
\]
As neither \( p \) nor \( B \) depends on \( u \), the \( \delta u - \text{EL equation} \) is \( \delta S_{\text{ph}} / \delta u = \rho v - \rho u = 0 \), i.e. in IMHD we have \( v = u \). The IMHD equation of motion, which can be written in conservation form as
\[
\partial_t (\rho u) + \nabla \cdot T_{\text{MHD}} = 0, \tag{20}
\]
where
\[
T_{\text{MHD}} \equiv \rho uu + \left( p + \frac{B^2}{2 \mu_0} \right) I - \frac{BB}{\mu_0}, \tag{21}
\]
follows as it does for the \( \xi - \text{EL equation} \) in the canonical form.

It will shown below that an isothermal version of IMHD can be derived by replacing the holonomic variational constraint \( \delta p = -\gamma p \nabla \cdot \xi - \xi \cdot \nabla p \) with a global entropy conservation constraint, giving thermal relaxation, a more realistic model for hot plasmas than the microscopic entropy constraints implied by \( \delta p = -\gamma p \nabla \cdot \xi - \xi \cdot \nabla p \).

\footnote{Sometimes Hamilton’s Principle is misleadingly referred to as the Principle of Least Action. However, as action is kinetic minus potential energy, minimizing energy to find a relaxed equilibrium will maximize action in some directions in the infinite-dimensional phase space on which our action is defined, in which we therefore seek \textit{minimax} (saddle) points.}
3 Implications of the IOL constraint

In this section we examine consequences of applying the IOL constraint (2) in the form (see Subsection 1.4) \( E'[v] = 0 \), which can be written \(-E = v \times B\) or \( \epsilon \rho \partial_t A + \nabla \Phi = v \times B \).

3.1 \( E \times B \) drift

As \( E' = E + v \times B \) we have the two identities

\[
B \times E' = -E \times B + (B^2 I - BB) \cdot v, \tag{22}
\]

and \( v \times E' = -E \times v - (v^2 I - vv) \cdot B. \tag{23} \)

Equation (22) leads to a decomposition of the relative fluid flow into a component \( v_\parallel \) tangential to \( B \) at \( x \), and a component \( v_\perp \), its projection onto the plane transverse to \( B \), the "\( E \times B \) drift,"

\[
v_\perp = \frac{E_\perp \times B}{B^2}. \tag{24}
\]

It is usually safe to assume \( B^2 \neq 0 \) anywhere in toroidally confined plasmas, so the representation (24) generally applies everywhere, and to both equilibrium and dynamic ES MHD cases.

3.2 The equilibrium ergodicity problem

Resolving the IOL onto \( B \) and \( v \) (or \( u \)) eliminates the \( v \times B \) term so in equilibrium these components of the IOL imply

\[
B \cdot \nabla \Phi = 0, \tag{25}
\]

\[
u \cdot \nabla \Phi = 0. \tag{26}
\]

This means \( \Phi = \text{const} \) on stream lines as well as magnetic field lines. As a consequence, level sets of \( \Phi \) are invariant under magnetic and fluid flow. For instance, if \( \Phi \) has smoothly nested level surfaces in a region then both \( u \) and \( B \) lie in the local tangent plane at each point on each isopotential surface — the magnetic and fluid flows are both locally integrable.

In the opposite extreme, Finn & Antonsen (1983) [after Eq. (29)] conclude from the constancy of \( \Phi \) along a field line that "if the turbulent relaxation has ergodic field lines throughout the plasma volume," then \( \nabla \Phi = 0 \), which implies that \( u \times B = 0 \) — the fluid flows along magnetic field lines. As already mentioned, we call such field-aligned steady flows fully relaxed equilibria (though the converse does not apply — field-aligned flows can be integrable).

However, field-aligned flow equilibria exclude many applications of physical interest — in particular tokamaks with strong toroidal flow. For such axisymmetric equilibria Dewar et al. (2020) show RxMHD can give the same axisymmetric relaxed solutions with cross-field flow as found by Finn & Antonsen.

The case \( u^2 = 0 \) may well occur in plasma containment devices so using (23) to make a decomposition of \( B \) in terms of \( u \) analogous to the reverse in (24) seems less useful.
Figure 1: Ergodic partition of iterates of the standard map as depicted in Fig. 11 of [Levnajić & Mezić 2010]. (Reprinted with permission from Chaos.)

Unlike [Finn & Antonsen 1983] we are not appealing to turbulence to justify relaxation, but, in fully three dimensional (3-D) plasmas, we may be able to appeal to the existence of chaotic magnetic field and stream lines. However “chaotic” is not the same as “ergodic” — while chaotic flows do involve ergodicity, this is in an infinitely complicated way, visualized in Figure 1 in terms of the fractal ergodic partition of [Mezić & Wiggins 1999; Levnajić & Mezić 2010]. (This figure is generated for an iterated area-preserving map, but magnetic field-line flows being flux preserving, the magnetic field-line return map of a Poincaré section onto itself in a magnetic containment device is similar.)

A similar problem involving chaos and ergodicity arises in magnetohydrodynamics, [Hudson et al. 2012], where the equilibrium condition $\nabla p = j \times B$ implies $B \cdot \nabla p = 0$, analogously to (25) for $\Phi$, so the fractal ergodic partition for field-line flow is as relevant to the pressure $p$ as it is for the potential $\Phi$. In their MRxMHD equilibrium code [Hudson et al. 2012] solved the puzzle posed by [Grad 1967] (i.e. how to formulate the three-dimensional IMHD equilibrium problem so as to avoid a “pathological” pressure profile) by using a much simpler ergodic partition obtained by aggregating contiguous elements of the fractal ergodic partition into a finite number of constant-pressure “relaxation regions” $\Omega_i$, with pressure changing (discontinuously) only across the interfaces between the $\Omega_i$s. The code was thus named the Stepped Pressure Equilibrium Code (SPEC).

### 3.2.1 Continuity of Electrostatic Potential

One might think that an analogous “stepped potential equilibrium” could provide a solution to the problem of finding a non-trivial but tractable solution of $\nabla \cdot \Phi \equiv (B/B) \cdot \nabla \Phi = 0$ in a chaotic magnetic-field-line flow. Unfortunately however we must restrict $\nabla \cdot \Phi \equiv (1 - BB/B^2) \cdot \nabla \Phi$ to square-integrable functions in order to keep the $E \times B$ drift from acquiring a $\delta$-function component.

This rules out having steps in $\Phi$ because $\delta$-functions are not square integrable, so stepped potentials would make the kinetic energy integral infinite.
However, this does not necessarily imply $\Phi$ is constant in weakly chaotic regions with a finite measure of KAM surfaces — perhaps weak KAM theory [see e.g. Fathi (2009)] would allow fractal potential profiles having finite kinetic energy associated with them.

As a way to handle non-constant $\Phi$ computationally we propose using a penalty or augmented Lagrangian method [see e.g. Nocedal & Wright (2006)]. That is, we treat Hamilton’s Principle as a constrained saddle-point optimization problem and add a penalty functional to the Hamiltonian, which regularizes the variational problem by approaching the (perhaps fractal) IMHD “feasible region” of configuration space from outside, in the less-constrained space on which RxMHD is defined [which is smoother, see Figure 1 of Dewar et al. (2020)].

Another approach might be a time-evolution code with added dissipation such that the long-time solution is attracted to one having chaotic regions of constant pressure interspersed with integrable regions with changing pressure. This can be viewed as a steepest-descents solution of the same optimization problem.

### 3.3 Differential implications

Assuming the IOL holds at each point in $\Omega$ the divergence and curl of $E'$ must vanish, giving

\[
\nabla \cdot (E + v \times B) = - (\epsilon_F \partial_t \nabla \cdot A + \nabla^2 \Phi) + \nabla \cdot (v \times B) = 0 . \tag{27}
\]

\[
\nabla \times (E + v \times B) = -\epsilon_F \partial_t \nabla \times A + \nabla \times (v \times B) = 0 . \tag{28}
\]

(27) shows $E$ satisfies a Maxwell-Poisson equation $\nabla \cdot E = -\nabla \cdot (v \times B)$ (to be given as an Euler–Lagrange equation in Subsection 5.5), with the charge density source term provided by $\nabla \cdot (v \times B)$. Finally, (28) gives the solvability condition for $\Phi$, defined in ES MHD as the solution of the electrostatic ideal Ohm’s Law $\nabla \Phi = v \times B$.

### 4 Constraints and Constrained Optimization

#### 4.1 Augmented Lagrangian constraint method

In implementing the IOL constraint we propose to adapt the Augmented Lagrangian method from finite-dimensional optimization theory, as described by Nocedal & Wright (2006) §17.3), or for Banach spaces [see e.g. Kanzow et al. (2018) and references therein]. This is a hybrid numerical method that combines two constraint approaches: the Lagrange multiplier method and the penalty function method. We shall use the Lagrange multiplier method in Subsection 4.3 for imposing the conservation of entropy, magnetic helicity and cross helicity as hard constraints, causing the EL equations, and hence the conserved quantities, to be parametrized by the triplet of multipliers $\tau_\Omega$, $\mu_\Omega$, and $\nu_\Omega$ (the subscripts $\Omega$ indicating they are constant throughout $\Omega$, but may jump across $\partial \Omega$ if there are adjacent relaxation regions as in MRxMHD).

To impose the IOL as a hard constraint using the Lagrange multiplier method we would “simply” add $\lambda \cdot (E + v \times B)$ to the Lagrangian density, solve the resultant EL equations to give $E + v \times B$ as a function of the Lagrange multiplier
and then solve for $\lambda$ such that $E + v \times B = 0$. Apart from the unavoidable complication that $\lambda$ is not just a 3-vector but also is a function of $x$ and $t$, so infinite dimensional, there is the more fundamental problem, flagged in Subsection 3.2, that the limit $E + v \times B \to 0$ is likely singular in 3-D equilibria because $E$, $v$, and $B$ presumably tend toward being fractal functions. Thus there is good reason to believe the hard IOL constraint problem is ill-posed in 3-D systems such as stellarators, which leads us to seek a soft IOL constraint approach in order to to regularize the Hamilton’s Principle optimization problem.

The simplest soft IOL constraint approach is to add $\frac{1}{2} \mu_P^\Omega (E + v \times B)^2$ to the Hamiltonian density (thus subtracting it from our Lagrangian density), where $\mu_P^\Omega \to +\infty$ is a penalty multiplier. In this limit the penalty term is supposed to dominate all other terms in the Hamiltonian or Lagrangian and enforce IOL feasibility through a sequence of infeasible solutions. However, this method is clearly ill-conditioned numerically, leading us to resort to the “best of both worlds” augmented Lagrangian method described below.

We start by mapping from the notation of Nocedal & Wright (2006, §17.3) to ours in the context of two closely related physical tasks:

1. The equilibrium problem: To construct a relaxed MHD equilibrium (a subset of ideal MHD equilibria) with steady flow, given a static boundary $\partial \Omega$. We seek a numerical algorithm that starts from an initial guess for the physical fields and iterates to extremize (minimize if seeking a stable equilibrium) a Hamiltonian, under the IOL equality constraint, (2); or

2. The time evolution problem: This is similar to Task 1 except we seek an evolution, a dynamical path over the time interval $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$ given a time-dependent boundary $\partial \Omega(t)$ and the extremization is of an action integral. The initial guess in Task 1 now needs to be a guessed evolution.

Remarks:
(i) Task 1 can be treated as a subclass of Task 2 in which time derivatives are set to zero and $t$ is taken to be an irrelevant constant.
(ii) The iteration method for implementing constraints is implicit, meaning that the state variables in the $k^{th}$ iteration need to be found by solving Euler–Lagrange equations, taking it for granted the Euler–Lagrange equations can be solved and any sub-iterations required have converged.

We shall not discuss this issue here, except to remark that time evolution over a large time interval can be implemented in an outer time-stepping loop in which the large time interval is split into multiple short time intervals (timesteps) $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$, within each of which constraint iterations are repeated until converged to the required accuracy. Thus the evolutions required in implementing the constraint iterations are over short time intervals, with each initial guess being the converged evolution from the previous timestep and the evolution representable to sufficient accuracy on a low-dimensional interpolation basis (e.g. dimension 2 for piecewise-linear representation of the full evolution) — the increase in difficulty in going from Task 1 to Task 2 may not be as great as at first it appears to be.

As well as adapting notation from optimization theory we shall borrow the terms feasible region, meaning the range in which $X$ obeys the constraints, i.e.
$C = 0$, and infeasible region, its complement, where $C \neq 0$. By hard constraint we mean one where $X$ must be in the feasible region, and by soft constraint we mean one where $X$ need only be in some neighbourhood of the feasible region, which is useful both practically and for regularizing when, as in MHD, defining the boundary between feasible and infeasible is complicated by the possibility of singular behaviour like current sheets and reconnection points.

To treat the implementation of the IOL in Hamilton’s Principle, a constrained saddle point optimization problem, we shall use the set of values of the components of $E'(x \in \Omega)$ as the infinite-dimensional generalization of the finite set of equality constraints $\{c_i\}$ in the notation of Nocedal & Wright (2006).

$$C(x,t) = E + v \times B . \quad (29)$$

Note the identities

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial E} = I, \quad \frac{\partial C}{\partial v} = I \times B \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial C}{\partial B} = -I \times v . \quad (30)$$

We could try to implement the constraint in hard form, $C = 0, \forall x \in \Omega(t)$, using a Lagrange multiplier, but where this is impractical, or if we need to regularize singular solutions, we prefer to use a soft form $C \to 0, \forall x \in \Omega(t)$, where $\to$ denotes a limiting process whereby the field theories we shall construct through Hamilton’s Principle move from the infeasible (non-ideal MHD) class where $C \neq 0$ toward the feasible (ideal MHD) class defined pointwise as $C = 0, \forall x \in \Omega(t)$, or, in a weak form, $||C|| = 0$.

The spatio-temporal function $C(x,t)$ is the infinite-dimensional analogue of the array of equality constraints $c_i$ of Nocedal & Wright (2006, §17.3). These authors also define an augmented Lagrangian, which in our terminology is an augmented Hamiltonian, a quadratic functional of $C$,

$$H_A \equiv \int_\Omega \left[ \mathcal{H}(x,t) - \lambda(x,t) \cdot C(x,t) + \frac{1}{2} \mu^p_\Omega(t) C^2(x,t) \right] dV , \quad (31)$$

where $\lambda$ is a Lagrange multiplier and $\mu^p_\Omega \geq 0$ is a penalty multiplier of the non-negative quadratic penalty function $\int_\Omega C^2 dV$.

When $\mu^p_\Omega = 0$, the pure Lagrange multiplier method, feasible critical points of $H_A$ might be saddle points with descending directions in the infeasible sector even if they are physically stable ideal equilibria where the IMHD Hamiltonian is minimized. When $\lambda = 0$, the pure penalty function method, feasible stable equilibria could be approximated arbitrarily well in the limit as $\mu^p_\Omega$ tends to infinity, but this becomes an increasingly ill-posed optimization problem. (It does however have the attractive feature of providing a continous family of relaxed MHD models running from RxMHD when $\mu^p_\Omega = 0$ to weak IMHD when $\mu^p_\Omega \to +\infty$.)

Nocedal & Wright (2006, §17.3) give an iterative algorithmic framework that combines the advantages of both methods, so we shall keep both $\lambda$ and $\mu^p_\Omega$ in the following formal implementation of the IOL constraint. In their algorithm the user provides an increasing sequence (which could be a time series) of $\mu^p_\Omega$ values and adjusts $\lambda$ to solve for the critical points of the minimized augmented Hamiltonians parametrized by $\mu^p_\Omega$. We shall adapt this to solve for a stationary point of the augmented action functional $S_{ph}^A \equiv \int_\Omega (au \cdot v - \mathcal{H}_\Omega^p) dV d\tau$, 

\[14\]
where the augmented penalty constraint PSL density $\mathcal{L}^C_{\Omega}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{L}^C_{\Omega} \equiv \lambda \cdot C - \frac{\mu^P_{\Omega} C^2}{2},$$

(32)

with $\lambda$ and $\mu^P_{\Omega}$ taken as given external parameters in each application of Hamilton’s Principle, giving a sequence of regularized magnetofluid models, either EM (electromagnetic) RxMHD in case $\epsilon_F = 1$ or ES RxMHD, a relaxed version using the electrostatic approximation in case $\epsilon_F = 0$.

Summarizing, the mapping from the finite-dimensional optimization notation of [Nocedal & Wright (2006)]§17.3 to infinite-dimensional MHD is:

\[
\begin{align*}
i \in \mathcal{E} & \mapsto (x, t), \quad x \in \Omega, \ t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}] \\
x_i & \mapsto X(x, t), \ x \mapsto X = \{u, v, r, p, A, \Phi; \lambda\} \\
c_i & \mapsto C(x, t) = E + v \times B \\
\lambda_i & \mapsto \lambda(x, t) \text{ (vector Lagrange multiplier)} \\
\mu & \mapsto \mu^P_{\Omega} \text{ (Penalty multiplier, const over } \Omega) \\
x_k, \ \lambda_k, \ldots & \mapsto X^k, \ \lambda^k(x, t), \ldots \text{ (kth iterates).}
\end{align*}
\]

(33)

In the following we shall take the default iteration index as $k$ and suppress this superscript unless needed for clarity. (In particular, $\mu^P_{\Omega}$ should be understood as $\mu^P_{\Omega}^k$ because the algorithmic framework of Nocedal and Wright allows for the penalty multiplier to be increased at each iteration.) If the iteration ceases to improve the feasibility, i.e. ceases to reduce $||C||$ at each step, then we would interpret this physically as a sign of incipient reconnection and regularize by terminating the iteration.

### 4.2 Global constraints for RxMHD, ES and EM RxMHD and isothermal IMHD

We shall always retain the microscopic holonomic constraints (Section 2) on $\rho$ and $v$, but when $\epsilon_F = 0$ we relax the infinite number of microscopic dynamical constraints on $p$ and $B$ imposed in IMHD by replacing these constraints with only three macroscopic hard constraints to get Electrostatic MHD (ES MHD). These three constraints, described below, are chosen to be quantities that are exact invariants under IMHD dynamics in order to ensure that relaxed equilibria are subset of all ideal equilibria. Further, as we seek plasma relaxation formalisms applicable in arbitrary 3-D toroidal geometries, we invoke only the MHD invariants least dependent on integrability of the fluid and magnetic field line flows, the conservation of total mass $M_{\Omega} \equiv \int_{\Omega} \rho dV$ being the most fundamental (whose conservation is built in microscopically). While these global invariants are not as well conserved as mass under small resistive, viscous and 3-D chaos effects, in the spirit of [Taylor (1986)] we assume they are sufficiently robust that postulating their conservation produces a model that is useful in appropriate applications.

When $\epsilon_F = 1$ we can get IMHD by retaining all the microscopic holonomic constraints of Section 2, but it seems more physically relevant to almost collisionless hot plasmas with high thermal conductivity along magnetic field lines.
to relax the plasma thermally, in a similar manner to when \( \epsilon_F = 0 \), by relaxing the microscopic dynamical constraint on \( p \) and replacing it with the first global constraint below (entropy) to give isothermal IMHD.

As just indicated, our first global constraint is the adiabatic-ideal-gas thermodynamic invariant, total entropy

\[
S_\Omega[p, p] \equiv \int_{\Omega} \frac{p}{\gamma - 1} \ln \left( \frac{p}{\rho^\gamma} \right) dV, \tag{34}
\]

where \( \kappa \) is, for our purposes, an arbitrary dimensionalizing constant, though it can be identified physically through a statistical mechanical derivation of [34] [see e.g. Dewar et al. (2015)]. Its functional derivatives are

\[
\frac{\delta S_\Omega}{\delta \rho} = \frac{1}{\gamma - 1} \ln \left( \frac{p}{\rho^\gamma} \right) - \frac{\gamma}{\gamma - 1}, \tag{35}
\]

\[
\frac{\delta S_\Omega}{\delta p} = \frac{1}{\gamma - 1} \frac{\rho}{p}. \tag{36}
\]

We also impose conservation of the magnetic helicity \( 2\mu_0 K_{\Omega} \), where, following Bhattacharjee & Dewar (1982), we define the invariant \( K_{\Omega} \) as

\[
K_{\Omega}[A] \equiv \frac{1}{2\mu_0} \int_{\Omega} A \cdot B \, dV \tag{37}
\]

giving, with help of (82), the functional derivative

\[
\frac{\delta K_{\Omega}}{\delta A} = \frac{B}{\mu_0}. \tag{38}
\]

As discussed by Hameiri (2014), in single-fluid IMHD we do not have a separate fluid helicity invariant, but do have the cross helicity \( \mu_0 K_{\Omega}^X \), which can be derived from a relabelling symmetry in the Lagrangian representation of the fields, see e.g. Ch. 7 of Webb (2018). Analogously to our other constraint parameters containing \( B \), we include \( \mu_0^{-1} \) in the definition of the cross helicity functional,

\[
K_{\Omega}^X[u, A] \equiv \frac{1}{\mu_0} \int_{\Omega} u \cdot B \, dV, \tag{39}
\]

which, like \( P_\Omega \) and \( S_\Omega \), has two functional derivatives

\[
\frac{\delta K_{\Omega}^X}{\delta u} = \frac{B}{\mu_0}, \quad \frac{\delta K_{\Omega}^X}{\delta B} = \frac{u}{\mu_0}. \tag{40}
\]

### 4.3 IOL-constrained Phase-Space Lagrangians and Actions

As foreshadowed, our recipe for constructing a non-dissipative relaxed magnetofluid model is to start with the IMHD noncanonical Hamiltonian, \( \{18\} \), but to relax many, but not all, of the microscopic constraints to which it is subject when deriving the IMHD Euler–Lagrange equations. Specifically, to retain the basic compressible Euler–fluid backbone of our relaxed MHD model Dewar et al. (2015) we keep the microscopic kinematic and mass conservation constraints, \( \{12\} \) and \( \{13\} \).
However we delete the microscopic ideal gas and flux-frozen magnetic field variational constraints, 
\[ \delta p = -\gamma p \nabla \cdot \xi - \xi \cdot \nabla p \] and \[ \delta B = \nabla \times (\xi \times B) \], replacing these infinities of constraints with only the three robust IMHD global invariants (34–39). These global constraints are imposed by adding the global-invariants-constraint (GIC) Lagrange multiplier term

\[ L_{\text{GIC}}^\Omega \equiv \tau_\Omega \frac{\rho}{\gamma - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\rho p}{\rho^\gamma} \right) + \mu_\Omega \frac{A \cdot B}{2\mu_0} + \nu_\Omega \frac{u \cdot B}{\mu_0} \] (41)

to \( L_{\text{MHD}} \) to form the RxMHD PSL density [Dewar et al. (2020)]

\[ L_{\text{Rx}}^\Omega \equiv L_{\text{MHD}}^\Omega + L_{\text{GIC}}^\Omega = \rho u \cdot v - \frac{\rho u^2}{2} - \frac{p}{\gamma - 1} - \frac{B^2}{2\mu_0} + \tau_\Omega \frac{\rho}{\gamma - 1} \ln \left( \frac{\rho p}{\rho^\gamma} \right) + \mu_\Omega \frac{A \cdot B}{2\mu_0} + \nu_\Omega \frac{u \cdot B}{\mu_0} \] (42)

In (41) the Lagrange multipliers \( \tau_\Omega, \mu_\Omega, \) and \( \nu_\Omega \) are spatially constant throughout \( \Omega \), but can change in time to enforce constancy respectively of total entropy, magnetic helicity and cross helicity in \( \Omega \). By removing the infinite numbers of microscopic constraints on \( p \) and \( B \) that are imposed in IMHD, in the RxMHD formalism [Dewar et al. (2020)] we greatly increased the variationally feasible region of the state space, thus allowing the system to access a lower energy equilibrium. In fact, as the Eulerian fields \( \delta p(x, t) \) and \( \delta A(x, t) \) are now locally free variations at each point \( x \), we have added two infinities of degrees of freedom, which turns out to be too many as the IOL constraint embedded in IMHD is entirely lost in RxMHD.

Thus we reduce the degrees of freedom of RxMHD by imposing a soft penalty-function IOL constraint using the augmented Lagrangian constraint density \( L_{\text{C}}^\Omega \), (32). As the IOL constraint applies pointwise throughout \( \Omega \), giving an infinite number of constraints, on \( \Phi \) and \( B \). Adding the constraint term we get the full Lagrangian density with augmented constraint

\[ L_{\text{A}}^\Omega \equiv L_{\text{Rx}}^\Omega + L_{\text{C}}^\Omega \] (43)

We shall also have need to define the gauge-invariant part of the Lagrangian density by substracting off the magnetic helicity term,

\[ L_{\text{A}}^\Omega \cdot A \equiv L_{\text{A}}^\Omega - \mu_\Omega \frac{A \cdot B}{2\mu_0} \] (44)

(For derivatives of the Lagrangian density with respect to anything other than \( A, B, x, \) or \( t \), \( L_{\text{A}}^\Omega \) and \( L_{\text{A}}^\Omega \cdot A \) can be used interchangeably.)

The augmented phase-space action integral is

\[ S_{\text{A}}^\Omega = \int dt \int_\Omega dV L_{\text{A}}^\Omega \] (45)

As in (19), the fluid velocity \( u \) is treated as a noncanonical momentum variable that is freely variable in the phase-space version of Hamilton’s Principle, \( \delta S_{\text{A}}^\Omega = 0 \), and \( v \) is a relative flow whose variation with respect to \( \xi \) obeys the kinematical constraint (12). It is also the flow appearing in the mass conservation constraint equations (13) and (14).
5 Euler–Lagrange (EL) equations

5.1 General view of EL equations

The utility of Hamilton’s action-principle approach is that a complete set of equations for our physical variables is provided by the EL equations following from the general variation of the generic augmented action $S_A$:

$$\delta S_A = \int dt \int V \left[ \delta u \cdot \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial u} + \delta A \cdot \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial A} + \delta B \cdot \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial B} + \delta E \cdot \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial E} + \delta p \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial p} + \delta \rho \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial \rho} + \delta v \cdot \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial v} \right]$$

where the top equation on the RHS is simply an integral over the first variation of $L_A$ and the second RHS equation defines the functional derivatives with respect to the independent variables by matching the corresponding terms in the top RHS equation after the variations of the explicit variables in $L_A$ are expanded and integrations by parts where necessary — ignoring boundary terms as we can assume the support of the variations does not include the boundary [note that there are no $\delta \lambda$ or $\delta \mu$ terms as these are taken as given — see discussion around (32)]. For instance $\delta S_A / \delta x$ is the sum of the terms linear in $\xi$ obtained from $\delta \rho$ and $\delta v$ given in (13), and (12) respectively. (Note: For notational convenience $\delta x$ is used in the denominator of the functional derivative as an alternative to the Lagrangian variation of $x$, denoted everywhere else as $\Delta x$ or $\xi$. It does not denote the Eulerian variation of $x$, which is by definition zero.)

Inspecting (32) we see that $L_A$ contains $E$ and $B$ but does not contain $u$, $p$, or $\rho$, and no term in $L_A^{\Omega x}$ contains $E$, $\nabla u$, $\nabla p$, or $\nabla \rho$, so the corresponding functional derivatives of $S_A$ are are simply partial derivatives of $L_A$, e.g. the $\delta u$- and $\delta p$-EL equations are

$$\frac{\delta S_A}{\delta u} = \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial u} = 0 , \quad \frac{\delta S_A}{\delta p} = \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial p} = 0 .$$

The $\delta A$-EL equation is best displayed by splitting $L_A$ into the gauge-invariant part $L_A^{\Omega -}$, and the magnetic helicity constraint term $\mu \Omega A \cdot B / 2 \mu_0$ in order to make manifest the explicit $A$-dependence. Thus

$$\frac{\partial L_A}{\partial A} = \frac{\mu \Omega B}{2 \mu_0} , \quad \frac{\partial L_A^{\Omega -}}{\partial B} = \frac{\mu \Omega A}{2 \mu_0} + \frac{\mu \Omega A}{2 \mu_0}$$

The $\delta A$-EL equation is then found by using these results in the lemma (82) to give

$$\frac{\delta S_A}{\delta A} = \frac{\mu \Omega B}{2 \mu_0} + \nabla \times \frac{\partial L_A^{\Omega -}}{\partial B} + \nabla \times \frac{\mu \Omega A}{2 \mu_0} + \epsilon \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{\partial L_A^{\Omega -}}{\partial E} = 0 ,$$

i.e.
\[ \nabla \times \frac{\partial L_A^\Omega}{\partial B} = -\frac{\mu_0 B}{\mu_0} - \epsilon \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{\partial L_A^\Omega}{\partial E}. \]  
(50)

The \( \delta \Phi \)-EL equation is, using (83),
\[ \frac{\delta S_A^\Omega}{\delta \Phi} = \nabla \cdot \frac{\partial L_A^\Omega}{\partial E} = 0. \]  
(51)

and, using (12), \( \delta v = \partial_t \xi + v \cdot \nabla \xi - \xi \cdot \nabla v, \) the \( \Delta x \)-EL [or \( \xi \)-EL — see (46)] equation is
\[ \frac{\delta S_A^\Omega}{\delta x} = -\partial_t \Pi - \nabla \cdot (v \Pi) - (\nabla v) \cdot \Pi 
+ \nabla \left( \rho \frac{\partial L_A^\Omega}{\partial \rho} \right) - (\nabla \rho) \frac{\partial L_A^\Omega}{\partial \rho} = 0, \]  
(52)

where
\[ \Pi \equiv \frac{\partial L_A^\Omega}{\partial v}. \]  
(53)

is a new canonical momentum density (cf. \( \pi \) in Subsection (15)).

5.2 Conservation-form momentum equations

A general form of the equation of motion is provided by the \( \Delta x \)-EL equation (52), which agrees with (21) of [Dewar et al. 2020] in the special case of their \( \lambda = [\rho], V = [0], \) and \( A = [1]. \)

To get a more transparent version we now derive a canonical-momentum conservation form of the equation of motion, the existence of which is implied by Noether’s theorem and translational invariance (within \( \Omega \), i.e. not including \( \partial \Omega \)). To do this we transform (52) into the same form as (22) of [Dewar et al. 2020] by subtracting \( \nabla L_A^\Omega \) from both sides, giving, after a little rearrangement,
\[ \partial_t \Pi + \nabla \cdot \left( v \Pi + I \left( L_A^\Omega - \rho \frac{\partial L_A^\Omega}{\partial \rho} \right) \right) 
= \nabla L_A^\Omega - (\nabla v) \cdot \Pi - (\nabla \rho) \frac{\partial L_A^\Omega}{\partial \rho}, \]  
(54)

Local translational invariance implies the only \( x \) dependence of \( L_A^\Omega \) is through its component fields, so the chain rule gives
\[ \nabla L_A^\Omega = (\nabla u) \cdot \frac{\partial L_A^\Omega}{\partial u} + (\nabla p) \frac{\partial L_A^\Omega}{\partial p} 
+ (\nabla B) \cdot \frac{\partial L_A^\Omega}{\partial B} + (\nabla A) \cdot \frac{\partial L_A^\Omega}{\partial A} + (\nabla E) \cdot \frac{\partial L_A^\Omega}{\partial E} 
+ (\nabla \rho) \frac{\partial L_A^\Omega}{\partial \rho} + (\nabla v) \cdot \Pi + (\nabla \lambda) \cdot \frac{\partial L_A^\Omega}{\partial \lambda}, \]

Unfortunately the seemingly general stress tensor (27) derived by [Dewar et al. 2020] was limited to scalar fields like \( \Phi \). Appendix [B] derives (86) to handle vector fields like \( A \).
which can be simplified slightly because the two terms on the top line of the RHS vanish by (47) and (48). Using also (49) we get

\[ \nabla L_A = \left( \nabla B \right) \cdot \partial L_A - \Omega \partial B + \mu \Omega^2 \left( \nabla B \right) \cdot A + \left( \nabla A \right) \cdot B \]  

\[ + \left( \nabla E \right) \cdot \partial L_A - \Omega \partial E + \left( \nabla \rho \right) \cdot \Pi + \left( \nabla \lambda \right) \cdot \partial L_A - \Omega \partial \lambda \]

where we used the identity (87),

\[ \left( \nabla B \right) \cdot f = \left( \nabla \times f \right) \times B - \nabla \cdot \left[ \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial B} \times 1 \times B \right] \]  

of Appendix B, with

\[ f = \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial B} \]  

and the \( \delta \Phi \)-EL equation (50). Also the identity (85)

\[ \left( \nabla E \right) \cdot f = \nabla \cdot \left[ f \cdot \left( \nabla \times B \right) \right] - \epsilon_F f \times \partial B \]  

with

\[ f = \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial E} \]  

and the \( \delta \Phi \)-EL equation (51), to reduce all but the last three terms to divergence form. Eliminating these \( \nabla \rho \) and \( \nabla v \) terms between those in (54) and \( \nabla L_A \) above, and also cancelling the \( A \cdot B \) terms, gives a general momentum equation in gauge-independent conservation form on the LHS, but with the \( \nabla \lambda \) term on the RHS acting as an external forcing term,

\[ \partial_t \left( \Pi + \epsilon_F \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial E} \times B \right) + \nabla \cdot T = \left( \nabla \lambda \right) \cdot \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial \lambda} , \]  

where the tensor \( T \) is given by

\[ T = \epsilon v \Pi + \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial B} \times 1 \times B - \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial E} \cdot E + 1 \left( L_0 - \rho \frac{\partial L_A}{\partial \rho} \right) . \]  

[See (88) for a dyadic identity that is useful for interpreting the second term on the RHS.]

This construction illustrates that the momentum conservation form is a general property of any translation-invariant Lagrangian formulation (by Noether’s theorem) and thus is preserved even with our augmented penalty function constraint (except for the forcing term from the symmetry-breaking Lagrange multiplier). It is not manifestly symmetric but we expect it to be symmetrizable from local rotational invariance [Dewar (1970), Dewar (1977)].

We now examine the implications of our EL equations in more detail.
5.3 Variation of Eulerian velocity

From the $\delta u$-EL equation \(^{(47)}\),

$$\rho (v - u) + \frac{\nu \Omega B}{\mu_0} = 0 ,$$

(57)

which is equivalent to the relative flow formula \(^{(9)}\) given in the Introduction, thus both motivating and justifying substituting $v$ for $u$ [see text below \(^{(9)}\)]. We shall use this below in the form $v = u - u^{Rx}$ for eliminating $v$ when required. (Recall $u^{Rx} \equiv \nu \Omega B / \mu_0 \rho$.)

N.B. Taking the divergence of both sides of \(^{(9)}\) the EL equation \((57)\), we have $\nabla \cdot (\rho v) = \nabla \cdot (\rho u)$. Thus, as noted below \(^{(9)}\), $u$ obeys the same continuity equation as $v$. \(^{(14)}\). That is,

$$\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho u) = 0 .$$

(58)

5.4 Variation of pressure

From the $\delta p$-EL equation \(^{(48)}\),

$$\frac{1}{\gamma - 1} \left( \frac{\tau_0 \rho}{p} - 1 \right) = 0 ,$$

which leads to the isothermal equation of state

$$p = \tau_0 \rho .$$

(59)

A related result is sometimes useful: From \(^{(43)}\) after a little algebra,

$$\frac{\partial L^\Lambda C}{\partial \rho} = u \cdot v - \frac{u^2}{2} - \tau_0 \ln \frac{\rho}{\rho_\Omega} ,$$

$$\equiv u \cdot v - h_\Omega$$

where the Bernoulli "head" $h_\Omega$ is defined by

$$h_\Omega = \frac{u^2}{2} + \tau_0 \ln \frac{\rho}{\rho_\Omega} ,$$

(60)

with $\rho_\Omega$ a spatially constant reference density that need not be given as it does not contribute to the $\Delta x$-EL. \(^{(52)}\).

5.5 Variation of scalar potential

From the $\delta \Phi$-EL equation \(^{(51)}\) and \(^{(65)}\),

$$\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\partial L^\Omega C}{\partial E} \right) = \nabla \cdot \lambda' = 0 .$$

(61)

where \(^{(62)}\)

$$\lambda' \equiv \lambda - \mu_\Omega^p C .$$

(62)

As explained at the end of Subsection \(^{(4.1)}\) in the iterative augmented Lagrangian method $\lambda \equiv \lambda^k = \lambda^{k-1} - \mu_\Omega^{p-k} C^{k-1}$, $\lambda' \equiv \lambda^{k+1} = \lambda^k - \mu_\Omega^p C^k$, etc.
Taking the divergence of both sides of (62) gives \( \nabla \cdot C = \frac{1}{\mu_\Omega} \nabla \cdot \lambda - \nabla \cdot (v \times B) \), which, with (29), leads to the Maxwell-Poisson form of the \( \delta \Phi \)-EL equation

\[
\nabla \cdot E = \frac{1}{\mu_\Omega} \nabla \cdot \lambda - \nabla \cdot (v \times B),
\]

which, in the limit as \( \nabla \cdot \lambda / \mu_\Omega \rightarrow 0 \), is the same as the Maxwell-Poisson equation \( \nabla \cdot E = -\nabla \cdot (v \times B) \) that follows from (55), derived when the IOL was assumed exactly satisfied.

5.6 Variation of vector potential (24)

From (44), (42) and (30) we have

\[
\frac{\partial \rho_{\Omega}^L}{\partial B} = \frac{\partial}{\partial B} \left( -\frac{B^2}{2\mu_0} + \frac{\mu_\Omega B \cdot u}{\mu_0} + C \cdot \lambda - \frac{\mu_\Omega^P C^2}{2} \right)
\]

\[
= -\frac{B}{\mu_0} + \frac{\nu_{\Omega} u}{\mu_0} + \frac{\partial C}{\partial B} \cdot \lambda'
\]

\[
= -\frac{\mu_\Omega B}{\mu_0} + \nu_{\Omega} u - v \times \lambda'
\]

and \( \frac{\partial \rho_{\Omega}^L}{\partial E} = \lambda' \). (64)

Inserting these identities in the \( \delta A \)-EL equation (50) gives

\[
\nabla \times \left( -\frac{B}{\mu_0} + \frac{\nu_{\Omega} u}{\mu_0} - v \times \lambda' \right) = -\frac{\mu_\Omega B}{\mu_0} - \epsilon F \frac{\partial \lambda'}{\partial t},
\]

and multiplying both sides by \( -\mu_0 \) gives

\[
\nabla \times B = \mu_\Omega B + \nu_\Omega \omega + \mu_0 [\epsilon F \partial_t \lambda' - \nabla \times (v \times \lambda')] \),
\]

where \( \omega \equiv \nabla \times u \) is the vorticity.

5.6.1 Electric current

We can also identify the electric current, \( j \equiv \nabla \times B / \mu_0 \), so (66) can be written

\[
\]

\[
\]

The first term on the RHS of (66) is the usual parallel electric current term of the linear-force-free (Beltrami) magnetic field model, the second term is a vorticity-driven current [Yokoi (2013)] term, while the last term is a new IOL constraint current which, (taking into account the EL equation \( \nabla \cdot \lambda' = 0 \)) maintains the divergence-free nature of \( j \) as required to maintain quasi-neutrality. Crossing with \( B \) on the right gives the Lorentz force density

\[
\]

\[
\]

\[
\]

\[
\]
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The total physical force density acting on the fluid is \(- \nabla p + j \times B\) (while temperature is constant in our thermally relaxed theory, if there is a density gradient there is a pressure gradient). Dewar et al. (2020) show unconstrained RxMHD satisfies this physical requirement and it would be desirable to apply this “physicality test” on the feasible (IOL-compliant) subset of electrostatic or electromagnetic RxMHD evolutions. As \(j \times B\) is only part of the force we shall revisit this question after deriving the momentum equation below.

5.7 Lagrangian variation of fluid element position

This final Euler–Lagrange equation will in principle provide sufficient equations to solve for the unknowns. Rather than the raw \(\Delta x\)-EL equation (52), consider the conservation form (55) where, from (30), (53) and (32)

\[
\Pi + \varepsilon_F \frac{\partial L^A_{\Omega}}{\partial E} \times B = \rho u + \frac{\partial L^C_{\Omega}}{\partial v} + \varepsilon_F \frac{\partial L^C_{\Omega}}{\partial E} \times B \\
= \rho u + \frac{\partial C}{\partial v} \cdot \lambda' + \varepsilon_F \left( \frac{\partial C}{\partial E} \cdot \lambda' \right) \times B \quad (69)
\]

\[
\Pi + \varepsilon_F \frac{\partial L^A_{\Omega}}{\partial B} \times B = \rho u + (1 - \varepsilon_F) B \times \lambda'. \quad (70)
\]

Starting with the coefficient of \(I\) in the tensor \(T\), (56), and referring to (42), (43) and (44) we find

\[
L^A_{\Omega} - \rho \frac{\partial L^A_{\Omega}}{\partial \rho} = \frac{p}{\gamma - 1} - \frac{\gamma \tau \rho}{\gamma - 1} - \frac{B^2}{2\mu_0} + \nu_\Omega u \cdot B - \frac{\mu_0}{\mu_0} + \frac{L^C_{\Omega}}{\mu_0} \\
= p - \frac{B^2}{2\mu_0} + \nu_\Omega u \cdot B - \frac{\mu_0}{\mu_0} + \lambda \cdot C - \frac{\mu_0}{\mu_0} \frac{C^2}{2}. \quad (71)
\]

The penultimate term in \(T\) is

\[
- \frac{\partial L^C_{\Omega}}{\partial E} E = - \lambda' E \quad (72)
\]

which consists of a symmetric \(E' E'\) term and a non-symmetric \(E' u \times B\) term.

The preceding term of \(T\) is, using (64) and (68),

\[
\frac{\partial L^A_{\Omega}}{\partial B} \times B = (-B + \nu_\Omega u - \mu_0 v \times \lambda') \times B - \frac{\mu_0}{\mu_0} \\
= \frac{B}{\mu_0} (-B + \nu_\Omega u - \mu_0 v \times \lambda') \\
- \frac{I}{\mu_0} (-B^2 + \nu_\Omega u \cdot B - \mu_0 v \times \lambda' \cdot B),
\]

and the remaining, first term is

\[
evI = \left( u - \frac{\nu_\Omega B}{\mu_0 \rho} \right) \left( \rho u + B \times \lambda' \right).
\]

Thus, combining all terms, (73) becomes
\[ \partial_t [\rho u + (1 - \epsilon_F) B \times \lambda'] + \nabla \cdot (T_{\text{MHD}} + T_{\text{Res}}) = (\nabla \lambda) \cdot C, \tag{73} \]

where \( T_{\text{MHD}} \) is the momentum transport plus stress tensor for both IMHD and RxMHD [Dewar et al. (2020)].

\[ T_{\text{MHD}} = \rho uu + (p + \frac{B^2}{2\mu_0}) I - \frac{BB}{\mu_0}, \tag{74} \]

the terms in \( \nu_\Omega \) that might have contributed to \( T_{\text{MHD}} \) in the RxMHD case having cancelled.

The new term \( T_{\text{Res}} \) is the “internal” residual stress contribution arising when action-extremizing solutions are infeasible, i.e. when the IOL constraint is not satisfied exactly,

\[ T_{\text{Res}} \equiv \left( \lambda \cdot C - \frac{\mu_\Omega^P C^2}{2} - \lambda' \cdot v \times B \right) I - Bv \times \lambda' + vB \times \lambda' - \lambda' E \]

\[ = \left( \lambda' \cdot C - \lambda' \cdot u \times B + \frac{\mu_\Omega^P C^2}{2} \right) I + B\lambda' \times u + uB \times \lambda' + \lambda'u \times B - \lambda' C . \tag{75} \]

(Interestingly, the \( \nu_\Omega \) cancellation also occurred in deriving \( T_{\text{Res}} \) when \( v \) was replaced by \( u - \nu_\Omega B/\mu_0 \).

The “external” residual force on the RHS of (73) obviously vanishes for feasible solutions, thus passing the physicality test proposed after (5). However it is not obvious that \( T_{\text{Res}} \) vanishes when \( C \neq 0 \) as it involves the unknown converged Lagrange multiplier \( \lambda^\infty \) (= \( \lambda^\infty \) when \( C = 0 \)), but it is easy to verify that both the diagonal and off-diagonal terms of \( T_{\text{Res}} \) not involving \( C \) explicitly do vanish if \( \lambda \) is proportional to \( B \). A version of the augmented constraint method that satisfies this condition is given in Subsection 6.1. In this case, assuming \( \mu_\Omega^P \neq 0 \), \( T_{\text{Res}} = 0 \) if and only if \( C = 0 \).

5.7.1 Momentum and angular momentum conservation

When a trial solution is IOL-infeasible, i.e. \( C \neq 0 \), \( T_{\text{Res}} \) is not a symmetric tensor, indicating it imparts both an isotropic pressure force and a torque on the plasma, presumably tending to change \( u \) in such a way as to “bend” the flow toward conformity with the Ideal Ohm’s Law. There is a cyclic symmetry in \( T_{\text{Res}} \) among the three terms in \( \lambda' \cdot u \), \( B \) that indicate that the magnetic field is coupled to \( E' \) in a similar fashion as \( u \), and indeed we see from (67) that there is a “dynamo” term depending on \( E' \) in \( j \) that modifies \( B \), by Ampère’s Law.

6 Questions for further investigation

In this section we propose two avenues of investigation for better understanding, improving and testing the augmented Lagrangian approach for adding, as
a weak constraint, an almost-ideal Ohm’s Law to relaxed MHD (hopefully establishing it as an improvement on ideal MHD for modelling non-axisymmetric toroidally confined plasmas). These ideas are to be discussed in more detail in a planned future publication in the context of applications to test problems.

6.1 A modified Lagrange multiplier iteration?

A physically more instructive and possibly faster variant of the vector augmented Lagrangian method is to decompose $C$ into its perpendicular projection $C_\perp \equiv C \cdot (\mathbf{I} - e_B e_B)$, and its parallel projection $C_\parallel = E_\parallel e_B$, where the unit vector in the “parallel direction” $e_B \equiv \mathbf{B}/B$ is the tangent vector at a point on a magnetic field line, orthogonal to the “perpendicular plane”.

Then the augmented Lagrangian iteration can be split into an outer loop where the parallel component is updated using

$$
\lambda^k_\parallel = \lambda^{k-1}_\parallel - \mu^k_\Omega E^{k-1}_\parallel,
$$

assuming $\lambda^k_\perp$ has already been updated during the solution of the Euler–Lagrange equations for all the other $k^{th}$ iteration variables (using inner loops as necessary). That is $\lambda^k_\parallel$ is updated using the perpendicular IOL constraint, $E^k_\perp + v^k \times B^k = 0$, with $E^k_\perp$ the perpendicular component of $E^k$ determined from

$$\nabla \cdot E^k = \nabla \cdot \left( \lambda^k_\parallel e_B + \lambda^k_\perp \right)/\mu^k_\Omega - \nabla \cdot (v^k \times B^k).
$$

This modified augmented Lagrangian method puts the focus on $E_\parallel$, seen as a potential source of singular behaviour if we write $\nabla \cdot E = \mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \left( E_\parallel/|\mathbf{B}| \right) + \nabla \cdot E_\perp$ and try to solve for $E_\parallel$ by inverting $\mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla$, which is a singular operator. Physically, reconnection is typically attributed to resistivity, which makes $E_\parallel$ nonzero. Thus this version of $L^\Omega_\parallel$ seems well motivated physically. We anticipate that stopping the iteration at a small but finite tolerance $\|E_\parallel\|_{\text{max}}$ will provide sufficient regularization that the formation of singular MHD behaviour can studied as the limit of a sequence of smoother solutions parametrized by $\|E_\parallel\|_{\text{max}}$.

As $\lambda^k_\parallel$ is now determined consistently with the variables being varied in Hamilton’s Principle, only $\lambda^k_\parallel$ needs to be regarded as “external” so the derivation of (55) needs to be revised accordingly.

6.2 Are converged EM RxMHD and isothermal IMHD equivalent?

Setting $\epsilon_F = 1$ and taking the curl of both sides of (7) gives

$$
\partial_t \mathbf{B} = - \nabla \times \mathbf{E},
$$

which gives $\partial_t \mathbf{B} = \nabla \times (v \times \mathbf{B})$ only if $\mathbf{E} = -v \times \mathbf{B}$ everywhere in $\Omega$, i.e. the augmented Lagrangian iteration converges pointwise. In this case EM RxMHD and isothermal IMHD are equivalent provided we can show the IMHD equations are compatible with our EM RxMHD Euler–Lagrange equations, for instance with the version of the $\delta A$-EL equation. This equation appears to indicate we need to know the Lagrange multiplier $\lambda$ ($= \lambda$ as $C = 0$) before we can show compatibility, but the problem goes away if we turn around and read it as an equation for $\lambda$,

$$
\partial_t \lambda - \nabla \times (v \times \lambda) = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \left( \nabla \times \mathbf{B} - \mu_\Omega \mathbf{B} - \nu_\Omega \omega \right),
$$

(77)
which is an inhomogeneous version of the IMHD evolution equation for \( B \), driven by terms that are advanced by the IMHD equations. If this equation can be solved for \( \lambda \), the compatibility problem moves to the other EL equations.

The homogeneous equation is solved by

\[
\lambda_0 = \alpha \Omega = \nu_\Omega / \mu_0 \frac{B}{B_0},
\]

with \( \alpha \) a dimensionless constant over \( \Omega \) and the time interval of interest. Here \( B_0 \) is a typical magnetic field value and factor \( \nu_\Omega / \mu_0 \) is used to make the dimensions of \( \lambda_0 \cdot C \) compatible with other terms in the Lagrangian.

Consider the static case \( \partial_t \lambda = 0 \), when (77) is solved by any \( \lambda \) satisfying

\[
v \times \lambda = \frac{1}{\mu_0} [-B + \mu_\Omega (A + \nabla \chi) + \nu_\Omega u],
\]

with \( \chi \) to be determined by the solvability condition that the RHS be orthogonal to \( v \), i.e.

\[
v \cdot \nabla \chi = v \cdot (B - \mu_\Omega A - \nu_\Omega u).
\]

If this equation can be solved for \( \chi \), crossing(81) with \( v \) on the right gives

\[
(v^2 I - vv) \cdot \lambda = \frac{1}{\mu_0} [-B + \mu_\Omega (A + \nabla \chi) + \nu_\Omega u] \times v.
\]

However, solving for \( \chi \) requires inverting the singular operator \( v \cdot \nabla \), which, like \( B \cdot \nabla \), can only be done if the RHS of (81) obeys special non-resonance conditions. Thus we conclude uniformly converged EM RxMHD and isothermal IMHD are, at best, equivalent only in integrable systems. In the general 3-D case we conjecture that equivalence will break down and reconnection of magnetic field lines and fluid stream lines will occur during the augmented Lagrangian iteration.

7 Conclusion

Invoking the augmented Lagrangian version of the penalty function method for constrained optimization we have sketched out what we hope is a practical computational way for iteratively solving the Relaxed MHD (RxMHD) Euler–Lagrange equations of Dewar et al. (2020) with added Ideal Ohm’s Law (IOL) constraint terms.

This method depends crucially on the existence of a Lagrange multiplier field to be found using the augmented Lagrangian iteration algorithm borrowed from finite-dimensional optimization theory. A formal proof of convergence may be difficult, but a practical approach will be to test the algorithm by perturbing away from IOL-feasible relaxed equilibria in simple geometries. A suitable such starting point is the rigidly rotating axisymmetric tokamak equilibrium discussed by Dewar et al. (2020). Convergence can be tested using numerical experimentation, but formal numerical analysis would be desirable to determine conditions for, and rates of, convergence.

To find the constrained momentum equation we have used a little-known dyadic identity to derive a general conservation form. Substituting the constrained-RxMHD Lagrangian into this general form reveals residual terms in the stress
tensor and a fictitious external force that should tend to zero uniformly in \( \Omega \) if the constraint iteration converges so as to satisfy the IOL equality constraint.

However in non-axisymmetric, three-dimensional (3-D) plasma confinement systems such as stellarators and real tokamaks with field errors and intentionally resonant magnetic perturbations, there is good physical reason to believe uniform pointwise convergence is impossible. In such cases the best we can hope for is convergence in an \( L^2 \)-norm, which will provide a weak-form regularization to cope with the singularities to which IMHD is prone in 3-D. This regularization should break the frozen-in flux condition of IMHD on small scales and allow interesting behaviour to be simulated, such as reconnection events and the conjectured formation of equilibrium fractal flow patterns in 3-D systems. Other potential physical phenomena to investigate in 3-D systems include the linear normal mode spectrum, nonlinear saturation, bifurcations to oscillatory modes, and the effect of quasisymmetry [Nührenberg & Zille (1988); Burby et al. (2020); Rodriguez et al. (2020); Constantin et al. (2021)] on 3-D equilibria with flow [Vanneste & Wirosoetisno (2008)].

Also, to improve the physical applicability of relaxed MHD it will be important to extend the handling of thermal relaxation beyond MHD with isotropic pressure — relaxation parallel to the magnetic field is very reasonable physically but perpendicular relaxation has forced the use of discontinuous pressure profiles in the MRxMHD-based SPEC code described by Hudson et al. (2012). Thus it will be important to build on the work of Dennis et al. (2014a) to include an anisotropic pressure tensor in a weakly IOL-feasible model.

Appendices

A A very brief history of relaxed MHD

The term relaxation in the physical sciences generally connotes a process by which a system tends toward an equilibrium state: thermodynamic, chemical, electrodynamic, mechanical, or a combination of these. For example, in a closed, constant energy system initially out of thermodynamic equilibrium, relaxation occurs as the entropy increases toward a maximum. In an open system at a temperature above that of a surrounding heat bath, relaxation occurs as heat carries energy out of the system, so its thermal energy tends toward a minimum. In an open system with unbalanced mechanical forces, potential energy is converted into kinetic energy, which in turn is dissipated by friction into heat that is lost to the outside world, thus minimizing total energy, thermal and potential. This is the paradigm implicit in our use of the term “relaxation”, the assumption that a relaxed state is defined by the minimum of a Hamiltonian.

In plasma physics the first use of the term may have been in the paper by Chandrasekhar & Woltjer (1958), which proposes two variational principles other than maximizing entropy or minimizing energy: maximum energy for given mean-square current density and minimum dissipation for a given magnetic energy. The common element in these, and the minimum energy at constant magnetic helicity principle used by Woltjer (1958a) and Taylor (1974) is the derivation of a “linear-force-free” magnetic field obeying the Beltrami equation \( \nabla \times B = \mu B \), with \( \mu \) constant, as the outcome. The Chandrasekhar and Woltjer work was in the context of plasma astrophysics, justifying
the force-free assumption (where the force density in question is $j \times B$) basically on the assumption the plasma has low $\beta \equiv p / (B^2/2\mu_0)$ and no confining forces that are strong compared with gradients of magnetic pressure. In contrast Taylor considered a toroidal terrestrial plasma confined in a metal shell and driven by a strong induced current, creating a turbulent state from which the plasma relaxes. Taylor regards the relaxation mechanism as the breaking of the microscopic IMHD topological invariants leaving only the global magnetic helicity as conserved.

Taylor (1974) is uncommital as to the exact details of this breaking of microscopic invariants and is content to use successful comparison with experiment of the predictions flowing from his derivation of the Beltrami equation as sufficient validation of his elegantly simple model, a general philosophy we also adopt. However in his later review, Taylor (1986) gives some more detail on the decay mechanism, citing some turbulence simulations and invokes turbulence scale length arguments to explain why it is energy that is minimized rather than magnetic helicity. Moffatt (2015) has recently critically reviewed the arguments of Taylor (1986) from a more modern perspective.

Woltjer (1958b) pointed out there were other global IMHD invariants beyond magnetic helicity, in particular his eq. (2), the cross helicity involving both flow and magnetic field. Bhattacharjee & Dewar (1982) pointed that in an axisymmetric system an infinity of additional global invariants could be generated by taking moments of $A \cdot B$ with powers of a flux function, and used lower moments to generate more physical pressure and current profiles for tokamak equilibria than the very restricted profiles given by Taylor’s relaxation principle. Hudson et al. (2012) developed multi-region relaxed MHD (MRxMHD), a generalization of single-region Taylor relaxation by inserting thin IMHD barrier interface tori to frustrate global Taylor relaxation. This generalization is appropriate to non-axisymmetric equilibria in stellarators and in tokamaks with symmetry-breaking perturbations, where magnetic field-line flow can be chaotic even without turbulence. This MRxMHD formulation is implemented in the now well-established Stepped-Pressure Equilibrium Code (SPEC).

A relaxation approach for finding equilibria with flow by adding a constraint additional to conservation of magnetic helicity, conservation of cross helicity, was used by Finn and Antonsen Finn & Antonsen (1983) using an entropy-maximization relaxation principle [see also the contemporaneous paper by Hameiri Hameiri (1983)]. However, they show this leads to the same equations as energy minimization. Thus we take, as in IMHD, the entropy in $\Omega$ to be conserved and follow Taylor in defining relaxed states as energy minima.

Pseudo-dynamical energy-descent relaxation processes that conserve topological invariants have been developed, Vallis et al. (1989); Vladimirov et al. (1999) but we stay within the framework of conservative classical mechanics by developing a dynamical formalism, RxMHD, that includes relaxed equilibria as stationary points of a relaxation Hamiltonian, with Lagrange multipliers to constrain chosen macroscopic invariants, but which also allows non-equilibrium motions, most easily done using Hamilton’s action principle. Stability can also be examined by taking the second variation of the Hamiltonian, Vladimirov et al. (1999) but in this paper, as in Dewar et al. (2015) and Dewar et al. (2020) we deal only with first variations.
Some vector calculus identities

In the body of this paper we have used the usual coordinate-free vector (and dyadic) calculus notations, but in this appendix we derive some identities that are more easily proved using elementary tensor notation. Assuming an arbitrary fixed orthonormal basis \( \{ e_i \}, i = 1, 2, 3 \mod 3 \), a vector, \( \mathbf{a} \), say, is represented as \( \mathbf{a} = a_i e_i \), the summation convention for contraction over repeated dummy indices being assumed throughout.

Thus dot and cross products are represented as \( \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b} = a_i b_i \) and \( \mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b} = e_i \varepsilon_{ijk} a_j b_k \), respectively, where the alternating Levi-Civita tensor \( \varepsilon_{ijk} \) is 1 or \( -1 \) according as \( \{ i, j, k \} \) is an even or odd permutation of \( \{ 1, 2, 3 \} \), or 0 if it is neither (e.g. if there are repeated integers). Also the operations of grad and curl acting on scalar and vector functions \( f \) and \( \mathbf{f} \), respectively, are represented as \( \nabla f = \partial f / \partial x_i \equiv e_i \partial / \partial x_i f \) and \( \nabla \times \mathbf{f} \equiv e_i \varepsilon_{ijk} \partial_j a_k \), where \( \partial_i \equiv \partial / \partial x_i \). We use parentheses to limit the scope of the rightward differentiation of such operators.

NB Left-right ordering is more important in vector notation. E.g. the dyadics \( \mathbf{ab} \) and \( \mathbf{ba} \) are distinct, but \( a_i b_j = b_j a_i \).

Lemma 1. Variational derivative of functional \( F[A, \Phi] = \int \int \int f(A, B, E) \, dV \, dt \) is

\[
\frac{\delta F}{\delta A} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial A} + \nabla \times \frac{\partial f}{\partial B} + \epsilon_F \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{\partial f}{\partial E},
\]

where \( \epsilon_F \) is an arbitrary scalar-valued function of \( A, B = \nabla \times A \), and \( E = -\epsilon_F \partial_t A - \nabla \Phi \) from (7), \( A \) being an arbitrary vector field.

Varying \( A \)

\[
\delta F = \int \int \left[ \frac{\partial f}{\partial A} \cdot \delta A + \frac{\partial f}{\partial B} \cdot \nabla \times \delta A - \epsilon_F \frac{\partial f}{\partial E} \cdot \partial_t \delta A \right] \, dV \, dt
= \int \int \left[ \frac{\partial f}{\partial A} \delta A_i + \frac{\partial f}{\partial B} \varepsilon_{i,j,k} \partial_j \partial_k \delta A_i - \epsilon_F \frac{\partial f}{\partial E} \partial_t \delta A_i \right] \, dV \, dt
= \int \int \left[ \frac{\partial f}{\partial A} \delta A_i - \varepsilon_{k,j,i} \left( \partial_j \frac{\partial f}{\partial B} \right) \delta A_i + \epsilon_F \left( \partial_t \frac{\partial f}{\partial E} \right) \delta A_i \right] \, dV \, dt, \quad i \rightleftarrows k \& \text{ibp}
= \int \int \left[ \frac{\partial f}{\partial A} + \varepsilon_{i,j,k} \left( \partial_j \frac{\partial f}{\partial B} \right) + \epsilon_F \left( \partial_t \frac{\partial f}{\partial E} \right) \right] \delta A_i \, dV \, dt, \quad \varepsilon_{i,j,k} = -\varepsilon_{i,k,j}
= \int \int \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial A} + \nabla \times \frac{\partial f}{\partial B} + \epsilon_F \frac{\partial f}{\partial E} \right) \delta A \, dV \, dt \equiv \int \frac{\delta F}{\delta A} \cdot \delta A \, dV \, dt,
\]

where \( \rightleftarrows \) stands for “have swapped dummy indices” and “ibp” stands for “have integrated by parts” (neglecting surface terms on the assumption that the supports of variations do not include the boundary). □

Lemma 2. Variational derivative of functional \( F \) above is

\[
\frac{\delta F}{\delta \Phi} = \nabla \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial E},
\]

Derivation: Varying \( \Phi \)
\[ \delta F = \int \left[ -\frac{\partial f}{\partial E} \cdot \nabla \delta \Phi \right] \, dV dt \]

\[ = \int \left[ \left( \nabla \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial E} \right) \delta \Phi \right] 
\, dV dt \equiv \int \frac{\delta F}{\delta \Phi} \, d\Phi \, dV dt , \]

neglecting surface term as above. \( \square \)

Two useful identities, closely related to integration by parts, for deriving conservation forms of Euler–Lagrange equations for freely variable fields [members of the set denoted \( \eta \) in Dewar et al. (2020)] are

**Lemma 3.** For scalar fields, e.g. \( \Phi \)

\[ (\nabla \nabla \Phi) \cdot f = \nabla \cdot [f \nabla \Phi] - (\nabla \Phi) \nabla \cdot f , \quad (84) \]

where \( f \) is an arbitrary vector field, e.g. \( \partial \mathcal{L} / \partial \nabla \Phi \).

**Derivation:** Follows directly from fact \( \nabla \nabla \Phi \) is a symmetric dyadic, proved in first line below,

\[ (\nabla \nabla \Phi) \cdot f = e_i (\partial_i \partial_j \Phi) f_j = e_i (\partial_i \partial_j \Phi) f_j , \quad \partial_i = \partial_j \]

\[ = e_i (\partial_i \partial_j \Phi f_j) - e_i (\partial_i \Phi) \partial_j f_j \]

\[ = \nabla \cdot [f \nabla \Phi] - (\nabla \Phi) \nabla \cdot f , \]

where \( \Rightarrow \) stands for “have commuted operators”. \( \square \)

**Corollary 1.** For \( E = -\nabla \Phi - \epsilon_F \partial_t A \),

\[ (\nabla E) \cdot f = \nabla \cdot [f E] - E \nabla \cdot f - \epsilon_F f \times \partial_t B . \quad (85) \]

**Derivation:** Multiplying each side of (84) by \(-1\), writing \( -\nabla \Phi = E + \epsilon_F \partial_t A \) and subtracting \( \epsilon_F \partial_t A \) from both sides, the lemma (84) becomes

\[ (\nabla E) \cdot f = \nabla \cdot [f (E + \epsilon_F \partial_t A)] - (E + \epsilon_F \partial_t A) \nabla \cdot f - \epsilon_F (\nabla \partial_t A) \cdot f , \]

\[ = \nabla \cdot [f E] - E \nabla \cdot f - \epsilon_F f \cdot (\nabla \partial_t A) - \epsilon_F (\nabla \partial_t A) \cdot f \]

\[ = \nabla \cdot [f E] - E \nabla \cdot f - \epsilon_F f \times (\nabla \times \partial_t A) \]

\[ = \nabla \cdot [f E] - E \nabla \cdot f - \epsilon_F f \times \partial_t B . \quad \square \]

**Lemma 4.** For \( A \) an arbitrary vector field and \( B = \nabla \times A \),

\[ (\nabla B) \cdot f = -\nabla \cdot [f \times (\nabla A)^T] + (\nabla A) \cdot \nabla \times f , \quad (86) \]

where \( f \) is an arbitrary vector field, e.g. \( \partial \mathcal{L} / \partial \nabla B \). [N.B. For a more useful form see the corollary (87) below.]

**Derivation:**

\[ (\nabla \nabla \times A) \cdot f = e_i (\partial_i \varepsilon_{j,k,l} \partial_k A_l) f_j = e_i (\partial_k \varepsilon_{j,k,l} \partial_l A_l) f_j , \quad \partial_i = \partial_k \]

\[ = e_i \delta_{ik} \varepsilon_{j,k,l} \partial_k f_j - e_i (\partial_i \varepsilon_{j,k,l} \partial_k A_l) f_j \]

\[ = -\delta_{ik} \varepsilon_{j,k,l} f_j (\nabla A_l) + (\nabla A_l) \varepsilon_{i,k,l} \partial_k f_j , \quad \text{anticyclic perm. of } j, k, l \]

\[ = -\nabla \cdot [f \times (\nabla A)^T] + (\nabla A) \cdot \nabla \times f , \]

where \( (\nabla A)^T \) is the transpose of the dyadic \( \nabla A \). \( \square \)
Corollary 2.

\[
(\nabla B) \cdot f = (\nabla \times f) \times B - \nabla \cdot [f \times I \times B]
\]  

(87)

**Derivation:** Because of the identity \(\nabla \cdot (f \times \nabla A) - (\nabla \times f) \cdot \nabla A = 0\) (which is easily proven using the properties of the scalar product and the identity \(\nabla \times \nabla = 0\)) we can add \(\nabla \cdot (f \times \nabla A) - (\nabla A)^T \cdot (\nabla \times f)\) to the RHS of (86) to antisymmetrize \(\nabla A\) and thus to eliminate it in favour of \(\nabla \times A = B\):

\[
(\nabla B) \cdot f = \nabla \cdot [f \times (\nabla A - (\nabla A)^T)] + (\nabla A - (\nabla A)^T) \cdot \nabla \times f
\]

\[
= - \nabla \cdot [f \times I \times (\nabla A)] + (\nabla \times f) \times (\nabla \times A)
\]

the second term in the second line following from

\[
f \times (\nabla A - (\nabla A)^T) = f \times e_i e_i \cdot (\nabla A - (\nabla A)^T)
\]

\[
= - f \times e_i e_i \times (\nabla \times A)
\]

\(\square\)

Alternatively, verify without using vector potential but assuming \(\nabla \cdot B = 0\):

\[
\text{RHS} = (\nabla \times f) \times B - \nabla \cdot [f \times e_i e_i \times B]
\]

\[
= (\nabla \times f) \times B - (\nabla \times f) \cdot e_i e_i \times B
\]

\[
+ f \cdot e_j \times \nabla B \times e_j
\]

\[
= - e_m f \varepsilon_{j,i,k} e_j e_j \delta_k B_l
\]

\[
= - e_m f \delta_{i,m} \delta_{k,l} - e_j f \delta_{k,m} \partial_k B_l
\]

\[
= e_k f \delta_{i,m} \delta_{k,l} - e_j f \delta_{i,m} \partial_k B_k
\]

\[
= (\nabla B) \cdot f - f \nabla \cdot B
\]

\(= \text{LHS}\)

where we used the Levi-Cività tensor contraction result \(\varepsilon_{a,b,c} \varepsilon_{a,j,k} = \delta_{b,j} \delta_{c,k} - \delta_{b,k} \delta_{c,j}\), where here \(\delta\) is the Kronecker symbol. 

**Lemma 5.**

\[
f \times I \times g = g f - f \cdot g \ I
\]

(88)

**Derivation:**

\[
(f \times I \times g)_{i,j} = f_k e_i \cdot e_k \times e_i e_i \times e_m \cdot e_j g_m
\]

\[
= f_k \varepsilon_{i,k} \varepsilon_{i,m,j} g_m = f_k \varepsilon_{i,k} \varepsilon_{i,m,j} g_m
\]

\[
= f_k (\delta_{i,m} \delta_{k,j} - \delta_{i,j} \delta_{k,m}) g_m
\]

\[
= f_j g_i - f_k g_k \delta_{i,j}
\]

\(\square\)

**Verification:**

\(\square\)

\(\text{This contraction result was obtained using the helpful tool at } \text{https://demonstrations.wolfram.com/ProductOfTwoLeviCivitaTensorsWithContractions/}\)
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\[ a \cdot \text{LHS} = a \cdot f \times 1 \times g \]
\[ = a \times f \cdot 1 \times g \]
\[ = (a \times f) \times g \]
\[ = (a \cdot g) f - (f \cdot g) a \]
\[ = a \cdot \text{RHS} \quad \forall \ a. \square \]

\[ \text{LHS} \cdot b = f \times 1 \cdot (g \times b) \]
\[ = f \times (g \times b) \]
\[ = (f \cdot b) g - (f \cdot g) b \]
\[ = \text{RHS} \cdot b \quad \forall \ b. \square \]
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