

Lagrangian characterization of sub-Alfvénic turbulence energetics

R. Skalidis *, K. Tassis & V. Pavlidou

*Department of Physics & Institute of Theoretical and Computational Physics, University of Crete, Vasilika Vouton, GR-70013, Heraklion, Greece, and
Institute of Astrophysics, Foundation for Research and Technology-Hellas, Vasilika Vouton, GR-70013 Heraklion, Greece*

The energetics of strongly magnetized turbulence has so far resisted all attempts to understand them. Numerical simulations of compressible turbulence reveal that kinetic energy can be orders of magnitude larger than fluctuating magnetic energy. We solve this lack-of-balance puzzle by calculating the energetics of compressible and sub-Alfvénic turbulence based on the dynamics of coherent cylindrical fluid parcels. Using a Lagrangian formulation, we prove analytically that the bulk of the magnetic energy transferred to kinetic is the energy stored in the coupling between the initial and fluctuating magnetic field. The analytical relations are in striking agreement with numerical data, up to second order terms.

I. Introduction

Magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) turbulence is involved in a plethora of physical phenomena [1–5]. The interplay between kinetic and magnetic energy is important for understanding such processes [6–14]. The energetics of MHD turbulence depend on the initial magnetization of the fluid [15–19], which can be quantified in terms of the Alfvén Mach number (\mathcal{M}_A , the ratio between turbulent velocities over the characteristic propagation speed V_A of magnetized fluctuations). Here we focus on sub-Alfvénic turbulence ($\mathcal{M}_A \lesssim 1$), which is encountered in systems such as tokamaks [20–22], in the interstellar medium [23–27], and the Sun [28–31].

In sub-Alfvénic turbulence, the amplitude of magnetic perturbations ($\delta\vec{B}$) is smaller than \vec{B}_0 , hence magnetic fluctuations are rapidly suppressed [32]. Despite the rapid suppression of $\delta\vec{B}$, direct numerical simulations suggest that a fluid, which is constantly perturbed (forced), can maintain large amounts of kinetic energy, such that $\rho\langle u^2 \rangle / 2 \gg \langle \delta B^2 \rangle / 8\pi$ [19, 33–36]. Furthermore, numerical results show that the ratio between kinetic (E_{kinetic}) and fluctuating magnetic ($E_{\text{b,harmonic}}$) energy depends on the strength of \vec{B}_0 [15–19].

The discrepancy between E_{kinetic} , and $E_{\text{b,harmonic}}$ has been phenomenologically attributed to the coupling between \vec{B}_0 and $\delta\vec{B}$ (i.e., $\vec{B}_0 \cdot \delta\vec{B}$), which should store most of the magnetic energy [35–38]; the coupling potential is realizable only in compressible fluids [39–42]. Thus, the magnetic coupling seems to hold the key for exploring turbulence

*rskalidis@physics.uoc.gr

energetics in sub-Alfvénic turbulence. However, there is yet lack of first-principles understanding of the role of $\vec{B}_0 \cdot \delta\vec{B}$ in turbulence dynamics and energetics.

We present an analytical theory of the role of the coupling potential in the energy exchange of sub-Alfvénic, and compressible turbulence. We use a Lagrangian formulation of coherent [43] flux tube segments. The motion of coherent tubes is the net effect of magnetic and velocity perturbations propagating through the surface of the tube. We calculate the energy exchange between kinetic and magnetic forms as a function of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A}}$, and find remarkable agreement with MHD numerical simulations.

II. Setup

Statistical properties of strongly magnetized turbulence are axially symmetric, with \vec{B}_0 being the axis of symmetry [44, 45]. For this reason, we consider a fluid consisting of coherent flux tube segments (or fluid parcels) with coordinates $(r(t), \phi(t), z(t))$. We assume the following initial conditions: 1) uniform temperature; 2) uniform density (ρ); 3) no bulk velocity; 4) uniform static magnetic field ($\vec{B}_0 = B_0\hat{z}$). We ignore gravity.

We perturb the magnetic field of a coherent fluid parcel by $\delta\vec{B}$ such that $|\vec{B}_0| \gg |\delta\vec{B}|$, which applies to sub-Alfvénic turbulence. Magnetic perturbations tend to redistribute the magnetic flux within a fluid. For ideal-MHD (flux-freezing) conditions, the magnetic flux is preserved. Thus, the perturbed volume's surface \vec{S} follows the magnetic field lines. The motion of the field lines, and hence of \vec{S} , can be either parallel or perpendicular to \vec{B}_0 : 1) squeezing and stretching of \vec{S} along \vec{B}_0 leads to parallel motions, $\dot{z} \neq 0$; 2) fluctuations of r lead to perpendicular motions, $\dot{r} \neq 0$; 3) twisting of the perturbed volume leads to rotational motions, $\dot{\phi} \neq 0$. The motion of \vec{S} is coherent, which means that the ensemble of sub-volumes embedded within the perturbation volume moves on average as \vec{S} . This naturally defines z , and r as the coherence lengths of the perturbed volume parallel and perpendicular to \vec{B}_0 respectively. We invoke as a boundary condition the presence of a local environment beyond the coherence length of the fluid parcel (“pressure wall”).

The flux freezing theorem can be expressed as,

$$\frac{d\vec{B}}{dt} \cdot \vec{S} = -\vec{B} \cdot \frac{d\vec{S}}{dt}. \quad (1)$$

The cross sections of the perturbed volume perpendicular and parallel to the initial field \vec{B}_0 are $\vec{S}_{\perp} = 2\pi r z \hat{r}$, and $\vec{S}_{\parallel} = \pi r^2 \hat{z}$ respectively. The cross section related to the rotational motion is $\vec{S}_{\phi} = z r \hat{\phi}$. The total magnetic field in cylindrical coordinates can be expressed as $\vec{B} = \delta B_r \hat{r} + \delta B_{\phi} \hat{\phi} + (B_0 + \delta B_{\parallel}) \hat{z}$. From Eq. 1 we obtain that when $|\vec{B}_0| \gg |\delta\vec{B}|$, magnetic perturbations along \vec{S}_{\parallel} are associated with a movement such that,

$$\dot{r}(t) = -\frac{\delta \dot{B}_{\parallel}(t)}{2B_0 + \delta B_{\parallel}} r(t) \approx -\frac{\delta \dot{B}_{\parallel}(t)}{2B_0} r_0, \quad (2)$$

where we have considered that the initial dimension of the perturbed volume r_0 is much larger than its perturbations. Along \vec{S}_\perp we find that,

$$\dot{z}(t) = -\left(\frac{\delta\dot{B}_r(t)}{\delta B_r(t)} - \frac{\delta\dot{B}_\parallel(t)}{2B_0}\right)z(t) \approx -\frac{\delta\dot{B}_r(t)}{\delta B_r(t)}z(t), \quad (3)$$

while the azimuthal velocity along \vec{S}_ϕ is,

$$u_\phi \equiv \dot{\phi}(t)r(t) \approx -\left(\frac{\delta\dot{B}_r(t)}{\delta B_r(t)} - \frac{\delta\dot{B}_\phi(t)}{\delta B_\phi(t)}\right)r(t). \quad (4)$$

In the approximate expressions we have employed that $|\vec{B}_0| \gg |\delta\vec{B}|$, which implies that parallel and perpendicular motions are independent. The coupling of parallel and perpendicular motions becomes inevitable when $|\vec{B}_0| \sim |\delta\vec{B}|$ (Eq. 3).

We henceforth use the following notation: $z = L_\parallel$, and $r = L_\perp$. From Eqs. 2, and 3 we derive,

$$\delta B_\parallel(t) \propto -B_0 \log L_\perp(t), \quad (5)$$

$$\delta B_\perp(t) \propto L_\parallel^{-1}(t). \quad (6)$$

The difference in the scaling is due to the Lorentz force by \vec{B}_0 , which affects perpendicular motions, while it has no effect on parallel motions.

III. Lagrangian formulation

We employ the Lagrangian of the perturbed volume. We place the reference frame at the center of mass of the target volume, hence there is no bulk velocity term in the Lagrangian. Therefore, all the velocity components are due to internal motions induced by magnetic perturbations. We focus on low plasma-beta fluids where thermal pressure is subdominant.

When $\mathcal{M}_A \ll 1$, magnetic tension dominates over magnetic pressure [32]. The large tension rapidly suppresses transverse oscillations and induces large restoring torques. Thus, twisting would have minimum contribution to the dynamics [e.g., 46] and motions would be mostly longitudinal ($\dot{\phi}, \delta B_\phi \approx 0$). Since $u_\phi \rightarrow 0$ then, due to Eqs. 3, and 4, $L_\parallel \gg L_\perp$. This implies that untwisted coherent structures are stretched towards the \vec{B}_0 axis, which is consistent with the anisotropic properties of sub-Alfvénic turbulence [9, 15, 44, 47–54].

The local perturbed Lagrangian [55, 56] of the fluid parcel can be split into parallel (\parallel) and perpendicular (\perp) terms to \vec{B}_0 as:

$$\delta\mathcal{L} = \overbrace{\left(\frac{1}{2}\rho u_\parallel^2 - \frac{\delta B_\perp^2}{8\pi}\right)}^{\delta\mathcal{L}_\perp} + \overbrace{\left(\frac{1}{2}\rho u_\perp^2 - \frac{B_0\delta B_\parallel}{4\pi} - \frac{\delta B_\parallel^2}{8\pi}\right)}^{\delta\mathcal{L}_\parallel}. \quad (7)$$

For untwisted fluid parcels, $\delta\mathcal{L}$ is independent of δB_ϕ , hence $\delta B_\perp = \delta B_r$. Quantities u_\parallel and u_\perp are the parallel and perpendicular velocity components, which correspond to the motion of L_\parallel and L_\perp respectively, $u_\parallel = \dot{L}_\perp$, $u_\perp = \dot{L}_\parallel$. Then, due to Eqs. 2, and 3, δB_\parallel , and δB_\perp are generalized coordinates of $\delta\mathcal{L}$. From Eq. 6, we obtain that $L_\parallel(t) = C/\delta B_\perp(t)$, where C is a constant determined from the initial conditions. With this expression we eliminate L_\parallel from the Lagrangian, which up to second order terms, is:

$$\delta\mathcal{L}_\perp(\delta B_\perp, \delta\dot{B}_\perp) \approx \frac{1}{2}\rho C^2 \frac{\delta\dot{B}_\perp^2}{\delta B_\perp^4} - \frac{\delta B_\perp^2}{8\pi}, \quad (8)$$

$$\delta\mathcal{L}_\parallel(\delta B_\parallel, \delta\dot{B}_\parallel) \approx \frac{1}{8}\rho \frac{\delta\dot{B}_\parallel^2}{B_0^2} L_{\perp,0}^2 - \frac{B_0\delta B_\parallel}{4\pi} - \frac{\delta B_\parallel^2}{8\pi}, \quad (9)$$

where $L_\perp(t=0) = L_{\perp,0}$. L_\parallel and L_\perp are unconstrained, hence the dynamics of the untwisted perturbed volume are self-similar, and $L_\parallel \gg L_\perp$. Below we solve the Euler-Lagrange equations for $\delta\mathcal{L}_\parallel$ and $\delta\mathcal{L}_\perp$.

IV. Solutions of $\delta\mathcal{L}_\parallel$

From the Euler-Lagrange equation of $\delta\mathcal{L}_\parallel$ we obtain:

$$\delta\ddot{B}_\parallel(t) = -(\delta B_\parallel(t) + B_0) \frac{4V_A^2}{L_{\perp,0}^2}, \quad (10)$$

where $V_A = B_0/\sqrt{4\pi\rho}$ is the Alfvénic speed.

Initially we compress the perturbed volume perpendicularly to \vec{B}_0 , then release it and let the compression propagate (initial conditions: $u_\perp(t=0) = 0$, $\delta B_\parallel(t=0) = \delta B_{\parallel,\max}$). Solutions of Eq. 10 are harmonic, but are valid only in the linear regime. From the jump conditions, we obtain analytically that when the sonic Mach number (\mathcal{M}_s) is $\mathcal{M}_s \gg 1$, an isothermal shock, perpendicular to \vec{B}_0 forms when:

$$\delta B_\parallel \lesssim \frac{B_0}{2} (\mathcal{M}_A^2 - 1) \quad (11)$$

Thus, in sub-Alfvénic turbulence, $\mathcal{M}_A < 1$, magnetized shocks form when $\delta B_\parallel < 0$. This means that δB_\parallel will never perform a full harmonic cycle, hence solutions of Eq. 10 are valid only at early times when perturbations are quasi-linear.

Keeping the dominant term of the expansion of the harmonic solutions we derive that,

$$\delta B_\parallel(t) \approx \delta B_{\parallel,\max} - 2B_0 \frac{V_A^2}{L_{\perp,0}^2} t^2. \quad (12)$$

The above solution, through Eq. 2 yields,

$$u_\perp(t) \approx \frac{2V_A^2}{L_{\perp,0}} t. \quad (13)$$

From Eqs. 12, and 13 we obtain that as the magnetic field of the perturbed volume decompresses, u_{\perp} increases. When the shock is formed, the perturbed volume instantaneously bounces off its environment, which acts as a pressure wall [57]. At the post-shock phase the motion is reversed and the perturbed volume will start contracting until $+\delta B_{\parallel, \max, p}$. The post-shock solutions are obtained from Eq. 10 with initial conditions: $u_p(t=0) > 0$, and $\delta B_{\parallel, p}(t=0) < 0$, where the subscript p denotes post-shock quantities; acceleration in the post-shock phase is negative.

At the post-shock phase, the magnetic field increases until $+\delta B_{\parallel, \max, p}$, which is smaller than the initial magnetic field increase ($+\delta B_{\parallel, \max}$) of the pre-shock phase, because energy has been dissipated by the shock [58, 59]. When the perturbed volume reaches $+\delta B_{\parallel, \max, p}$, velocity is zero, and the motion is reversed. Then, the volume starts expanding until it forms a shock again. Overall, the perturbed volume would perform damped oscillations until all the energy is dissipated [57, 60].

Fluids in nature are commonly assumed to be constantly perturbed until turbulence reaches a steady state [61–63]. Various driving mechanisms could maintain turbulent energy in nature [64–74]. In our model, turbulent driving is equivalent to adding externally kinetic energy to the perturbed volume, such that the initial velocity at the post-shock phase is sufficient to compress the perturbed volume until $\delta B_{\parallel, \max, p} \approx +\delta B_{\max, \parallel}$.

We consider the presence of an external driver, which ensures that δB_{\parallel} fluctuations, and hence energy, are maintained in a quasi-static state. In addition, we consider that the fluid is ergodic [75, 76]. For ergodic fluids, δB_{\parallel} would oscillate ballistically, $\delta B_{\parallel} \propto t^2$, between $+\delta B_{\parallel, \max}$ and $-\delta B_{\parallel, \max}$, as we argue below, with period $T_b = 4L_{\perp, 0}V_A^{-1}\sqrt{\delta B_{\parallel, \max}/2B_0}$.

When we initially compress the magnetic field of the perturbed volume along \vec{B}_0 , then due to Eq. 5, L_{\perp} decreases. This forces the surface of the environment of the perturbed volume to increase by equal amounts. Thus, the $+\delta B_{\parallel, \max}$ initial increase of the magnetic field of the perturbed volume, causes the magnetic field of the environment to decrease by $-\delta B_{\parallel, \max}$, due to flux freezing. If the fluid is ergodic, then different fluid parcels correspond to different oscillation phases of the target fluid parcel [75, 76]. Therefore, the $-\delta B_{\parallel, \max}$ of the environment, corresponds to the maximum decrease of the magnetic field strength of the target volume. Non-linear effects can break the symmetry between $+\delta B_{\parallel, \max}$ and $-\delta B_{\parallel, \max}$, but ergodicity is only weakly broken when $\vec{B}_0 \neq 0$ [77].

The perturbed volume would spend most of its time in the compressed state, since there the velocity is minimum. On the other hand, the velocity of the fluid parcel is maximum when $\delta B_{\parallel} < 0$, and hence the fluid parcel would spend minimum time there. As a result, due to ergodicity, the majority of fluid parcels at a given time would be compressed ($\delta B_{\parallel} > 0$), which is verified by numerical simulations [36].

V. Solutions of $\delta \mathcal{L}_{\perp}$

From the Euler-Lagrange equation of $\delta \mathcal{L}_{\perp}$ we obtain,

$$\delta \ddot{B}_{\perp}(t)\delta B_{\perp}(t) - 2\delta \dot{B}_{\perp}^2(t) + \frac{\delta B_{\perp}^6(t)}{4\pi\rho C^2} = 0. \quad (14)$$

For $|\vec{B}_0| \gg |\delta\vec{B}|$, the sixth-order term above can be neglected, and then the solutions are straightforward. The total pressure of the fluid exerted by δB_\perp is transferred to parallel motions (Eq. 3), hence $\rho u_{\parallel, \max}^2/2 = \delta B_{\perp, \max}^2/(8\pi)$. We derive the following solutions:

$$\delta B_\perp(t) \approx \frac{f B_0}{1 \pm f V_A L_{\parallel, 0}^{-1} t}, \quad u_\parallel(t) \approx \pm f V_A, \quad (15)$$

where $L_\parallel(t=0) = L_{\parallel, 0}$, and $f = \delta B_{\perp, \max}/B_0 \ll 1$. In the above equations signs depend on the initial conditions. Initially we consider that $\delta B_\perp(t=0) = \delta B_{\perp, \max}$, and $u_\parallel(t=0) = u_{\perp, \max}$, which leads to positive signs.

If the initial velocity along \vec{B}_0 is zero, then both u_\parallel and δB_\perp would remain static. The coupling of parallel and perpendicular motions (Eq. 3) would induce parallel motions when $\delta \dot{B}_\parallel \neq 0$, even if $u_\parallel(0) = 0$. However, since we have neglected the coupling of motions, we initiate u_\parallel from the initial conditions.

From Eq. 6 we obtain that the free streaming of the perturbed volume causes L_\parallel to expand as:

$$L_\parallel(t) \approx L_{\parallel, 0} \left(1 + \frac{f V_A}{L_{\parallel, 0}} t \right) \quad (16)$$

As the target fluid parcel expands, its environment along the \vec{B}_0 axis contracts, provided that the fluid has fixed boundaries. Due to the expansion of the target volume, the initial velocity of the environment would be $-u_{\parallel, \max}$, which results to negative sign in the denominator of Eq. 15, and hence δB_\perp increases in the environment. On the other hand, δB_\perp in the target volume stops increasing when $t_c = L_{\parallel, 0}/(f V_A)$, because δB_\perp in the environment becomes infinite. In sub-Alfvénic flows $|\vec{B}_0| \gg |\delta\vec{B}_\perp|$, so this infinity should be treated as an asymptotic behaviour of δB_\perp : there is a physical limit above which δB_\perp cannot grow. After t_c , the motion is reversed and the environment starts expanding along \vec{B}_0 , causing the target volume to contract with δB_\perp growing as $\delta B_\perp(t) \approx f B_0/(2 - f V_A L_{\parallel, 0}^{-1} t)$ * until it reaches $\delta B_{\perp, \max}$. If the interaction between the target fluid parcel and its environment were elastic, then the target volume would oscillate periodically, since there would be no energy losses[†], between $\delta B_{\perp, \max}$ and $\delta B_{\perp, \max}/2$ with period $T_\parallel = 2L_{\parallel, 0}/(f V_A)$.

VI. Energetics

For an ergodic fluid [75, 76], the volume-averaged energetics ($\langle f \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}$) at a given time are equivalent to the time-averaged energetics ($\langle f \rangle_t$) of a fluid parcel. We next compute analytically the $\langle f \rangle_t$ energy contribution of each Lagrangian term (Eq. 7) and their relative ratios. We compare the energy ratios against the $\langle f \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}$ numerical values. The numerical data correspond to simulations of ideal, isothermal MHD turbulence without self-gravity; turbulence is forced and maintained in a quasi-static state.

*This solution is obtained by considering that the initial conditions in the reversed motion of the fluid parcel are: $\delta B_\perp(0) = \delta B_{\perp, \max}/2$, $u_\parallel(0) = -u_{\parallel, \max}$, and $L_\parallel(0) = 2L_{\parallel, 0}$. These values correspond to the solutions of Eqs. 15, and 16 for $t = t_c$.

[†]Shocks can form in parallel motions and diffuse energy. External driving can maintain the maximum amplitude of fluctuations constant.

A. Kinetic energy

The averaged total kinetic energy (E_{kinetic}) of the fluid parcel is,

$$\frac{1}{2}\rho \left(\langle u_{\perp}^2 \rangle + \langle u_{\parallel}^2 \rangle \right) \approx \frac{B_0 \delta B_{\parallel, \text{max}}}{6\pi} + \frac{\delta B_{\perp, \text{max}}^2}{8\pi}, \quad (17)$$

where brackets denote averaging over a single period. The kinetic energy is dominated, to first order, by u_{\perp} . Thus, the average Alfvénic Mach number is, to first order,

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A}} \equiv \frac{\langle v^2 \rangle^{1/2}}{V_A} \approx \sqrt{\frac{4\delta B_{\parallel, \text{max}}}{3B_0}}. \quad (18)$$

B. Harmonic potential

From Eqs. 12, and 15 we find that $\langle \delta B_{\parallel}^2 \rangle = 7\delta B_{\parallel, \text{max}}^2/15$, and $\langle \delta B_{\perp}^2 \rangle = \delta B_{\perp, \text{max}}^2/2$. The total average harmonic potential energy (E_{harmonic}) density is equal to,

$$\frac{\langle \delta B_{\text{tot}}^2 \rangle}{8\pi} \approx \frac{\delta B_{\text{max}, \parallel}^2}{8\pi} \left(\frac{7}{15} + \frac{\zeta^2(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A}})}{2} \right), \quad (19)$$

where $\zeta = \delta B_{\perp, \text{max}}/\delta B_{\parallel, \text{max}}$. Sub-Alfvénic turbulence is anisotropic [15, 44, 47, 48], with the anisotropy between δB_{\perp} and δB_{\parallel} depending on $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A}}$ [78]. To account for this property we assume that ζ is a function of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A}}$. When $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow 0$, \vec{B}_0 suppresses any bending of the magnetic field lines with the amplitude of δB_{\parallel} being larger than that of δB_{\perp} [78], hence $\zeta \rightarrow 0$. For $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow 1$, fluctuations tend to become more isotropic, and hence $\zeta \rightarrow \sqrt{2}$. These limiting behaviors are consistent with numerical simulations [36, 78].

C. Coupling potential

According to Eq. 17, $\vec{B}_0 \cdot \delta \vec{B}$ contributes to E_{kinetic} as,

$$\frac{B_0 \delta B_{\parallel, \text{max}}}{6\pi} = \sqrt{\frac{15}{7}} \frac{B_0 \langle \delta B_{\parallel}^2 \rangle^{1/2}}{6\pi} \approx \frac{B_0 \langle \delta B_{\parallel}^2 \rangle^{1/2}}{4\pi}. \quad (20)$$

This equation demonstrates that the energy stored in the coupling potential (E_{coupling}) is in equipartition with the average kinetic energy, when turbulence is sub-Alfvénic.




Fig. 1 Comparison between analytical and numerical results. Solid and dashed thick black lines correspond to the $E_{\text{harmonic}}/E_{\text{coupling}}$ ratio obtained analytically for $\mathcal{M}_A \rightarrow 0$ ($\zeta = 0$) and $\mathcal{M}_A \rightarrow 1$ ($\zeta = \sqrt{2}$) respectively. Numerical data are shown with colored dots. The blue line corresponds to the analytically-obtained $E_{\text{kinetic}}/E_{\text{coupling}}$ ratio, while colored triangles show the same quantities calculated from numerical data. Red boxes correspond to $E_{\text{kinetic}}/E_{m,\text{total}}$. The thin green line shows energy terms in equipartition. The colorbar shows the sonic Mach number (\mathcal{M}_s) of the simulations.

D. Energetics ratios

We compute the $E_{\text{kinetic}}/E_{\text{coupling}}$ ratio:

$$\frac{E_{\text{kinetic}}}{E_{\text{coupling}}} = \frac{2\pi\rho\langle u_{\text{tot}}^2 \rangle}{B_0\langle \delta B_{\parallel}^2 \rangle^{1/2}} \approx 1 + \frac{9}{16} \mathcal{M}_A^2 \zeta^2(\mathcal{M}_A). \quad (21)$$

For $\mathcal{M}_A \rightarrow 0$, $E_{\text{coupling}} \approx E_{\text{kinetic}}$, while for $\mathcal{M}_A \rightarrow 1$, $E_{\text{kinetic}} \gtrsim E_{\text{coupling}}$. E_{kinetic} becomes larger than E_{coupling} , since u_{\parallel} contributes more in E_{kinetic} as \mathcal{M}_A increases. When $\mathcal{M}_A \rightarrow 1$, $\zeta \approx \sqrt{2}$ so the $E_{\text{kinetic}}/E_{\text{coupling}}$ ratio in trans-Alfvénic turbulence scales as:

$$\frac{E_{\text{kinetic}}}{E_{\text{coupling}}} \approx 1 + \frac{9}{8} \mathcal{M}_A^2. \quad (22)$$

For $\mathcal{M}_A \rightarrow 0$, $E_{\text{kinetic}} \approx E_{\text{coupling}}$.

Regarding the $E_{\text{harmonic}}/E_{\text{coupling}}$ ratio we find that,

$$\frac{\langle \delta B_{\text{tot}}^2 \rangle}{2B_0\langle \delta B_{\parallel}^2 \rangle^{1/2}} = \frac{3}{8} \sqrt{\frac{15}{7}} \mathcal{M}_A^2 \left(\frac{7}{15} + \frac{\zeta^2(\mathcal{M}_A)}{2} \right), \quad (23)$$

which, for the two limiting cases of ζ , becomes,

$$\frac{E_{\text{harmonic}}}{E_{\text{coupling}}} \approx \begin{cases} 0.25 \mathcal{M}_A^2, & \mathcal{M}_A \rightarrow 0 \\ 0.80 \mathcal{M}_A^2, & \mathcal{M}_A \rightarrow 1 \end{cases}. \quad (24)$$

E. Numerical simulations

In the figure, we compare the analytically-calculated energy ratios against numerical results from the literature [36]. Lines correspond to the analytical relations for $E_{\text{harmonic}}/E_{\text{coupling}}$ (Eq. 24), and $E_{\text{kinetic}}/E_{\text{harmonic}}$ (Eq. 22), while colored markers correspond to the numerical values. The numerical data behave as predicted by the analytical relations. Accounting for the contribution from both $\vec{B}_0 \cdot \delta \vec{B}$ and δB^2 , the total energy stored ($E_{\text{m,total}} = E_{\text{coupling}} + E_{\text{harmonic}}$) in magnetic fluctuations is very close to equipartition with kinetic energy, as shown by the red boxes.

VII. Summary

This work presents a Lagrangian description of the energy transfer between kinetic and magnetic fluctuations of compressible and sub-Alfvénic fluids. From the flux-freezing theorem, we showed that δB_{\parallel} and δB_{\perp} are generalized coordinates of the local perturbed Lagrangian. We derived analytically the relations which connect kinetic and magnetic energy of sub-Alfvénic and compressible fluids, as a function of \mathcal{M}_A . We conclude that when $\mathcal{M}_A \leq 1$, the total

magnetic energy density transferred to kinetic is equal to $(2B_0\sqrt{\langle\delta B_{\parallel}^2\rangle} + \langle\delta B^2\rangle)/8\pi$. The consistency between our analytical relations and numerical data is remarkable and for this reason we believe that the formalism presented here could offer new insights into MHD turbulence.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to C. F. McKee, and T. Ch. Mouschovias for stimulating discussions. We also thank E. N. Economou, V. Pelgrims, E. Ntormousi, A. Tsouros, and I. Komis for useful suggestions on the manuscript. We acknowledge support by the European Research Council under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, grant agreement No. 771282 (RS and KT); by the Hellenic Foundation for Research and Innovation under the “First Call for H.F.R.I. Research Projects to support Faculty members and Researchers and the procurement of high-cost research equipment grant”, Project 1552 CIRCE (VP); and from the Foundation of Research and Technology - Hellas Synergy Grants Program (project MagMASim, VP, and project POLAR, KT).

References

- [1] Biskamp, D., “Magnetohydrodynamic Turbulence,” *Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion*, Vol. 45, No. 9, 2003, pp. 1827–1827. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0741-3335/45/9/701>, URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/0741-3335/45/9/701>.
- [2] Beresnyak, A., “MHD turbulence,” *Living Reviews in Computational Astrophysics*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 2019, 2. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41115-019-0005-8>.
- [3] Matthaeus, W. H., and Velli, M., “Who Needs Turbulence?. A Review of Turbulence Effects in the Heliosphere and on the Fundamental Process of Reconnection,” *Space Sci Rev*, Vol. 160, No. 1-4, 2011, pp. 145–168. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-011-9793-9>.
- [4] Matthaeus, W. H., “Turbulence in space plasmas: Who needs it?” *Physics of Plasmas*, Vol. 28, No. 3, 2021, 032306. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0041540>.
- [5] Schekochihin, A. A., “MHD Turbulence: A Biased Review,” *arXiv e-prints*, 2020, arXiv:2010.00699.
- [6] Goldstein, M. L., Roberts, D. A., and Matthaeus, W. H., “Magnetohydrodynamic Turbulence in the Solar Wind,” *Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, Vol. 33, No. 1, 1995, pp. 283–325. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.aa.33.090195.001435>, URL <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.aa.33.090195.001435>.
- [7] Ciolek, G. E., and Basu, S., “Formation and Collapse of Nonaxisymmetric Protostellar Cores in Planar Magnetic Interstellar Clouds: Formulation of the Problem and Linear Analysis,” *ApJ*, Vol. 652, No. 1, 2006, pp. 442–457. <https://doi.org/10.1086/507865>.
- [8] Kirk, H., Johnstone, D., and Basu, S., “The Interplay of Turbulence and Magnetic Fields in Star-Forming Regions: Simulations and Observations,” *ApJ*, Vol. 699, No. 2, 2009, pp. 1433–1453. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/699/2/1433>.

- [9] Oughton, S., Wan, M., Servidio, S., and Matthaeus, W. H., “On the Origin of Anisotropy in Magnetohydrodynamic Turbulence: The Role of Higher-order Correlations,” *ApJ*, Vol. 768, No. 1, 2013, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/768/1/10>.
- [10] Matthaeus, W. H., Goldstein, M. L., and Montgomery, D. C., “Turbulent Generation of Outward-Traveling Interplanetary Alfvénic Fluctuations,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, Vol. 51, 1983, pp. 1484–1487. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.51.1484>, URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.51.1484>.
- [11] Zweibel, E. G., and McKee, C. F., “Equipartition of Energy for Turbulent Astrophysical Fluids: Accounting for the Unseen Energy in Molecular Clouds,” *ApJ*, Vol. 439, 1995, p. 779. <https://doi.org/10.1086/175216>.
- [12] Schekochihin, A. A., Iskakov, A. B., Cowley, S. C., McWilliams, J. C., Proctor, M. R. E., and Yousef, T. A., “Fluctuation dynamo and turbulent induction at low magnetic Prandtl numbers,” *New Journal of Physics*, Vol. 9, No. 8, 2007, p. 300. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/9/8/300>.
- [13] Cho, J., and Lazarian, A., “Compressible Sub-Alfvénic MHD Turbulence in Low- β Plasmas,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, Vol. 88, No. 24, 2002, 245001. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.88.245001>.
- [14] Federrath, C., Chabrier, G., Schober, J., Banerjee, R., Klessen, R. S., and Schleicher, D. R. G., “Mach Number Dependence of Turbulent Magnetic Field Amplification: Solenoidal versus Compressive Flows,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, Vol. 107, No. 11, 2011, 114504. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.114504>.
- [15] Oughton, S., Priest, E. R., and Matthaeus, W. H., “The influence of a mean magnetic field on three-dimensional magnetohydrodynamic turbulence,” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, Vol. 280, 1994, p. 95–117. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022112094002867>.
- [16] Bian, X., and Aluie, H., “Decoupled Cascades of Kinetic and Magnetic Energy in Magnetohydrodynamic Turbulence,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, Vol. 122, No. 13, 2019, 135101. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.135101>.
- [17] Cho, J., Vishniac, E. T., Beresnyak, A., Lazarian, A., and Ryu, D., “Growth of Magnetic Fields Induced by Turbulent Motions,” *ApJ*, Vol. 693, No. 2, 2009, pp. 1449–1461. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/693/2/1449>.
- [18] Federrath, C., “Magnetic field amplification in turbulent astrophysical plasmas,” *Journal of Plasma Physics*, Vol. 82, No. 6, 2016, 535820601. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022377816001069>.
- [19] Lim, J., Cho, J., and Yoon, H., “Generation of Solenoidal Modes and Magnetic Fields in Turbulence Driven by Compressive Driving,” *ApJ*, Vol. 893, No. 1, 2020, 75. <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab8066>.
- [20] Strauss, H. R., “Nonlinear, three-dimensional magnetohydrodynamics of noncircular tokamaks,” *Physics of Fluids*, Vol. 19, No. 1, 1976, pp. 134–140. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.861310>.
- [21] Strauss, H. R., “Dynamics of high β tokamaks,” *Physics of Fluids*, Vol. 20, No. 8, 1977, pp. 1354–1360. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.862018>.

- [22] Zocco, A., and Schekochihin, A. A., “Reduced fluid-kinetic equations for low-frequency dynamics, magnetic reconnection, and electron heating in low-beta plasmas,” *Physics of Plasmas*, Vol. 18, No. 10, 2011, pp. 102309–102309. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3628639>.
- [23] Mouschovias, T. C., Tassis, K., and Kunz, M. W., “Observational Constraints on the Ages of Molecular Clouds and the Star Formation Timescale: Ambipolar-Diffusion-controlled or Turbulence-induced Star Formation?” *ApJ*, Vol. 646, No. 2, 2006, pp. 1043–1049. <https://doi.org/10.1086/500125>.
- [24] Panopoulou, G., Tassis, K., Blinov, D., Pavlidou, V., King, O. G., Paleologou, E., Ramaprakash, A., Angelakis, E., Baloković, M., Das, H. K., and et al., “Optical polarization map of the Polaris Flare with RoboPol,” *MNRAS*, Vol. 452, No. 1, 2015, pp. 715–726. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv1301>.
- [25] Panopoulou, G. V., Psaradaki, I., and Tassis, K., “The magnetic field and dust filaments in the Polaris Flare,” *MNRAS*, Vol. 462, No. 2, 2016, pp. 1517–1529. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stw1678>.
- [26] Planck Collaboration, Ade, P. A. R., Aghanim, N., Alves, M. I. R., Arnaud, M., Arzoumanian, D., Ashdown, M., Aumont, J., Baccigalupi, C., Banday, A. J., Barreiro, R. B., and et al., “Planck intermediate results. XXXV. Probing the role of the magnetic field in the formation of structure in molecular clouds,” *A&A*, Vol. 586, 2016, A138. <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201525896>.
- [27] Skalidis, R., Tassis, K., Panopoulou, G. V., Pineda, J. L., Gong, Y., Mandarakas, N., Blinov, D., Kiehlmann, S., and Kyriotakis, J. A., “H₁-H₂ transition: Exploring the role of the magnetic field. A case study toward the Ursa Major cirrus,” *A&A*, Vol. 665, 2022, A77. <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202142512>.
- [28] Verdini, A., and Velli, M., “Alfvén Waves and Turbulence in the Solar Atmosphere and Solar Wind,” *ApJ*, Vol. 662, No. 1, 2007, pp. 669–676. <https://doi.org/10.1086/510710>.
- [29] Tenerani, A., and Velli, M., “Evolving Waves and Turbulence in the Outer Corona and Inner Heliosphere: The Accelerating Expanding Box,” *ApJ*, Vol. 843, No. 1, 2017, 26. <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa71b9>.
- [30] Kasper, J. C., Klein, K. G., Lichko, E., Huang, J., Chen, C. H. K., Badman, S. T., Bonnell, J., Whittlesey, P. L., Livi, R., Larson, D., Pulupa, M., Rahmati, A., Stansby, D., Korreck, K. E., Stevens, M., Case, A. W., Bale, S. D., Maksimovic, M., Moncuquet, M., Goetz, K., Halekas, J. S., Malaspina, D., Raouafi, N. E., Szabo, A., MacDowall, R., Velli, M., Dudok de Wit, T., and Zank, G. P., “Parker Solar Probe Enters the Magnetically Dominated Solar Corona,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, Vol. 127, No. 25, 2021, 255101. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.255101>.
- [31] Zank, G. P., Zhao, L. L., Adhikari, L., Telloni, D., Kasper, J. C., Stevens, M., Rahmati, A., and Bale, S. D., “Turbulence in the Sub-Alfvénic Solar Wind,” *ApJL*, Vol. 926, No. 2, 2022, L16. <https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ac51da>.
- [32] Passot, T., and Vázquez-Semadeni, E., “The correlation between magnetic pressure and density in compressible MHD turbulence,” *A&A*, Vol. 398, 2003, pp. 845–855. <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361:20021665>.

- [33] Heitsch, F., Zweibel, E. G., Mac Low, M.-M., Li, P., and Norman, M. L., “Magnetic Field Diagnostics Based on Far-Infrared Polarimetry: Tests Using Numerical Simulations,” *ApJ*, Vol. 561, No. 2, 2001, pp. 800–814. <https://doi.org/10.1086/323489>.
- [34] Andrés, N., Sahraoui, F., Galtier, S., Hadid, L. Z., Dmitruk, P., and Mininni, P. D., “Energy cascade rate in isothermal compressible magnetohydrodynamic turbulence,” *Journal of Plasma Physics*, Vol. 84, No. 4, 2018, 905840404. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022377818000788>.
- [35] Skalidis, R., Sternberg, J., Beattie, J. R., Pavlidou, V., and Tassis, K., “Why take the square root? An assessment of interstellar magnetic field strength estimation methods,” *A&A*, Vol. 656, 2021, A118. <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202142045>.
- [36] Beattie, J. R., Krumholz, M. R., Skalidis, R., Federrath, C., Seta, A., Crocker, R. M., Mocz, P., and Kriel, N., “Energy balance and Alfvén Mach numbers in compressible magnetohydrodynamic turbulence with a large-scale magnetic field,” *arXiv e-prints*, 2022, arXiv:2202.13020.
- [37] Skalidis, R., and Tassis, K., “High-accuracy estimation of magnetic field strength in the interstellar medium from dust polarization,” *A&A*, Vol. 647, 2021, A186. <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202039779>.
- [38] Beattie, J. R., Krumholz, M. R., Federrath, C., Sampson, M., and Crocker, R. M., “Ion Alfvén velocity fluctuations and implications for the diffusion of streaming cosmic rays,” *arXiv e-prints*, 2022, arXiv:2203.13952.
- [39] Montgomery, D., Brown, M. R., and Matthaeus, W. H., “Density fluctuation spectra in magnetohydrodynamic turbulence,” *J. Geophys. Res.*, Vol. 92, No. A1, 1987, pp. 282–284. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JA092iA01p00282>.
- [40] Bhattacharjee, A., and Hameiri, E., “Energy confinement in turbulent fluid plasmas,” *Physics of Fluids*, Vol. 31, No. 5, 1988, pp. 1153–1160. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.866744>.
- [41] Bhattacharjee, A., Ng, C. S., and Spangler, S. R., “Weakly Compressible Magnetohydrodynamic Turbulence in the Solar Wind and the Interstellar Medium,” *ApJ*, Vol. 494, No. 1, 1998, pp. 409–418. <https://doi.org/10.1086/305184>.
- [42] Fujimura, D., and Tsuneta, S., “Properties of Magnetohydrodynamic Waves in the Solar Photosphere Obtained with Hinode,” *ApJ*, Vol. 702, No. 2, 2009, pp. 1443–1457. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/702/2/1443>.
- [43] Crowley, C. J., Pughe-Sanford, J. L., Toler, W., Krygier, M. C., Grigoriev, R. O., and Schatz, M. F., “Turbulence tracks recurrent solutions,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, Vol. 119, No. 34, 2022, e2120665119. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2120665119>.
- [44] Goldreich, P., and Sridhar, S., “Toward a Theory of Interstellar Turbulence. II. Strong Alfvénic Turbulence,” *ApJ*, Vol. 438, 1995, p. 763. <https://doi.org/10.1086/175121>.
- [45] Maron, J., and Goldreich, P., “Simulations of Incompressible Magnetohydrodynamic Turbulence,” *ApJ*, Vol. 554, No. 2, 2001, pp. 1175–1196. <https://doi.org/10.1086/321413>.
- [46] Longcope, D. W., and Klapper, I., “Dynamics of a Thin Twisted Flux Tube,” *ApJ*, Vol. 488, No. 1, 1997, pp. 443–453. <https://doi.org/10.1086/304680>.

- [47] Shebalin, J. V., Matthaeus, W. H., and Montgomery, D., “Anisotropy in MHD turbulence due to a mean magnetic field,” *Journal of Plasma Physics*, Vol. 29, No. 3, 1983, pp. 525–547. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022377800000933>.
- [48] Higdon, J. C., “Density fluctuations in the interstellar medium: Evidence for anisotropic magnetogasdynamic turbulence. I - Model and astrophysical sites.” *ApJ*, Vol. 285, 1984, pp. 109–123. <https://doi.org/10.1086/162481>.
- [49] Sridhar, S., and Goldreich, P., “Toward a Theory of Interstellar Turbulence. I. Weak Alfvénic Turbulence,” *ApJ*, Vol. 432, 1994, p. 612. <https://doi.org/10.1086/174600>.
- [50] Oughton, S., and Matthaeus, W. H., “Critical Balance and the Physics of Magnetohydrodynamic Turbulence,” *ApJ*, Vol. 897, No. 1, 2020, 37. <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab8f2a>.
- [51] Cho, J., and Lazarian, A., “Compressible magnetohydrodynamic turbulence: mode coupling, scaling relations, anisotropy, viscosity-damped regime and astrophysical implications,” *MNRAS*, Vol. 345, No. 12, 2003, pp. 325–339. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-8711.2003.06941.x>.
- [52] Yang, L., Zhang, L., He, J., Tu, C., Li, S., Wang, X., and Wang, L., “Coexistence of Slow-mode and Alfvén-mode Waves and Structures in 3D Compressive MHD Turbulence,” *The Astrophysical Journal*, Vol. 866, No. 1, 2018, p. 41. <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aadadf>, URL <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aadadf>.
- [53] Makwana, K. D., and Yan, H., “Properties of Magnetohydrodynamic Modes in Compressively Driven Plasma Turbulence,” *Physical Review X*, Vol. 10, No. 3, 2020, 031021. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.10.031021>.
- [54] Gan, Z., Li, H., Fu, X., and Du, S., “On the Existence of Fast Modes in Compressible Magnetohydrodynamic Turbulence,” *ApJ*, Vol. 926, No. 2, 2022, 222. <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac4d9d>.
- [55] Andreussi, T., Morrison, P. J., and Pegoraro, F., “Hamiltonian magnetohydrodynamics: Lagrangian, Eulerian, and dynamically accessible stability—Examples with translation symmetry,” *Physics of Plasmas*, Vol. 23, No. 10, 2016, 102112. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4964900>.
- [56] Kulsrud, R. M., *Plasma physics for astrophysics*, 2005.
- [57] Basu, S., Ciolek, G. E., Dapp, W. B., and Wurster, J., “Magnetically-regulated fragmentation induced by nonlinear flows and ambipolar diffusion,” *New Astron.*, Vol. 14, No. 5, 2009, pp. 483–495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newast.2009.01.004>.
- [58] Park, J., and Ryu, D., “Shock Waves and Energy Dissipation in Magnetohydrodynamic Turbulence,” *ApJ*, Vol. 875, No. 1, 2019, 2. <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab0d7e>.
- [59] Cho, H., Ryu, D., and Kang, H., “Effects of Forcing on Shocks and Energy Dissipation in Interstellar and Intracluster Turbulences,” *ApJ*, Vol. 926, No. 2, 2022, 183. <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac41cc>.
- [60] Yang, Y., Wan, M., Matthaeus, W. H., and Chen, S., “Energy budget in decaying compressible MHD turbulence,” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, Vol. 916, 2021, p. A4. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2021.199>.

- [61] Krumholz, M., and Burkert, A., “On the Dynamics and Evolution of Gravitational Instability-dominated Disks,” *ApJ*, Vol. 724, No. 2, 2010, pp. 895–907. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/724/2/895>.
- [62] Kritsuk, A. G., Ustyugov, S. D., and Norman, M. L., “The structure and statistics of interstellar turbulence,” *New Journal of Physics*, Vol. 19, No. 6, 2017, 065003. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/aa7156>.
- [63] Colman, T., Robitaille, J.-F., Hennebelle, P., Miville-Deschênes, M.-A., Brucy, N., Klessen, R. S., Glover, S. C. O., Soler, J. D., Elia, D., Traficante, A., Molinari, S., and Testi, L., “The signature of large-scale turbulence driving on the structure of the interstellar medium,” *MNRAS*, Vol. 514, No. 3, 2022, pp. 3670–3684. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stac1543>.
- [64] Eswaran, V., and Pope, S. B., “An examination of forcing in direct numerical simulations of turbulence,” *Computers and Fluids*, Vol. 16, No. 3, 1988, pp. 257–278.
- [65] McKee, C. F., “Photoionization-regulated Star Formation and the Structure of Molecular Clouds,” *ApJ*, Vol. 345, 1989, p. 782. <https://doi.org/10.1086/167950>.
- [66] Mac Low, M.-M., Klessen, R. S., Burkert, A., and Smith, M. D., “Kinetic Energy Decay Rates of Supersonic and Super-Alfvénic Turbulence in Star-Forming Clouds,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, Vol. 80, 1998, pp. 2754–2757. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.80.2754>, URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.80.2754>.
- [67] Piontek, R. A., and Ostriker, E. C., “Models of Vertically Stratified Two-Phase ISM Disks with MRI-Driven Turbulence,” *ApJ*, Vol. 663, No. 1, 2007, pp. 183–203. <https://doi.org/10.1086/518103>.
- [68] Elmegreen, B. G., “Star Formation in Disks: Spiral Arms, Turbulence, and Triggering Mechanisms,” *The Galaxy Disk in Cosmological Context*, Vol. 254, edited by J. Andersen, Nordströara, B. m, and J. Bland-Hawthorn, 2009, pp. 289–300. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743921308027713>.
- [69] Krumholz, M. R., and Burkert, B., “Is turbulence in the interstellar medium driven by feedback or gravity? An observational test,” *MNRAS*, Vol. 458, No. 2, 2016, pp. 1671–1677. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stw434>.
- [70] Girichidis, P., Walch, S., Naab, T., Gatto, A., Wunsch, R., Glover, S. C. O., Klessen, R. S., Clark, P. C., Peters, T., Derigs, D., and Baczynski, C., “The SILCC (SIMulating the LifeCYcle of molecular Clouds) project - II. Dynamical evolution of the supernova-driven ISM and the launching of outflows,” *MNRAS*, Vol. 456, No. 4, 2016, pp. 3432–3455. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv2742>.
- [71] Hanasoge, S. M., Hotta, H., and Sreenivasan, K. R., “Turbulence in the Sun is suppressed on large scales and confined to equatorial regions,” *Science Advances*, Vol. 6, No. 30, 2020, p. eaba9639. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aba9639>, URL <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/sciadv.aba9639>.
- [72] Iffrig, Olivier, and Hennebelle, Patrick, “Structure distribution and turbulence in self-consistently supernova-driven ISM of multiphase magnetized galactic discs,” *A&A*, Vol. 604, 2017, p. A70. <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201630290>, URL <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201630290>.

- [73] Klessen, R. S., and Hennebelle, P., “Accretion-driven turbulence as universal process: galaxies, molecular clouds, and protostellar disks,” *A&A*, Vol. 520, 2010, A17. <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/200913780>.
- [74] Elmegreen, B. G., and Scalo, J., “Interstellar Turbulence I: Observations and Processes,” *ARA&A*, Vol. 42, No. 1, 2004, pp. 211–273. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.astro.41.011802.094859>.
- [75] Monin, A. S., and I’Aglom, A. M., *Statistical fluid mechanics; mechanics of turbulence*, 1971.
- [76] Galanti, B., and Tsinober, A., “Is turbulence ergodic?” *Physics Letters A*, Vol. 330, No. 3-4, 2004, pp. 173–180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physleta.2004.07.009>.
- [77] Shebalin, J. V., “Broken ergodicity in magnetohydrodynamic turbulence,” *Geophysical and Astrophysical Fluid Dynamics*, Vol. 107, No. 4, 2013, pp. 411–466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03091929.2011.589385>.
- [78] Beattie, J. R., Federrath, C., and Seta, A., “Magnetic field fluctuations in anisotropic, supersonic turbulence,” *MNRAS*, Vol. 498, No. 2, 2020, pp. 1593–1608. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa2257>.