

Unstable coronal loops : numerical simulations with predicted observational signatures.

T. D. Arber, A. W. Longbottom

Department of Mathematical and Computational Sciences, University of St. Andrews, KY16 9SS, Scotland.

R. A. M. Van der Linden ¹

Centre for Plasma Astrophysics, KULeuven, Celestijnenlaan 200B, 3001 Heverlee, Belgium

ABSTRACT

We present numerical studies of the nonlinear, resistive magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) evolution of coronal loops. For these simulations we assume that the loops carry no net current, as might be expected if the loop had evolved due to vortex flows. Furthermore the initial equilibrium is taken to be a cylindrical flux tube with line-tied ends. For a given amount of twist in the magnetic field it is well known that once such a loop exceeds a critical length it becomes unstable to ideal MHD instabilities. The early evolution of these instabilities generates large current concentrations. Firstly we show that these current concentrations are consistent with the formation of a current sheet. Magnetic reconnection can only occur in the vicinity of these current concentrations and we therefore couple the resistivity to the local current density. This has the advantage of avoiding resistive diffusion in regions where it should be negligible. We demonstrate the importance of this procedure by comparison with simulations based on a uniform resistivity. From our numerical experiments we are able to estimate some observational signatures for unstable coronal loops. These signatures include: the timescale of the loop brightening; the temperature increase; the energy released and the predicted observable flow speeds. Finally we discuss to what extent these observational signatures are consistent with the properties of transient brightening loops.

Subject headings: MHD – Sun:corona – Sun:magnetic fields

¹Postdoctoral Research Fellow of the Flemish Fund for Scientific Research

1. Introduction

Coronal magnetic loops have been the subject of considerable observational and theoretical study. Of particular relevance here are observations of transient brightening loops (Shimizu et. al. 1994). Theoretical studies of the stability of such loops have hoped to explain some of their observational characteristics. In the linear regime the stabilizing effect of line-tied boundary conditions has been clearly demonstrated (e.g. Hood & Priest 1979; Velli, Einaudi & Hood 1990). These boundary conditions model the fact that on the timescale of ideal MHD instabilities the ends of coronal loops can be considered to be frozen into a high-density, stationary photosphere. Line-tying allows coronal loops to have a more twisted magnetic field, with consequently more free magnetic energy, before the onset of instabilities. However, once a critical amount of twist is introduced into the loop it does become unstable to ideal MHD modes. The non-linear evolution of these instabilities has been the subject of a number of recent papers. The ideal evolution has been studied for a variety of equilibrium profiles (Baty & Heyvaerts 1996; Baty 1997; Baty et. al. 1998). The full resistive evolution has also been studied (Lionello et. al. 1998; Velli, Lionello & Einaudi 1997) but both of these papers assume uniform resistivity. In this paper we extend the work of these papers by performing detailed non-linear simulations from both Eulerian and Lagrangian codes.

All theoretical studies to date have assumed that the initial equilibria are one dimensional, i.e. cylinders with photospheric line-tying at each end. We also make this initial simplification. This has the advantage of greatly simplifying the initial equilibrium and allows comparison with previous work. We further restrict our attention to loops which carry no net current. This class of equilibrium would result from slowly applying a coherent vortex flow to the flux tube. This has been shown to lead to a coronal loop of the desired form, with a stable input of energy, in numerical experiments (Mikić, Schnack & Van Hoven 1990; Van Hoven, Mok & Mikić 1995). Such an equilibrium, along with the proposed mechanism for its formation, are of course greatly simplified, idealisations of the dynamism expected in active regions of the solar corona. Here many competing effects would be acting simultaneously on each loop. Observations show that there is a broad distribution of energy release events (Shimizu et. al. 1994) which

are present in active regions. The results here are idealised numerical experiments which would be relevant to the large scale, high energy tail of this distribution. This paper is more relevant to micro-flares than nano-flares. However, as the distribution of flarings/brightenings is very broad it should be understood that for the remainder of this paper when we refer to brightening loops we are referring to the high energy tail of such events, i.e. compact loop flares or micro-flares.

Several papers have investigated the non-linear evolution of a variety of cylindrical equilibria. It is important that the relationship between these previous studies and our work is made clear. As this paper only considers equilibria which carry no net current it should be understood that when discussing results from these papers we are only referring to those results which are for similar equilibria. Two papers (Baty & Heyvaerts 1996; Baty 1997) have started with unstable coronal loops and run codes with large implicit steps, steadily increasing viscosity until all plasma motion is damped. Eventually this process reaches a bifurcated equilibrium state. They have found that in this final state the maximum current density generated, j_{max} , scales with the length of the loop. In this paper we resolve the full time-dependent solution and find no evidence that j_{max} scales with the loop length. We find that for simulations without resistivity j_{max} is always the largest current possible for the given resolution. This is determined by the numerical mesh size in the region of j_{max} , not the loop length, and is true for both the Lagrangian and Eulerian simulations. This does not contradict the results about *equilibrium* current densities as the j_{max} we observe is not part of an equilibrium. Indeed, we observe these large current concentrations at a time when there are velocities (resulting from the instability) of the order of the local Alfvén speed. Such features would have been damped by the numerical procedure adopted in searching for equilibrium solutions. The code used to find these equilibrium solutions has also been run with a fixed viscosity (Baty et. al. 1998). This paper found that the ideal instability, and consequently j_{max} , saturated before the current density reached the grid scale length. This is in contradiction with the results presented here in which there is no evidence for ideal MHD saturation of the instability. Furthermore, the resistive phase which is triggered by the large current densities in our simulations also prevents the loop from ever reaching the

ideal MHD bifurcated equilibria described earlier. In this regard we are in agreement with other non-linear simulations (Lionello et. al. 1998; Velli, Lionello & Einaudi 1997) which show the same collapse to grid scale lengths resulting from the ideal MHD instability, i.e. no signs of saturations of the ideal mode. We point out here that while it is often assumed that current sheets form as a result of ideal MHD instabilities this has never actually been proven. Some papers (Baty et. al. 1998) actually contradict this belief while the only two papers which seem to lend weight to this argument (Lionello et. al. 1998; Velli, Lionello & Einaudi 1997) have only published results for a single resolution. At this resolution the current density in the current concentration is only a few times that present in the initial equilibrium. Bearing in mind the lack of consensus on this issue we deal with the formation of current sheets in some detail in this paper before treating the resistive evolution. The use of a Lagrangian code in this paper allows the formation of current densities which are two orders of magnitude larger than has been possible in previous studies. We also present detailed tests of the scaling of the current density with grid size for both Lagrangian and Eulerian simulation. These tests combine to give the most convincing evidence to date that current sheets do indeed form as a result of ideal MHD instabilities in the corona. In this paper what is meant by a current sheet is that unless some dissipative processes is introduced into the system the current density will continue to collapse to shorter scale lengths without limit. In reality it is resistive effects which stop this collapse. It is the treatment of resistivity, the greater number of scalings on different grids and tests with a Lagrangian code which distinguishes our work from previous publications. It is also these differences which allows us to make the first quantitative predictions about unstable coronal loops.

While the papers discussed in the previous paragraph have treated a variety of equilibria here we study only equilibria which carry no net current. We concentrate on a single representative equilibrium and perform a variety of detailed numerical experiments. In these we abandon the common practice of assuming a uniform resistivity and instead couple the resistivity to the current. In this model the resistivity is only present in regions where the current density exceeds some critical value. In this way resistivity is only applied in those regions where reconnection is allowed. This procedure allows us to get closer to a

converged answer for real coronal values and gives us increased confidence in the quantitative predictions of observational signatures which we make from our simulations. The evolution is largely independent of the form of resistivity used provided that it is localised in the current sheet. This point has been postulated in other papers (Velli, Lionello & Einaudi 1997) but is confirmed for the first time in our simulations. We also include a comparison with simulations in which the resistivity is assumed constant and highlight the differences between the two cases.

The paper is organised as follows. In §2 we describe the physical model and explain our motivation for the choice of resistivity. §3 contains the details of the equilibrium we have chosen along with its linear stability properties. The formation of current sheets has been investigated numerically and the results of this study are included in §4. The full non-linear resistive evolution of the loop is outlined in §5. Finally the conclusions which we can draw from our studies, including predictions of observational signatures of unstable loops, are presented in §6.

2. Physical Model

In this paper we represent coronal loops as initially cylindrical tubes. These tubes have each end tied into the photosphere. Photospheric line-tying is modelled by imposing zero velocity at the ends of the loop along with suitable symmetry properties on the components of the magnetic field. We ensure that the tube, of length L_z , is sufficiently long that it is unstable to ideal MHD modes. The solution domain is Cartesian with transverse size (L_x, L_y) . The instability remains localised inside a specific radius so that provided (L_x, L_y) are large enough the choice of boundary conditions in (x, y) makes no difference to the evolution of the loop.

The evolution of the coronal loop is modelled by the resistive MHD equations. In dimensionless form these are

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{\partial (\rho \mathbf{v})}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}) + (\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \times \mathbf{B} - \nabla P \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t} = -\nabla \times (\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}) - \nabla \times (\eta \nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} \varepsilon) - P \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} + \eta j^2 \quad (4)$$

Where $\mathbf{j} = \nabla \times \mathbf{B}$ is the current density, $\mathbf{v}$ is the ve-

locity, P is the thermal pressure, $\varepsilon = P/(\Gamma - 1)$ is the internal energy density ($\Gamma = 5/3$ is the specific heat ratio), ρ is the mass density and η is the resistivity. For all simulations we assume a plasma β of 0.01. This model ignores thermal conduction, radiation, gravity and heating terms other than Ohmic. Ignoring the transport terms is justified because of the short timescales involved in these simulations. The validity of the neglect of gravity is of course dependent on the actual length of the loop being considered. With pressure scale heights of $\sim 100 Mm$ in the corona this is a good approximation for transient brightening loops but clearly less valid for large quiescent loops.

The choice of the functional form for the resistivity η in the simulations presented in this paper is particularly important. Normally η is treated as a constant chosen on numerical grounds such that the explicitly included resistive diffusion exceeds numerical diffusion. In this paper η is chosen so that it is only included in those regions where it is needed. The classical resistivity of coronal plasmas is negligible on the timescale of MHD instabilities, i.e. the timescale of interest here, everywhere except in regions of intense current concentration. Hence we choose a resistivity given by

$$\eta = \eta_0 \text{MAX}(0, |j| - j_{crit}) \quad (5)$$

In this formula $\eta = 0$ if $|j| \leq j_{crit}$ where j_{crit} is the critical value of current density needed before the resistivity is turned on. Thus while η_0 is still chosen on numerical grounds the resistive effects are only applied to those regions in which they are actually needed. The point here is essentially that if we were to take a uniform resistivity we would be diffusing the magnetic field in regions where resistivity should be negligible. It is true that *locally* the effect of uniform resistivity would be largest in the current sheet and in that region the difference due to the choice of uniform resistivity over equation 5 would be small. However, the small resistive effects which are then applied over a much larger total volume do change the nature of the final solution. This will be discussed in §5 where a comparison of the two approaches is presented.

If intense current concentrations form as a result of the ideal MHD instability then the electron fluid flow speed U_e will become large. These current concentrations lead to localised heating of the electrons and on the timescales of interest here these are not in thermal equilibrium with the ions. Thus the electron temperature will exceed the ion's and once U_e exceeds the

local ion sound speed the current concentration will drive ion-acoustic turbulence. The fluctuating electric field of this turbulence causes electron scattering which is manifested at the fluid level as an increase in the local resistivity (Rosner et. al. 1978). By rapidly creating a current sheet the ideal MHD instability therefore creates all of the conditions necessary for the onset of ion-acoustic turbulence. These are that the electron temperature exceeds the ion temperature and that the electron flow speed exceeds the local ion sound speed. While these conditions are satisfied for the current sheets driven by ideal MHD instabilities it must be noted that in other circumstances in which current sheets form this may not be the case. If the electron flow speed continues to be driven, as is the case here, this enhanced resistivity increases. Equation 5 would then be a suitable macroscopic parameterisation of the sub-grid scale turbulence. For a coronal loop with number density $10^{16} m^{-3}$; ion thermal speed $1.3 \times 10^5 ms^{-1}$; width $10^6 m$ and magnetic field strength $100 G$ the normalised critical current density required for the onset of such turbulence is $j_{crit} \sim 3000$. These are order of magnitude estimates of coronal values appropriate for transient brightening loops (Shimizu 1996). Unless otherwise stated these characteristic values for density etc. are the ones used throughout the paper when estimating real, i.e. unnormalised, values. Note however that the temperature assumed in calculating the thermal speed is $2 \times 10^6 K$. This is taken as an average temperature of an active region and is meant as an estimate of the loop temperature *before* the brightening occurs. Of course the codes use normalised variables so scaling to other coronal values is a trivial matter and does not affect the qualitative features of these simulations. This estimate of j_{crit} should be compared with the equilibrium current density which has a maximum value of 4.5 in these units. When ion acoustic turbulence is active the characteristic electron scattering time is approximately the ion plasma period. This gives an increase in the plasma resistivity by a factor of up to 10^6 . If one uses the Spitzer formula for classical resistivity one concludes that the normalised resistivity is $\sim 10^{-12}$. However in current sheets which trigger ion-acoustic turbulence η_0 in equation (5) is $\sim 10^{-6}$. It should also be pointed out that ion-acoustic turbulence is not the only possible source of enhanced resistivity. For example the initial rapid heating in the current sheets of unstable loops has been shown to trigger Langmuir wave

enhanced resistivity (Takakura 1991). While there is theoretical evidence that the mechanism described above would lead to enhanced resistivity there is no direct evidence that such levels of turbulence are indeed generated and sustained on the required scale in current sheets in the solar corona. As a result the arguments in support of the use of Equation 5 as the correct *physical* form of resistivity, as opposed to being simply *numerically* appropriate as discussed in the previous paragraph, must remain speculative at this stage.

3. Equilibrium and Linear Stability

Throughout this paper we limit our attention to just one equilibrium. This has allowed us to perform a detailed set of numerical experiments, over a range of grid sizes, using different codes. The equilibrium is taken to be a force-free cylinder which carries no net current. The precise form is given in terms of the axial current density in the loop, j_z , by

$$j_z = j_0 \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{b^2} + a \frac{r^3}{b^3} \right) \quad (6)$$

The normalisation used is that the loop is confined within a radius $r = 1$ so that the free parameters a and b are found from the conditions $j_z(1) = 0$ and $\int_0^1 r j_z(r) dr = 0$. These guarantee that the equilibrium does not contain a surface current at $r = 1$ and that the total current in the loop is zero. The actual values are $a = 5/(6\sqrt{6})$ and $b = 1/\sqrt{6}$. The poloidal component of the magnetic field, B_θ , is then found from Ampere's law and B_z from the force-free condition,

$$B_z^2 = B_0^2 - B_\theta^2 - 2 \int_0^r \left(\frac{B_\theta^2}{r'} \right) dr' \quad (7)$$

This equilibrium definition has two free parameters, B_0 and j_0 . These are chosen to be 1.0 and 4.3 respectively. With this choice the equilibrium profiles are shown in Figure A1. Note that outside $r = 1$ the magnetic field is purely axial. This choice of equilibrium is similar to equilibria with no net current studied elsewhere (Velli, Lionello & Einaudi 1997; Baty et. al. 1998; Lionello et. al. 1998). These works all showed that once the critical length for the onset of instability has been exceeded the growth rate increases rapidly, eventually reaching a growth rate which is almost independent of length. Our choice of $L_z = 10$ for most of our simulations puts the

equilibrium in this region. We therefore do not self-consistently follow the loop as, for example, its length increases from a stable length up to the length considered here. We simply assume that it is initialised at a length which is already unstable at the saturated growth rate. This is necessary numerically so that the instability grows sufficiently quickly to be simulated in a reasonable time. We have performed some simulations for shorter initial lengths and found that our predicted observational signatures are insensitive to this choice. As far as the ideal phase of our simulations are concerned we show broad agreement with the results in earlier works. This shows that these results are not critically sensitive to the details of the equilibrium and is a useful confirmation of the results from a completely different set of codes. This paper differs from those earlier publications in performing more detailed scaling tests on the formation of the current sheet and more detailed simulations of the resistive phase. The choice of equation 5 for the resistivity is a particularly important difference between this work and previous publications.

In the first instance we studied the linear ideal MHD stability of our model equilibrium. The MHD equations (1)-(4) for zero resistivity are linearised, and a time dependence $\propto \exp(\gamma t)$ assumed to obtain the equations for the linear normal mode spectrum in ideal MHD. These normal modes are then calculated using a bicubic finite element code similar to that described in Van der Linden & Hood 1998. The qualitative features of the stability of this equilibrium are the same as those for previously studied equilibrium profiles, e.g. Lionello et. al. 1998. Unless otherwise stated the length of the loop in the remainder of this paper will be fixed at $L_z = 10$. This point is chosen some distance from the marginal stability point, so that the growth rate of the fundamental mode ($\gamma \approx 0.302$) is nearly equal to its maximal value. This allows the instability to develop sufficiently rapidly to save computational overhead. At this loop length, two more instabilities exist: the first overtone has a growth rate of 0.197, while the second has growth rate 0.037. The latter is certainly not expected to have any significant contribution to the development of the instability due to its small growth rate, while the former might contribute, but in practice does not show up in the time-dependent simulations presented in this paper (which is mainly due to the choice of initial perturbation).

To make a clear distinction between the growth of

the linear instability and the effects of non-linearity on its evolution, it is very useful to compare both linear and non-linear time-evolution of the same initial perturbation. A good approximation of the linear time-evolution may be obtained from the spectrum of normal modes by writing the initial perturbation as a linear combination of the full spectrum of normal modes. A quantitative comparison of the linear versus non-linear evolution is made at $t = 5$ in Figure A2, where the perturbed current density is plotted along a line through the centre of the loop parallel to the photospheric line-tied ends from the linear and both non-linear simulations. It is clear that at this time, the evolution of the instability is still linear in nature. In Figure A3 a similar comparison is made at the later time of $t = 10$. At the early time, i.e. $t = 5$, the linear and non-linear results differ in two noticeable ways. Firstly the peaks from the non-linear analysis are shifted to the right due to the central plasma column moving in the x direction. Figure A4 shows v_x along the same x -axis at $t = 5$ from the linear code. From this one can see that the regions with the steepest gradients are located in the region $0.6 \leq |x| \leq 0.8$. These are regions of compression for $x > 0$ and expansion for $x < 0$. They account for the asymmetry seen in both non-linear results. By $t = 10$ the general structure of the linear mode is still evident but non-linear effects are becoming significant. Most prominent is the formation of a large current density at $x = 0.8$. Note that Figure A3 is truncated at $|j_1| = 10$ and that for the Lagrangian code $|j_1|^{max} = 31$ at $t = 10$

4. The Formation of Current Sheets

The fully non-linear evolution of the instability is followed using two time-dependent nonlinear MHD codes. The first is an ideal MHD Lagrangian code that follows the initial phase and the formation of the current sheet, the second a resistive MHD Eulerian code that allows the resulting reconnection to be followed and the later phases of the evolution examined.

The Lagrangian code is based on the equilibrium code of Longbottom et. al. 1998 and is described in the appendix. It has two main features relevant to this study. The code solves the ideal MHD equations (there is no dissipation due to resistivity or viscosity). The grid on which the equations are solved moves with the fluid and thus in this case, where the inner region of the loop is forced out against the near

stationary outer potential field, more grid points will accumulate at the regions where large gradients form. These two features together ensure that the current structures resulting from the instability remain highly resolved.

The loop is confined inside $r = 1$ and centred in the (x, y) computational plane which is $L_x = 6$ by $L_y = 6$. The simulations were carried out on grids of $61 \times 61 \times 21$, $91 \times 91 \times 31$ and $151 \times 151 \times 101$ points in the (x, y, z) directions. The (x, y) grid is uniform inside $-1.1 \leq x, y \leq 1.1$ and only stretched outside this central core, with the initial grid spacing (at $t = 0$) within $-1.1 \leq x, y \leq 1.1$ being 0.05, 0.033 and 0.02 respectively. The z grid is uniform with $-5 < z < 5$. Simulations are started with a small velocity perturbation ($v_{max} = 0.01$) whose structure is taken to approximate that found from the linear analysis. The results below are shown for $151 \times 151 \times 101$ grid points.

As described in the previous section the initial evolution agrees well with that predicted by linear theory, the linear eigenfunction and growth rate being reproduced. However, from $t = 5$ onwards a helical current structure grows as a result of the inner twisted magnetic field being forced against the surrounding potential field by the developing kink mode. This behaviour can be seen in Figure A5 which shows the perturbed current ($|j_1|$) plotted along the x -axis at $y = z = 0$ as a function of time. Here the maximum value of current plotted has been truncated at $j_1 = 50$ so that the details at earlier times can be seen. The actual maximum value of current in the current sheet at $t = 11.5$ is $j_1 = 766$. Even at late times the remnant of the linear mode are still visible in the central part of the loop. The formation of the current structure at the rational surface can be clearly seen. The maximum current after $t = 10$ scales faster than n_x^2 , where n_x is the number of gridpoints in the x direction in the Lagrangian code. No sign of saturation of the current is seen. This behaviour is indicative of the formation of current sheets (Longbottom et. al. 1998).

A surface plot of the total current in the (x, y) plane at the loop apex is shown in Figure A6. Again the current has been truncated at $j = 50$ so that both the shape of the current concentration and the inner structure is visible. The global structure is that of a helix wrapped around the central loop column and is essentially identical to that found by the Eulerian code, Figure A7a. The half-width of the current sheet

at $t = 11.5$ is approximately 0.0025. This would mean that for the Eulerian code to resolve this current at this time there would need to be ~ 3500 grid points in both the x and the y directions.

These results have also been confirmed with the Eulerian code described in detail in the next section. The important point as far as the current sheet formation is concerned is that running in the ideal MHD model, i.e. with $\eta = 0$, the current generated in the current sheet scaled as $1/dx$, where dx is the grid resolution in the current sheet, and showed no signs of saturating as the resolution was increased. Note that the scaling of the maximum current is different than in the Lagrangian code as the Lagrangian code moves points into the region where the current sheet is formed. For the Eulerian code the highest current obtained in the current sheet was ~ 30 . This behaviour is consistent with previous work in this area (Lionello et. al. 1998; Velli, Lionello & Einaudi 1997) although by performing scalings on different grid resolutions we are able to verify the correct scaling with mesh size which is required if these are indeed current sheets. Furthermore the current densities generated in the Lagrangian code are two orders of magnitude larger than has been possible with the Eulerian codes used in previous studies. The results in this paper contradict some simulations which found non-linear saturation of the instability with a purely ideal MHD description (Baty et. al. 1998). This discrepancy between different codes has been noted before (Baty et. al. 1998; Lionello et. al. 1998) and has been attributed to the different treatment of small scales, with associated numerical dissipation, in the codes used. Here we have used two non-linear codes, each with distinctively different properties from earlier codes, and found no saturation. This is the first time a Lagrangian code has been for such simulations and that tests on the scaling of the current density with dx have been presented. These provide strong evidence that these instabilities do not saturate while still described by ideal MHD and that the generated current concentrations are current sheets. We have also performed simulations of loops with lengths $L_z = 5.5$ finding the same magnitude current sheet evolving in both cases. Previous studies of bifurcated equilibria (Baty & Heyvaerts 1996; Baty 1997) have found that j_{max} scales linearly with L_z . Our simulations show that this is not true of the instability driven current sheet which forms while the loop is still in a highly dynamic, non-equilibrium state.

5. The Resistive Phase

The Lagrangian code is only valid for ideal MHD. To follow the resistive evolution of the loop an Eulerian code is used. The ideal MHD part of this code is based on the MH3D code (Lucek & Bell 1996) written at Imperial College, London. The code uses a stretched Eulerian grid. Variables on this fixed grid are updated using a split Lagrangian, Eulerian remap technique, with the advection handled by a second order Van Leer upwind scheme (Youngs 1982). The code maintains $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$ by using the constrained transport model for magnetic flux advection (Evans & Hawley 1988). During the Lagrangian phase of each timestep an artificial viscosity term is added to equation 2. This is applied as a viscous pressure at cell boundaries for cells which are being compressed (van Neumann & Richtmyer 1950). This viscosity results purely from compressive effects, i.e. shear viscosity is not included. For comparison with papers which add a viscous term of the form $\nu \rho \nabla^2 \mathbf{v}$ to equation 2 the formula we use is approximately equivalent to this form with $\nu = 10^{-3}$. We have confirmed this with direct comparison of the two forms on low resolution runs. It should also be pointed out that in our units $\nu = 10^{-3}$ is the correct order of magnitude for a transient brightening loop. The viscous heating in these simulations is significant in the overall energy balance and so must be included in the energy equation.

The results presented here are from runs with a 161^3 Cartesian grid. This is the resolution used in the largest set of numerical experiments and therefore constitutes our largest consistent data set. Some higher resolution tests have been performed to test convergence. These had a $221 \times 221 \times 101$ grid in (x, y, z) with the grid stretched to give twice the resolution in (x, y) of the 161^3 experiments. Results from this resolution will be called the high resolution results in the remainder of this paper. Unless explicitly stated it should be assumed that results are from the 161^3 runs. The loop is confined inside $r = 1$ and centred in the (x, y) computational plane which is $L_x = 6$ by $L_y = 6$. The (x, y) grid is uniform inside $-1.1 < x, y < 1.1$ and only stretched outside this central core. The ratio of minimum to maximum grid spacing was 3.2. The z grid was uniform with the coordinate range $-5 < z < 5$. Simulations are started with a small velocity perturbation ($v_{max} = 0.01$) whose structure is taken to approximate that found from the linear analysis.

Figure A7 shows iso-surfaces of the magnitude of the current density at two different times. The surfaces are iso-surfaces of $|j| = 3$. As the maximum current in the initial equilibrium is 4.5 these surfaces show the perturbed central column as well as the current sheet. While current density is not experimentally observable these figures are presented as they give the clearest picture of the physical processes present in this unstable loop. These results are from a simulation with $\eta_0 = 10^{-3}$ and $j_{crit} = 5$. The value of η_0 is the smallest value we can use in this code and still guarantee that the deliberately included, numerically controlled resistivity is larger than the numerical resistivity inherent in the difference scheme. j_{crit} is fixed to the largest value that allows us to fully resolve the current sheet. The non-linear feedback through resistivity of the form given in equation 5 then restricts the maximum current in our current sheets to about 10. Figure A7(a) shows the iso-surface at $t = 10$ with the central column perturbed into the characteristic helical $m = 1$ mode. Wrapped around this central column is the current sheet which is formed at the place where the pitch of the instability matches the pitch of the magnetic field (see Baty & Heyvaerts 1996 for a detailed discussion of this process). At this time the current in this outer current sheet has just reached 5. Therefore up to this point equation 5 has been setting $\eta = 0$ everywhere and the code has been solving the ideal MHD equations. Beyond $t = 10$ the current in the current sheet continues to increase and equation 5 ‘turns on’ the resistivity and the code automatically begins solving the resistive MHD equations but with the resistivity only present in the outer current sheet. Figure A7(b) shows the current iso-surface at $t = 15$. More of the central column has been moved out, by the ideal MHD instability, into the region of the current sheet. In this region reconnection is allowed so that the twist in field lines can be removed, or equivalently the current dissipated. This process continues until at $t = 20$ sufficient current has been dissipated that no region has $|j| > 5$ and the resistivity ‘turns off’. In summary Figure A7 shows that the ideal MHD instability drives the current in the loop out into the current sheet where it is dissipated.

The above experiment has been run with two different plasma density profiles. In both cases the pressure is uniform, as required by the force-free condition. In one set of tests the plasma density was taken to be uniform across the whole computational

domain. In the other the density profile was taken to be $\rho = 0.45(1 + \cos(\pi r)) + 0.1$ for $r \leq 1$ and $\rho = 0.1$ for $r > 1$. This second choice makes the average density inside the loop 3.67 times that of the surrounding coronal plasma and was motivated by observations that the density inside a brightening loop exceeds that of the surrounding coronal plasma. These experiments showed that the evolution of the unstable loop is insensitive to the choice of density profile. It should be noted that while the second density profile does imply a drop in temperature inside the loop this is unimportant for MHD simulations. It is the pressure which exerts a force and the temperature does not appear in equations (1)–(4). Changing the density merely changes the timescales involved. What is clear from the second density profile is that in the final state, i.e. at $t = 20$, the density enhanced region still lies within the same bounding radius. In other words the loop is not destroyed by the instability but the twisted magnetic field lines are straightened out. This is in agreement with previous studies (Lionello et. al. 1998).

Figure A8 shows two different iso-surfaces of energy density taken at the same time, $t = 20$. Figure A8(a) shows regions which have been heated to 3 times the initial background value. This shows that the loop has brightened along its whole length. Figure A8(b) shows the higher energy components which have been heated to 6 times the background value. In this Figure the central region has been heated by Ohmic dissipation in the current sheet while the ends have been heated by the viscosity in the code. The rings at each end of Figure A8(b) are where the loop is tied into the photosphere. The very dynamic nature of the loop at $t = 20$, see below, causes viscous stresses at the ends where the velocity is forced to be zero by the photospheric boundary conditions. Once the current density drops below j_{crit} everywhere the resistive phase is over and the code reverts to ideal MHD (although viscosity is still present). No simulations have been performed beyond this time as from that time onwards the timescale of interest is the timescale for thermal conduction. This is too long to be studied in 3D with this kind of resolution.

At $t = 20$ there are very large flows set up due to the ideal instability and field line reconnection. The peak value is $\sim 0.8 V_A$, where V_A is the Alfvén speed. However, observations of flows in the corona are based on Doppler shift measurements. Such measurements include averaging over exposure times, pixel sizes and

line of sight effects. To estimate the importance of these effects we have taken a simple density weighted average of one of the transverse components of velocity, i.e. v_x or v_y , over an area of approximately $1.5 Mm \times 1.5 Mm$, an exposure time of 10 seconds and along a line of sight. This averaging time and area are typical of solar observations. The flow structure after this averaging is shown in Figure A9. In this figure the photospheric footpoints are at $\pm 5 Mm$ and the points are the centres of our pixels. This sort of simple averaging can only be taken as an estimate of the kind of velocities which could be observable experimentally. Issues such as ionisation population levels, temperature dependence of the weighting function are beyond the scope of the current work. Figure A9 does however show that the very large flow speeds present in our simulations would not be directly observable. These simulations therefore suggest that after a loop with parameters typical of a brightening loop has gone unstable, flows of $\sim 40 km s^{-1}$ should be observable. The averaging implicit in these measurements would however mask the real loop plasma flows which are highly localised and as large as $1500 km s^{-1}$.

The energy released from this instability is 54% of the available magnetic energy. This is split almost equally between Ohmic heating, kinetic energy and viscous heating. The available energy is defined as the energy stored in the B_θ component of the equilibrium magnetic field. For this equilibrium the free magnetic energy for the coronal values in §2 is $9.5 \times 10^{28} ergs$. For typical brightening loop values the resistive phase lasts about 5 seconds.

For comparison we have repeated the above simulation with a uniform resistivity. This is turned on at $t = 10$ and the simulation is stopped at $t = 20$. In this way the resistivity is applied for the same length of time as above. For this run we took $\eta = 10^{-3}$ so that this too is consistent with the value used above. We find that for this uniform resistivity model 62% of the available energy is released. This is sufficiently close to the value found from using equation 5 that the difference can be ignored. However, the kinetic energy generated with a uniform resistivity is approximately half that of the value from using equation 5 and the total Ohmic heating is three times larger. The peak flows are less than half those shown in Figure A9. At present all simulations are forced to use resistivity which is unphysically large. These tests show that applying such a large resistivity *uniformly* over the computational domain, instead of localising it to just

those regions where it should have an effect, over-estimates the Ohmic heating and under-estimates the kinetic energy in the final dynamic state. Neither of these points is surprising as including resistivity everywhere will clearly increase the overall Ohmic dissipation and smooth the fields driving the instability. What is important here is that these effects have now been quantified for the values of resistivity typically used in large scale numerical simulations. Using a uniform resistivity does release the same amount of magnetic energy as using equation 5 but splits it between Ohmic heating and kinetic energy in a very different way. It is worth noting that runs with *zero* resistivity also release the same amount of energy but most of this energy is simply lost from the system. In this case when the current density scale length reaches the grid spacing *numerical* diffusion dissipates the current. Thus getting the correct amount of total magnetic energy released in a simulation is not of itself a useful indicator that the resistive effects have been correctly modelled.

All of the results above are from 161^3 stretched grids with $\eta_0 = 10^{-3}$ and $j_{crit} = 5$. By running the same simulations on 81^3 and 121^3 grids we have confirmed that, for these values of η_0 and j_{crit} , these results are the correct, converged solutions. We have also conducted three higher resolution simulations on a stretched $221 \times 221 \times 101$ grid. The first was a purely ideal MHD simulation. This confirmed that the current density in the current sheet scales as $1/dx$ demonstrating that we have no evidence of the current density saturating consistent with the results from the Lagrangian code. The second simulation repeated previous resistive runs with $\eta_0 = 10^{-3}$ and $j_{crit} = 5$. This confirmed the accuracy and convergence of these results. The last high resolution run repeated this last simulation but with $j_{crit} = 10$. It is only at this higher resolution that enough grid points are present in the current sheet for energy conservation to be acceptable, i.e. the Ohmic heating is much larger than the energy loss through numerical diffusion, for this value of j_{crit} . The interesting point here is that the results with $j_{crit} = 10$ are not significantly different, i.e. none of the observational signatures change, from those with $j_{crit} = 5$. Similarly, increasing η_0 to 10^{-2} does not alter our observational predictions. Hence over the range of dimensionless parameters resolvable by the simulations we have performed we find that the predicted observational signatures are insensitive to the choice of η_0 and j_{crit} . However, the use of

equation 5 for coronal values assuming that turbulence enhanced resistivity (as discussed in §2) was active would require 100 times the resolution we have used. If such enhanced resistivity were absent then of course much higher resolution still would be required. Such grid sizes are of course impossible at present. Our predicted signatures are therefore based on the assumption that this independence on η_0 and j_{crit} remains true up to coronal values.

The results above are for a loop with $L_z = 10$. We have also checked this result for $L_z = 5.5$ which has approximately half the growth rate and is closer to the marginal stability length. The resistive evolution of this loop showed the same behaviour as for $L_z = 10$. The maximum current in the current sheet was the same; the timescale for the resistive phase was 10 Alfvén transit times as before and the energy released was the same fraction of the available free energy. The only difference was that as a result of the lower growth rate it took longer to reach the stage where the current density in the current sheet triggered the resistivity. A final set of tests has also been performed in which the resistivity was set to a constant value of 10^{-3} in any computational cell with current density larger than j_{crit} . These also gave the same set of observational signatures as presented above verifying that the results are also insensitive to the functional form chosen for the resistivity provided that it is only present in the current sheet.

6. Discussion

Our aim in this work has been to perform non-linear numerical solutions of unstable coronal loops using resistive MHD. In these simulations we have concentrated on a single equilibrium. We have confirmed some of the results of previous papers using different initial conditions and different numerical approaches. Where there has been a lack of consensus in previous studies we have clarified these issues by supplying detailed numerical results. These include the formation of current sheets; the basic structure of those current sheets and the general features of the resistive evolution. There are however important quantitative differences between this paper and previous work. Most of these differences stem from only applying resistivity locally in current sheets. Before progressing to a description of the observational signatures it is worth highlighting what those differences are.

1. We have run the non-linear codes on a range of grids. These confirm that the current generated near the resonance surface scales as $1/dx$ for the Eulerian code and faster than $1/dx^2$ for the Lagrangian code. The current densities found in the Lagrangian code are two orders of magnitude large than those found in previous studies. This combined with the above scalings with grid size provide convincing evidence that the current density would continue to collapse to smaller and smaller scales unless stopped by some dissipative process, i.e. they are current sheets.
2. Coronal simulations require the use of a resistivity which is larger than the real coronal value in order to limit the current densities formed in such simulations. We adopt this procedure but only apply resistivity where it is needed by using equation 5 to localise resistive effects to regions with high current densities. If the current density exceeds 3000 (in our normalised units) then equation 5 may be viewed as a parameterisation of the effects of sub-grid scale turbulence enhanced resistivity based on theories of ion-acoustic turbulence. While there is theoretical evidence that this may be true a direct proof of this is beyond the scope of this paper.
3. We have quantified the discrepancies between using equation 5 and taking η to be uniform over the computational domain.
4. For all of the tests we have run, the observable properties of the loop are independent of the choice of j_{crit} and η_0 in equation 5. As far as we can determine it is the rate at which magnetic flux is moved into the reconnection region which is important. This is determined by the correct resolution of the ideal MHD instability. We have also shown that the results are insensitive to the function form of equation 5.

The simulations we have performed are only for one equilibrium. This equilibrium carries no net current. Such an equilibrium might evolve due to long scale length correlated twisting of the flux tube either in its rise through the convection zone or through photospheric vortex flows once it has emerged into the corona. We further assume that the equilibrium is force-free and that at the start of our simulation the

loop is unstable. The loop could have become unstable from increased twisting of the magnetic field due to photospheric motion or from rising higher into the corona and hence increasing in length. Provided these conditions are satisfied, or at least a reasonable approximation, then the observational signature of the ensuing instability are those set out below. Where results are presented in unnormalised units it is assumed that they relate to the typical brightening loop values listed in §2. While we have shown that our results are independent of η_0 and j_{crit} over a large range of values it should be noted that these observational signatures are only valid if we assume that this remains true when extrapolating to real coronal values. Implicit in this is of course the assumption that the microscopic details of magnetic field diffusion and reconnection can be adequately parameterised on the fluid level in terms of a scalar resistivity. We have no reason to doubt this but of course a proof is beyond the scope of these, or any currently available, numerical simulations.

1. The instability will trigger the formation of an intense current concentration (a current sheet). The combination of instability and current sheet dissipation will cause the loop temperature to increase along its whole length by a factor of 3 over the initial background value, i.e. heating up to about $6 \times 10^6 K$. A higher temperature component, perhaps 6 times the initial temperature (around $1.8 \times 10^7 K$), may also be observable (see Figure A8(b)).
2. The whole resistive phase takes about 10 Alfvén transit times (approximately 5 seconds) so the loop would brighten very rapidly. The viscous dissipation timescale for this loop is $\tau_\nu \sim 4$ minutes. In this we have taken $\tau_\nu = L_v^2/\nu$ where L_v is the velocity scale length and we have taken $L_v = 10^6 m$. The conductive timescale (the timescale for which the loop should be visible at 3 times background temperature) is also of the order of minutes.
3. For this equilibrium the total magnetic energy released is $\sim 5 \times 10^{28} ergs$. This is split approximately equally between Ohmic heating, viscous heating and kinetic energy. The energy released for other size loops can be found from noting that the energy released scales as $B_0^2 a_0^2 L_z$ where B_0 is the magnetic field in the loop, a_0 is the loop radius and L_z the loop length.
4. The loop is not destroyed but remains confined within the same region of the corona. The twisted field lines become straightened within the same confining region.
5. After brightening there will be very large, localised flows in the loop. These have a maximum of $\sim 0.8V_A$ ($\sim 1500 km s^{-1}$). However, after taking into account the line of sight effect; exposure times and averaging over a diagnostic pixel size we find that the predicted *observable* flows are $\sim 40 km s^{-1}$. The timescale of viscous dissipation means that these flows would persist for minutes after the initial brightening and therefore should be observable.
6. The kinetic energy generated is about half the total thermal energy released (both Ohmic and viscous heating) and this may be indirectly observable. The averaging inherent in measurements outlined above would mean that temperature estimates based on spectral line widths (which would included the averaged Doppler broadening) should be about 1.5 times those from calculations based on ratios of line intensities (which will be insensitive to the plasma motion predicted here).

The clearest study of transient brightening loops (Shimizu et. al. 1994) shows that the above diagnostic signatures are consistent with some of the SXT observations from Yohkoh. The energy released by the instability is at the high end of observed energies for brightening loops, i.e. they are micro-flares. This is as should be expected since the idealised nature of these simulations is only applicable to loops which have been twisted by a long timescale input of energy. The majority of these loops are seen to brighten along their entire length consistent with the picture in Figure A8(a). Assuming a background active region coronal temperature of $2 \times 10^6 K$ the iso-surfaces in Figure A8(a) would correspond to temperatures of $\sim 6 \times 10^6 K$. The more structured, high temperature component shown in Figure A8(b) would correspond to a temperature of $\sim 2 \times 10^7 K$. The conductive loss timescale for a coronal loop at $\sim 10^6 K$ is $\sim 10^2 s$, so one would expect the brightening of the loops predicted here to last several minutes. However the very high temperature component is highly localised (see Figure A8) and would be smoothed out on a much more rapid timescale. It would therefore require an exposure time of the order of seconds, on a diagnostic

sensitive to temperatures $\sim 2 \times 10^7 K$ to confirm or dismiss the predictions shown in Figure A8(b). The speeds predicted in these simulations are consistent with observed speeds from Doppler measurements but a more directed study is needed to confirm if the size and structure shown in Figure A9 are present *after* a loop brightening event. The predicted discrepancy between temperature measurements based on line broadening and ratios of different spectral line intensities is also as yet untested.

In summary, we have performed a set of numerical simulations of unstable coronal loops which carry no net current. By using high resolution numerical experiments, with a resistivity given by equation 5, we have been able to have greater confidence in our *quantitative* predictions from these simulations than would have been possible by simply assuming uniform resistivity. Our predictions for these observational signatures are listed above. Where comparison with current observational data is possible these are in broad agreement with the properties of brightening (compact flare) loops. The full set of predictions can now be used as the basis of a directed observational study which may then confirm, or dismiss, whether large scale MHD instabilities are the cause of the high energy, micro-flare end of the spectrum of transient loop brightenings.

This work was supported in part by a PPARC rolling grant at St. Andrews and by a mobility allowance granted to one of the authors by the Flemish Fund for Scientific Research. The authors would also like to thank Alan Hood for many helpful discussions, A. R. Bell of Imperial College for making his MH3D code available to us and to S. G. Lucek, also from Imperial College, for invaluable discussions about the use of the MH3D code.

A. Details of the Lagrangian Code

The Lagrangian code used to follow the ideal evolution of the instability is based on the equilibrium code described in Longbottom et. al. 1998 and Craig & Sneyd 1986. It solves the ideal Lagrangian MHD equations

$$\rho \frac{D\mathbf{v}}{Dt} = (\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \times \mathbf{B} - \nabla P, \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$\frac{D\mathbf{x}}{Dt} = \mathbf{v}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

with

$$\left(\frac{P}{\rho^\Gamma}\right) = \text{constant (moving with the fluid)} \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\rho = \rho_0 / \Delta, \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$B_i = \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial X_j} B_{0j} / \Delta, \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$\Delta = \frac{\partial(x_1, x_2, x_3)}{\partial(X_1, X_2, X_3)}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

Here $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is the current position of the fluid element which is initially at $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, X_3)$, $\mathbf{v}$ is the velocity moving with the fluid, ρ and ρ_0 are the current and initial densities of the fluid element, $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, B_2, B_3)$ and $\mathbf{B}_0 = (B_{01}, B_{02}, B_{03})$ are the current and initial magnetic fields and P is the pressure.

Equations A1 and A2 are advanced in time using a Lax-Wendroff type method (fourth order in space, second order in time). Once the new positions of the fluid elements are known the other variables can be calculated directly from equations A3-A6 without further time integration. The method preserves total mass, entropy and $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$ identically and gives excellent energy conservation.

As time progresses the grid deforms moving more points into regions of compression. For the time evolution considered here, with the inner part of the twisted loop being forced by the instability into the almost static external potential field, the grid points accumulate in the regions where the current sheet forms. This allows these increasing currents to be resolved for much larger values than would be possible by the equivalent Eulerian code. It should be noted, however, that as the Lagrangian code relies on the system being ideal it can say nothing about the evolution of the system once dissipation becomes important.

REFERENCES

- Baty, H., & Heyvaerts, J. 1996, A&A, 308, 935.
- Baty, H. 1997, A&A, 318, 621.
- Baty, H., Einaudi, G., Lionello, G., & Velli, M. 1998, A&A, 333, 305.
- Craig, I. J. D., & Sneyd, A. D. 1986, ApJ, 311, 451.
- Evans, C. E. & Hawley, J. F. 1988, ApJ, 332, 659.
- Hood, A. W. & Priest, E. R. 1979, Sol. Phys., 64, 303.

Lionello, R., Velli, M., Einaudi, G., & Mikić, Z. 1998, *ApJ*, 494, 840.

Longbottom, A. W., Rickard, G. J., Craig, I. J. D., & Sneyd, A. D. 1998, *ApJ*, 500, 471.

Lucek, S.G. & Bell, A. R. 1996, *MNRAS*, 281, 245.

Mikić, Z., Schnack, D. D., & Van Hoven, G. 1990, *ApJ*, 361, 690.

Rosner, R., Golub, L., Coppi, B., & Vaiana, G. S. 1978, *ApJ*, 222, 317.

Shimizu, T., Tsuneta, S., Acton, L. W., Lemen, J. R. Ogawara, Y. & Uchida, Y. 1994, *ApJ*, 422, 906.

Shimizu, T. 1996, in *Magnetic Reconnection in the Solar Atmosphere*, APS Conference Series (Bentley, R. D. & Mariska, J. T. eds) Vol 111, 59

Takakura, T. 1991, *Sol. Phys.*, 136, 303.

Van der Linden, R. A. M. & Hood, A. W. 1998, *A&A*, 339, 887.

Van Hoven, G., Mok, Y., & Mikić, Z. 1995, *ApJ*, 440, L105.

van Neumann, J. & Richtmyer, R. D. 1950, *J. Appl. Phys.*, 21, 232.

Velli, M., Einaudi, G. & Hood, A. W. 1990, *ApJ*, 350, 419.

Velli, M., Lionello, R., & Einaudi, G. 1997, *Sol. Phys.*, 172, 257.

Youngs, D. L., *Numerical Methods in Fluid Dynamics*, Morton, K. W. & Baines, M. J. eds., 1982, Academic Press, New York, p273.

Fig. A1.— Magnetic field components B_θ and B_z vs. radius for the initial equilibrium.

Fig. A2.— The modulus of the current perturbation, $|\mathbf{j}_1|$ at $y = z = 0$, $t = 5$, from the linear (dotted line), the non-linear Lagrangian (solid line) and non-linear Eulerian (dashed line) time-evolution simulations.

Fig. A3.— As in Figure A2 but for $t = 10$.

Fig. A4.— The x -component of the velocity, v_x at $y = z = 0$, $t = 5$, taken from the linear time evolution.

Fig. A5.— The modulus of the current perturbation, $|\mathbf{j}_1|$ at $y = z = 0$ as a function of x and time from the nonlinear Lagrangian simulation.

Fig. A6.— The modulus of the current, $|\mathbf{j}|$ at $z = 0$ from the nonlinear Lagrangian simulation at $t = 11.5$.

Fig. A7.— Iso-surfaces of $|j| = 3$ at $t = 10$, and $t = 15$ from the Eulerian simulation.

Fig. A8.— Iso-surfaces of 3 times background energy and 6 times background at $t = 20$ from the Eulerian simulation.

Fig. A9.— Plasma velocity after averaging over a 10 seconds exposure time and a $1.5 Mm \times 1.5 Mm$ square vs. distance along the loop. Photospheric footpoints are at $\pm 5 Mm$.





















