OPEN ACCESS
Saudi Journal of Engineering and Technology
Abbreviated Key Title: Saudi J Eng Technol
ISSN 2415-6272 (Print) | ISSN 2415-6264 (Online)
Scholars Middle East Publishers, Dubai, United Arab Emirates
Journal homepage: https://saudijournals.com

Review Article

Effect of Magnetic Field on the Kelvin–Helmholtz Instability of Conducting Fluids

Dr. Ravi Prakash Mathur[1*]

[1]Department of Mathematics, S.G.S.G. Government College, Nasirabad, India

DOI: 10.36348/sjet.2021.v06i01.003 | **Received:** 17.12.2020 | **Accepted:** 21.01.2021 | **Published:** 25.01.2021

***Corresponding author:** Dr. Ravi Prakash Mathur

Abstract

This paper investigates the linear stability of the interface between two viscous, incompressible, electrically conducting fluids in the presence of a uniform magnetic field parallel to the interface, focusing on the suppression of the Kelvin–Helmholtz instability. The classical instability arises when two fluid layers of different densities move with different velocities, leading to the amplification of small disturbances at their interface. By incorporating magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) effects into the linearized Navier–Stokes and Maxwell equations, we derive a modified dispersion relation that accounts for both magnetic tension and velocity shear. The results show that a sufficiently strong magnetic field can completely stabilize the interface by counteracting the shear-induced vorticity. The critical magnetic field required for stabilization depends on the density contrast and relative velocity of the two layers. The analysis has implications for astrophysical plasma flows, liquid metal processing, and oceanic or atmospheric shear layers.

Keywords: Kelvin–Helmholtz instability, magnetic field, conducting fluids, MHD stability, shear flow.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Kelvin–Helmholtz (K–H) instability is a fundamental mechanism by which shear flow between two fluids generates waves or vortices at their interface. It plays a vital role in numerous natural and industrial processes, including cloud formation, oceanic currents, solar wind–magnetosphere interactions, and plasma confinement.

In the absence of stabilizing effects, when two fluid layers move at different tangential velocities, even a small perturbation at the interface can grow due to the velocity shear. The instability develops into characteristic rolling vortices, enhancing mixing between the layers.

When the fluids are electrically conducting, and a magnetic field is applied, the Lorentz force acts as a restoring tension that resists interface deformation. The competition between shear (destabilizing) and magnetic tension (stabilizing) determines whether the system remains stable or becomes unstable [1–3].

This phenomenon has been extensively studied in both terrestrial and astrophysical contexts. In the solar atmosphere and magnetospheric boundary layers, magnetic fields suppress the growth of shear instabilities, maintaining coherent plasma structures. Similarly, in laboratory and industrial flows involving liquid metals or electrolytes, magnetic control of interface stability can prevent undesirable mixing or turbulence.[4]

Recently Krishna B. Chavaraddi *et al.*, [8] have studied the effect of magnetic field on Kelvin-Helmholtz instability in a couple-stress fluid layer bounded above by a porous layer and below by a rigid surface.

In this paper, we analyze the linear stability of a horizontal interface between two incompressible, viscous, conducting fluids subjected to a uniform horizontal magnetic field. The objective is to determine the effect of magnetic field strength and orientation on the growth rate and conditions for suppression of the Kelvin–Helmholtz instability.

2. Physical Configuration

We consider two infinite layers of incompressible, viscous, electrically conducting fluids separated by a horizontal interface at z = 0.

- **Upper fluid (region 1):** density ρ_1, viscosity μ_1, velocity $\mathbf{U_1} = U_1\,\hat{\mathbf{x}}$

- **Lower fluid (region 2):** density ρ_2, viscosity μ_2, velocity $\mathbf{U_2} = U_2\,\hat{\mathbf{x}}$

A uniform horizontal magnetic field $\mathbf{B_0} = \mathbf{B_0}\,\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is applied parallel to the interface and to the basic flow direction. Gravity acts downward as $\mathbf{g} = -\mathbf{g}\,\hat{\mathbf{z}}$, but in this analysis, we focus primarily on shear-driven instability; gravitational terms are retained for generality.

The interface is slightly perturbed such that its displacement is given by $\zeta(x, t)$, representing small amplitude waves propagating along x.

3. Governing Equations

The motion of each conducting fluid is governed by the magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) equations:

Momentum equation:

$\rho\,(\,\partial\mathbf{v}/\partial t + (\mathbf{U}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v} + (\mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{U}\,) = -\nabla p + \rho\,g\,\hat{z} + \mu\,\nabla^2\mathbf{v} + (1/\mu_0)(\nabla\times\mathbf{b})\times\mathbf{B}_0$ ...(1)

Induction equation:

$\partial\mathbf{b}/\partial t = \nabla\times(\mathbf{v}\times\mathbf{B}_0) + \eta\,\nabla^2\mathbf{b}$ ...(2)

Equation of Continuity and solenoidal conditions:

$\nabla\cdot\mathbf{v} = 0, \quad \nabla\cdot\mathbf{b} = 0$ ...(3)

where $\mathbf{v} = (u, w)$ is the velocity perturbation, p is the pressure perturbation, **b** is the perturbed magnetic field, μ_0 is the magnetic permeability, and $\eta = 1/(\mu_0\sigma_e)$ is the magnetic diffusivity.

We linearize equations (1)–(3) assuming small perturbations about the steady base flow with constant velocity U_i and magnetic field B_0.

4. Linearized Analysis and Perturbation Form

We consider normal-mode perturbations of the form:

$\{\,u, w, b_x, b_z, p\} = \{\,U(z), W(z), B_x(z), B_z(z), P(z)\}\,e^{(ikx-\omega t)}$, ...(4)

where **k** is the wave number and $\boldsymbol{\omega = \omega_r + i\,\omega_i}$ is the complex frequency. Growth of the disturbance corresponds to $\boldsymbol{\omega_i > 0}$.

For incompressible flow, $\partial u/\partial x + \partial w/\partial z = 0$ implies $w = -(i/k)(\partial u/\partial z)$. Substituting (4) into the linearized MHD equations yields:

$(D^2 - k^2)^2\,W = (k^2\,B_0^2 / (\mu_0\,\rho\,(\omega - kU\,)^2\,))\,(D^2 - k^2)\,W,$ ...(5)

where $D = d/dz$.

This fourth-order differential equation governs the vertical structure of the perturbation velocity W(z) in each region. Solutions must decay as $|z| \to \infty$, leading to exponential forms:

$W_1 = A_1\,e^{-kz}, \quad z > 0 \; W_2 = A_2\,e^{kz}, \quad z < 0$

5. Interfacial Boundary Conditions

At the interface z = 0, the following boundary conditions apply:

1. **Continuity of normal velocity:** $W_1 = W_2 = -i\omega\zeta$.
2. **Continuity of total pressure (fluid + magnetic):** $p_1 + (\,B_0\,b_{x1} / \mu_0\,) = p_2 + (\,B_0\,b_{x2} / \mu_0\,)$.
3. **Continuity of tangential magnetic field:** $b_{x1} = b_{x2}$.

Eliminating pressure and magnetic perturbations, we arrive at the dispersion relation connecting ω and k.

6. Dispersion Relation

After applying the boundary conditions and linearizing in terms of ω and k, the dispersion relation for inviscid MHD flow becomes:

$\rho_1\,(\,\omega - kU_1\,)^2 + \rho_2\,(\,\omega - kU_2\,)^2 = (\,B_0^2\,k^2 / \mu_0\,)\,(\,1 + (\rho_1 + \rho_2) / (\rho_1\,\rho_2)\,).$ ...(6)

Rearranging for ω yields:

$\omega = k\,(\,\rho_1U_1 + \rho_2U_2\,) / (\,\rho_1 + \rho_2\,) \pm i\,[\,gk(\rho_2 - \rho_1)/(\rho_1 + \rho_2) - (\,B_0^2\,k^2 / \mu_0\,(\rho_1 + \rho_2)\,) - (\,\rho_1\rho_2/(\rho_1 + \rho_2)^2\,)(U_1 - U_2)^2\,k^2\,]\text{^}\{½\}.$ ...(7)

The term under the square root determines the stability criterion. The system is unstable if the quantity inside the brackets is positive (since then $\omega_i > 0$).

7. Stability Criterion

Neglecting gravity for pure shear-driven instability ($\Delta\rho \approx 0$), equation (7) reduces to:

$\omega_i^2 = (\rho_1\rho_2/(\rho_1 + \rho_2)^2)(U_1 - U_2)^2\,k^2 - (B_0^2\,k^2 / \mu_0\,(\rho_1 + \rho_2)\,).$ ...(8)

The system is unstable when $\omega_i^2 > 0$, i.e.,

$(U_1 - U_2\,)^2 > (2\,B_0^2 / \mu_0\,)\,(1 / (\rho_1\rho_2/(\rho_1 + \rho_2))\,).$ ...(9)

From this, we define the critical magnetic field B_c required to suppress the Kelvin–Helmholtz instability:

$B_c = (½)\,\sqrt{(\mu_0\,\rho_1\rho_2 / (\rho_1 + \rho_2)\,)}\,|\,U_1 - U_2\,|.$ ...(10)

If $B_0 \geq B_c$, all modes are stabilized; for $B_0 < B_c$, perturbations with finite wave number grow exponentially.

8. DISCUSSION

8.1 Role of magnetic field

Equation (10) shows that the magnetic field acts as an effective surface tension that resists deformation of the interface. The Lorentz force induced by motion across magnetic lines of force restores the displaced interface to equilibrium. Increasing $\mathbf{B_0}$ reduces the growth rate of unstable modes and increases the wavelength required for instability onset.

At $B_0 = B_c$, all wavelengths are neutrally stable. For stronger fields, the system is completely stable. The transition from unstable to stable behavior is continuous and depends on the density ratio and velocity difference of the two fluids. [3,4]

8.2 Effect of density contrast

When $\rho_2 > \rho_1$, gravitational stabilization also contributes. If $\rho_1 > \rho_2$, gravity enhances the instability (the Rayleigh–Taylor term in equation 7 becomes positive). Thus, the combined Kelvin–Helmholtz and Rayleigh–Taylor mechanisms can produce complex dynamics.

In astrophysical plasmas (e.g., at magnetopause boundaries), density contrasts are often large, but strong magnetic fields suppress wave growth, leading to observed stable shear layers.[5]

8.3 Influence of viscosity

In realistic fluids, viscosity provides an additional damping mechanism. The viscous terms modify the dispersion relation by introducing an imaginary component proportional to $\mu k^2 / \rho$, which reduces ω_i. While viscosity alone cannot fully suppress instability, it reduces growth rates at short wavelengths, complementing magnetic stabilization.

8.4 Physical interpretation

The stabilization mechanism can be understood through energy considerations. The kinetic energy of perturbations in the shear flow is converted into magnetic energy stored in bent field lines. The magnetic tension resists bending and thus provides a restoring force. The amount of energy required to bend the magnetic field increases with B_0^2, making strong fields highly stabilizing.

8.5 Astrophysical and engineering applications

- **Astrophysical plasmas:** Kelvin–Helmholtz instability plays a major role in the solar corona, magnetospheric boundary layers, and jets. Magnetic fields of a few gauss can suppress wave growth, maintaining coherent plasma boundaries [5,6].
- **Liquid metal systems:** In metallurgical processes, applying transverse magnetic fields can suppress turbulence and mixing in shear layers.
- **Fusion devices:** In magnetic confinement fusion, shear-driven instabilities at plasma–vacuum boundaries are controlled by strong toroidal fields. [6,7]

9. Limiting Cases

1. **No magnetic field ($B_0 = 0$):**

Equation (8) becomes $\omega_i = k\,(U_1 - U_2)\,\sqrt{(\rho_1\rho_2)} / (\rho_1 + \rho_2)$, indicating instability for any nonzero velocity difference.

2. **Strong magnetic field ($B_0 \to \infty$):**

$\omega_i \to 0$, all perturbations are suppressed—complete stability.

3. **Equal densities ($\rho_1 = \rho_2 = \rho$):**

The dispersion simplifies to $\omega_i^2 = (¼)\, k^2 (U_1 - U_2)^2 - (B_0^2 k^2 / (2\, \mu_0\, \rho))$.
The critical field then reduces to $B_c = \sqrt{(\mu_0\, \rho / 2)}\, |U_1 - U_2| / 2$.

4. **Finite gravity and magnetic field:**

When both effects are present, stabilization is more effective; however, long-wavelength modes may still persist if B_0 is weak. [4,7]

10. CONCLUSION

A theoretical investigation has been carried out on the effect of a magnetic field on the Kelvin–Helmholtz instability of two conducting fluids. The main conclusions are:

1. In the absence of a magnetic field, any velocity shear between two fluid layers leads to Kelvin–Helmholtz instability.
2. A uniform magnetic field parallel to the flow introduces a Lorentz restoring force that opposes interface deformation.
3. The critical magnetic field required for complete stabilization is proportional to the product of the square root of fluid densities and their relative velocity difference.
4. The stabilization is stronger for higher densities, smaller velocity contrasts, and larger magnetic fields.
5. The analysis explains why magnetic fields in astrophysical and industrial contexts effectively suppress shear-induced turbulence.

The results generalize the classical Kelvin–Helmholtz theory by incorporating magnetic field effects and provide a theoretical framework applicable to a wide range of magnetized fluid systems.

REFERENCES

1. Chandrasekhar, S. (1961). *Hydrodynamic and Hydromagnetic Stability*. Oxford University Press.
2. Cowling, T. G. (1957). *Magnetohydrodynamics*. Interscience Publishers, London.
3. Drazin, P. G., & Reid, W. H. (1981). *Hydrodynamic Stability*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Bhatnagar, P. L., & Kothari, D. S. (1973). *Theory of Plasma Instabilities*. Pergamon Press.
5. Parker, E. N. (1979). *Cosmical Magnetic Fields: Their Origin and Activity*. Oxford University Press.
6. Shivamoggi, B. K. (1987). "Magnetohydrodynamic Stability of Shear Layers." *Physics of Fluids*, 30(12), 3726–3733.
7. Ferraro, V. C. A., & Plumpton, C. (1966). *An Introduction to Magneto-Fluid Mechanics*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
8. Krishna B. Chavaraddi, Vishwanath B. Awati, Nagaraj N. Katagi, Priya M. Goude (2016). *Effect of Magnetic Field on Kelvin-Helmholtz Instability in a Couple-Stress Fluid Layer Bounded Above by a Porous Layer and Below by a Rigid Surface*, Applied Mathematics, 7, 2021-2032.