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Abstract: Buoyancy driven motion of a highly viscous electrically conducting fluid under the influence of Lorentz forces is investigated theoretically and experimentally. This problem is relevant to the processing of glass, where it is of considerable interest to know whether electromagnetic forces can effectively improve mixing and help to avoid undesired flow patterns in glass melting furnaces. Two highly simplified models are proposed in which the fluid is assumed to be confined in a circular loop containing several localized resistive heating, convective cooling, and electromagnetic forcing elements. The first model is used to derive the scaling laws of the mean velocity and maximum temperature depending on the electric current density and magnetic field. The predictions of this model are found to be in agreement with numerical simulations and with experiments in a small-scale glass melting furnace. Using the second model which contains two cooling elements we demonstrate that the steady-state velocity in the general case is determined by a single nonlinear algebraic equation whose bifurcation structure reveals an unexpectedly subtle influence of the Lorentz force on buoyancy driven convection. It is shown that the system undergoes a transition from a nearly stably stratified "slow" mode for weak Lorentz forces, in which the velocity $v$ and temperature $\theta_H$ scale with the electric current density $J_0$ as $v \sim \text{const.}$ and $\theta_H \sim J_0^2$ to a "fast" mode for strong Lorentz forces in which the scaling on the magnetic field $B_0$ is $v \sim J_0 B_0$ and $\theta_H \sim J_0^{4/3} B_0^{-2/3}$. In a wide range of parameters this transition depends discontinuously on the magnetic field and has the character of a subcritical bifurcation involving hysteresis. The scaling laws imply that already a comparatively weak electromagnetic force can strongly modify buoyancy driven convection. The consequences of this finding for electromagnetic control of glass melting processes are briefly discussed.

1 Introduction and technical background

Glass is a ubiquitous material whose reliable production requires a comprehensive understanding and accurate prediction of its flow when it is in its liquid phase at temperatures between 1200°C and 1600°C. Although there have been intensive efforts in the glassmaking industry (Krause & Loch 2002) and from the side of commercial computational fluid dynamics (CFD) software developers (Prasad et al 1999) to implement and exploit numerical models of glass flows in melting furnaces, the underlying fluid dynamical problem - mixed convection of a high-Prandtl number fluid with internal heat generation at high Rayleigh and low Reynolds numbers - remains poorly understood. This is particularly true for all-electric furnaces where the flow is driven by the combined action of (Joule-heat-induced) buoyancy and Lorentz forces. In this case there is a long-standing and still unresolved controversy (Hofmann & Philip 1992, Choudhary 1995, Hofmann & Thess 2002) as to whether naturally occuring electromagnetic forces should be included into numerical models of glass melt flows. Moreover, one would like to know whether additional Lorentz forces, created by applying external magnetic fields, can lead to sufficiently strong changes in the flow velocity (which usually is of the order of a couple of millimeters per second) so as to enhance mixing and to avoid undesired flow patterns. While the application of electromagnetic fields for flow control in other areas of materials processing like semiconductor crystal growth, steel casting, and production of aluminum is a well established technique based on a good understanding of the underlying fluid dynamical phenomena (Davidson 1999, Davidson 2001, Davidson & Lindsay 1998), the application of electromagnetic fields to glass melts is a comparatively new topic. The difficulty with glass melts arises from the fact that their electrical conductivity is nearly than five orders of magnitude smaller than that of liquid metals. The goal of the present work is to formulate a conceptually simple model which displays the delicate interplay
between buoyancy, viscous friction, and Lorentz forces in its purest form and permits one to systematically investigate how strong electromagnetic forces ought to be in order to effectively control the flow of a glass melt. The present model should be considered as a prologue to a comprehensive analysis of electromagnetic forces in glass melts because it does not take into account the dependence of viscosity and electrical conductivity on temperature and the heat transfer by radiation.

The paper is organized as follows. With the detailed explanation of the technical background we pave the ground for the definition of our family of models which shall be formulated in section 2. Section 3 contains an analysis of the simplest representative of this family, referred to as model A, which is embodied in eq. (33). This model is amenable to fully analytic treatment and is compared with numerical simulations and laboratory experiments but does not represent the most general case. In section 4 we analyze a slightly more realistic model, called model B, which is described by eq. (45). This model displays the non-monotonic action of the magnetic field. Section 5 summarizes our conclusions and translates our findings into general scaling laws which are believed to provide a rational framework for the application of Lorentz forces to control glass melt flows.

Fig. 1 shows a highly simplified picture of an all-electric furnace for glass melting. An alternating electric current of about 1000 Ampere is injected into the electrically conducting highly viscous glass melt using two or more electrodes. This electric current has three effects, namely (i) resistive heating of the melt, (ii) creation of buoyancy, (iii) generation of a Lorentz force. Heating and buoyancy is a result of the volumetric heat production

\[ q = \frac{J^2}{\sigma} \]  

where \( J(x,t) \) is the electric current density and \( \sigma \) the electrical conductivity of the melt. Glass melts are poor electric conductors with conductivities of the order \( \sigma \approx 10^{-1} \Omega^{-1} m^{-1} \) as compared with \( \sigma \approx 10^6 \Omega^{-1} m^{-1} \) for liquid metals and molten semiconductors. The origin of the Lorentz force may be twofold. On the one hand, the electric current in the electrodes, and in the busbar system creates its own magnetic field \( b(x,t) \) determined by Ampere’s law \( \mu_0 J = \nabla \times b \) and by \( \nabla \cdot b = 0 \). This field results in a “natural” Lorentz force

\[ f = J \times b \]  

which is always present in all-electric melting furnaces and was studied by Hofmann & Philip 1992 and Choudhary 1996. Similar flows occur in a variety of electromagnetic materials processing techniques and are often called electrically induced vortical flows (Bojarevics et al 1988). On the other hand, since the pioneering work of Osmanis and co-workers (Osmanis et al 1987), there has been a growing interest in the application of external magnetic fields \( B(x,t) \) in order to create additional "artificial" Lorentz forces

\[ f = J \times B \]
so as to intensify mixing, which is crucial in the production of high-homogeneity glasses for optical applications.

The challenge in any practical application is to predict the velocity and temperature distribution of the liquid glass in the melting volume for a prescribed set of geometry parameters, electric current, and magnetic field distributions. More precisely, one would generally like to answer the following two questions: Is it necessary to take into account the natural Lorentz forces [cf. eq. (2)] when performing numerical simulations of glass melt flows in all-electric furnaces? How strong should an artificial Lorentz force [cf. eq. (3)] be in order to rearrange the flow in some predetermined manner? Up to now, the influence of Lorentz forces on glass melt flows was not systematically explored. It was generally believed that the effect of Lorentz forces is a linear one in the sense that the increase in stirring velocity \( \Delta v \) due to a Lorentz force \( f \) is of the order \( \Delta v \sim f \). We are not able to address the foregoing questions in their full generality, as this would involve the consideration of an infinite variety of possible configurations of electric current and magnetic field distributions. We shall rather limit the scope of our work to the search for a physical mechanism which involves a non-trivial action of a Lorentz force upon a convective flow. Our model, to be defined below, shows indeed that Lorentz forces affect buoyancy driven convection in a very subtle way, and that under appropriate circumstances small changes in \( f \) may lead to drastic increases of the flow velocity.

Our model shown in Fig. 2, is inspired by early (Keller 1966, Welander 1967, Creveling et al 1975) and more recent work (Davis & Roppo 1987, Yorke et al 1987, Ehrhard et al 1989, Ehrhard & Müller 1990) modelling thermal convection by the motion of a fluid in a closed vertical loop as well as by the recent progress in the application of scaling and similarity theory to the description of thermal convection at high Rayleigh number (Siggia 1994, Grossmann & Lohse 2000, 2003).

2 Formulation of the problem and general considerations

2.1 Definition of the considered system

Let us consider a circular loop filled with a fluid with kinematic viscosity \( \nu \), thermal diffusivity \( \kappa \), coefficient of thermal expansion \( \alpha \), density \( \rho = \rho_0[1 - \alpha(T - T_0)] \), and electrical conductivity \( \sigma \). Since the Prandtl number \( Pr = \nu/\kappa \) of glass melts is of the order \( 10^3 \), we shall assume \( Pr \gg 1 \). We take into account that \( \nu, \kappa, \alpha, \) and \( \sigma \) are functions of temperature but neglect their variation within the loop in order to keep the model as simple as possible. However, the reader should have in mind that in real glass melts \( \nu \) and \( \sigma \) can vary by orders of magnitude and that these variations give rise to strong nonlinear effects such as thermal runaway and freezing instabilities (Lange & Loch 2002). Similar effects are known to occur in lava flows, which have been investigated by Wylie & Lister (1995, 1998). Our neglect of viscosity and con-
ductivity variations within the loop should therefore be considered as a preliminary measure which is taken in order not to obscure the interaction between Lorentz forces and buoyancy.

As shown in Fig. 2, the fluid is heated by passing a homogeneous electric current \( J = J_0 \mathbf{e}_x \) through it, applied over a section with length \( L_H \) which delivers a volumetric heat generation rate \( q = J_0^2/\sigma \) to the fluid. At the same time a magnetic field \( \mathbf{B} = B_0 \mathbf{e}_y \) is assumed to act upon the heating section. At this point we do not distinguish between natural and artificial Lorentz force and suppose that \( B_0 \) and \( J_0 \) are independent input parameters, even though \( B_0 \) may depend on \( J_0 \). The resulting Lorentz force density \( \mathbf{f} = J_0 B_0 \mathbf{e}_x \) drives the fluid in counterclockwise direction. The Lorentz Forces are concentrated near by the electrodes. The reason is the decreasing electrical field density by increasing distance according \( J \sim r^{-1} \) for rod electrodes and \( J \sim r^{-2} \) for point electrodes. These relations allow us to concentrate the Lorentz Force at the heating section. In addition to the Lorentz force, a buoyancy force is generated due to the nonuniform distribution of temperature which results from cooling the fluid. We shall consider two models, referred to as model A and model B, characterized by one and two cooling sections respectively. Model A is the simplest nontrivial system, while model B is a more general caricature of the original system shown in Fig. 1 in that it takes into account both cooling at the free surface and at the sidewalls. In general, the model might be formulated for any position of the heating and cooling sections. The position of the cooling sections of model B is applicable for internal vortices which do not meet the side walls. This specific kind of vortices appears between two inner rod electrodes of a rod electrode line immersed into a glass melt furnace. Cooling in our model is accomplished by exposing the walls of the loop to a prescribed ambient temperature \( T_0 \) along the cooling elements. The remaining portions of the wall are assumed adiabatic. It is convenient to write the temperature as \( T = T_0 + \theta \) and to formulate the theory in terms of the temperature deviation \( \theta \).

For prescribed values of \( J_0, B_0, T_0 \), and a given set of material and geometry parameters, the goal of our theoretical model is to predict the velocity \( \nu \) and temperatures \( \theta_H, \theta_C, [\theta_{H1}, \theta_{C1}, \theta_{H2}, \theta_{C2}] \) for model A [model B] in a steady state. The velocity is related to the volume flux \( Q \) through the cross-sectional area \( A \) of the pipe by \( \nu = Q/A \) and is assumed to be the same at all points of the fluid. Our model is based on two ingredients namely (i) the balance of torques acting on the fluid, expressed by

\[
\theta = \Sigma_V + \Sigma_B + \Sigma_L
\]

where \( \Sigma_V \) is the viscous torque, \( \Sigma_B \) the buoyancy torque and \( \Sigma_L \) the Lorentz torque, respectively and (ii) a set of constitutive relations of the form

\[
\theta_C = f(v) \theta_H, \quad \theta_H = \theta_C + g(v)
\]

[for model A]

\[
\theta_{C1} = f_1(v) \theta_H, \quad \theta_{C2} = f_2(v) \theta_{C1}, \quad \theta_H = \theta_{C2} + g(v)
\]

[for model B]

where the functions \( f(v) \) and \( g(v) \) describe the relation between the temperatures of the fluid entering and leaving the heating or cooling section. A number of properties of the systems can be deduced from very general qualitative considerations without any reference to the specific form of these functions, as will be shown next. It is readily verified that the torque on the fluid is in the \( y \)-direction and can therefore be expressed as \( \Sigma = -\Sigma_y \).

For flows at low Reynolds number, such as glass melt flows, the viscous torque must be of the form

\[
\Sigma_V = -\mu \nu
\]

where the friction coefficient \( \mu \) depends on the shape of the cross-section and on the viscosity, as will be described in detail in section 3. The buoyancy torque is written as

\[
\Sigma_B = \beta(v)
\]

where the function \( \beta(v) \) depends on the properties of the heating and cooling system as well as on the (unknown) velocity. The shape of \( \beta(v) \) will be separately discussed for models A and B below. Finally, the Lorentz torque can be expressed as

\[
\Sigma_L = \gamma
\]

where \( \gamma \sim J_0 B_0 \) describes the strength of the Lorentz force. As a result, the velocity is determined by the non-linear equation

\[
\mu \nu = \beta(v) + \gamma
\]

The family of steady solutions \( v(\gamma) \) of this equation can be qualitatively understood by tracing the intersection between the functions \( \mu \nu \) and \( \beta(v) + \gamma \) once the shape of \( \beta(v) \) is known.
2.2 General properties of steady states

Consider first model A, characterized by a single cooling element. The heat taken up by each fluid element is proportional to the volumetric rate of Joule heat production $J_0^2/\sigma$ and to the time $L_H/v$ necessary to traverse the heating element. Consequently, the temperature difference $\theta_H - \theta_C$ is a decreasing function of $v$. Moreover, the spatial distribution of hot (light) and cold (heavy) fluid which determines the sign of $\beta(v)$ is always the same because the system is always top-heavy with cold fluid corresponding to unstable stratification. As a result, $\beta(v)$ is a monotonically decreasing function of $v$ whose qualitative shape is shown in Fig. 3a.

For $\gamma = 0$ its intersection with $\mu v$ defines a velocity scale $v_0$ characterizing the intensity of the nonmagnetic flow. As $\gamma$ is increased, the intersection is displaced to the right and the velocity is a monotonically increasing function of the Lorentz force as shown in Fig. 3b. However, model A does not represent the most general case because the fluid is always unstably stratified.

Model B is the simplest variant of the generic case including the possibility of transition from unstable to stable stratification. This system is characterized by the presence of two cooling elements. Assume for a moment that $v$ were known and let us derive, from general considerations, the shape of $\beta(v)$. For low velocities the first cooling section will be very effective in cooling the fluid down to a low temperature. Therefore the temperature distribution will be virtually the same as in model A (cf. insert 1 in Fig. 4a) and $\beta(v)$ will decay as shown in Figs. 4a and c for $v \rightarrow 0$. However, as $v$ is increased, the first cooling section becomes less effective and warm fluid invades the left part of the annulus before it is completely cooled down by the second cooling section.

There is some velocity at which the total torque becomes zero, as shown in inset 2 of Fig. 4a. Further increase of $v$ leads to a reversal of the sign of $\beta(v)$ (cf. insert 3 of Fig. 4a) which, for $v \rightarrow \infty$, tends to zero. For low electric current $\beta(v)$ sketched in Fig. 4a is smaller and less steep than for higher current, shown in Fig. 4c. This behavior is based on the fact, that the heat generation is proportional to $J_0^2$. For increasing velocities and higher electric current the reduction of generated heat and therefore the reduction of $\beta(v)$ is greater than for smaller electrical current. It turns out that there exists a critical electric current $I_c$ which strongly affects the behavior of the system once the Lorentz force is switched on. For $I < I_c$ there is a unique intersection between $\mu v$ and $\beta(v)$ as seen in Fig. 4a which leads to a monotonic function $v(\gamma)$ shown in Fig. 4b. When $I > I_c$ there are multiple intersections (cf. Fig. 4c) implying that there is a jump in the velocity once $\gamma$ is increased beyond a critical value. This transition involves hysteresis, as demonstrated in Fig. 4d.

2.3 Specification of the heat transfer models

Before proceeding to an analysis of both systems we need to supply our model with specific functions $f(v)$ and $g(v)$.

To derive the cooling function $f(v)$ we observe that the Peclet number $Pe = vd/\kappa$ in glass melt flows is usually high. We therefore assume that the passage of the hot fluid with $\theta = \theta_H$ along the cold isothermal wall with $\theta = 0$ results in a thermal boundary layer, shown in Fig.
Figure 4: General behaviour of model B: (a), (c) Graphic solutions of eq. (10) together with a sketch of the steady state velocities depending on the Lorentz force (b), (d). The case $I < I_c$ with continuous parameter dependence is shown in (a) and (b) while the case $I > I_c$ exhibiting jumps and hysteresis is shown in (c) and (d). Insets in (a) show the distribution of hot (H), warm (W), and cold (C) fluid corresponding to points 1, 2, and 3 of the curve $\beta(v)$.

Figure 5: Structure of the thermal boundary layer in the cooling section.

5, whose thickness evolves as

$$\delta(s) = c_T \left( \frac{\kappa s}{\tau} \right)^{1/3}$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

which is typical of high-Prandtl-number fluids (Shraiman & Siggia 1990, Wylie & Lister 1995, Ching 1997). Here $s$ is the arc-length, $\kappa$ the thermal diffusivity of the fluid, $\tau = dv_t/dn$ the wall-normal gradient of the tangential velocity, and $c_T$ a numerical constant of order one. We parenthetically note that this boundary layer structure also underlies the empirical relations for estimating mixing and homogenization times in glass processing (Beerkens 2002). For high Peclet numbers i.e. $Pe = vd/\kappa \gg 1$ the mean (cross-section averaged) temperature $\theta(s)$ is a weighted average between $\theta = \theta_H$ and $\theta = 0$ in the form

$$\theta(s) = \left[ 1 - \frac{2\delta(s)}{d} \right] \theta_H$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

For high Peclet numbers the heat transfer by conduction is small in comparison with convection and radiation. To keep the model simple the internal heat transfer by radiation is not included, but can be phenomenologically taken into account using an enhanced heat diffusivity. It should be mentioned that the Peclet number should not be too large to prevent the temperature to become uniform after passing the cooling element and before entering the heating section.

With eq. (12) $\theta_c = \theta(L_c)$ can be expressed as soon as $\tau$ is known. For general flows $\tau = c_f(v)v^2/2\nu$ can be expressed using the friction factor $c_f(v)$ (White 2002).
For laminar flows we have $c_f = c_V/Re$ (e.g. $c_V = 16$ for laminar flow in a circular pipe) leading to $\tau = c_V v/2d$ and thus to

$$f(v) = 1 - \left(\frac{16 c_v^2 L_c}{c_V v d^2}\right)^{1/3} \quad (13)$$

For $v \to \infty$ we have $f \to 1$ implying that the temperature is unchanged. For $v \to 16 \kappa L_c/c_V d^2$, on the other hand, $f \to 0$, i.e. the fluid is cooled down to the lowest possible temperature $\theta = 0$. In addition to that we assume that $f = 0$ for $v < 16 \kappa L_c/c_V d^2$. However, this case is of no importance here, since it corresponds to low Peclet numbers while we are interested in $Pe \gg 1$ here.

The heating function $g(v)$ is derived from the observation that a fluid element moving through the electric heating section obeys

$$c_p \rho_0 \frac{d\theta}{ds} = \frac{J_0^2}{\sigma} \quad (14)$$

where $c_p$ is the specific heat of the fluid. This equation is easily integrated over the heating section $-L_H/2 \leq s \leq +L_H/2$ using the boundary condition $\theta(-L_H/2) = \theta_C$ to obtain $\theta_H = \theta_C + \frac{J_0^2 L_H}{c_p \rho_0 \sigma v}$ as

$$\theta_H = \theta_C + \frac{J_0^2 L_H}{c_p \rho_0 \sigma v} \quad (15)$$

Thus we have

$$g(v) = \frac{J_0^2 L_H}{c_p \rho_0 \sigma v} \quad (16)$$

which decreases as $1/v$ as expected from our general discussion.

The constitutive relations can now be written in a compact form as

$$f(v) = 1 - \left(\frac{v_s}{v}\right)^{1/3} \quad (17)$$

$$g(v) = \theta_s \frac{v_s}{v} \quad (18)$$

With

$$v_s = \frac{16 \kappa L_c c_f^2}{c_V d^2} \quad (19)$$

$$\theta_s = \frac{J_0^2 L_H c_V d^2}{16 c_p \rho_0 \sigma L_c c_f^2} \quad (20)$$

For model B we have two velocities $v_{s1}$ and $v_{s2}$, evaluated with $L_{C1}$ and $L_{C2}$ respectively, and $g(v)$ should be computed using $L_C = L_{C1}$. Finally we shall need the expressions for the temperatures in terms of $f$ and $g$. They are readily derived from eqn. (2.2) and (2.3) as

$$\theta_H = \frac{g}{1-f}, \quad \theta_C = \frac{fg}{1-f} \quad (21)$$

and

$$\theta_H = \frac{g}{1-f_1 f_2}, \quad \theta_{C1} = \frac{f_1 g}{1-f_1 f_2}, \quad \theta_{C2} = \frac{f_1 g}{1-f_1 f_2} \quad (22)$$

3 Analysis for the case of a single cooling element

3.1 Mathematical model and nondimensional variables

We apply the general theory first to analyze model A, a laminar flow in a loop with circular cross section, small diameter ($d \ll R$), and a single cooling element as shown in Fig. 2a.

The viscous torque $\Sigma_V = RF_V$ can be computed from the force $F_V = 16 \pi^2 \rho_0 v RV$ acting on the wall of a straight pipe whose length is equal to the circumference $2\pi R$ of our loop assuming a Poiseuille velocity profile. We thus obtain

$$\mu = 16 \pi^2 R^2 \rho_0 v \quad (23)$$

for the friction coefficient defined in eq. (7).

To compute the buoyancy torque we start from the equation

$$\Sigma_B \equiv \beta(v) = \frac{\pi}{4} d^2 R^2 \rho_0 \alpha g \int_0^{2\pi} \theta(\phi) \cos(\phi) d\phi \quad (24)$$

valid for any temperature distribution $\theta(\phi)$ in a circular loop. In order to simplify the analysis we assume that both the heating and cooling sections are very short, i.e. $L_H \ll R, L_C \ll R$. Then we can compute the integral as if the temperature distribution were given by

$$\theta(\phi) = \theta_H \quad (0 \leq \phi < \pi/2) \quad (25)$$

$$\theta(\phi) = \theta_C \quad (\pi/2 \leq \phi < 2\pi) \quad (26)$$

The result $\beta(v) = \pi d^2 R^2 \rho_0 \alpha g (\theta_H - \theta_C)/4$ can be rewritten using eq. (21) and takes the form

$$\beta(v) = \frac{\pi}{4} d^2 R^2 \rho_0 \alpha g \theta_s \frac{v}{v_s} \quad (27)$$
As expected from Fig. 3a, \( \beta \sim v^{-1} \).

The third ingredient, namely the electromagnetic torque \( \Sigma_L = RF_L \) is readily computed from the Lorentz force \( F_L = \pi d^2L_H J_0 B_0 / 4 \) acting on the fluid in the heating section. As a result we have

\[
\gamma = \frac{\pi}{4} R d^2 L_H J_0 B_0
\]  

(28)

The explicit expressions for \( \mu, \beta, \) and \( \gamma \) can now be inserted into (2.7) and we obtain the desired equation

\[
16\pi^2 R^2 \rho_0 v v = \frac{\pi d^2 R^2 \alpha g J_0^2 L_H}{4 c_p \sigma v} + \frac{\pi R d^2 L_H J_0 B_0}{4}
\]  

(29)

for \( \nu(J_0, B_0) \). Once the velocity has been obtained, the temperatures can be evaluated using eq. (21).

The model can be converted into a more compact form by introducing nondimensional velocity and temperature according to

\[
v = v_0 V, \quad \theta_H = \theta_0 T_H, \quad \theta_C = \theta_0 T_C
\]  

(30)

where

\[
v_0 = \frac{d J_0}{8} \left( \frac{\alpha g L_H}{\pi \rho_0 v c_p \sigma} \right)^{1/2}
\]  

(31)

\[
\theta_0 = \left( \frac{64\pi^2 J_0^3 L_H^2 v}{k L c_T^3 \rho_0 v c_p \sigma^2} \right)^{1/3}
\]  

(32)

The resulting equations are

\[
V^2 = 1 + M V
\]  

(33)

\[
T_H = \frac{1}{V^{2/3}}
\]  

(34)

\[
T_C = \frac{1}{V^{2/3}} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{P V^{1/3}} \right]
\]  

(35)

They contain two dimensionless parameters, namely a modified Peclet number

\[
P = d \left( \frac{J_0}{8 \kappa L c_T} \right)^{1/3} \left( \frac{\alpha g L_H}{\pi \rho_0 v c_p \sigma} \right)^{1/6}
\]  

(36)

which is a nondimensional measure of the electric current, and the Lorentz force parameter

\[
M = \frac{d B_0}{8 R} \left( \frac{L_H c_p \sigma}{\pi \rho_0 v c_p g} \right)^{1/2}
\]  

(37)

which is proportional to the magnetic field. Eqn. (3.11)-(3.13) uniquely determine the velocity and temperatures of the considered system as functions of the control parameters \( P \) and \( M \).

### 3.2 Solution

The solution of the governing equation (3.11) is easily found as

\[
V = \frac{1}{2} \left( M + \sqrt{M^2 + 4} \right)
\]  

(38)

\[
T_H = \left( \frac{2}{M + \sqrt{M^2 + 4}} \right)^{2/3}
\]  

(39)

\[
T_C = \left( \frac{2}{M + \sqrt{M^2 + 4}} \right)^{2/3} \times \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{P \left( M + \sqrt{M^2 + 4} \right)} \right]^{1/3}
\]  

(40)

These solutions are shown in Fig. 6. In the nonmagnetic case \( M = 0 \) we have \( V = 1, T_H = 1, \) and \( \Delta T \equiv \Delta T \approx 0 \) which corresponds to \( v \approx j_0, \theta_H \approx j_0^{1/3}, \) and \( \Delta \theta \approx j_0 \). Fig. 6 shows that the velocity is a monotonically increasing function of the magnetic field. For sufficiently strong magnetic fields \( M \gg 1 \) \( V \sim M \), i.e. the flow is proportional to the Lorentz force density \( \nu \sim j_0 B_0 \). At the same time, the Lorentz force leads to an improved heat transfer and thereby to a reduction of the temperature which is expressed by the asymptotic relations \( T_H \sim M^{-2/3}, \Delta T \sim M^{-1} \) corresponding to \( \theta_H \sim j_0^{1/3} B_0^{-2/3} \) and \( \Delta \theta \sim j_0 B_0^{-1} \). Let us translate the nondimensional results of Fig. 6 into physical parameters for a low temperature fluid which is often used in “cold” model experiments whose material properties are given in Table 1. It can be seen in Fig. 7 that for \( B_0 = 0 \) the velocity is of the order of 0.1mm/s and increases almost linearly when a magnetic field is applied.

Already a field with moderate strength \( B_0 = 0.1 T \) can increase the velocity of the high temperature fluid by an order of magnitude and effectively reduces the maximum temperature as shown in Fig. 11. Notice that in the computation of Fig. 7 the values of \( \eta \) and \( \sigma \) of the model substance were taken at the constant reference temperature of 30°C. This is because their temperature-dependence is weak in the considered range of temperatures. By contrast, when applying to our glass melts in section 3.4, \( \eta \) and \( \sigma \) will have to be determined by a self-consistent procedure which takes into account the solutions for \( \Theta_C \) and \( \Theta_H \).
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Figure 6: Solution for nondimensional temperature (a) and velocity (b) in a loop with a single heating and cooling element (model A) as a function of the Lorentz force parameter defined in eq. (36). Notice that $v$ and $T_H$ are independent of $P$.

Table 1: Used thermophysical properties of a model substance (Glycerin + LiCl, Stanek 1977) at a reference temperature of 30°C and a glass melt at a reference temperature of 1180°C ($\rho_0$, $\alpha$) and 1400°C ($c_P$), respectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Model substance</th>
<th>Glass melt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_0$ [kg m$^{-3}$]</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>3357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta$ [Pas]</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>$lg \eta = -1.00Pas + \frac{454.36K}{T - 1035.34K}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma$ [m$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>$lg \sigma = 6.24\Omega^{-1}m^{-1} - \frac{8.80 \times 10^3 K}{T}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_P$ [J kg$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>2427</td>
<td>1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$ [K$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>4.80 $\times$ 10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>1.18 $\times$ 10$^{-4}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Comparison with numerical simulations

In order to check the validity of our model and to justify its extension to the case of two cooling sections we have performed a series of numerical simulations using the commercial CFD software FLUENT. Rather than solving the three-dimensional pipe-flow problem we have implemented the two-dimensional case corresponding to the flow in a cylindrical gap. Since the latter case differs from the former one only by the value of the coefficient of resistance $c_V$ and the thermal boundary layer parameter $c_T$ (the precise numerical values of which being of no importance for our general conclusions), and since two dimensional flow visualization provides full information on the velocity and temperature fields, this approach was considered more appropriate. We used no-slip boundary conditions for the velocity field and assumed adiabatic sidewalls everywhere except at cooling section where the condition $\theta = 0$ was enforced. The electric current density was held constant at a value of $J_0 = 0.1 A cm^{-2}$, while the magnetic field was varied between $B_0 = 0$ and $B_0 = 1 T$.

Fig. 8 shows the distributions of temperature perturbation $\theta$ and velocity magnitude $v = (v_x^2 + v_y^2)^{1/2}$ for the case $B_0 = 0$ and the material properties corresponding to the room temperature model substance specified in table 1. The global structure of the temperature field agrees well with our assumption [eq. (25) and (26)]. Although the flow is very slow ($v \approx 0.23 mm/s$), and the Reynolds number $Re = vd/\nu$ is as small as $Re \approx 3.6 \times 10^{-3}$, the Peclet number $Pe = vd/\kappa \approx 24$ is sufficiently high for a thermal boundary layer to develop in the cooling section. The structure of this boundary layer is clearly visible in the upper inset of Fig. 8a.

The lower inset shows that near-wall fluid elements are heated up over a comparatively short path while particles in the middle of the pipe have to travel over a much longer distance before attaining the high temperature state. This observation is a consequence of the fact that near-wall particles travel slowly and are therefore longer exposed to the resistive heating. Fig. 8b demon-
Table 2: Comparison of the numerical results for the two-dimensional stationary problem with the analytical results of model A (3.16)-(3.18) for the room temperature model substance. The thermophysical properties are given in Table 1. Moreover the following geometry and model parameters were assumed for the numerical simulations: \( d = 0.01 \) m, \( R = 0.1 \) m, \( L_H = L_C = 0.01 \) m, \( g = 9.81 \text{ms}^{-1} \), \( c_V = 16 \), \( c_T = 1 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Analytical result</th>
<th>Numerical result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Theta_H(\text{B}=0\text{T}) ) [K]</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Theta_H(\text{B}=1\text{T}) ) [K]</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Theta_C(\text{B}=0\text{T}) ) [K]</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Theta_C(\text{B}=1\text{T}) ) [K]</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v(\text{B}=0\text{T}) ) [mm s(^{-1})]</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v(\text{B}=1\text{T}) ) [mm s(^{-1})]</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the Lorentz force is switched on, the velocity increases, and the temperatures decrease, but the global appearance of the hydrodynamic fields remains virtually unchanged as compared with Fig. 7. In Table 2 we list selected numerical values and compare them to the predictions of our analytic model. Not only does the theory reflect the qualitative behavior of \( \Theta_C \) and \( \Theta_H \), but it is also quantitatively similar, which is noteworthy since we have not made any attempt to “tune” the free parameters \( c_T \) and \( c_V \).

In summary, the numerical results indicate that our analytical model correctly reflects the physics of the problem and can therefore be used to predict the influence of Lorentz forces on buoyancy driven flows. We parenthetically note that already an extension of the simulations to real glass melts with \( \Delta T \sim 100 \text{K} \) and \( R = 1 \text{m} \) is quite expensive computationally, as it would correspond to a fully time-dependent convection problem at Rayleigh numbers of the order of \( Ra \sim 10^{10} \) which is at the limit of current numerical capabilities.

3.4 Comparison with experimental results

Beside the numerical simulations we have developed an experimental setup to investigate the influence of Lorentz forces on the flow of glass melts. Details of the experimental setup and selected results on the influence of the electromagnetic stirring on the homogeneity of the solidified melt have been published by Hülsenberg et al. 2003 and Halbedel et al. 2004. Fig. 9 shows a sketch of the experiment.

The used glass melt consists of 27.1\%SiO\(_2\), 47.7\%BaO, 20.0\%B\(_2\)O\(_3\), 5.2\%Fe\(_2\)O\(_3\) (all data in mass\%) with the material properties listed in Table 1. The composition
results in a nearly black glass melt. For this melt the heat transfer by radiation is negligible and therefore agrees with our model property. To avoid contamination as a result of corrosion and to attain high temperature stability the cylindrical crucible consists of oxide dispersion strengthened platinum. The inner diameter of the crucible is 80 mm, the filling height is 80 mm. Two plate electrodes are immersed 60 mm into the glass melt at a distance of 20 mm from the axis of symmetry of the cylindrical crucible. An alternating current with a frequency of 50 Hz results in electrical heating of the glass melt due to the Joule Effect. An external magnetic field with the same frequency is applied perpendicular to the electric current and yields, upon interacting with the electrical current, an upwardly directed Lorentz force between the plate electrodes. The melt cools down at the free surface. Six SiC heating rods are placed axially symmetric around the crucible and provide a highly stable temperature around the crucible. Additional insulation around the whole setup prevents heat loss. This setup leads to an ambient temperature of approximately $T_0 = 1180^\circ\text{C}$. The temperature distribution of the glass melt is measured in situ by a thermocouple, which can be moved along the
rotation axis of the crucible. The measurement of the velocity is not possible due to the high operating temperature. During the experiments a current of 35A is applied in combination with an external magnetic field of either 0T or 44mT.

Fig. 10 shows the temperature distribution along the rotational symmetry axis without and with applied external magnetic field. Although we do not have direct access to the velocity field it seems reasonable to assume that the melt rises between the electrodes and falls near the side wall of the crucible. For both cases the glass melt seems to be heated up while ascending along the electrodes and cools down at the free surface. With applied magnetic field the influence of the upward Lorentz force is obvious: the enhanced velocity results in a reduced temperature difference along the rotational axis. Furthermore, the maximum temperature is shifted upward. This is the first direct experimental proof for the homogenizing influence of Lorentz forces on glass melts.

For the analytical calculations the following geometrical parameters are adopted beside the physical properties of the glass melt: the diameter is set to \( d = 0.02m \), the radius of the loop is set to \( R = 0.08m \) and the length of the cooling and heating zones are set to \( L_C = 0.08m \) and \( L_H = 0.06m \), respectively. First calculations were performed with a constant viscosity \( \eta \) and a constant electrical conductivity \( \sigma \) of the glass melt for a temperature of 1400°C. On average the calculated temperatures \( \Theta_C \) and \( \Theta_H \) are 15 times higher than the measured ones as seen in Fig. 11a. To understand this apparent discrepancy, let us check if the numerical values of \( \sigma \) and \( \eta \) for the calculated temperature range are consistent with our given numerical values of \( \sigma(T = 1400°C) \) and \( \eta(T = 1400°C) \). To this end, a definition of mean temperatures is necessary in order to calculate \( \sigma(T_C) \) and \( \eta(T_H) \). The mean temperature of the viscosity is set to \( T_\eta = \frac{3}{4} T_C + \frac{1}{4} T_H \) to fulfill the friction distribution over the whole loop. The electrical conductivity influences the heating of the glass melt while passing the heating section. For this reason the average temperature of the heating section \( T_H = \frac{1}{2} T_C + \frac{1}{2} T_H \) is used as the mean temperature of \( \sigma \). As result the electrical conductivity \( \sigma(T_C) \) varies between \( 3.24 \times 10^5 \Omega^{-1}m^{-1} \) and \( 506.54 \Omega^{-1}m^{-1} \), the viscosity \( \eta(T_H) \) varies between 0.16Pas and 0.21Pas, respectively. This comparison indicates, that the model with pre-defined material properties \( \sigma \) and \( \eta \) is "non-self-consistent". To attain a "self-consistent" system the numerical values of \( \sigma \) and \( \eta \) are adopted to the loop temperatures iteratively until the given temperature to determine \( \sigma \) and \( \eta \) are identical to the temperatures calculated with \( \sigma \) and \( \eta \). Fig. 11b shows the result of the consistent calculations and Table 3 compares the characteristic measured and calculated temperature values. As a result of our self consistent procedure and without tuning the parameters \( c_T, c_V, c_P \) and \( k \) the measured temperatures and the calculated ones are now in the same order of amplitude. Furthermore, the experimental setup differs from the analytical model and the internal heat transfer by conduction is neglected. However, the relative temperature changes agree very well and therefore model A describes the main aspects of the experiment quite well. A complete 3D-simulation is in work.

4 Analysis for the case of two cooling elements

4.1 Mathematical model and nondimensional variables

The case of two cooling elements differs from the previous one only in the shape of the buoyancy torque. Using eq. (24) and assuming the temperature field to be of the form

\[
\theta(\phi) = \theta_H \quad (0 \leq \phi < \pi/2)
\]

\[
\theta(\phi) = \theta_C \quad (\pi/2 \leq \phi < 3\pi/2)
\]

\[
\theta(\phi) = \theta_C \quad (3\pi/2 \leq \phi < 2\pi)
\]

we readily obtain \( \beta(v) = \pi d^2 R^2 \rho_0 \alpha g(\theta_H - 2\theta_C + \theta_{C2})/4 \). With the help of relation (2.19) and the nondimensionalisation

\[
v = v_0 V, \quad \theta_H = \theta_0 T_H, \quad \theta_C = \theta_0 T_C, \quad \theta_{C2} = \theta_0 T_{C2}
\]

we obtain the following system

\[
V^2 = \frac{(P_2 - P_1)V^{1/3} + 1}{(P_2 + P_1)V^{1/3} - 1} + MV
\]

\[
T_H = \frac{1}{V^{1/3} (P_1 + P_2)V^{1/3} - 1}
\]

\[
T_C = \frac{P_2}{V^{1/3} (P_1 + P_2)V^{1/3} - 1} - 1
\]

\[
T_{C2} = \frac{P_2}{V^{1/3} (P_1 + P_2)V^{1/3} - 1}
\]
Figure 11: Solutions for dimensional velocity and temperature in a loop with a single heating and cooling element for the experimentally investigated glass melt as a function of the magnetic field. (a) is a non-self-consistent calculation at a mean melt temperature of 1400°C while (b) is a self-consistent calculation. The material parameters are given in table 1, the geometry parameters are mentioned in table 3.

Table 3: Comparison of the results of the self-consistent calculation for model A (3.16)-(3.18) with the experimental results for the glass melt with an ambient temperature of $T_0 = 1180°C$. In accordance with our experimental setup following geometrical parameters are used for the calculations: $d = 0.02m$, $R = 0.08m$, $L_H = 0.06m$, $L_C = 0.08m$, $g = 9.81ms^{-1}$, $c_v = 16$, $c_T = 1$. Out of the set of measured data the maximum temperature is used to define $\Theta_H$ and the temperature at the crucible bottom is used to define $\Theta_C$. The thermophysical properties are given in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Analytical result [K]</th>
<th>Experimental result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Theta_H(B=0T)$</td>
<td>781.5</td>
<td>137.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Theta_H(B=44mT)$</td>
<td>473.7</td>
<td>109.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Theta_C(B=0T)$</td>
<td>479.2</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Theta_C(B=44mT)$</td>
<td>388.4</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{\partial \Theta_H}{\partial \varepsilon}(B=0T)$</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{\partial \Theta_H}{\partial \varepsilon}(B=44mT)$</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{\partial \Theta_C}{\partial \varepsilon}(B=0T)$</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{\partial \Theta_C}{\partial \varepsilon}(B=44mT)$</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{\Theta_H(B=44mT)}{\Theta_C(B=0T)}$</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which determines the unknown velocity and temperatures. Here $P_1$ and $P_2$ are the modified Peclet numbers defined by eq. (36) with $L_C$ replaced by $L_{C1}$ and $L_{C2}$, respectively. In the interest of clarity, however, we find it more appropriate to write

$$L_{C1} = L_C(1 + \varepsilon), \quad L_{C2} = L_C(1 - \varepsilon)$$

in which case $P_1$ and $P_2$ can be expressed as

$$P_1 = \frac{P}{(1 + \varepsilon)^{1/3}}, \quad P_2 = \frac{P}{(1 - \varepsilon)^{1/3}}$$

Eq. (45)-(48) represent our mathematical model for system B. For a given geometry parameter $\varepsilon$ and prescribed electromagnetic control parameters $P \sim J_0^{1/3}$ and $M \sim B_0$ the nonlinear algebraic equation (4.5) determines the velocity $V(\varepsilon, P, M)$ of steady states from which the temperatures $T_H(\varepsilon, P, M)$, $T_C1(\varepsilon, P, M)$, and $T_{C2}(\varepsilon, P, M)$ can be explicitly determined. Observe that model A is a particular case of model B corresponding to $\varepsilon \rightarrow 1$. 

where $P$ is given by eq. (36).
4.2 Solution

We start by discussing the nonmagnetic case \( M = 0 \). Fig. 12 shows numerical solutions corresponding to the case of two cooling sections with equal length (\( \varepsilon = 0 \)), to the case where the lower cooling section is stronger than the upper one (\( \varepsilon < 0 \)) as well as the results for model A. For \( \varepsilon = 0 \) the velocity is found to decay as \( V \sim P^{-3/7} \) which implies that the dimensional velocity scales as \( v \sim J_0^{6/7} \) being only slightly different from model A where \( v \sim J_0 \). This scaling is also easily recovered from the asymptotic behavior of eq. (45) in the limit \( P \to \infty \). The slightly slower increase of the velocity in model B as compared with model A is due to the fact that hot fluid can invade the left side of the loop weakening the unstable stratification.

Further qualitative changes occur when \( \varepsilon < 0 \). As seen in Fig. 12a, the velocity decays much faster than for \( \varepsilon = 0 \), more precisely as \( V \sim P^{-3} \) for \( P \gg 1 \). This implies \( v \to \text{const.} \), i.e. the velocity converges to a value independent of the driving electric current. This phenomenon, which we shall refer to as blocking, is a manifestation of the stable stratification already identified in Fig. 4a (inset 2). Mathematically, the zero of the numerator of the first term on the right-hand side of eq. (45) which exists for \( P_2 < P_1 \) (i.e. \( \varepsilon < 0 \)) implies that the velocity cannot exceed a maximum \( V_{\text{max}} = (P_1 - P_2)^{-3} \) explaining the observed scaling. It is remarkable that already a slight modification of the geometry parameters can completely change the velocity scaling in thermal convection.

In discussing the behavior of the present system for the general case \( M \neq 0 \) we shall focus our attention on the case \( \varepsilon < 0 \) in which a transition from unstable to stable stratification is possible. Fig. 13a-d shows the stationary velocity at different values of \( P \) for varying magnetic field. As long as \( P \) is below a critical value \( P_c(\varepsilon) \), as is
Figure 13: Solution of model B in the general case for $\varepsilon = -0.22$. 
Figure 14: Location of the critical points $P_c(\varepsilon)$ (a), $M_c(\varepsilon)$ (b), $V_c(\varepsilon)$ (c), $\theta_{Hc}(\varepsilon)$, $\theta_{C1c}(\varepsilon)$, $\theta_{C2c}(\varepsilon)$ as a function of the geometry parameter $\varepsilon$.

the case in Fig. 13a and b, the flow velocity is a monotonically increasing function of $M$ similar to the behavior of model A.

As soon as $P > P_c$ the solution of eq. (45) becomes multiple-valued, i.e. there exist three solutions in an interval $M_- < M < M_+$. To analyze the stability of the three solutions the torque balance equation (2.1) is made time-dependent by expressing the change in angular momentum as $\zeta \frac{dv}{dt}$ (with $\zeta$ being related to the moment of inertia) and leads to $\zeta \frac{dv}{dt} = -\mu v + \beta(v) + \gamma = F(v)$. For time-dependent velocities $v(t) = v_S + \xi(t)$ with the steady state solution $v_S$ the function $F(v)$ is linearized with respect to the infinitesimal perturbation $\xi(t)$ and results in $\zeta \frac{d\xi}{dt} = F'(v_S)\xi$. Numerical calculations show, that the derivative $F'(v_S)$ at the middle branch is always greater than zero and therefore the corresponding $v_S$ is an unstable solution as expected.

When $M > M_+$ the solution jumps from the slow branch to the fast branch. This transition involves hysteresis. Indeed, if $M$ is decreased, the transition back to the slow branch occurs for $M = M_-$ as shown in Fig. 13c and d. The discontinuous transition, which is the main finding of the present work, can be understood as a breakdown of blocking due to the action of the Lorentz forces. Consider a system which is on the slow branch, for instance at $\varepsilon = -0.22$, $P = 30$, $M = 0.7$ (cf. Fig. 13c). According to our discussion of the nonmagnetic problem, this corresponds to a situation where the system is close to stable stratification with a temperature distribution similar to that of inset 2 in Fig. 4a. If the velocity is increased by a sufficiently high amount $\delta V > 0$ due to some external perturbation, less heat will be taken up by the fluid in the heating section. Consequently, less hot fluid invades the region to the left of cooling section 1, and the torque acting on the fluid increases, thereby reinforcing the initial perturbation. This feedback mechanism results in a jump of the system to the fast branch. On this branch $V \sim M$ as in model A. The jump to the last branch is
accompanied by a jump of the temperatures to a lower “cold” state. The overall parameter dependence of the flow is visualized in Fig. 13e where we plot $V(P, M)$ for $\varepsilon = -0.22$. The most important characteristic of this surface is the point $(P_c, M_c, V_c)$, which we shall refer to as the critical point, at which the discontinuous transition occurs first. Since the structure of this surface is identical for all $\varepsilon < 0$, the one-parameter family of critical points $[P_c(\varepsilon), M_c(\varepsilon), V_c(\varepsilon), T_{Hc}(\varepsilon), T_{C1c}(\varepsilon), T_{C2c}(\varepsilon)]$ plotted in Fig. 14 characterizes the behavior of our system to a large extent. Notice that as $\varepsilon$ decreases from 0 to $-1$, corresponding to an increasing asymmetry of the cooling sections, the critical electric current decreases but the critical magnetic field increases.

5 Discussion and Conclusions

We have formulated a simple model which permits one to understand how a Lorentz force affects thermal convection in an electrically conducting fluid with high Prandtl number. Our main result is the identification of a discontinuous transition between a slow mode (with higher temperature) and a fast mode (with lower temperature) which occurs for $P > P_c(\varepsilon)$ and has the form of a subcritical bifurcation as a function of the magnetic field.

Fig. 15 summarizes the behavior of our system in the two-dimensional space of control parameters $(P, M)$ for the case $\varepsilon < 0$ together with the scaling laws for the velocity and temperature. In the slow mode $M \ll 1$ the velocity is independent of the electric current and the magnetic field, while the temperatures increase as $J_c^2$. On the other hand, in the fast mode the velocity is proportional to the Lorentz force density. The scaling laws for $\Delta \theta$ and $\theta_H$ show that the magnetic field does not only affect the velocity but also the heat transfer. The cusp to the right of the critical point represents the region where both fast and slow modes can coexist. Although the scaling relations have been obtained from a simple one-dimensional model, they reflect the competition between the buoyancy and Lorentz force and are therefore believed to hold in more complex geometries with practical relevance as well.

In order to demonstrate that most practically relevant flows have $P > P_c$ and are therefore located in the region where the transition to the fast mode is discontinuous, let us translate the nondimensional values of the critical parameters into physical quantities. For $\varepsilon = -0.96$ we have $P_c = 2.22, M_c = 1.73, V_c = 0.340, T_{Hc} = 0.576$ (cf. Fig. 14). With the parameters of the room temperature model substance (cf. Table 1) this translates into the critical values $J_{0c} = 0.0451 A/cm^2, B_{0c} = 0.287 T, v_c = 0.0355 mm/s, \theta_{Hc} = 51.7 K$, while for the glass melt we have $J_{0c} = 1.16 A/cm^2, B_{0c} = 0.0118 mT, v_c = 0.0233 mm/s, \theta_{Hc} = 229 K$. These data can be interpreted in two different ways. Firstly, as soon as the electric current density is higher than $J_{0c}$, the transition from slow to fast flow takes place discontinuously when the magnetic field exceeds a value of the order $B_{0c}$. Secondly, if a system is heated such that its temperature is higher than $\theta_{Hc}$ above the ambient temperature $T_0$, then the velocity is a discontinuous function of $B_0$. Notice that $J_{0c}$ for the glass melt is of the order $0.1 A/cm^2$ which is a typical value of electric current densities in all-electric glass furnaces, and that the minimum required rate of overheating is only $229 K$. We can conclude from these figures that all-electric glass melting furnaces operate in a parameter range which is characterized by $P > P_c$ and are therefore susceptible to comparatively weak Lorentz forces.

The general formulas for the dimensional critical parameters are readily derived from the definitions (3.14) and
Moreover, the critical Lorentz force density \( \theta \) obeys
\[
\frac{F_{0c}}{B_{0c} \nu_{c}} \sim s^{-3}
\]
implies that with increasing system size the system becomes increasingly susceptible to Lorentz forces. This observation suggests that electromagnetic forces might be quite effective in controlling glass melt flows in large enclosures. We parenthetically note that electromagnetic boundary layer control in another poorly conducting fluid - namely seawater - has attracted a considerable research interest (Gailitis & Lielausis 1961, Tsinober & Shtern 1967, Tsinober 1990). Even if there is no externally applied magnetic field in glass processing, the magnetic field of the current itself may often be important to include Lorentz forces in simulations of all-electric glass furnaces.

Finally, a brief comment on the limits of validity of the present theory is in order. We have neglected the internal heat transfer by radiation as well as the temperature dependence of both \( \eta \) and \( \sigma \), which limits the validity of our approach to small temperature variations as in the interior of a glass melting furnace. However, the present model can be modified so as to incorporate these effects at only slightly increased mathematical complexity as has been demonstrated by Lange & Loch 2002 for (nonmagnetic) flow of a glass melt in a pipe. A similar statement is true for inertial effects which could be taken into account by using the full expression for the friction coefficient \( c_f(v) \) rather than the laminar expression. Also, more general heat transfer models including experimentally determined heat transfer coefficients could be used.
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### Table 4: List of symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$B_0$</td>
<td>[T]</td>
<td>magnetic field density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon_f$</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>friction factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon_p$</td>
<td>[kJ kg$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>specific heat capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_T$</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>numerical value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_V$</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>friction coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d$</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>inner diameter of the loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>[m s$^{-2}$]</td>
<td>acceleration of gravity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J_0$</td>
<td>[A m$^{-2}$]</td>
<td>electric current density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_H$</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>length of the heating section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_C$</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>length of the cooling section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>non-dimensional lorentz force parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>modified Peclet number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>radius of the loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>non-dimensional temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v$</td>
<td>[m s$^{-2}$]</td>
<td>velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_0$</td>
<td>[m s$^{-2}$]</td>
<td>norm velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V$</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>non-dimensional velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>[K$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>coefficient of expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>[N m]</td>
<td>buoyancy torque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>[N m]</td>
<td>lorentz torque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon$</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>length scaling parameter of the cooling sections in Model B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>[m$^2$ s$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>thermal diffusivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>[N s$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>friction coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>[m$^2$ s$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>dynamic viscosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>[kg m$^{-3}$]</td>
<td>density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>[$\Omega$ m$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>electrical conductivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta$</td>
<td>[K]</td>
<td>temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_0$</td>
<td>[K]</td>
<td>norm temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi$</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>angle of the loop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


