



Spontaneous generation of helical flows by salt fingers

Adrian E. Fraser¹ , Adrian van Kan² , Edgar Knobloch² ,
Keith Julien¹ and Chang Liu³ 

¹Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309, USA

²Department of Physics, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

³School of Mechanical, Aerospace and Manufacturing Engineering, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269, USA

Corresponding author: Adrian E. Fraser; Email: adrian.fraser@colorado.edu

(Received 27 June 2025; revised 22 August 2025; accepted 24 August 2025)

We study the dynamics of salt fingers in the regime of slow salinity diffusion (small inverse Lewis number) and strong stratification (large density ratio), focusing on regimes relevant to Earth's oceans. Using three-dimensional direct numerical simulations in periodic domains, we show that salt fingers exhibit rich, multiscale dynamics in this regime, with vertically elongated fingers that are twisted into helical shapes at large scales by mean flows and disrupted at small scales by isotropic eddies. We use a multiscale asymptotic analysis to motivate a reduced set of partial differential equations that filters internal gravity waves and removes inertia from all parts of the momentum equation except for the Reynolds stress that drives the helical mean flow. When simulated numerically, the reduced equations capture the same dynamics and fluxes as the full equations in the appropriate regime. The reduced equations enforce zero helicity in all fluctuations about the mean flow, implying that the symmetry-breaking helical flow is generated spontaneously by strictly non-helical fluctuations.

Key words: double diffusive convection, stratified flows, stratified turbulence

1. Introduction

The salt-finger instability occurs in stably stratified fluid layers with background temperature and salinity that both increase with height, and a sufficiently small ratio of salinity diffusivity κ_S to thermal diffusivity κ_T . This instability drives significant turbulent

mixing and a broad range of dynamics in the ocean (Radko 2013), where this diffusivity ratio – the inverse Lewis number – is quite small: $\tau \equiv \kappa_S/\kappa_T \approx 10^{-2}$.

In stably stratified systems where heat is the sole contributor to buoyancy, large thermal diffusivity has been leveraged to derive asymptotically reduced sets of partial differential equations valid in the so-called ‘low-Péclet number’ (LPN) limit (Lignières 1999; Garaud 2021), where the buoyancy equation reduces to a diagnostic balance between advection of the background temperature gradient and diffusion of thermal fluctuations. Given that rapid thermal diffusion is fundamental to the salt-finger instability, one might naturally expect similar asymptotic reductions to be applicable. Indeed, Prat *et al.* (2015) explored the LPN limit for salt fingers in astrophysical regimes (cf. Knobloch & Spruit 1982), where both τ and the ratio of viscosity to thermal diffusivity, the Prandtl number $Pr \equiv \nu/\kappa_T$, are extremely small (Pr , $\tau \sim 10^{-6}$; Garaud 2018). They found that the LPN limit reproduces the same turbulent fluxes as the full equations in the appropriate limit. The low salinity diffusivity limit was also studied, albeit in two dimensions (2-D), by Xie *et al.* (2017), who showed, in addition, that in the oceanographic regime of $Pr \gtrsim O(1)$, the momentum equation reduces to a diagnostic balance involving buoyancy and viscosity. In this regime, the evolution is driven by the salinity field alone, with subdominant inertial terms, resulting in inertia-free salt convection (IFSC).

The reductions offered by these limits simplify both numerical and analytical computations while excluding presumably irrelevant dynamics in their respective regimes of validity. For instance, in the LPN limit internal gravity waves are overdamped, and thus a large buoyancy frequency no longer constrains the simulation time step in this limit. However, the regions in parameter space where the excluded dynamics remain important are not always clear *a priori*. The spontaneous formation of thermohaline staircases and the large-scale, secondary instabilities that often precede them (e.g. the collective and gamma instabilities, see Radko 2003; Traxler *et al.* 2011) are excluded in the LPN limit, but these can still occur when τ and/or Pr are extremely small, provided the system is not too strongly stratified (Garaud 2018). Thus, one expects the LPN and IFSC limits to faithfully capture the dynamics of salt fingers provided τ and/or Pr are sufficiently small and the density stratification is sufficiently large.

With these uncertainties in mind, we extend here the work of Xie *et al.* (2017) to three dimensions, performing a suite of direct numerical simulations (DNS) of both the primitive and IFSC equations at $\tau = 0.05$ and $Pr = 5$ with varying degrees of stratification, focusing on the limit of moderate or strong stratification (moderate or weak instability). We find that this regime is characterised by remarkably rich, multiscale dynamics, including helical mean flows (resembling the mean flows seen in bounded domains by Yang, Verzicco & Lohse 2016) that are not captured by the IFSC reduction of Xie *et al.* (2017). Motivated by the simulation results, we consider a multiscale asymptotic expansion of our system, which points to a natural modification of the IFSC model. This modified IFSC (MIFSC) model reproduces the dynamics seen in simulations of the full equations for much weaker stratification (stronger instability), provides an explanation and reduced description of the mean flows observed by Yang *et al.* (2016), and suggests how the fields and fluxes might scale with stratification, which we show to be broadly consistent with the simulations.

2. Problem formulation

We are interested in the dynamics of salt fingers in the simultaneous limits of fast thermal diffusion and weak or moderate instability. We consider fluctuations atop linear background profiles of salinity and potential temperature in the vertical with constant

slopes β_S and β_T , respectively. We assume the flows are slow enough and the layer height small enough to permit the use of the Boussinesq approximation. In this limit, the standard control parameters include the Prandtl number $Pr \equiv \nu/\kappa_T$, the inverse Lewis number $\tau \equiv \kappa_S/\kappa_T$, and the density ratio $R_\rho \equiv \alpha_T \beta_T / (\alpha_S \beta_S)$ with $\alpha_T > 0$, $\alpha_S > 0$ being the respective coefficients of expansion. We consider periodic boundary conditions in all directions, in which case our system is linearly unstable to the salt-finger instability for $1 < R_\rho < \tau^{-1}$ (Baines & Gill 1969), with $R_\rho = \tau^{-1}$ corresponding to marginal diffusive stability and $R_\rho < 1$ to an unstably stratified background and hence dynamical instability. In the regime of interest here, it is helpful to introduce the following control parameters:

$$\mathcal{R} \equiv \frac{\alpha_S \beta_S \kappa_T}{\alpha_T \beta_T \kappa_S} = \frac{1}{R_\rho \tau}, \quad \varepsilon \equiv \mathcal{R} - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad Sc \equiv \frac{\nu}{\kappa_S} = \frac{Pr}{\tau}, \quad (2.1)$$

where \mathcal{R} is the Rayleigh ratio (with marginal stability now at $\mathcal{R} = 1$), ε is a measure of supercriticality and Sc is the Schmidt number. In all results presented, we fix $Pr = 5$, $\tau = 0.05$ and thus $Sc = 100$.

We follow § 3.1 of Xie *et al.* (2017) in our choice of non-dimensionalisation, taking the characteristic finger width $d = [\kappa_T \nu / (g \alpha_T \beta_T)]^{1/4}$ (with gravitational acceleration g) as the length scale and the salinity diffusion time d^2/κ_S as the time scale. As our temperature scale, we take the background temperature difference across a height d rescaled by τ , yielding $\tau \beta_T d$. Similarly, our unit for salinity fluctuations is the background salinity difference across d rescaled by \mathcal{R}^{-1} , yielding $\mathcal{R}^{-1} \beta_S d$. The governing equations, with hats over dependent and independent variables (and derivatives) to indicate this choice of non-dimensionalisation, are

$$\frac{1}{Sc} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{t}} + \hat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \hat{\nabla} \right) \hat{\mathbf{u}} = -\hat{\nabla} \hat{p} + (\hat{T} - \hat{S}) \mathbf{e}_z + \hat{\nabla}^2 \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\hat{\nabla} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{u}} = 0, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\tau \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{t}} + \hat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \hat{\nabla} \right) \hat{T} + \hat{w} = \hat{\nabla}^2 \hat{T} \quad (2.4)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{t}} + \hat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \hat{\nabla} \right) \hat{S} + \mathcal{R} \hat{w} = \hat{\nabla}^2 \hat{S}, \quad (2.5)$$

with unit vector \mathbf{e}_z in the z direction, velocity $\hat{\mathbf{u}} = (\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{w})$ and temperature, salinity and pressure fluctuations \hat{T} , \hat{S} and \hat{p} . Note that \hat{T} and \hat{S} represent fluctuations atop the imposed background profiles of potential temperature and salinity, which vary linearly with depth. These equations are identical to those that have been used to study salt fingers in triply periodic boxes elsewhere (see e.g. Radko 2013; Garaud 2018), albeit with a different non-dimensionalisation, and thus with different control parameters appearing in different places.

In what follows, we present DNS of the system for different values of \mathcal{R} . These simulations were performed using the pseudospectral-tau method implemented in Dedalus v2 (Burns *et al.* 2020). We use periodic boundary conditions with a horizontal domain size of $(L_x, L_y) = (4 \times 2\pi/\hat{k}_{opt}, 2 \times 2\pi/\hat{k}_{opt})$, where $\hat{k}_{opt}(Pr, \tau, R_\rho)$ is the horizontal wavenumber at which the linear instability has the largest growth rate for a given set of parameters (for a subset of our parameters, we have checked that the dynamics and time-averaged fluxes change negligibly upon increasing L_x and L_y). For the parameters of interest,

the salt fingers become very extended in z (cf. Fraser *et al.* 2024), and thus our domain height must be very large to avoid artificial domain-size effects (see e.g. Appendix A.3 of Traxler *et al.* 2011). For most of the cases reported here, we find $L_z = 64 \times 2\pi/\hat{k}_{opt}$ to be sufficient (where we confirm this by comparing against results with $L_z = 128 \times 2\pi/\hat{k}_{opt}$), although we find that shorter domains suffice for $\varepsilon \gtrsim 1$, while taller domains are necessary for $\varepsilon \lesssim 1/8$. We dealias using the standard 3/2-rule and use a numerical resolution of eight Fourier modes per $2\pi/\hat{k}_{opt}$ in each direction, although twice this resolution becomes necessary (as verified by convergence checks) for our simulations with the largest values of ε . Note that, per our dealiasing procedure, nonlinearities are evaluated on a grid with 3/2 times this resolution. We time step using a semi-implicit, second-order Adams–Bashforth/backwards difference scheme (Dedalus’ ‘SBDF2’ option, (2.8) of Wang & Ruuth 2008), with nonlinearities treated explicitly and all other terms treated implicitly, and an advective Courant–Friedrichs–Lewy safety factor of 0.3 (sometimes 0.15 for our highest ε cases). We initialise simulations with small-amplitude noise in \hat{S} , and all other fields set to zero.

3. Trends across ε

Figure 1 shows velocity snapshots from simulations with $\varepsilon = 1/80$ (panels *a–c*), $1/10$ (panels *d–f*) and 1 (panels *g–i*), i.e. $R_\rho \simeq 19.75$, 18.18 and 10 , illustrating general trends in this regime. In each case, we see highly anisotropic and multiscale dynamics, with vertically elongated, large-amplitude structures (the characteristic salt fingers) in w , and smaller-amplitude, isotropic eddies seen in each velocity field. The separation between the long vertical and the short isotropic scales shrinks as ε increases.

At very small ε (see panels *a–c*), the fingers become vertically invariant ‘elevator modes’ disturbed by isotropic ripples. For moderate supercriticality, $\varepsilon \sim 0.1$, the fingers are no longer vertically invariant but still very anisotropic, with much larger vertical scale and velocity than in the horizontal. We remark that at larger ε , self-connecting structures only persist for insufficiently tall domains and lead to bursty and domain height-dependent dynamics. At very small ε , self-connecting structures persist in even the tallest domains we can reasonably achieve numerically, but they do not drive bursty dynamics or domain height-dependent dynamics.

In this regime, a horizontal mean flow $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_\perp = (\hat{U}(z), \hat{V}(z), 0)$ develops spontaneously (cf. Liu *et al.* 2024), as shown by the magenta curves in panels (*e,f*). The two components of $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_\perp$ are $\pi/2$ out of phase in z – i.e. one component passes through 0 as the other reaches an extremum – resulting in a mean flow with non-zero helicity $H[\hat{\mathbf{U}}_\perp]$, where

$$H[\hat{\mathbf{u}}] = \int \hat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot (\hat{\mathbf{v}} \times \hat{\mathbf{u}}) dV \quad (3.1)$$

defines the helicity of a given flow field $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$. As the mean flow has no vertical component, its helicity arises from the horizontal components of $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_\perp$ and $\hat{\mathbf{v}} \times \hat{\mathbf{U}}_\perp$, and it advects the fingers into a corkscrew-like shape (the graphical abstract accompanying this article shows a volume rendering of the vertical velocity for the same $\mathcal{R} = 2$ simulation as shown in figure 1(*g–i*) and provides a visualisation of this flow). In fact, this mean flow is nearly a maximally helical (Beltrami) flow in that its relative helicity $H_{rel}[\hat{\mathbf{U}}_\perp] \equiv H[\hat{\mathbf{U}}_\perp]/[(\int |\hat{\mathbf{U}}_\perp|^2 dV)(\int |\hat{\mathbf{v}} \times \hat{\mathbf{U}}_\perp|^2 dV)]^{1/2}$, calculated using the time- and horizontally averaged flow, is over 0.99 – alternatively, H_{rel} of the instantaneous mean flow saturates at roughly 0.8, see figure 2. While $H_{rel} > 0$ for this particular simulation, other random initial conditions lead to $H_{rel} < 0$ (not shown) with no clear statistical preference between




Figure 1. Flow velocity snapshots at $y = 0$ in the saturated state from simulations of (2.2)–(2.5) with varying supercriticality: $\varepsilon = 1/80$ (a–c), $\varepsilon = 1/10$ (d–f) and $\varepsilon = 1$ (g–i), with time traces of the corresponding salinity flux $|\hat{F}_S|$ (blue solid lines) shown in (j), (k) and (l), respectively, alongside fluxes from different reduced models (orange dashed and red dash-dotted lines, see § 4). All cases exhibit a multiscale and anisotropic flow where fingers with large vertical extent and vertical velocity (compared with horizontal width and velocity) coexist with small-scale isotropic disturbances. Magenta curves (e, f, h, i) show the time-average (over the saturated state) of the horizontal, helical mean flow $\hat{U}_\perp = (\hat{U}(z), \hat{V}(z), 0)$ that becomes a significant feature for $\varepsilon \gtrsim 0.1$.

the two signs based on our limited sample. In stark contrast to the strongly helical mean flow, the relative helicity of the fluctuations about the mean ($\hat{u}' \equiv \hat{u} - \hat{U}_\perp$) is roughly 10^{-5} . This leads to the remarkable observation that the system spontaneously forms a symmetry-breaking, maximally helical flow from non-helical fluctuations. In fact the generation of such mean flows by salt fingers was already seen in vertically bounded domains by Yang *et al.* (2016) (see their figure 16), albeit without comment (see also the discussion of fingers ‘twisting about one another’ in Schmitt & Lambert 1979). Similar spontaneous mirror symmetry breaking and Beltrami flow formation have also been observed in other systems, including active matter (Słomka & Dunkel 2017; Romeo *et al.* 2024) and magnetohydrodynamic (Agoua *et al.* 2021) turbulence, but without such strikingly non-helical fluctuations.

For yet larger ε (see figure 1(g–i)), both the mean flow and the fingers become more vigorous, and the anisotropy of the fingers is less extreme, permitting shorter vertical domains. In this regime, the mean flow is still very helical at each z , but tends to have a shorter vertical scale and its helicity may change sign with z . The helicity is also less stationary in this regime, and for some initial conditions it is observed to change sign




Figure 2. Relative helicity (see text) of the mean flow (blue) and of the fluctuations about the mean flow (orange; multiplied by 10^4 to ease comparison) for two values of ε . At small ε , the flow is almost maximally helical, and in both cases the fluctuations are almost non-helical, with $H_{rel}[\hat{\mathbf{u}}'] \sim 10^{-5}$.




Figure 3. Horizontal (blue) and vertical (orange) kinetic energy spectra (time-averaged over the statistically stationary state) versus \hat{k}_z at $\hat{k}_y = 0$ and $\hat{k}_x = \hat{k}_{opt}$. Black lines show $\hat{k}_z = \hat{k}_{opt}$ to highlight the small-scale isotropic flow component while the red vertical lines correspond to the secondary peak in the horizontal spectrum to highlight the anisotropic, small \hat{k}_z flow component. The ratio between these two wavenumbers provides one measure of anisotropy shown in figure 4.

with time, similar to the finite lifetimes of different flow patterns observed in convection (see e.g. Ahlers, Cannell & Steinberg 1985; Winchester, Dallas & Howell 2021; Wang, Goluskin & Lohse 2023).

Both the multiscale aspect of this system and the trends in scale separation with ε are readily seen in figure 3, which shows spectra of the kinetic energy as a function of the vertical wavenumber \hat{k}_z at $\hat{k}_{\perp} = \hat{k}_{opt}$, the fastest-growing wavenumber of the linear instability. Two distinguishing features are seen most clearly in the horizontal kinetic energy, which has a local maximum (or otherwise a clear change in the spectrum, in the case of large ε) at isotropic scales where $\hat{k}_z \sim \hat{k}_{opt}$, indicated by the black vertical lines, and a local maximum at smaller \hat{k}_z indicated by the red vertical lines. Note that the gap in \hat{k}_z between these two local maxima shrinks as ε increases, consistent with the observed decrease in scale separation with increasing ε (figure 1).

4. Asymptotic models

The IFSC model of Xie *et al.* (2017), in three dimensions (3-D), is appropriate when $\tau \ll 1$ and $Sc \gg 1$ and is described by the equations

$$\hat{w} = \hat{\nabla}^2 \hat{T}, \quad (4.1)$$

$$0 = -\hat{\nabla} \hat{p} + (\hat{T} - \hat{S}) \mathbf{e}_z + \hat{\nabla}^2 \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \quad (4.2)$$

with (2.3) and (2.5) left unchanged. While it appears that the model should be valid for all order-one ε , we show in figure 1 that this is not the case: the model does produce dynamics and fluxes consistent with the full system at sufficiently small supercriticality,




Figure 4. Scalings with respect to ε of several quantities (indicated in the caption for each panel) for the full system, (2.2)–(2.5) (blue dots), the IFSC model, with (2.4) and (2.2) replaced by (4.1) and (4.2) (green diamonds), and the MIFSC model, where (2.2) is replaced instead by (4.14)–(4.15) (orange crosses). Black dashed lines show scalings predicted by the multiscale asymptotic analysis described in the text. The green dashed lines and the two measures of anisotropy are described in the text.

roughly $\varepsilon \lesssim 1/80$, but, for $\varepsilon \approx 1/20$ or larger, it produces dynamics that differ qualitatively from solutions of the full equations – while the full system exhibits helical mean flows that disrupt and twist the fingers on large scales, the IFSC model removes the Reynolds stress term from the horizontal mean of (2.2) and thus lacks these flows. Without mean flows to disrupt the long fingers, such fingers drive temporally bursty dynamics that dramatically raise the fluxes, as shown by the IFSC curve in figure 1(k).

However, the IFSC model can be modified to capture mean flow generation. Our simulations suggest that anisotropy is an essential aspect of a reduced description of salt fingers valid in the regime depicted in figure 1, possibly with a rescaling of the various fields to retain the Reynolds stress at leading order. In order to capture both the elongated fingers shown in figure 1 and the small-scale isotropic fluctuations therein, we employ a multiscale asymptotic analysis inspired by a related approach to turbulence in stably stratified fluids employed by Chini *et al.* (2022), Shah *et al.* (2024) and Garaud *et al.* (2024).

To begin, we note that the growth rate and optimal wavenumber of the linear instability scale as $\varepsilon^{3/2}$ and $\varepsilon^{1/4}$, respectively, for sufficiently small ε – for the Pr, τ considered here, this scaling is achieved for $\varepsilon \lesssim 1$ (see e.g. figure 3 of Xie *et al.* 2017). It is thus convenient to rescale the independent and dependent variables as follows (cf. Radko 2010):

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \varepsilon^{-1/4} \mathbf{x}, \quad \hat{t} = \varepsilon^{-3/2} t, \quad \hat{\mathbf{u}} = \varepsilon^{5/4} \mathbf{u}, \quad \hat{p} = \varepsilon^{3/2} p, \quad (\hat{T}, \hat{S}) = \varepsilon^{3/4} (T, S). \quad (4.3)$$

Equations (2.2)–(2.5) then become

$$\varepsilon \frac{1}{Sc} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{t}} + \hat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla \right) \hat{\mathbf{u}} = -\nabla \hat{p} + \varepsilon^{-1} (\hat{T} - \hat{S}) \mathbf{e}_z + \nabla^2 \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\varepsilon \tau \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{t}} + \hat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla \right) \hat{T} + \hat{w} = \nabla^2 \hat{T} \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$\varepsilon \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \right) S + \mathcal{R} w = \nabla^2 S, \quad (4.6)$$

with (2.3) left unchanged. When $\varepsilon = O(1)$ but $\tau \ll 1$ and $Sc \gg 1$, the inertial terms in (4.4)–(4.5) drop out and the resulting equations correspond to the 3-D IFSC model with (4.6) providing the sole prognostic equation. On the other hand, when $\varepsilon \ll 1$, we may expand all fields as asymptotic series in ε as $q = \sum_n q_n \varepsilon^n$. Inspecting the z component of (4.4) in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ shows that $T_0 = S_0$, i.e. the dynamics are neutrally buoyant in this limit. In the following it is helpful to introduce the buoyancy $b \equiv \varepsilon^{-1}(T - S)$ and subtract (4.5) from (4.6), yielding

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \right) (S - \tau T) + w = -\nabla^2 b. \quad (4.7)$$

We now perform a multiscale asymptotic expansion employing the following four steps:

- (i) Introduce fast and slow scales in z and t and allow each field q to depend on them both, i.e. $q = q(\mathbf{x}_\perp, z_s, z_f, t_s, t_f)$, with $\partial_z \mapsto \alpha^{-1} \partial_{z_s} + \partial_{z_f}$ and $\partial_t \mapsto \alpha^{-1} \partial_{t_s} + \partial_{t_f}$; here the fast vertical scale z_f is isotropic, and the anisotropy of the slow vertical scale z_s is controlled by α , which we take to be $\alpha = Sc/\varepsilon \gg 1$ (which we note is qualitatively consistent with the trends seen in figures 1 and 3).
- (ii) Decompose each field q into its fast-averaged and fluctuating components: $q = \langle q \rangle_f + \tilde{q}$ where $\langle \cdot \rangle_f$ denotes an average over z_f and t_f , so that $\langle q \rangle_f$ depends only on \mathbf{x}_\perp , z_s and t_s , while \tilde{q} depends on all coordinates. The only exception to this $q = \langle q \rangle_f + \tilde{q}$ decomposition is for the pressure and horizontal flow fluctuations (defined as $\mathbf{u}'_\perp \equiv \mathbf{u}_\perp - \mathbf{U}_\perp$), where we instead take $p = \alpha^{-1} \langle p \rangle_f + \tilde{p}$ and $\mathbf{u}'_\perp = \alpha^{-1} \langle \mathbf{u}'_\perp \rangle_f + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}'_\perp$. (Note that this is without loss of generality: we are simply taking different non-dimensionalisations for $\langle p \rangle_f$ and \tilde{p} and likewise for $\langle \mathbf{u}'_\perp \rangle_f$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}'_\perp$.)
- (iii) Take the fast average of each of the governing equations to obtain an equation for $\partial_{t_s} \langle q \rangle_f$, and subtract the result from the original equation to obtain an equation for $\partial_{t_f} \tilde{q}$.
- (iv) Finally, retain only leading-order terms by removing terms that are small in the limits $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\tau \rightarrow 0$, $Sc \rightarrow \infty$ and $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ (with $\alpha\varepsilon/Sc = 1$).

An explicit illustration of these steps is provided in, for example, Chini *et al.* (2022) and Shah *et al.* (2024).

The resulting equations are

$$\langle w \rangle_f = \nabla_\perp^2 \langle T \rangle_f \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{w} = \nabla_f^2 \tilde{T}, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{U}_\perp \rangle_f \cdot \nabla_\perp \langle S \rangle_f + \langle \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_f \tilde{S} \rangle_f + \langle w \rangle_f = -\nabla_\perp^2 \langle b \rangle_f, \quad (4.9)$$

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t_f} + \langle \mathbf{U}_\perp \rangle_f \cdot \nabla_\perp + \langle w \rangle_f \frac{\partial}{\partial z_f} \right] \tilde{S} + \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_f \tilde{S} - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \nabla_f \tilde{S} \rangle_f + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_\perp \cdot \nabla_\perp \langle S \rangle_f + \tilde{w} = -\nabla_f^2 \tilde{b}, \quad (4.10)$$

$$0 = -\nabla_\perp \langle p \rangle_f + \langle b \rangle_f \mathbf{e}_z + \nabla_\perp^2 \langle \mathbf{u}' \rangle_f \quad \text{and} \quad 0 = -\nabla_f \tilde{p} + \tilde{b} \mathbf{e}_z + \nabla_f^2 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}', \quad (4.11)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t_s} \langle \mathbf{U}_\perp \rangle_f + \frac{\partial}{\partial z_s} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_\perp \tilde{w} \rangle_{f,\perp} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_s^2} \langle \mathbf{U}_\perp \rangle_f, \quad (4.12)$$

$$\nabla_s \cdot \langle \mathbf{u}' \rangle_f = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla_f \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}}' = 0, \quad (4.13)$$

where we have introduced $\nabla_s \equiv (\partial_x, \partial_y, \partial_{z_s})$ and $\nabla_f \equiv (\partial_x, \partial_y, \partial_{z_f})$, with $\langle \cdot \rangle_{f,\perp}$ denoting an average over \mathbf{x}_\perp in addition to z_f and t_f . The structure of this system of equations is broadly similar to the IFSC model: the temperature equations reduce to a diagnostic balance between diffusion and advection of the background, the salinity equations retain nonlinearity on fast scales (and so do not yield a quasilinear structure as in the work of Chini *et al.* 2022), and the momentum equations for fluctuations about the mean flow involve a dominant balance between pressure, buoyancy and viscosity. However, in contrast to the IFSC model, (4.12) retains the Reynolds stress term absent from (4.2). Thus, modifying the IFSC model to capture the leading-order dynamics of the full equations in this limit merely requires retaining the Reynolds stress in the $\mathbf{k}_\perp = 0$ component of the momentum equation:

$$\frac{1}{Sc} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{t}} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_\perp + \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{z}} \langle \hat{\mathbf{u}}'_\perp \hat{w}' \rangle_\perp \right) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \hat{z}^2} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_\perp, \quad (4.14)$$

$$0 = -\hat{\nabla} \hat{p}' + (\hat{T}' - \hat{S}') \mathbf{e}_z + \hat{\nabla}^2 \hat{\mathbf{u}}', \quad (4.15)$$

with temperature given by (4.1), and (2.3) and (2.5) retained in full. Figure 1 shows that this MIFSC model captures the same dynamics as the full equations even for $\varepsilon = O(1)$.

The rescaling applied to arrive at the multiscale asymptotic system offers a natural suggestion for the scaling of the various fields in this limit. For (2.2)–(2.5), this analysis predicts that both \hat{S} and \hat{T} should scale as $\varepsilon^{3/4}$, $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_\perp$ and \hat{w} as $\varepsilon^{5/4}$, and the scaling of $\hat{\mathbf{u}}'_\perp$ should differ between fast and slow scales in \hat{z} , with $\langle \mathbf{u}'_\perp \rangle_f \sim \varepsilon^{9/4}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}'_\perp \sim \varepsilon^{5/4}$. The predicted stronger ε dependence of $\langle \mathbf{u}'_\perp \rangle_f$ is consistent with figure 3, which shows that the horizontal kinetic energy peaks at large \hat{k}_z for small ε but at small \hat{k}_z for large ε .

We present a more quantitative comparison between these predictions and DNS in figure 4 by calculating the root-mean-square of $\hat{\mathbf{u}}'_\perp$, $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_\perp$, \hat{w} , \hat{S} and \hat{T} (denoted by subscript ‘rms’ in figure 4; here, $\hat{\mathbf{u}}'_{\perp,rms} \equiv \sqrt{\hat{u}_{rms}^2 + \hat{v}_{rms}^2}$ etc.), and the volume-averaged fluxes $\hat{F}_S = \langle \hat{w} \hat{S} \rangle$ and $\hat{F}_T = \langle \hat{w} \hat{T} \rangle$, with the blue dots corresponding to DNS of the full equations, green diamonds to the IFSC model, and orange crosses to the MIFSC model. Anisotropy is quantified by two means: using the wavenumber ratio corresponding to the two spectral peaks in figure 3 (crosses; the lowest ε values are suppressed because the low- \hat{k}_z peak is difficult to identify and is likely constrained by domain size), and the ratio $\hat{w}_{rms}/\hat{\mathbf{u}}'_{\perp,rms}$ (dots). In each panel, black dashed lines correspond to the predicted scalings (for $\hat{\mathbf{u}}'_{\perp,rms}$, the black line shows the predicted $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}'_\perp \sim \varepsilon^{5/4}$ scaling while the green line shows the $\langle \mathbf{u}'_\perp \rangle_f \sim \varepsilon^{9/4}$ scaling). The scalings of most of these quantities are consistent with predictions as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, especially \hat{w}_{rms} , \hat{S}_{rms} , \hat{T}_{rms} , \hat{F}_S and \hat{F}_T , with the anisotropy measurement inconclusive. In contrast, the rms of the mean flow, $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_{\perp,rms}$, follows the predicted $\varepsilon^{5/4}$ scaling at larger ε only; at small ε , its scaling is perhaps more consistent with $\varepsilon^{5/2}$ (green line), although it is difficult to measure $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_{\perp,rms}$ accurately at the smallest ε values as the mean flow is then very weak and evolves very slowly.

5. Conclusions

We have explored the dynamics of salt fingers in 3-D and in the limit of slow salinity diffusion ($\tau \ll 1$, $Pr/\tau \gg 1$) and weak or moderate instability ($\varepsilon \equiv R_\rho^{-1}\tau^{-1} - 1 \leq 4$). This regime was studied in 2-D by Xie *et al.* (2017), who showed that the temperature equation reduces to a diagnostic balance akin to the low-Péclet number limit of Lignières (1999) (see also Prat *et al.* 2015; Garaud 2021) and that the vorticity equation is governed by a diagnostic balance between buoyancy and viscous diffusion; Xie *et al.* referred to these reduced equations as the IFSC model.

Simulations of the full equations in 3-D exhibit significant departures from the 2-D system. First, the 3-D case is characterised by rich, multiscale dynamics where anisotropic fingers are twisted at large vertical scales by a helical mean flow and disrupted at small scales by isotropic eddies. This helical mean flow is a maximally helical, Beltrami flow in some regimes, with helicity of either sign depending on the random initial conditions, and provides a striking example of spontaneous symmetry breaking, much as occurs in the systems studied by Słomka & Dunkel (2017), Agoua *et al.* (2021) and Romeo *et al.* (2024). Second, 3-D simulations of the IFSC model exhibit qualitatively different dynamics and significantly enhanced fluxes over the full equations unless the instability is very weak ($\varepsilon \ll 0.1$) – a consequence of the exclusion of Reynolds stresses in the IFSC model.

The observed multiscale dynamics inform a multiscale asymptotic expansion in the supercriticality ε where the leading-order equations form a closed system. This analysis identifies the leading-order terms missing from the IFSC model – the Reynolds stresses in the equations for the horizontal mean flow – and predicts the scaling of the various fields and fluxes with ε . Simulations of the full equations are consistent with these predictions except for the scaling of the mean flow, which has a stronger dependence on ε than suggested by the asymptotic analysis. Furthermore, simulations of the MIFSC equations – the IFSC equations with Reynolds stresses retained – yield qualitative and quantitative agreement with DNS of the full equations up to $\varepsilon \approx 1$, further supporting the derived leading-order balances and shedding light on the physical processes contributing to the observed helical flow: for example, because the reduced equations preclude vertical vorticity, internal gravity waves and modifications to the mean temperature profile, we know such effects are not necessary to produce our helical flows.

A noteworthy feature of the MIFSC model is that, to leading order, the fluctuations $\hat{\mathbf{u}}'_\perp \equiv \hat{\mathbf{u}}_\perp - \hat{\mathbf{U}}_\perp$ have strictly zero helicity. Thus, the helical flow represents a spontaneous symmetry-breaking instability arising from asymptotically non-helical fluctuations, analogous to the development of unidirectional travelling waves in reflection-symmetric systems (Knobloch *et al.* 1986).

Our computations of the rms values of the various fields broadly support the scalings with ε predicted from the asymptotic analysis. For comparison, Garaud *et al.* (2024) devised a means to extract the scalings of fast-averaged quantities $\langle q \rangle_f$ and their fluctuations \tilde{q} separately, demonstrating that in their system these differed. In the present case, our asymptotic analysis points to fields other than $\hat{\mathbf{u}}'_\perp$ and \hat{p} exhibiting identical scalings on fast and slow scales. While we find no clear discrepancies in our simulations, future work should extend the approach of Garaud *et al.* (2024) to the present system to test these predictions more carefully.

Our reduced equations – and those of Prat *et al.* (2015) and Xie *et al.* (2017) – indicate that for $\tau \ll 1$ the dynamics no longer depend on Pr and τ separately, and only depend on the combination $Sc \equiv Pr/\tau$. Thus, while we have only simulated the full equations at $Pr = 5$, we may expect our simulations of the reduced equations at $Sc = 100$ to be consistent with the full system in the astrophysically relevant regime of small

$Pr, \tau \sim 10^{-7} - 10^{-4}$ (Prat *et al.* 2015; Fraser *et al.* 2022). We are thus led to expect that helical flows may form in the interiors of stars, an exciting prospect due to their tendency to support dynamo growth (Rincon 2019; Tobias 2021).

Both the reduced and the full equations admit (unstable) single-mode solutions that may provide a useful proxy for flux computations in the strongly nonlinear regime, and investigations of the role played by the helical mean flow. Outstanding questions involve possible reversals of this flow in longer simulations, and the generation of such flows in vertically confined domains. The multiparameter nature of the problem raises additional questions involving distinct asymptotic regimes when both τ and Sc^{-1} are small and if $Sc = O(1)$ in the regime of small τ and Pr – note that $Sc \sim 10^2$ is likely in stars (Skoutnev & Beloborodov 2025).

Supplementary material. Supplementary material is available at <https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2025.10641>.

Acknowledgements. K.J. passed away before this manuscript was finalised. We have attempted to present the results of our collaboration in accordance with his high standards. Any errors or misinterpretations remain our own. A.F. thanks I. Grooms and B. Hindman for many useful discussions about helicity and multiscale asymptotic analyses; E.K. acknowledges an insightful discussion with N. Yokoi on the topic of helicity generation in turbulent flow.

Funding. This work was supported by NSF under grants OCE-1912332 (A.F. and K.J.), AST-2402142 (A.F.) and DMS-2308337 (A.v.K. and E.K.). The computational resources were provided by the NSF ACCESS program (projects PHY250118 and PHY230056), allowing us to utilise the Purdue Anvil CPU cluster.

Declaration of interests. The authors report no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- AGOUE, W., FAVIER, B., DELACHE, A., BRIARD, A. & BOS, W.J.T. 2021 Spontaneous generation and reversal of helicity in anisotropic turbulence. *Phys. Rev. E* **103**, L061101.
- AHLERS, G., CANNELL, D.S. & STEINBERG, V. 1985 Time dependence of flow patterns near the convective threshold in a cylindrical container. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54**, 1373–1376.
- BAINES, P.G. & GILL, A.E. 1969 On thermohaline convection with linear gradients. *J. Fluid Mech.* **37**, 289–306.
- BURNS, K.J., VASIL, G.M., OISHI, J.S., LECOANET, D. & BROWN, B.P. 2020 Dedalus: a flexible framework for numerical simulations with spectral methods. *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 023068.
- CHINI, G.P., MICHEL, G., JULIEN, K., ROCHA, C.B. & CAULFIELD, C.P. 2022 Exploiting self-organized criticality in strongly stratified turbulence. *J. Fluid Mech.* **933**, A22.
- FRASER, A.E., JOYCE, M., ANDERS, E.H., TAYAR, J. & CANTIello, M. 2022 Characterizing observed extra mixing trends in red giants using the reduced density ratio from thermohaline models. *Astrophys. J.* **941**, 164.
- FRASER, A.E., REIFENSTEIN, S.A. & GARAUD, P. 2024 Magnetized fingering convection in stars. *Astrophys. J.* **964**, 184.
- GARAUD, P. 2018 Double-diffusive convection at low Prandtl number. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **50**, 275–298.
- GARAUD, P. 2021 Journey to the center of stars: the realm of low Prandtl number fluid dynamics. *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **6**, 030501.
- GARAUD, P., CHINI, G.P., COPE, L., SHAH, K. & CAULFIELD, C.P. 2024 Numerical validation of scaling laws for stratified turbulence. *J. Fluid Mech.* **991**, R1.
- KNOBLOCH, E., DEANE, A.E., TOOMRE, J. & MOORE, D.R. 1986 Doubly diffusive waves. *Contemp. Maths* **56**, 203–216.
- KNOBLOCH, E. & SPRUIT, H.C. 1982 Stability of differential rotation in stars. *Astron. Astrophys.* **113**, 261–268.
- LIGNIÈRES, F. 1999 The small-Péclet-number approximation in stellar radiative zones. *Astron. Astrophys.* **348**, 933–939.
- LIU, C., SHARMA, M., JULIEN, K. & KNOBLOCH, E. 2024 Fixed-flux Rayleigh–Bénard convection in doubly periodic domains: generation of large-scale shear. *J. Fluid Mech.* **979**, A19.
- PRAT, V., LIGNIÈRES, F. & LAGARDE, N. 2015 Numerical simulations of zero-Prandtl-number thermohaline convection. In *SF2A-2015: Proc. Annu. Meet. French Soc. Astron. Astrophys.* (ed. Martins, F., Boissier,

- S., Buat, V., Cambr sy, L. & Petit, P.), pp. 419–422. Soci t  Fran aise d’Astronomie et d’Astrophysique (SF2A).
- RADKO, T. 2003 A mechanism for layer formation in a double-diffusive fluid. *J. Fluid Mech.* **497**, 365–380.
- RADKO, T. 2010 Equilibration of weakly nonlinear salt fingers. *J. Fluid Mech.* **645**, 121–143.
- RADKO, T. 2013 *Double-Diffusive Convection*. Cambridge University Press.
- RINCON, F. 2019 Dynamo theories. *J. Plasma Phys.* **85**, 205850401.
- ROMEO, N., SŁOMKA, J., DUNKEL, J. & BURNS, K.J. 2024 Vortex line entanglement in active Beltrami flows. *J. Fluid Mech.* **982**, A12.
- SCHMITT, R.W. & LAMBERT, R.B. 1979 The effects of rotation on salt fingers. *J. Fluid Mech.* **90**, 449–463.
- SHAH, K., CHINI, G.P., CAULFIELD, C.P. & GARAUD, P. 2024 Regimes of stratified turbulence at low Prandtl number. *J. Fluid Mech.* **998**, A60.
- SKOUTNEV, V.A. & BELOBORODOV, A.M. 2025 Zones of Tayler instability in stars. *Astrophys. J.* **988**, 195.
- SŁOMKA, J. & DUNKEL, J. 2017 Spontaneous mirror-symmetry breaking induces inverse energy cascade in 3D active fluids. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **114**, 2119–2124.
- TOBIAS, S.M. 2021 The turbulent dynamo. *J. Fluid Mech.* **912**, P1.
- TRAXLER, A., STELLMACH, S., GARAUD, P., RADKO, T. & BRUMMELL, N. 2011 Dynamics of fingering convection. Part 1 small-scale fluxes and large-scale instabilities. *J. Fluid Mech.* **677**, 530–553.
- WANG, D. & RUUTH, S.J. 2008 Variable step-size implicit-explicit linear multistep methods for time-dependant partial differential equations. *J. Comput. Maths* **26**, 838–855.
- WANG, Q., GOLUSKIN, D. & LOHSE, D. 2023 Lifetimes of metastable windy states in two-dimensional Rayleigh–B nard convection with stress-free boundaries. *J. Fluid Mech.* **976**, R2.
- WINCHESTER, P., DALLAS, V. & HOWELL, P.D. 2021 Zonal flow reversals in two-dimensional Rayleigh–B nard convection. *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **6**, 033502.
- XIE, J.-H., MIQUEL, B., JULIEN, K. & KNOBLOCH, E. 2017 A reduced model for salt-finger convection in the small diffusivity ratio limit. *Fluids* **2**, 6.
- YANG, Y., VERZICCO, R. & LOHSE, D. 2016 Scaling laws and flow structures of double diffusive convection in the finger regime. *J. Fluid Mech.* **802**, 667–689.