Banner appropriate to article type will appear here in typeset article

Turbulent transport in a non-Markovian velocity field

G. Kishore[†] and Nishant K. Singh[‡]

Inter-University Centre for Astronomy & Astrophysics, Post Bag 4, Ganeshkhind, Pune 411 007, India

(Received xx; revised xx; accepted xx)

The commonly used quasilinear approximation allows one to calculate the turbulent transport coefficients for the mean of a passive scalar or a magnetic field in a given velocity field. Formally, the quasilinear approximation is exact when the correlation time of the velocity field is zero. We calculate the lowest-order corrections to the transport coefficients due to the correlation time being nonzero. For this, we use the Furutsu-Novikov theorem, which allows one to express the turbulent transport coefficients in a Gaussian random velocity field as a series in the correlation time. We find that the turbulent diffusivities of both the mean passive scalar and the mean magnetic field are suppressed. Nevertheless, contradicting a previous study, we show that the turbulent diffusivity of the mean magnetic field is smaller than that of the mean passive scalar. We also find corrections to the α effect.

1. Introduction

Astrophysical magnetic fields are observed on galactic, stellar, and planetary scales (Brandenburg & Subramanian 2005*a*, section 2; Jones 2011). Stars such as the Sun exhibit periodic magnetic cycles, while the Earth itself has a dipolar magnetic field that shields it from the solar wind. Dynamo theory attempts to explain the generation and sustenance of such magnetic fields (Moffatt 1978; Krause & Rädler 1980; Brandenburg & Subramanian 2005*a*; Shukurov & Subramanian 2022). Magnetic fields are often correlated at length scales much larger than that of the turbulent velocity field. Mean-field magnetohydrodynamics takes advantage of this scale-separation to make the problem analytically tractable.

In general, the Lorentz force turns the evolution of the magnetic field into a nonlinear problem, which is difficult to study analytically. As a first step, one can study the *kinematic limit*, where the magnetic field is assumed to be so weak that the effect of the Lorentz force on the velocity field can be neglected. The statistical properties of the velocity field can then be treated as given quantities, the effects of which on the magnetic field are to be determined. In this study, we restrict ourselves to the kinematic dynamo.

Even in the kinematic limit, the evolution equation for the mean magnetic field depends on the correlation between the fluctuating velocity field and the fluctuating magnetic field, with the evolution equation for this correlation in turn depending on higher-order correlations (schematically, $\partial \langle v^n B \rangle / \partial t = \langle v^{n+1} B \rangle$ where v is the velocity field and B is the magnetic field). To keep the system of equations manageable, one has to truncate this hierarchy by applying a *closure*. The most common closure in mean-field dynamo theory is the quasilinear

[†] Email address for correspondence: kishoreg@iucaa.in

[‡] Email address for correspondence: nishant@iucaa.in

approximation (also known as the First Order Smoothing Approximation, FOSA; or the Second Order Correlation Approximation, SOCA) (e.g. Moffatt 1978, sec. 7.5; Krause & Rädler 1980, sec. 4.3), in which the evolution equation for the fluctuating magnetic field is linearized. Strictly, this closure is valid at either low Reynolds number (*Re*, the ratio of the viscous timescale to the advective timescale) or low Strouhal number (*St*, the ratio of the correlation time of the velocity field to its turnover time¶). The former limit is astrophysically irrelevant. The applicability of the latter limit can be judged from the fact that in simulations (Brandenburg & Subramanian 2005*b*; Käpylä *et al.* 2006), one typically finds $0.1 \le St \le 1$. While this suggests that the effects of a nonzero correlation time are not negligible, it leaves room for hope that perturbative approaches can at least capture the qualitative effects of having a nonzero correlation time.

A two-scale averaging procedure, where one performs successive averages over different spatiotemporal scales, is sometimes thought of as a simple device to go beyond the quasilinear approximation by capturing the effects of higher order correlations of the velocity field (e.g. Kraichnan 1976; Silant'ev 2000, p. 341). This has been applied to passive-scalar and magnetic-field transport (Kraichnan 1976; Moffatt 1978, sec. 7.11; Singh 2016; Gopalakrishnan & Singh 2023). In particular, Kraichnan (1976) has found that the turbulent diffusion of the mean passive scalar is not affected, while that of the mean magnetic field is suppressed.

More rigorous perturbative calculations have been performed by Knobloch (1977), Drummond (1982), and Nicklaus & Stix (1988). Using independent approaches, Knobloch (1977, using the cumulant expansion) and Drummond (1982, using a path integral formalism) have found that to the lowest order, the turbulent diffusion of the mean passive scalar is suppressed when the correlation time is nonzero. Applying the cumulant expansion, Nicklaus & Stix (1988) have found that the turbulent diffusion of the magnetic field is also suppressed when the correlation time is nonzero. † As we will later see, comparison of the results obtained by Knobloch (1977) and Drummond (1982) for the passive scalar with that reported by Nicklaus & Stix (1988) for the magnetic field suggests that the turbulent diffusivity for the mean magnetic field is *identical* to that for the mean passive scalar even when the correlation time of the velocity field is nonzero. This disagrees qualitatively with the findings of Kraichnan (1976).

Mizerski (2023), using a renormalization group analysis, has calculated the effect of the kinetic helicity on the diffusion of the mean magnetic field in the limit of low fractional helicity. In their method, the correlation time of the velocity field is nonzero, and is implicitly determined by the equations of motion. In qualitative agreement with the other studies mentioned above, they report that turbulent diffusion of the magnetic field is suppressed in a helical velocity field. However, they have not considered the case of a passive scalar, and so it is still unclear if turbulent diffusion affects the mean passive scalar and the mean magnetic field in the same way.

For a Gaussian random velocity field, one can use the Furutsu-Novikov theorem (Furutsu 1963; Novikov 1965) to write turbulent transport coefficients as series in the correlation time of the velocity field.[‡] While this approach has been used to study the small-scale dynamo (Schekochihin & Kulsrud 2001; Gopalakrishnan & Singh 2024), passive scalar transport

[¶] Note that this definition, which seems to be prevalent in the dynamo community (going back to Krause & Rädler 1980, eq. 3.14), is different from the more common definition which is used for oscillatory flows (e.g. White 1999, p. 295).

^{\dagger} While Knobloch (1977) also treated the case of the mean magnetic field, that particular result has a problem which we point out in section 4.3.2.

[‡] Schekochihin & Kulsrud (2001) discuss how this method is related to other methods such as the cumulant expansion.

(Gleeson 2000), and the effects of shear on plasma turbulence (Zhang & Mahajan 2017), we are not aware of it being used to study the transport of the mean magnetic field.

In this work, we use the Furutsu-Novikov theorem to calculate the lowest-order corrections (linear in the correlation time of the velocity field) to the transport coefficients for a mean passive scalar and a mean magnetic field. For the mean passive scalar, we find that the turbulent diffusivity is suppressed, in agreement with previous work (Drummond 1982; Knobloch 1977). We also find that turbulent diffusion of the mean magnetic field is suppressed more strongly than in the case of the mean passive scalar, disagreeing with the result obtained by Nicklaus & Stix (1988).

In section 2, we use the quasilinear approximation to study the diffusion of the mean passive scalar. In section 3, we apply the Furutsu-Novikov theorem to the same problem, highlighting the differences as compared to the quasilinear approximation. In section 4, we apply the same technique to the turbulent transport of the mean magnetic field. Finally, we summarize our conclusions in section 5.

2. Scalar transport in the quasilinear approximation

2.1. Mean and fluctuating fields

We consider a passive scalar, evolving according to

$$\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} = \kappa \nabla^2 \theta - \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \theta \,. \tag{2.1}$$

We split the scalar into mean and fluctuating components, $\theta = \Phi + \phi$, choosing an averaging procedure, $\langle \Box \rangle$, that obeys Reynolds' rules (e.g. Monin & Yaglom 1971, sec. 3.1). For simplicity, we assume $\langle u \rangle = 0$. The evolution equations for Φ and ϕ are

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = \kappa \nabla^2 \Phi - \langle \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \phi \rangle \tag{2.2}$$

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} = \kappa \nabla^2 \phi - \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \phi + \langle \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \phi \rangle - \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \Phi \,. \tag{2.3}$$

2.2. The quasilinear approximation

In the quasilinear approximation, we discard second-order correlations of the fluctuating quantities in equation 2.3, and write

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} = \kappa \nabla^2 \phi - \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \Phi \,. \tag{2.4}$$

The above is an diffusion equation with a source term $-\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \Phi$. Assuming the perturbations ϕ were zero at $t \to -\infty$, \dagger we can write

$$\phi(\mathbf{x},t) = -\int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathrm{d}\tau \int \mathrm{d}\mathbf{q} \, G(\mathbf{x},t|\mathbf{q},\tau) \, \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{q}} \Phi(\mathbf{q},\tau)$$
(2.5)

where the diffusive Green function is

$$G(\mathbf{x}, t | \mathbf{x}', t') \equiv [4\pi\kappa (t - t')]^{-3/2} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')^2}{4\kappa (t - t')}\right).$$
(2.6)

We now consider the term $\langle \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \phi \rangle$ in equation 2.2. Using equation 2.5, we write this term

† Note that under the quasilinear approximation, the initial condition does not contribute to $\langle \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \phi \rangle$ at later times if it is uncorrelated with the fluctuating velocity field.

$$\langle \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \phi \rangle = -\left\langle \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x}, t) \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} \int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathrm{d}\tau \int \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q} \, G(\boldsymbol{x}, t | \boldsymbol{q}, \tau) \, \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{q}, \tau) \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{q}} \Phi(\boldsymbol{q}, \tau) \right\rangle \,. \tag{2.7}$$

Assuming $\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u} = 0$, we write the above as

$$\langle \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \phi \rangle = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \int_{-\infty}^t \mathrm{d}\tau \int \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q} \, G(\boldsymbol{x}, t | \boldsymbol{q}, \tau) \left\langle u_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t) u_j(\boldsymbol{q}, \tau) \right\rangle \frac{\partial \Phi(\boldsymbol{q}, \tau)}{\partial q_j} \,. \tag{2.8}$$

2.3. White-noise velocity field

Let us assume a homogeneous, isotropic, delta-correlated velocity field, i.e.

$$\langle u_i(\mathbf{x},t)u_j(\mathbf{x},\tau)\rangle = \frac{2}{3}E\,\delta_{ij}\,\delta(t-\tau)\,.$$
 (2.9)

Setting $\kappa = 0$ (so that we have $G(\mathbf{x}, t | \mathbf{q}, \tau) = \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}) \Theta(t - \tau)$), equation 2.8 becomes

$$\langle \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \phi \rangle = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \int_{-\infty}^t \mathrm{d}\tau \left\langle u_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t) u_j(\boldsymbol{x}, \tau) \right\rangle \frac{\partial \Phi(\boldsymbol{q}, \tau)}{\partial x_j}$$
(2.10)

$$= -\frac{E}{3}\nabla^2\Phi \tag{2.11}$$

where we have used $\int_0^\infty \delta(t) dt = 1/2$. Plugging the above into equation 2.2, we obtain

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = \left(\kappa + \frac{E}{3}\right) \nabla^2 \Phi \tag{2.12}$$

where E/3 is referred to as the turbulent diffusivity. In this approximation, the only effect of the fluctuating velocity field is to enhance the diffusivity of the mean scalar field.

2.4. Nonzero correlation time

Recall that equation 2.8 contains an integral over past values of Φ . If the correlation time of the velocity field (say τ_c) is small, this integral can be converted to a series in τ_c by Taylor-expanding $\Phi(q, \tau)$ about the time *t*. Explicitly, expanding

$$\Phi(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) = \Phi(\boldsymbol{q},t) + (\tau-t) \frac{\partial \Phi(\boldsymbol{q},t)}{\partial t} + O((\tau-t)^2)$$
(2.13)

one writes[†]

$$\langle \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \phi \rangle = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \int_{-\infty}^t \mathrm{d}\tau \int \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q} \, G(\boldsymbol{x}, t | \boldsymbol{q}, \tau) \left\langle u_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t) u_j(\boldsymbol{q}, \tau) \right\rangle \frac{\partial \Phi(\boldsymbol{q}, t)}{\partial q_j} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \int_{-\infty}^t \mathrm{d}\tau \int \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q} \, G(\boldsymbol{x}, t | \boldsymbol{q}, \tau) \left\langle u_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t) u_j(\boldsymbol{q}, \tau) \right\rangle (\tau - t) \frac{\partial^2 \Phi(\boldsymbol{q}, t)}{\partial q_j \partial t} \quad (2.14) + O \left(\int_{-\infty}^t \mathrm{d}\tau \, (\tau - t)^2 \left\langle u(\cdot, t) u(\cdot, \tau) \right\rangle \right).$$

The three lines on the RHS are $O(\tau_c^0)$, $O(\tau_c^1)$, and $O(\tau_c^2)$ respectively. If one wishes to discard $O(\tau_c^2)$ terms above, one can use equation 2.12 to substitute for $\partial \Phi/\partial t$ appearing on the second line.

However, we shall soon see that the higher-order velocity correlations neglected in the

[†] In principle, one should also Taylor-expand the diffusive Green function which appears inside the integral, but here, we are only interested in the contributions that are independent of κ .

(3.4)

quasilinear approximation also have $O(\tau_c)$ contributions to the equation for $\langle \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \phi \rangle$; one thus has to go beyond the quasilinear approximation to study the effects of having a nonzero correlation time.

3. Scalar transport with nonzero correlation time

3.1. Application of the Furutsu-Novikov theorem

We use the Furutsu-Novikov theorem (Furutsu 1963, eq. 5.18; Novikov 1965, eq. 2.1):

$$\langle u_i(x,t)\lambda_i(x,t)\rangle = \int \left\langle u_i(x,t)u_j(x',t')\right\rangle \left\langle \frac{\delta\lambda_i(x,t)}{\delta u_j(x',t')}\right\rangle \mathrm{d}^3 x' \mathrm{d} t'$$
(3.1)

where u_i is a Gaussian random field with zero mean, and λ_i is some functional of u_i .

We treat the evolution equation for the total passive scalar (equation 2.1) as diffusion with a source term $-\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \theta$ and write \dagger

$$\theta(\boldsymbol{x},t) = -\int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathrm{d}\tau \int \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q} \, G(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \, u_m(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \frac{\partial \theta(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\partial q_m}$$
(3.2)

$$\implies \frac{\partial \theta(\boldsymbol{x},t)}{\partial x_i} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \int_{-\infty}^t \mathrm{d}\tau \int \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q} \, G(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \, u_m(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \frac{\partial \theta(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\partial q_m} \,. \tag{3.3}$$

Note that G does not depend on u. Defining $\lambda_i \equiv \partial_i \theta$ and taking the functional variation on both sides, we write

$$\delta\lambda_i(\boldsymbol{x},t) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \int_{-\infty}^t \mathrm{d}\tau \int \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q} \, G(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \left[\lambda_m(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \,\delta u_m(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) + u_m(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \,\delta \lambda_m(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)\right]$$

$$= -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \int_{-\infty}^{t} d\tau \int d\boldsymbol{q} G(\boldsymbol{x}, t | \boldsymbol{q}, \tau) \lambda_{m}(\boldsymbol{q}, \tau) \,\delta u_{m}(\boldsymbol{q}, \tau) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \int_{-\infty}^{t} d\tau \int d\boldsymbol{q} d\boldsymbol{x}^{\prime\prime} dt^{\prime\prime} G(\boldsymbol{x}, t | \boldsymbol{q}, \tau) \,u_{m}(\boldsymbol{q}, \tau) \,\frac{\delta \lambda_{m}(\boldsymbol{q}, \tau)}{\delta u_{k}(\boldsymbol{x}^{\prime\prime}, t^{\prime\prime})} \,\delta u_{k}(\boldsymbol{x}^{\prime\prime}, t^{\prime\prime}) \,.$$
(3.5)

Using the above, we write

$$\frac{\delta\lambda_i(\mathbf{x},t)}{\delta u_j(\mathbf{x}',t')} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} G(\mathbf{x},t|\mathbf{x}',t') \Theta(t-t') \lambda_j(\mathbf{x}',t')
-\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \int_{t'}^t d\tau \int d\mathbf{q} G(\mathbf{x},t|\mathbf{q},\tau) u_m(\mathbf{q},\tau) \frac{\delta\lambda_m(\mathbf{q},\tau)}{\delta u_j(\mathbf{x}',t')} \Theta(t-t').$$
(3.6)

Averaging both sides, we write

$$\left\langle \frac{\delta \lambda_i(\boldsymbol{x},t)}{\delta u_j(\boldsymbol{x}',t')} \right\rangle = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} G(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{x}',t') \,\Theta(t-t') \left\langle \lambda_j(\boldsymbol{x}',t') \right\rangle - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \int_{t'}^t \mathrm{d}\tau \int \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q} \, G(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \,\Theta(t-t') \left\langle u_m(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \,\frac{\delta \lambda_m(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\delta u_j(\boldsymbol{x}',t')} \right\rangle.$$

$$(3.7)$$

 \dagger We have ignored a term containing the convolution of the Green function with the initial condition, since we expect its functional derivative wrt. u at later times to be zero.

Now, we plug the above into equation 3.1 and write

$$\langle \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \theta \rangle = \int \left\langle u_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t) u_j(\boldsymbol{x}', t') \right\rangle \left\langle \frac{\delta \lambda_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t)}{\delta u_j(\boldsymbol{x}', t')} \right\rangle d\boldsymbol{x}' dt'$$

$$= -\int d\boldsymbol{x}' dt' \left\langle u_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t) u_j(\boldsymbol{x}', t') \right\rangle \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} G(\boldsymbol{x}, t | \boldsymbol{x}', t') \Theta(t - t') \left\langle \lambda_j(\boldsymbol{x}', t') \right\rangle$$

$$-\int d\boldsymbol{q} \, d\boldsymbol{x}' dt' \int_{t'}^t d\tau \left\langle u_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t) u_j(\boldsymbol{x}', t') \right\rangle \Theta(t - t') \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} G(\boldsymbol{x}, t | \boldsymbol{q}, \tau) \left\langle u_m(\boldsymbol{q}, \tau) \frac{\delta \lambda_m(\boldsymbol{q}, \tau)}{\delta u_j(\boldsymbol{x}', t')} \right\rangle$$

$$(3.8)$$

The first term in the above is exactly the expression obtained using the quasilinear approximation (equation 2.7). The second term becomes zero if the correlation time of the velocity field is zero, and can be thought of as a correction to the quasilinear approximation.

In fact, by repeated application of the Furutsu-Novikov theorem, the second term can be expanded as a series. To easily represent the terms of this series, we now define some new symbols. We use *a*, where a = 1, 2, ..., to denote a combination of position and time variables which are integrated over, so that, e.g., $u(x^{(1)}, t^{(1)})$ stands for u(). A derivative wrt. the position variable labelled by a is denoted by $\delta^{(a)}$. A denotes the special combination (x, t), which is not integrated over. We use $1_i 2_j$ to denote $\langle u_i()u_j(2) \rangle$. Further,

$$\boxed{\frac{\beta_m}{1_{j_1}\dots n_{j_n}}} \equiv \left\langle \frac{\delta^n \lambda_m \beta}{\delta u_{j_1} (1) \dots u_{j_n} n} \right\rangle$$
(3.10)

$$\mathfrak{O}_m(1|2) \equiv \mathfrak{d}_m^{(1)} G^c(1|2) \tag{3.11}$$

where G^c is the causal Green function (defined such that $G^c(x, t|x', t') = 0$ if t' > t; G(x, t|x', t') otherwise). In this notation, the *n*-th functional derivative of λ (the expression for which is derived in appendix A as equation A 7) can be written as

$$\boxed{\frac{\mathbf{\mathfrak{R}}_{i}}{1_{j_{1}}\dots n_{j_{n}}}} = -S_{1,2,\dots,n} \partial_{i}(\mathbf{\mathfrak{R}}|1) \boxed{\frac{1_{j_{1}}}{2_{j_{2}}\dots n_{j_{n}}}} - \int dAdB \partial_{i}(\mathbf{\mathfrak{R}}|A) \boxed{A_{m}B_{a}} \boxed{\frac{A_{m}}{B_{a}1_{j_{1}}\dots n_{j_{n}}}}$$
(3.12)

where $S_{abc...}$ is an operator that symmetrizes over all the arguments indicated in the subscript.⁺ Hereafter, we will dispense with integral symbols, proceeding with the understanding that \mathbf{x} is the only variable that is not integrated over. Applying equation 3.12 thrice to equation

† E.g.,
$$S_{12}A_{12} = A_{12} + A_{21}$$
.



Figure 1: Diagram used to find the order in τ_c of the neglected terms.

3.1 and discarding terms with more than two velocity correlations, we are left with

$$\langle \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \theta \rangle = \left[\boldsymbol{\underbrace{\boldsymbol{H}}_{i}}_{1_{i_{1}}} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} \boldsymbol{\underbrace{\boldsymbol{H}}_{i}}\\ 1_{i_{1}} \end{array} \right]$$

$$= - \left[\boldsymbol{\underbrace{\boldsymbol{H}}_{i}}_{1_{i_{1}}} \right] \partial_{i} (\boldsymbol{\underbrace{\boldsymbol{H}}}|1) \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}} \right] \right\rangle$$

$$- \left[\boldsymbol{\underbrace{\boldsymbol{H}}_{i}}_{1_{i_{1}}} \right] \partial_{i} (\boldsymbol{\underbrace{\boldsymbol{H}}}|2) \left[\begin{array}{c} 2_{i_{2}} 3_{i_{3}} \end{array} \right] \partial_{i_{2}} (2|1) \partial_{i_{1}} (1|3) \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}} \right] \right\rangle$$

$$- \left[\boldsymbol{\underbrace{\boldsymbol{H}}_{i}}_{1_{i_{1}}} \right] \partial_{i} (\boldsymbol{\underbrace{\boldsymbol{H}}}|2) \left[\begin{array}{c} 2_{i_{2}} 3_{i_{3}} \end{array} \right] \partial_{i_{2}} (2|3) \partial_{i_{3}} (3|1) \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}} \right] \right\rangle .$$

$$(3.13)$$

As pointed out earlier, the first term above is just the quasilinear term (see equation 2.7). To consistently obtain the $O(\tau_c)$ contributions to the above equation, one should also expand the quasilinear term as a series in the correlation time, as described in section 2.4.

3.2. The order of the neglected terms

The leading-order (in τ_c) contribution of a particular term can be deduced as follows.[†] Each velocity correlation introduces a factor of \mathfrak{D} (see equation 3.15), for which $\int \mathfrak{D}(\tau) d\tau = O(1)$. Each of the remaining time integrals contributes a factor of τ_c . The order of a particular term in τ_c is then simply the number of time integrals minus the number of velocity correlations. The object on the RHS of equation 3.13 contains one time integral with one velocity correlation, so it has no 'explicit' factors of τ_c (everything is hidden inside the functional derivative).

In figure 1, the vertical lines denote functional derivatives of various orders. Starting from the RHS of equation 3.13 (black circle), one obtains various terms after repeated application of the recursion relation (equation A 7 or 3.12; in the figure, each blue circle with arrows leading out corresponds to one application of the relation). A rightward step adds two time integrals and a velocity correlation, while a leftward step introduces neither velocity correlations nor time integrals. The order of a particular term in τ_c is thus simply the number of rightward steps taken to reach it, starting from the black circle. The terms we have neglected are $O(\tau_c^2)$.

† A term whose leading-order contribution is at a particular order in τ_c may contain higher-order contributions as well, as discussed in section 2.4.

Name	$\mathfrak{D}(au)$	<i>8</i> 2
Exponential	$\frac{1}{2\tau_c} e^{- \tau /\tau_c}$	1/8
Top hat	$\frac{1}{4\tau_c} \Theta(2\tau_c - \tau) \Theta(\tau + 2\tau_c)$	1/12

Table 1: Values of g_2 for some temporal correlation functions. The corresponding values of g_1 can be calculated using equation B 2. The constants in the correlation functions have been chosen to satisfy equations 3.16.

3.3. Simplification assuming separable, weakly inhomogeneous turbulence

3.3.1. Assumptions

Assuming $\kappa = 0$ (which corresponds to $Pe \gg 1$; Pe, the *Peclet number*, is the ratio of the diffusive timescale to the advective timescale for the total passive scalar), we simplify the terms on the RHS of equation 3.14 in appendix D. The expressions obtained are somewhat long. We proceed by assuming the velocity correlations are separable, i.e.

$$\left\langle u_i(\boldsymbol{x},t+\tau)\partial_{i_1\dots i_n}^n u_j(\boldsymbol{x},t) \right\rangle = C_{iji_1\dots i_n}(\boldsymbol{x},t)\mathfrak{D}(\tau) \,. \tag{3.15}$$

The temporal correlation function, \mathfrak{D} , has the properties

$$2\int_0^\infty \mathfrak{D}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = 1\,,\quad 2\int_0^\infty t\,\mathfrak{D}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = \tau_c\,,\qquad(3.16)$$

where τ_c is the correlation time. Note that we have assumed the correlation time is independent of the spatial scale. We further assume that $C(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $\langle \lambda_i(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle$ vary on a timescale much larger than the timescale of $\mathfrak{D}(\tau)$. Discarding terms with more than two derivatives of the mean scalar field (Φ) and taking the 'weakly inhomogeneous' case (where we keep only one large-scale derivative of the turbulent spectra; see appendix C), we obtain simple expressions, which we describe below.

3.3.2. The diffusion equation for the mean scalar

Setting $\kappa = 0$, the average of the evolution equation for the total passive scalar (equation 2.1)

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = -\langle \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \theta \rangle \tag{3.17}$$

Using equations D 10, D 11, and D 12 (appendix D.4), we write the above as

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[\left(\frac{E}{3} + \frac{\tau_c g_1 H^2}{18} - \frac{\tau_c 2 g_2 E N}{9} \right) \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x_i} \right].$$
(3.18)

where g_1 and g_2 depend on the temporal correlation function $\mathfrak{D}(\tau)$ (table 1 lists some examples), and

$$E(\mathbf{x},t) \equiv \int_0^\infty \left\langle u_i(\mathbf{x},t+\tau)u_i(\mathbf{x},t) \right\rangle d\tau \qquad (3.19a)$$

$$H(\mathbf{x},t) \equiv 2 \int_0^\infty \left\langle u_i(\mathbf{x},t+\tau)\omega_i(\mathbf{x},t) \right\rangle d\tau \qquad (3.19b)$$

$$N(\mathbf{x},t) \equiv 2 \int_0^\infty \left\langle \omega_i(\mathbf{x},t+\tau)\omega_i(\mathbf{x},t) \right\rangle \mathrm{d}\tau \,. \tag{3.19c}$$

Note that the definition of E is consistent with that in equation 2.9.

For a maximally helical velocity field with a top-hat temporal correlation function ($g_2 = 1/12$ and $H^2 = 2EN$), the $O(\tau_c)$ correction to the turbulent diffusivity becomes zero. On the other hand, if the temporal correlation function is exponential, we obtain

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[\left(\frac{E}{3} - \frac{\tau_c}{144} \left(4EN - H^2 \right) \right) \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x_i} \right] + O(\tau_c^2) \,. \tag{3.20}$$

Note that the $O(\tau_c)$ terms in this case cannot be zero, since the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality guarantees that $H^2 \leq 2EN$. The corrections above match those obtained by Drummond (1982, eq. 5.1) and Knobloch (1977, eq. 38).[†]

Examination of equation 3.18 shows that for weakly inhomogeneous turbulence, the effective diffusivity becomes negative when $\tau_c N(2g_2 - g_1f^2) > 3$ (where we have defined $f^2 \equiv H^2/2EN \in [0, 1]$) and is positive otherwise. However, when the $O(\tau_c)$ corrections are so strong, one would expect the neglected $O(\tau_c^2)$ terms to also become non-negligible, making equation 3.18 invalid.

3.3.3. Validity of the expansion

We now make a crude estimate of how $\tau_c N$, which controls the validity of equation 3.20, depends on *Re*. Assuming the velocity field is homogeneous and isotropic, we estimate (recall that *N* was defined in equation 3.19)

$$N \propto \int k^2 \widetilde{C}_{ii}(k) \,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{k} \tag{3.21}$$

where \tilde{C}_{ii} is the Fourier transform of C_{ii} (equation 3.15). Let us assume $\tilde{C}_{ii}(k)$ is a power law in $k_0 < k < k_{\nu}$ (which we refer to as the inertial range) and zero elsewhere. If we assume the velocity field obeys the Kolmogorov scaling relations (e.g. Davidson 2004, section 1.6) in the inertial range, the fact that $C_{ii}(\mathbf{x})$ is dimensionally a diffusivity implies $\tilde{C}_{ii}(k) \sim k^{-13/3}$. We then estimate

$$N \propto \int_{k_0}^{k_{\nu}} k^{-1/3} \mathrm{d}k \propto k_{\nu}^{2/3} - k_0^{2/3} \approx k_{\nu}^{2/3}$$
(3.22)

where the last step assumes $k_{\nu} \gg k_0$. Similarly, we can also estimate $E \sim k_0^{-4/3}$, which gives us $N/(Ek_0^2) \propto Re^{1/2}$. Defining $St \equiv \tau_c Ek_0^2$, we then find

$$\tau_c N \propto St \, Re^{1/2} \,. \tag{3.23}$$

This means that for equation 3.20 to be valid, we require both the Strouhal number and the Reynolds number to not be large. We believe the latter limitation is due to our assumption that

[†] In both cases, we compared results after assuming an exponential temporal correlation function. The expressions given by Knobloch (1977) need to be further simplified assuming a statistically homogeneous and isotropic Gaussian velocity field.

the velocity field at all scales can be characterized by a single scale-independent correlation time (τ_c).

3.4. Aside: validity of the quasilinear approximation

Let us now try to understand the regimes in which the quasilinear approximation is valid. From the discussion above, it is clear that the quasilinear approximation becomes valid when the correlation time of the velocity field approaches zero.

There is also another limit in which the quasilinear approximation is valid. Even when the correlation time is nonzero, one may expect the quasilinear approximation to remain valid if the $O(\tau_c)$ corrections from the quasilinear approximation (section 2.4) are much larger than the $O(\tau_c)$ contributions from the second and third terms on the RHS of equation 3.14. We may estimate the ratios of these contributions as

$$\frac{\text{post-quasilinear}}{\text{quasilinear}} \sim \left(\frac{\tau^3 u^4}{l^4} \Phi\right) \left/ \left(\frac{\tau^2 u^2}{l^2} \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t}\right) \right.$$
(3.24)

where *l* denotes a length scale typical of the spatial derivative of an averaged quantity, τ denotes the correlation time of the fluctuating velocity field, and *u* is the RMS value of the fluctuating velocity field. If we further use equation 2.12 for $\partial \Phi / \partial t$, we can write

$$\frac{\text{post-quasilinear}}{\text{quasilinear}} \sim \frac{\tau u^2}{\kappa + \tau u^2/3} \,. \tag{3.25}$$

Estimating $\tau \sim l/u$ (i.e. $St \sim 1$), we find

$$\frac{\text{post-quasilinear}}{\text{quasilinear}} \sim \frac{Pe}{1 + Pe/3}.$$
(3.26)

where $Pe \equiv ul/\kappa$. We thus see that even if the correlation time of the velocity field is not small, the quasilinear approximation can remain valid as long as *Pe* is small.

4. Magnetic field transport with nonzero correlation time

4.1. Application of the Furutsu-Novikov theorem

Let us consider the induction equation with constant η :

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{B}}{\partial t} = \nabla \times (\boldsymbol{u} \times \boldsymbol{B}) + \eta \nabla^2 \boldsymbol{B} \,. \tag{4.1}$$

For simplicity, we assume $\langle u \rangle = 0$. Averaging both sides, we find that the equation for the mean magnetic field is

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{B}}{\partial t} = \nabla \times \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}} + \eta \nabla^2 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}}$$
(4.2)

where

$$\mathcal{E} \equiv \langle \boldsymbol{u} \times \boldsymbol{b} \rangle , \quad \boldsymbol{b} \equiv \boldsymbol{B} - \overline{\boldsymbol{B}} . \tag{4.3}$$

To solve for the evolution of the mean magnetic field without solving for the fluctuating fields, we require an expression for \mathcal{E} that depends only on known statistical properties of the velocity field and on \overline{B} .

Treating the first term on the RHS of equation 4.1 as a source, we can write the magnetic field at some arbitrary time as (analogous to equation 3.2 for the passive scalar)

$$B_{i}(\boldsymbol{x},t) = \int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathrm{d}\tau \int \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q} \, G(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \,\epsilon_{ijk}\epsilon_{klm} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_{j}} \left(u_{l}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)B_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \right) \,. \tag{4.4}$$

We assume u is a Gaussian random field. Recalling that $\langle u \rangle = 0$, the EMF can be written as $\mathcal{E} = \langle u \times B \rangle$. The Furutsu-Novikov theorem (equation 3.1) takes the form

$$\left\langle u_i(\boldsymbol{x},t)B_j(\boldsymbol{x},t)\right\rangle = \int d\boldsymbol{x}' dt' \left\langle u_i(\boldsymbol{x},t)u_k(\boldsymbol{x}',t')\right\rangle \left\langle \frac{\delta B_j(\boldsymbol{x},t)}{\delta u_k(\boldsymbol{x}',t')}\right\rangle \,. \tag{4.5}$$

For the sake of brevity, we will use notation similar to that described on page 6. Explicitly,

$$\boxed{\frac{\beta_m}{1_{j_1} \dots n_{j_n}}} \equiv \left\langle \frac{\delta^n \lambda_m (\beta)}{\delta u_{j_1} (1) \dots u_{j_n} (n)} \right\rangle$$
(4.6)

$$\Theta_m(1|2) \equiv \delta_m^{(2)} G^c(1|2) \tag{4.7}$$

$$\Upsilon_{ijlm} \equiv \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{klm} \,. \tag{4.8}$$

The average of the *n*-th functional derivative of *B* (derived in appendix \mathbf{E} as equation \mathbf{E} 4) can then be written as

$$\boxed{\frac{\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{R}}_{i}}{1_{i_{1}}\dots n_{i_{n}}}} = -\int dAdB \, \mathcal{D}_{j}(\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{R}}|\boldsymbol{\widehat{\alpha}}) \Upsilon_{ijlm} \boxed{A_{l}B_{a}} \boxed{\frac{A_{m}}{1_{i_{1}}\dots n_{i_{n}}B_{a}}} - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n} \mathcal{D}_{j}(\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{R}}|\boldsymbol{\widehat{\alpha}}) \Upsilon_{iji_{\alpha}m} \boxed{\frac{\alpha_{m}}{1_{i_{1}}\dots (\alpha-1)_{i_{\alpha-1}}(\alpha+1)_{i_{\alpha+1}}\dots n_{i_{n}}}}.$$
(4.9)

Henceforth, we adopt the convention that \cancel{F} is the only variable that is not integrated over. Equation 4.5 can be written as

$$\left\langle u_{i}(\boldsymbol{x},t)B_{j}(\boldsymbol{x},t)\right\rangle = \left[\boldsymbol{\mathbf{H}}_{i}\boldsymbol{1}_{k}\right] \left[\boldsymbol{\mathbf{H}}_{j}\right]$$

$$= -\Upsilon_{ji_{2}i_{1}i_{3}}\left[\boldsymbol{\mathbf{H}}_{i}\boldsymbol{1}_{i_{1}}\right] \partial_{i_{2}}(\boldsymbol{\mathbf{H}}|\boldsymbol{1})\overline{B}_{i_{3}}\boldsymbol{(}\boldsymbol{1})$$

$$- \Upsilon_{i_{5}i_{6}i_{1}i_{7}}\Upsilon_{jj_{3}i_{2}j_{2}}\Upsilon_{j_{2}i_{4}i_{3}i_{5}}\left[\boldsymbol{\mathbf{H}}_{i}\boldsymbol{1}_{i_{1}}\right] \partial_{j_{3}}(\boldsymbol{\mathbf{H}}|\boldsymbol{2})\left[\boldsymbol{2}_{i_{2}}\boldsymbol{3}_{i_{3}}\right] \partial_{i_{4}}(\boldsymbol{2}|\boldsymbol{3})\partial_{i_{6}}(\boldsymbol{3}|\boldsymbol{1})\overline{B}_{i_{7}}\boldsymbol{(}\boldsymbol{1})$$

$$- \Upsilon_{i_{5}i_{6}i_{3}i_{7}}\Upsilon_{jj_{3}i_{2}j_{2}}\Upsilon_{j_{2}i_{4}i_{1}i_{5}}\left[\boldsymbol{\mathbf{H}}_{i}\boldsymbol{1}_{i_{1}}\right] \partial_{j_{3}}(\boldsymbol{\mathbf{H}}|\boldsymbol{2})\left[\boldsymbol{2}_{i_{2}}\boldsymbol{3}_{i_{3}}\right] \partial_{i_{4}}(\boldsymbol{2}|\boldsymbol{1})\partial_{i_{6}}(\boldsymbol{1}|\boldsymbol{3})\overline{B}_{i_{7}}\boldsymbol{(}\boldsymbol{3})$$

$$\left(4.11\right)$$

where we have applied the relation 4.9 thrice and discarded terms with more than two velocity correlations. As argued in the case of the passive scalar (section 3), the first term is $O(\tau_c^0)$ (but also contains $O(\tau_c)$ contributions), while the next two terms are $O(\tau_c)$, where τ_c is the correlation time of the velocity field.

4.2. The white-noise limit

The $O(\tau_c^0)$ term of equation 4.11 is

$$\left\langle u_{i}B_{j}\right\rangle = -\Upsilon_{ji_{2}i_{1}i_{3}} \underbrace{\mathbf{\Phi}_{i}\mathbf{1}_{i_{1}}}_{i_{1}} \eth_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{\Phi}|\mathbf{1})\overline{B}_{i_{3}})$$

$$(4.12)$$

$$= -\Upsilon_{ji_2i_1i_3} \int d\mathbf{x}' dt' \left\langle u_i(\mathbf{x},t) u_{i_1}(\mathbf{x}',t') \right\rangle \frac{\partial G^c(\mathbf{x},t|\mathbf{x}',t')}{\partial x'_{i_2}} \overline{B}_{i_3}(\mathbf{x}',t') \,. \tag{4.13}$$

Assuming $\eta = 0$ and discarding the $O(\tau_c)$ parts of this term, we find that

$$\left\langle u_{i}B_{j}\right\rangle = \Upsilon_{ji_{2}i_{1}i_{3}} \int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' \left\langle u_{i}(\boldsymbol{x},t)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_{2}}}u_{i_{1}}(\boldsymbol{x},t')\right\rangle \overline{B}_{i_{3}}(\boldsymbol{x},t) + \Upsilon_{ji_{2}i_{1}i_{3}} \int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' \left\langle u_{i}(\boldsymbol{x},t)u_{i_{1}}(\boldsymbol{x},t')\right\rangle \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{3}}(\boldsymbol{x},t)}{\partial x_{i_{2}}} .$$

$$(4.14)$$

Assuming the velocity correlations are separable (equation 3.15) and the turbulence is homogeneous, we can use the expressions from appendix C.3 and write

$$\langle V_i B_j \rangle = \frac{1}{12} \epsilon_{ii_2 j} H \overline{B}_{i_2} - \frac{E}{3} \frac{\partial B_j}{\partial x_i}$$
(4.15)

where we have used the fact that the divergence of the magnetic field is zero. The EMF can then be written as

$$\mathcal{E}_{k} = \epsilon_{kij} \left\langle V_{i} B_{j} \right\rangle = -\frac{H}{6} \overline{B}_{k} - \frac{E}{3} \epsilon_{kij} \partial_{i} \overline{B}_{j}$$
(4.16)

which is exactly the same as the usual quasilinear expression (e.g. Moffatt 1978, chapter 7). This is usually written in the form

$$\mathcal{E}_k = \alpha \,\overline{B}_k - \eta \,\epsilon_{kij} \partial_i \overline{B}_j \,. \tag{4.17}$$

The coefficient α describes how a helical velocity field can drive the growth of a mean magnetic field, while the coefficient η (called the turbulent diffusivity) describes dissipation of a mean magnetic field through the action of turbulence.

4.3. Corrections due to nonzero correlation time

4.3.1. Expression for the EMF

In appendix F, we simplify all the three terms on the RHS of equation 4.11, keeping $O(\tau_c)$ contributions, assuming the turbulence is homogeneous and isotropic, and setting $\eta = 0$. Setting $\eta = 0$ in these terms corresponds to assuming $Rm \gg 1$ (Rm, the magnetic Reynolds number, is the ratio of the diffusive timescale to the advective timescale for the total magnetic field). The overall contribution to the EMF ($\mathcal{E}_k = \epsilon_{kij} \langle V_i B_j \rangle$, the contributions to which are given by equations F 6, F 9 and F 12) is

$$\mathcal{E}_{k} = (\alpha_{0} + \tau_{c}\alpha_{1})\overline{B}_{k} - (\eta_{0} - \tau_{c}\eta_{1})\epsilon_{kr_{0}r_{1}}\partial_{r_{0}}\overline{B}_{r_{1}}.$$
(4.18)

Above, α_0 and η_0 are the coefficients when the correlation time is zero (equation 4.17);

$$\alpha_1 \equiv \frac{g_2}{9} \left(2EL + HN \right) \,, \tag{4.19}$$

$$\eta_1 \equiv \frac{2ENg_2}{9} + \frac{H^2g_2}{18} + \frac{H^2}{24}; \qquad (4.20)$$

we have eliminated g_1 by using the fact that $g_1 + g_2 = 1/4$ (equation **B** 2); *E*, *H*, and *N* are defined in equations 3.19; and

$$L(\boldsymbol{x},t) \equiv 2 \int_0^\infty \left\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}(\boldsymbol{x},t+\tau) \cdot \left[\nabla \times \boldsymbol{\omega}(\boldsymbol{x},t) \right] \right\rangle \mathrm{d}\tau \,. \tag{4.21}$$

Note that the turbulent diffusivity is always reduced by the $O(\tau_c)$ terms. The validity of this equation is also determined by the criterion given in section 3.3.3.

Denoting the turbulent diffusivity for the mean magnetic field as η_B , and that for the mean

passive scalar (equation 3.18) as η_{θ} , we find that

$$\eta_B - \eta_\theta = -\tau_c H^2 \left(\frac{g_1 + g_2}{18} + \frac{1}{24} \right) = -\frac{\tau_c H^2}{18}$$
(4.22)

where we have used $g_1 + g_2 = 1/4$ (equation B 2). Note that this is independent of the form of the temporal correlation function of the velocity field.

4.3.2. Comparison with the cumulant expansion

Knobloch (1977) and Nicklaus & Stix (1988) have also studied such corrections using the cumulant expansion. $\dagger \ddagger$ In particular, Nicklaus & Stix (1988, eqs. 24,26) have further simplified their results by treating the velocity field as a Gaussian random field. Our results are expected to agree with theirs for $t \gg \tau_c$. Our corrections to the α effect indeed match theirs. However, their stated correction to the turbulent diffusivity of the magnetic field differs from our result above, and is instead identical to what we had obtained for passive scalar diffusion (equation 3.18).

The expression given by Knobloch (1977, eq. 42) for the difference between the magnetic and scalar diffusivities can be simplified by assuming the velocity correlation is separable (equation 3.15). However, the resulting expression contains an integral of the form $\int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \int_0^{t_2} dt_3 \mathfrak{D}(t-t_1) \mathfrak{D}(t_2-t_3)$; this integral diverges as $O(t; t \to \infty)$. It is unclear if this divergence is due to missed terms in their calculations, or a limitation of the cumulant expansion. We note that the results reported by Nicklaus & Stix (1988, eqs. 24,26) do not have this problem as the coefficient of this integral in their expressions turns out to be zero if the velocity field is Gaussian.

4.3.3. Relation to the α^2 effect

The negative contribution to the turbulent diffusivity in equation 4.18 is reminiscent of that obtained by Kraichnan (1976, eq. 4.8) using a multi-scale averaging procedure. However, in the calculations reported by Kraichnan (1976), the helicity of the velocity field does not have any effect on the mean passive scalar; he attributes this to differences between the conservation properties of the passive scalar and the magnetic field (Kraichnan 1976, p. 659). This is contrary to our finding that helicity can even suppress the diffusion of the mean passive scalar (equation 3.18). The fact that our $O(\tau_c)$ correction to the turbulent diffusivity of the mean passive scalar becomes zero when the temporal correlation function is given by a top hat suggests that the results of Kraichnan (1976) are attributable to his use of a 'renovating flow' model (which corresponds to such a temporal correlation function).

4.3.4. *Comparison with renormalization group theory*

In simulations of forced turbulence, Brandenburg *et al.* (2017, fig. 4) found that the turbulent diffusivity is smaller when the turbulence is helically forced than when it is nonhelically forced. Further, they found that for small Rm, the helicity-dependent correction to the turbulent diffusivity of the magnetic field scales as Rm^2 . This was later confirmed by Mizerski (2023) using renormalization group theory. Since we have focused on the limit of high Rm, we do not recover this scaling.

Mizerski (2023, eq. 18) also derived a correction to the turbulent diffusivity in the limit of small fractional helicity and large *Rm*. This correction seems consistent with our result

[†] Nicklaus & Stix (1988, p. 155) point out some issues with the calculation reported by Knobloch (1977). We agree with the misprint they have pointed out in Knobloch's equation A.13. However, we agree with Knobloch's equation A.8. We have not attempted to verify Knobloch's equation 42.

[‡] Schekochihin & Kulsrud (2001, sec. II D) have shown that at least for a simple model problem, the cumulant expansion is consistent with the method we have used.

(in the sense that the difference between the diffusivity in a helical velocity field and that in a nonhelical velocity field depends on the square of the helicity). While we assume a single scale-independent correlation time, the method used by Mizerski (2023) allows the scale-dependent correlation time to be determined by the equations of motion (and thus it does not appear as a free parameter). Note that Mizerski (2023) do not seem to have calculated the corrections to the α effect (see our equation 4.18); nevertheless, we expect such corrections to be obtainable using their method.

5. Conclusions

Conventional treatments of mean-field theory use the quasilinear approximation to derive expressions for transport coefficients which are exact when the correlation time of the velocity field is zero. Assuming the velocity field is a Gaussian random field with a nonzero correlation time, we have applied the Furutsu-Novikov theorem to find the lowest-order corrections to the transport coefficients for two kinds of passive tensors.

For the diffusion of the mean passive scalar in the limit of high Peclet number, we have verified that our result matches earlier results obtained through different methods (Drummond 1982; Knobloch 1977). Using the multi-scale averaging approach, Kraichnan (1976) has reported that the helicity of the velocity field does not affect the turbulent diffusion of the passive scalar. We have found that this is only the case for a specific form of the temporal correlation function of the velocity field, corresponding to the renovating flow model used in that work.

We have also considered the mean magnetic field (treated, in the kinematic limit, as a passive pseudovector) at high magnetic Reynolds number, and found that both the α effect and magnetic diffusion are affected by the correlation time of the velocity field. An earlier result for the diffusivity of the mean magnetic field (Nicklaus & Stix 1988, eqs. 24,26) turns out to be identical to that for the mean passive scalar; we obtain extra (negative) contributions to the diffusivity of the mean magnetic field.

The validity of the expressions we have derived is limited by our assumption that the correlation time of the velocity field is scale-independent. While the general formalism we have used can be adapted to account for a scale-dependent correlation time, this is left to future work.

Acknowledgements. We thank Alexandra Elbakyan for facilitating access to scientific literature. We acknowledge discussions with Matthias Rheinhardt, Igor Rogachevskii, Axel Brandenburg, and Petri Käpylä.

Funding. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Software. Sympy (Meurer et al. 2017).

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

Author ORCID. GK, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2620-790X; NS, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6097-688X

Author contributions. GK and NS conceptualized the research, interpreted the results, and wrote the paper. GK performed the calculations.

REFERENCES

- BRANDENBURG, A., SCHOBER, J. & ROGACHEVSKII, I. 2017 The contribution of kinetic helicity to turbulent magnetic diffusivity. *Astronomische Nachrichten* **338** (7), 790–793.
- BRANDENBURG, AXEL & SUBRAMANIAN, KANDASWAMY 2005*a* Astrophysical magnetic fields and nonlinear dynamo theory. *Physics Reports* **417** (1-4), 1–209.

- BRANDENBURG, AXEL & SUBRAMANIAN, K. 2005b Minimal tau approximation and simulations of the alpha effect. A&A **439** (3), 835–843.
- DAVIDSON, P. A. 2004 Turbulence: an introduction for scientists and engineers. Oxford Univ. Press.
- DRUMMOND, I. T. 1982 Path-integral methods for turbulent diffusion. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 123, 59–68.
- FURUTSU, K. 1963 On the statistical theory of electromagnetic waves in a fluctuating medium (i). *Journal* of Research of the National Bureau of Standards-D. Radio Propagation **67D** (3), 303–323.
- GLEESON, JAMES P. 2000 A closure method for random advection of a passive scalar. *Physics of Fluids* **12** (6), 1472–1484.
- GOPALAKRISHNAN, KISHORE & SINGH, NISHANT K. 2023 Mean-field dynamo due to spatio-temporal fluctuations of the turbulent kinetic energy. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **973**, A29.
- GOPALAKRISHNAN, KISHORE & SINGH, NISHANT K 2024 Small-scale dynamo with nonzero correlation time. *The Astrophysical Journal* **970** (1), 64.
- GOPALAKRISHNAN, KISHORE & SUBRAMANIAN, KANDASWAMY 2023 Magnetic helicity fluxes from triple correlators. *The Astrophysical Journal* **943** (1), 66.
- JONES, CHRIS A. 2011 Planetary magnetic fields and fluid dynamos. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* **43** (1), 583–614.
- KEARSLEY, ELLIOT A. & FONG, JEFFREY T. 1975 Linearly independent sets of isotropic cartesian tensors of ranks up to eight. *Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards, Section B: Mathematical Sciences* **79B** (1–2), 49–58.
- KNOBLOCH, EDGAR 1977 The diffusion of scalar and vector fields by homogeneous stationary turbulence. Journal of Fluid Mechanics 83 (1), 129–140.
- KRAICHNAN, ROBERT H. 1976 Diffusion of weak magnetic fields by isotropic turbulence. J. Fluid Mech **75** (4), 657–676.
- KRAUSE, F. & RÄDLER, K.-H. 1980 Mean-Field Magnetohydrodynamics and Dynamo Theory, 1st edn. Pergamon press.
- KÄPYLÄ, PETRI J., KORPI, M. J., OSSENDRIJVER, M. & TUOMINEN, I. 2006 Local models of stellar convection. III. the Strouhal number. A&A 448 (2), 433–438.
- LESIEUR, MARCEL 2008 Turbulence in Fluids, 4th edn., Fluid Mechanics and its Applications, vol. 84. Springer.
- MEURER, AARON, SMITH, CHRISTOPHER P., PAPROCKI, MATEUSZ, ČERTÍK, ONDŘEJ, KIRPICHEV, SERGEY B., ROCKLIN, MATTHEW, KUMAR, AMIT, IVANOV, SERGIU, MOORE, JASON K., SINGH, SARTAJ, RATHNAYAKE, THILINA, VIG, SEAN, GRANGER, BRIAN E., MULLER, RICHARD P., BONAZZI, FRANCESCO, GUPTA, HARSH, VATS, SHIVAM, JOHANSSON, FREDRIK, PEDREGOSA, FABIAN, CURRY, MATTHEW J., TERREL, ANDY R., ROUČKA, ŠTĚPÁN, SABOO, ASHUTOSH, FERNANDO, ISURU, KULAL, SUMITH, CIMRMAN, ROBERT & SCOPATZ, ANTHONY 2017 SymPy: symbolic computing in Python. PeerJ Computer Science 3, e103.
- MIZERSKI, KRZYSZTOF A. 2023 Helical correction to turbulent magnetic diffusivity. *Phys. Rev. E* 107, 055205.
- MOFFATT, HENRY KEITH 1978 Magnetic Field Generation In Electrically Conducting Fluids. Cambridge University Press.
- MONIN, A. S. & YAGLOM, A. M. 1971 Statistical Fluid Mechanics: Mechanics of Turbulence, , vol. 1. The MIT Press.
- NICKLAUS, BERNHARD & STIX, MICHAEL 1988 Corrections to first order smoothing in mean-field electrodynamics. *Geophysical & Astrophysical Fluid Dynamics* **43** (2), 149–166.
- NOVIKOV, EVGENII A. 1965 Functionals and the random-force method in turbulence theory. *Sov. Phys. JETP* **20** (5), 1290–1294.
- ROBERTS, P. H. & SOWARD, A. M. 1975 A unified approach to mean field electrodynamics. *Astronomische Nachrichten* **296** (2), 49–64.
- SCHEKOCHIHIN, ALEXANDER A. & KULSRUD, RUSSELL M. 2001 Finite-correlation-time effects in the kinematic dynamo problem. *Physics of Plasmas* 8 (11), 4937–4953.
- SHUKUROV, ANVAR & SUBRAMANIAN, KANDASWAMY 2022 Astrophysical Magnetic Fields: From Galaxies to the Early Universe. Cambridge Astrophysics 56. Cambridge University Press.
- SILANT'EV, N. A. 2000 Magnetic dynamo due to turbulent helicity fluctuations. A&A 364, 339-347.
- SINGH, NISHANT KUMAR 2016 Moffatt-drift-driven large-scale dynamo due to α fluctuations with non-zero correlation times. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **798**, 696–716.
- WHITE, FRANK M. 1999 Fluid Mechanics, 4th edn. WCB/McGraw-Hill.

ZHANG, Y. Z. & MAHAJAN, S. M. 2017 Limitations of the clump-correlation theories of shear-induced turbulence suppression. Physics of Plasmas 24 (5), 054502.

Appendix A. *n*-th functional derivative of $\nabla \theta$

We first recall the definition of the *n*-th functional derivative of a functional F[f] wrt. a function f(t):

$$\left. \frac{\mathrm{d}^{n} F[f + \epsilon \chi]}{\mathrm{d} \epsilon^{n}} \right|_{\epsilon=0} = \int \left. \frac{\delta^{n} F}{\delta f(t_{1}) \dots \delta f(t_{n})} \chi(t_{1}) \dots \chi(t_{n}) \, \mathrm{d} t_{1} \dots \mathrm{d} t_{n} \right. \tag{A1}$$

where ϵ is a real number, and $\chi(t)$ is an arbitrary test function.⁺

Using the same notation as in section 3, we write (similar to equation 3.3)

$$\lambda_i(\boldsymbol{x},t) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \int_{-\infty}^t \mathrm{d}\tau \int \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q} \, G(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \, u_m(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \lambda_m(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \,. \tag{A2}$$

Denoting $\bar{\lambda} \equiv \lambda [u_m + \epsilon \chi_m]$, we write

$$\bar{\lambda}_{i}(\boldsymbol{x},t) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathrm{d}\tau \int \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q} \, G(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \left(u_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}\chi_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)\right) \bar{\lambda}_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \,. \tag{A3}$$

Taking *n* derivatives on both sides and setting $\epsilon = 0$, we write

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^{n}\bar{\lambda}_{i}(\boldsymbol{x},t)}{\mathrm{d}\epsilon^{n}}\Big|_{\epsilon=0} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}\int_{-\infty}^{t}\mathrm{d}\tau\int\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q}\,G(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau)\,u_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)\,\frac{\mathrm{d}^{n}\bar{\lambda}_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\mathrm{d}\epsilon^{n}}\Big|_{\epsilon=0}$$
(A4)
$$-n\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}\int_{-\infty}^{t}\mathrm{d}\tau\int\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q}\,G(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau)\,\chi_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)\,\frac{\mathrm{d}^{n-1}\bar{\lambda}_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\mathrm{d}\epsilon^{n-1}}\Big|_{\epsilon=0}$$

which gives us the following relation between the functional derivatives (we use the notation $u_{i_i} \equiv u_{i_i}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, t^{(i)}))$:

$$\frac{\delta^{n}\lambda_{i}(\boldsymbol{x},t)}{\delta u_{j_{1}}\ldots\delta u_{j_{n}}} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}\int d\boldsymbol{q} \int_{\max(t^{(1)},\ldots,t^{(n)})}^{t} d\tau G(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau) u_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \frac{\delta^{n}\lambda_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\delta u_{j_{1}}\ldots\delta u_{j_{n}}} \\
-\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}G(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{x}^{(\alpha)},t^{(\alpha)}) \Theta(t-t^{(\alpha)}) \frac{\delta^{n-1}\lambda_{j_{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(\alpha)},t^{(\alpha)})}{\delta u_{j_{1}}\ldots\delta u_{j_{\alpha-1}}\delta u_{j_{\alpha+1}}\ldots\delta u_{j_{n}}}.$$
(A5)

We average both sides of the above and use the Furutsu-Novikov theorem (equation 3.1) to write

$$\left\langle \frac{\delta^{n}\lambda_{i}(\boldsymbol{x},t)}{\delta u_{j_{1}}\ldots\delta u_{j_{n}}} \right\rangle$$

$$= -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}\int d\boldsymbol{q}d\boldsymbol{x}'dt'\int_{\max(t^{(1)},\ldots,t^{(n)})}^{t}d\tau G(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \left\langle u_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)u_{a}(\boldsymbol{x}',t')\right\rangle \left\langle \frac{\delta^{n+1}\lambda_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\delta u_{a}(\boldsymbol{x}',t')\delta u_{j_{1}}\ldots\delta u_{j_{n}}} \right\rangle$$

$$-\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}G(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{x}^{(\alpha)},t^{(\alpha)})\Theta(t-t^{(\alpha)}) \left\langle \frac{\delta^{n-1}\lambda_{j_{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(\alpha)},t^{(\alpha)})}{\delta u_{j_{\alpha-1}}\delta u_{j_{\alpha+1}}\ldots\delta u_{j_{n}}} \right\rangle.$$
(A 6)

 \dagger One might be confused about why there is no 1/n! or similar term on the RHS, but one can confirm this is correct by considering a functional $\int A(x_1, x_2) dx_1 dx_2$ and comparing it with the Taylor series expansion for a functional (e.g. Novikov 1965, eq. 2.4).

.

By taking causality into account $(\delta \lambda(t) / \delta u(t') = 0$ if t' > t) we can write the above more compactly as

$$\left\langle \frac{\delta^{n}\lambda_{i}(\boldsymbol{x},t)}{\delta u_{j_{1}}\ldots\delta u_{j_{n}}} \right\rangle = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}\int d\boldsymbol{q}d\boldsymbol{x}'dt'd\tau G^{c}(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \left\langle u_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)u_{a}(\boldsymbol{x}',t')\right\rangle \left\langle \frac{\delta^{n+1}\lambda_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\delta u_{a}(\boldsymbol{x}',t')\delta u_{j_{1}}\ldots\delta u_{j_{n}}} \right\rangle - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}}G^{c}(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{x}^{(\alpha)},t^{(\alpha)}) \left\langle \frac{\delta^{n-1}\lambda_{j_{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(\alpha)},t^{(\alpha)})}{\delta u_{j_{1}}\ldots\delta u_{j_{\alpha-1}}\delta u_{j_{\alpha+1}}\ldots\delta u_{j_{n}}} \right\rangle.$$
(A7)

Note the superscript 'c' on the Green function, which denotes that it has been made causal $(G^{c}(x,t|x',t') = 0 \text{ if } t' > t; G(x,t|x',t') \text{ otherwise}).$

Appendix B. Coefficients that depend on the temporal correlation function

Our results depend on the form of the temporal correlation function of the velocity field only through the following coefficients:

$$g_{1} \equiv \frac{1}{\tau_{c}} \int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' \int_{-\infty}^{t'} dt_{1} \int_{-\infty}^{t_{1}} dt_{2} \mathfrak{D}^{(t-t_{1})} \mathfrak{D}^{(t'-t_{2})}$$
(B1a)

$$g_{2} \equiv \frac{1}{\tau_{c}} \int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' \int_{-\infty}^{t'} dt_{2} \int_{-\infty}^{t_{2}} dt_{1} \mathfrak{D}^{(t-t_{1})} \mathfrak{D}^{(t'-t_{2})} .$$
 (B 1*b*)

The values of these coefficients depend on the form of the temporal correlation function (table 1). Regardless of the form of the temporal correlation function, they satisfy the identity (Gopalakrishnan & Singh 2024, appendix C)

$$g_1 + g_2 = \frac{1}{4} \,. \tag{B2}$$

Appendix C. Velocity correlations for locally isotropic, weakly inhomogeneous turbulence

C.1. The equal-time correlation in Fourier-space

We define the Fourier transform as

$$\tilde{f}(\boldsymbol{k}) = \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^3 x}{(2\pi)^3} e^{-i\boldsymbol{k}\cdot\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x})$$
(C1)

and the two-point correlation of the Fourier transformed velocity field as $V_{ij}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{K}, t) \equiv \langle \tilde{u}_i(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{K} + \mathbf{k}, t)\tilde{u}_j(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{K} - \mathbf{k}, t) \rangle$. If \mathbf{k}_1 and \mathbf{k}_2 denote the Fourier conjugates of the two positions between which the correlation is taken, $\mathbf{K} \equiv \mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2$, and $\mathbf{k} \equiv (\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2)/2$. We interpret \mathbf{K} as the 'large scale' wavevector, and \mathbf{k} as the 'small scale' wavevector. According to the notion of weak inhomogeneity introduced by Roberts & Soward (1975), one Taylor-expands this double correlation function function as a series in \mathbf{K} ; assumes the lowest-order (\mathbf{K} -independent) terms are identical to those for homogeneous and isotropic turbulence (Moffatt 1978, eq. 7.56; Lesieur 2008, eq. 5.84); assumes that the higher-order terms only depend on the energy and helicity spectra (along with \mathbf{k} and \mathbf{K}); and discards $O(\mathbf{K}^2)$ terms. Requiring

the velocity field to be incompressible then leads to

$$\begin{aligned} V_{ij}(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{K},t) &= \mathrm{P}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{k})E(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{K},t) - \frac{i}{k^2}\epsilon_{ijc}k_cF(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{K},t) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2k^2}\left(k_j\delta_{ik} - k_i\delta_{jk}\right)K_kE(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{K},t) \\ &+ \frac{i}{2k^4}\left(k_i\epsilon_{jck} + k_j\epsilon_{ick}\right)k_cK_kF(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{K},t) + O(K^2) \,. \end{aligned}$$

C.2. Equal-time single-point correlations in real space

C.2.1. An example

As an example, we demonstrate how one can use equation C 2 to derive an expression for $\langle u_i u_j \rangle$ (an equal-time single-point correlation). We start from

$$\langle u_i(\mathbf{x})u_j(\mathbf{x})\rangle = \int d^3p d^3q \, e^{i(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q})\cdot\mathbf{x}} \langle \tilde{u}_i(\mathbf{q})\tilde{u}_j(\mathbf{p})\rangle .$$
 (C3)

Defining $K \equiv p + q$ and $k \equiv \frac{1}{2} (p - q)$,

$$\langle u_i(\mathbf{x})u_j(\mathbf{x})\rangle = \int \mathrm{d}^3 K \mathrm{d}^3 k \ e^{i\mathbf{K}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \left\langle \tilde{u}_i(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{k})\tilde{u}_j(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{K}+\mathbf{k})\right\rangle .$$
 (C4)

Using equation C2,

$$\left\langle u_{i}(\boldsymbol{x})u_{j}(\boldsymbol{x})\right\rangle = \int \mathrm{d}^{3}Kk^{2}\mathrm{d}k\mathrm{d}\Omega_{k} e^{i\boldsymbol{K}\cdot\boldsymbol{x}} \left(\mathrm{P}_{ji}(\boldsymbol{k})E(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{K},t) - \frac{i}{k^{2}}\epsilon_{jic}k_{c}F(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{K},t) - \frac{1}{2k^{2}}k_{j}K_{i}E(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{K},t) + \frac{1}{2k^{2}}k_{i}K_{j}E(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{K},t) - \frac{i}{k^{2}}\epsilon_{jic}k_{c}F(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{K},t) + \frac{i}{2k^{4}}k_{i}\epsilon_{jc}k_{c}K_{c}F(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{K},t) + \frac{i}{2k^{4}}k_{i}\epsilon_{jcd}k_{c}K_{d}F(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{K},t) + \frac{i}{2k^{4}}k_{i}\epsilon_{jcd}k_{c}K_{d}F(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{K},t) \right).$$

$$(C5)$$

Angular integrals over products of k can be evaluated by noting that the result has to be an isotropic tensor (and so needs to be constructed using δ_{ij} and ϵ_{ijk} , e.g. Kearsley & Fong 1975) and must be consistent with the symmetries of the integrand:

$$\int \mathrm{d}\Omega \, k_i = 0 \tag{C 6}$$

$$\int \mathrm{d}\Omega \, k_i k_j = \frac{4\pi k^2}{3} \delta_{ij} \tag{C7}$$

$$\int \mathrm{d}\Omega \, k_i k_j k_m = 0 \tag{C8}$$

$$\int d\Omega k_i k_j k_m k_n = \frac{4\pi k^4}{15} \left(\delta_{ij} \delta_{mn} + \delta_{im} \delta_{jn} + \delta_{in} \delta_{jm} \right) . \tag{C9}$$

Using these, equation C 5 can be written as

$$\langle u_i(\mathbf{x})u_j(\mathbf{x})\rangle = \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ji}\langle u^2(\mathbf{x},t)\rangle$$
 (C10)

The steps to derive the other expressions that follow are similar to those above, so we shall omit the intermediate steps and just state the results.

C.2.2. Results

$$\left\langle u_{i}u_{j}\right\rangle =\frac{1}{3}\delta_{ji}\left\langle u^{2}\right\rangle +O(\partial^{2}) \tag{C11}$$

$$\left\langle u_i \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k} \right\rangle = \left[\frac{1}{6} \delta_{ij} \partial_k + \frac{1}{12} \left(\delta_{ik} \partial_j - \delta_{jk} \partial_i \right) \right] \left\langle u^2 \right\rangle - \frac{1}{6} \epsilon_{ijk} h + O(\partial^2)$$
(C12)

$$\langle u_i \partial_a \partial_b u_j \rangle = \frac{1}{12} \epsilon_{jia} \partial_b h + \frac{1}{12} \epsilon_{jib} \partial_a h + \left(\frac{1}{30} \left[\delta_{ai} \delta_{bj} + \delta_{aj} \delta_{bi} \right] - \frac{2}{15} \delta_{ab} \delta_{ij} \right) \langle \omega^2 \rangle$$

$$- \frac{1}{60} \left(2 \delta_{ab} \epsilon_{ijk} + \delta_{jb} \epsilon_{iak} + \delta_{aj} \epsilon_{ibk} + \delta_{ib} \epsilon_{jak} + \delta_{ai} \epsilon_{jbk} \right) \partial_k h + O(\partial^2)$$
(C 13)

$$\left\langle u_i \partial_a \nabla^2 u_j \right\rangle = \left(-\frac{1}{20} \delta_{ai} \partial_j + \frac{7}{60} \delta_{aj} \partial_i - \frac{3}{10} \delta_{ij} \partial_a \right) \left\langle \omega^2 \right\rangle - \frac{1}{6} \epsilon_{jia} \mathcal{L} + O(\partial^2) \tag{C14}$$

where $\omega \equiv \nabla \times u$; $h \equiv \langle u \cdot \omega \rangle$; and $\mathcal{L} \equiv \langle \omega \cdot (\nabla \times \omega) \rangle$. We have also used the relations $\langle \omega^2 \rangle (\mathbf{R}, t) = \int 8\pi k^4 E(k, \mathbf{R}, t) dk$ (Moffatt 1978, eq. 7.51); and $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{R}, t) = \int dk \, 8\pi k^4 F(k, \mathbf{R}, t)$. Aside, we note that the expression given by Gopalakrishnan & Subramanian (2023, eq. A16) for $\langle u_i \partial_a \nabla^2 u_j \rangle$ is wrong.[†]

C.3. Generalization to unequal-time correlations

Assuming the velocity correlations are separable (equation 3.15), the results in appendix C.2 can be easily generalized as

$$C_{ij} = \frac{2}{3}\delta_{ij}E\tag{C15}$$

$$C_{ijk} = \frac{1}{6} \epsilon_{ikj} H + \left[\frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \partial_k + \frac{1}{6} \left(\delta_{ik} \partial_j - \delta_{jk} \partial_i \right) \right] E$$
(C16)

$$C_{ijkk} = -\frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij}N - \frac{1}{6}\epsilon_{ija}\partial_a H$$
(C17)

$$C_{ijab} = \left(\frac{1}{30} \left[\delta_{ai}\delta_{bj} + \delta_{aj}\delta_{bi}\right] - \frac{2}{15}\delta_{ab}\delta_{ij}\right)N + \frac{1}{12}\epsilon_{jia}\partial_bH + \frac{1}{12}\epsilon_{jib}\partial_aH$$
(C18)

$$-\frac{1}{60}\left(2\delta_{ab}\epsilon_{ijk}+\delta_{jb}\epsilon_{iak}+\delta_{aj}\epsilon_{ibk}+\delta_{ib}\epsilon_{jak}+\delta_{ai}\epsilon_{jbk}\right)\partial_{k}H$$

$$1\left(1,1,2,3,3,3,3,1\right)$$

$$C_{ijabb} = -\frac{1}{6}\epsilon_{jia}L + \left(-\frac{1}{20}\delta_{ai}\partial_j + \frac{7}{60}\delta_{aj}\partial_i - \frac{3}{10}\delta_{ij}\partial_a\right)N$$
(C19)

where E, H, and N are defined in equations 3.19, and L is defined in equation 4.21.

Appendix D. Simplification of the $O(\tau_c)$ corrections to the evolution equation for the mean passive scalar

We now simplify the terms on the RHS of equation 3.14.

D.1. The first higher-order term

Let us assume $\kappa = 0$ (this corresponds to neglecting $O(\kappa \tau_c)$ terms in the final evolution equation for Φ). We then have $G^c(\mathbf{x}, t | \mathbf{q}, \tau) = \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}) \Theta(t - \tau)$. For convenience, we will

† This can be checked by setting i = a in equation C 14 and comparing it with $\partial_i \langle u_i \nabla^2 u_j \rangle$ calculated using equation C 13 (which is the same as eq. A13 of Gopalakrishnan & Subramanian 2023).

use superscripts on the velocity fields to denote which ones are connected by averaging, such that velocity variables with matching superscripts are connected by averaging (e.g. $\langle uu \rangle \rightarrow u^{(1)}u^{(1)}$). Denoting $\oint \ldots \equiv \int d\tau_1 d\tau_2 d\tau_3 \Theta(\tau_1 - \tau_3) \Theta(t - \tau_2) \Theta(\tau_2 - \tau_1) \ldots$; assuming the velocity field is incompressible; and integrating by parts as required, we write

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{i}_{1}\mathbf{i}_{1}}}{\mathbf{A}_{i}(\mathbf{I}_{1}\mathbf{i}_{1})} & \partial_{i}(\mathbf{I}_{1}\mathbf{I}_{1}\mathbf{i}_{2}) \left[2i_{2}3i_{3}}{\mathbf{A}_{i}^{(2)}} \partial_{i}(2|1)\partial_{i_{1}}(1|3) \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}}\mathbf{G} \right\rangle \right) & (D 1) \\ = -\frac{\mathbf{A}_{i}\mathbf{I}_{i_{1}}}{\mathbf{A}_{i}^{(\mathbf{I})}} \partial_{i}^{c}(\mathbf{A}_{1}|2) \left[2i_{2}3i_{3}}{\mathbf{A}_{i}^{(2)}} \partial_{i}^{c}(2|1)\delta_{i_{1}}^{(1)}G^{c}(1|3) \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}}\mathbf{G} \right\rangle \right) \\ & \times \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(q^{(2)}, \tau_{2})u_{i_{3}}(q^{(3)}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \frac{\partial \delta(q^{(2)} - q^{(1)})}{\partial q^{(2)}_{i_{2}}} \frac{\partial \delta(q^{(1)} - q^{(3)})}{\partial q^{(1)}_{i_{1}}} & (D 2) \\ & \times \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}}(q^{(3)}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \right] \\ = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint u_{i}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}, t) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_{2}}} \left(u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1})u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2}) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_{1}}} \left[u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \right] \right) & (D 3) \\ = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t) \frac{\partial u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1})}{\partial x_{i_{2}}} \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2}) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{1}}} \right\rangle \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \\ & -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t)u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2}) \frac{\partial^{2} u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{1}}} \right\rangle \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \\ & -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t)u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2})u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \frac{\partial \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}\right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{1}}} \\ & -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t)u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2})u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \frac{\partial \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}\right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{1}}} \\ & -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t)u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2})u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \frac{\partial \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}\right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{1}}} \\ & -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t)u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2})u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \frac{\partial^{2} \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}\right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{1}}} \\ & -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t)u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2})u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \frac{\partial^{2} \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}\right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{1}}} \\ & -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t)u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2})u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \frac{\partial^{2} \left\langle$$

D.2. The second higher-order term

Denoting $\oint \ldots \equiv \int d\tau_1 d\tau_2 d\tau_3 \Theta(t - \tau_2) \Theta(\tau_2 - \tau_3) \Theta(\tau_3 - \tau_1) \ldots$ and following similar steps, we simplify the other term as follows.

$$- \left[\underbrace{\mathbf{\mathfrak{H}}_{i} \mathbf{1}_{i_{1}}}{\mathbf{D}_{i}} \underbrace{\mathbf{\mathfrak{O}}_{i}(\mathbf{\mathfrak{H}}|2)}{\mathbf{2}_{i_{2}} \mathbf{3}_{i_{3}}} \underbrace{\mathbf{D}}_{i_{2}}(2|3) \underbrace{\mathbf{D}}_{i_{3}}(3|1) \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}}(\underline{\mathbf{D}} \right\rangle \right) \\ = - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t) \frac{\partial u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1})}{\partial x_{i_{3}}} \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2}) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{2}}} \right\rangle \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle \\ - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2}) u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t) \frac{\partial^{2} u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1})}{\partial x_{i_{3}} \partial x_{i_{2}}} \right\rangle \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle \\ - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2}) u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t) \frac{\partial u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1})}{\partial x_{i_{3}}} \right\rangle \frac{\partial \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{3}}} \\ - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2}) u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t) u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle \frac{\partial \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{3}}} \\ - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2}) u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t) \frac{\partial u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1})}{\partial x_{i_{2}}} \right\rangle \frac{\partial \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{3}}} \\ - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2}) u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t) u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle \frac{\partial^{2} \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{3}}} \\ - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2}) u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t) u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle \frac{\partial^{2} \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{3}}} \\ - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \oint \left\langle u_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2}) u_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{3}) \right\rangle \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t) u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle \frac{\partial^{2} \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{1}) \right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{3}} \partial x_{i_{2}}} .$$

D.3. Taylor expansion of the quasilinear term

Expanding $\langle \lambda_i \rangle$ as indicated in equation 2.14 allows us to evaluate the contributions arising from the first term on the RHS of equation 3.14, neglecting $O(\tau_c^2)$ terms:

$$- \underbrace{\mathbf{\mathfrak{F}}_{i}\mathbf{1}_{i_{1}}}_{i_{1}} \supseteq_{i}(\mathbf{\mathfrak{F}}|1) \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{\tilde{1}}) \right\rangle$$

$$= -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \int_{-\infty}^{t} d\tau \int dq \,\delta(\mathbf{x} - q) \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t)u_{j}(q, \tau) \right\rangle \frac{\partial \Phi(q, t)}{\partial q_{j}} \qquad (D 6)$$

$$- \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \int_{-\infty}^{t} d\tau \int dq \,\delta(\mathbf{x} - q) \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t)u_{j}(q, \tau) \right\rangle (\tau - t) \frac{\partial^{2} \Phi(q, t)}{\partial q_{j} \partial t}$$

$$= -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \int_{-\infty}^{t} d\tau \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t)u_{j}(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \right\rangle \frac{\partial \Phi(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial x_{j}}$$

$$- \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \int_{-\infty}^{t} d\tau \int_{-\infty}^{t} d\tau_{2} \left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x}, t)u_{j}(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \right\rangle (\tau - t) \qquad (D 7)$$

$$\times \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j} \partial x_{k}} \left(\left\langle u_{k}(\mathbf{x}, t)u_{l}(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{2}) \right\rangle \frac{\partial \Phi(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial x_{l}} \right)$$

where we have used equations 2.2 and 2.8 (discarding κ as before).

D.4. Further simplification assuming separable correlations

To simplify the expressions obtained above, we assume the velocity correlations are separable (equation 3.15). From now on, we will discard terms which have more than two derivatives of the mean scalar (recall that $\langle \lambda_i \rangle = \partial_i \Phi$). The temporal integrals over the correlation functions in the terms of interest can be written in terms of the constants g_1 and g_2 , defined in equations B 1. We write equation D4 as (omitting spatial and temporal arguments since

they are the same for all terms)

$$- \underbrace{\mathbf{\mathfrak{F}}_{i} \mathbf{1}_{i_{1}}}_{i_{1}} \partial_{i} (\mathbf{\mathfrak{F}}|2) \underbrace{\mathbf{2}_{i_{2}} \mathbf{3}_{i_{3}}}_{i_{2}} \partial_{i_{2}} (2|1) \partial_{i_{1}} (1|3) \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}} \right\rangle \right\rangle \\ = -\tau_{c} g_{1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left(C_{ii_{1}i_{2}} C_{i_{2}i_{3}i_{1}} \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}} \right\rangle \right) - \tau_{c} g_{1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left(C_{ii_{1}} C_{i_{2},i_{3},i_{1},i_{2}} \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}} \right\rangle \right) \\ - \tau_{c} g_{1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left(C_{ii_{1}} C_{i_{2}i_{3}i_{1}} \frac{\partial \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}} \right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{2}}} \right) - \tau_{c} g_{1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left(C_{ii_{1}i_{2}} C_{i_{2}i_{3}} \frac{\partial \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}} \right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{1}}} \right)$$
(D8)
$$- \tau_{c} g_{1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left(C_{ii_{1}} C_{i_{2}i_{3}i_{2}} \frac{\partial \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}} \right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{1}}} \right).$$

Similarly, equation D 5 becomes

$$- \underbrace{\mathbf{\Psi}_{i} \mathbf{1}_{i_{1}}}_{i_{1}} \partial_{i} (\mathbf{\Psi}|2) \underbrace{\mathbf{2}_{i_{2}} \mathbf{3}_{i_{3}}}_{i_{2}} \partial_{i_{2}} (2|3) \partial_{i_{3}} (3|1) \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}} \right\rangle$$

$$= -\tau_{c} g_{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left(C_{ii_{1}i_{3}} C_{i_{2}i_{3}i_{2}} \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}} \right\rangle \right) - \tau_{c} g_{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left(C_{i_{2}i_{3}} C_{ii_{1}i_{3}i_{2}} \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}} \right\rangle \right)$$

$$- \tau_{c} g_{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left(C_{i_{2}i_{3}} C_{ii_{1}i_{3}} \frac{\partial \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}} \right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{2}}} \right) - \tau_{c} g_{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left(C_{i_{2}i_{3}i_{2}} C_{ii_{1}} \frac{\partial \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}} \right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{3}}} \right)$$

$$- \tau_{c} g_{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left(C_{i_{2}i_{3}} C_{ii_{1}i_{2}} \frac{\partial \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}} \right\rangle}{\partial x_{i_{3}}} \right).$$

$$(D 9)$$

We will now simplify the above using expressions from appendix C.3 and keeping only up to one derivative of the turbulent quantities (E, H, and N), i.e. we will neglect terms like $\nabla^2 E$ or $(\nabla E)^2$. Equation D 8 becomes

$$- \underbrace{\mathbf{\mathfrak{F}}_{i}}_{1i_{1}} \underbrace{\partial_{i}(\mathbf{\mathfrak{F}}|2)}_{2i_{2}} \underbrace{2_{i_{2}}}_{3i_{3}} \underbrace{\partial_{i_{2}}(2|1)}_{2i_{1}}(1|3) \left\langle \lambda_{i_{3}} \underbrace{3} \right\rangle$$
$$= - \frac{\tau_{c}g_{1}}{18} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left[H^{2} \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x_{i}} \right].$$
(D 10)

Equation **D**9 becomes

$$- \underbrace{\mathbf{\mathfrak{K}}_{i} \mathbf{1}_{i_{1}}}_{9} \partial_{i} (\mathbf{\mathfrak{K}}|2) \underbrace{\mathbf{2}_{i_{2}} \mathbf{3}_{i_{3}}}_{9} \partial_{i_{2}} (2|3) \partial_{i_{3}} (3|1) \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}} \right\rangle$$

$$= \frac{2\tau_{c} g_{2}}{9} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left[EN \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x_{i}} \right].$$
(D 11)

Equation D7 becomes

$$- \left[\mathbf{\Psi}_{i} \mathbf{1}_{i_{1}} \right] \partial_{i} (\mathbf{\Psi}|1) \left\langle \lambda_{i_{1}} \right\rangle = - \frac{1}{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left[E \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x_{i}} \right]. \tag{D12}$$

One might get additional terms on keeping two spatial derivatives of the turbulent quantities, but for that, we would need expressions like those in appendix C.3 up to the same order.

Appendix E. *n*-th functional derivative of *B*

Following a similar procedure to that used in appendix A, we wish to derive an expression for the *n*-th functional derivative of **B** with respect to **u**. Denoting $\tilde{B}_i \equiv B_i[u_m + \epsilon \chi_m]$ (where

 χ_m is some test function), we may use equation 4.4 to write

$$\tilde{B}_{i}(\boldsymbol{x},t) = \int \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q} \, G^{c}(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \, \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{klm} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_{j}} \left[\left(u_{l}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) + \epsilon \chi_{l}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \right) \tilde{B}_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \right] \,. \tag{E1}$$

Differentiating *n* times and setting $\epsilon = 0$, we obtain

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^{n}\tilde{B}_{i}(\boldsymbol{x},t)}{\mathrm{d}\epsilon^{n}}\Big|_{\epsilon=0} = -\int \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q} \,\epsilon_{ijk}\epsilon_{klm} \frac{\partial G^{c}(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\partial q_{j}} \,u_{l}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \,\frac{\mathrm{d}^{n}\tilde{B}_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\mathrm{d}\epsilon^{n}}\Big|_{\epsilon=0} \\ -n\int \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q} \,\epsilon_{ijk}\epsilon_{klm} \frac{\partial G^{c}(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\partial q_{j}} \,\chi_{l}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau) \,\frac{\mathrm{d}^{n-1}\tilde{B}_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\mathrm{d}\epsilon^{n-1}}\Big|_{\epsilon=0} \,.$$
(E2)

Note that we have integrated by parts to shift the spatial derivative onto the Green function. The functional derivatives of B_i are then related by (where we use the notation $u_{j_i} \equiv$ $u_{j_i}(x^{(i)}, t^{(i)}))$

$$\frac{\delta^{n}B_{i}(\boldsymbol{x},t)}{\delta u_{i_{1}}\ldots\delta u_{i_{n}}} = -\int d\tau d\boldsymbol{q} \,\epsilon_{ijk}\epsilon_{klm} \frac{\partial G^{c}(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\partial q_{j}}u_{l}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)\frac{\delta^{n}B_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\delta u_{i_{1}}\ldots\delta u_{i_{n}}} \\
-\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n}\epsilon_{ijk}\epsilon_{ki_{\alpha}m}\frac{\partial G^{c}(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{x}^{(\alpha)},t^{(\alpha)})}{\partial x_{j}^{(\alpha)}}\frac{\delta^{n-1}B_{m}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(\alpha)},t^{(\alpha)})}{\delta u_{i_{1}}\ldots\delta u_{i_{\alpha-1}}\delta u_{i_{\alpha+1}}\ldots\delta u_{i_{n}}}.$$
(E3)

Averaging both sides of the above and applying the Furutsu-Novikov theorem, we obtain

$$\left\langle \frac{\delta^{n}B_{i}(\boldsymbol{x},t)}{\delta u_{i_{1}}\dots\delta u_{i_{n}}} \right\rangle = -\int d\tau d\boldsymbol{q} d\boldsymbol{x}^{(n+1)} dt^{(n+1)} \left[\epsilon_{ijk}\epsilon_{klm} \frac{\partial G^{c}(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\partial q_{j}} \right. \\ \left. \times \left\langle u_{l}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)u_{i_{n+1}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(n+1)},t^{(n+1)}) \right\rangle \left\langle \frac{\delta^{n+1}B_{m}(\boldsymbol{q},\tau)}{\delta u_{i_{1}}\dots\delta u_{i_{n}}\delta u_{i_{n+1}}} \right\rangle \right] \\ \left. - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n} \epsilon_{ijk}\epsilon_{ki_{\alpha}m} \frac{\partial G^{c}(\boldsymbol{x},t|\boldsymbol{x}^{(\alpha)},t^{(\alpha)})}{\partial x_{j}^{(\alpha)}} \left\langle \frac{\delta^{n-1}B_{m}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(\alpha)},t^{(\alpha)})}{\delta u_{i_{1}}\dots\delta u_{i_{\alpha+1}}\delta u_{i_{\alpha+1}}\dots\delta u_{i_{n}}} \right\rangle.$$
(E 4)

Appendix F. Simplification of the EMF retaining $O(\tau_c)$ terms

For simplicity, we assume $\eta = 0$, in which case the diffusion Green function becomes a positional Dirac delta.⁺

F.1. Quasilinear term

We write (neglecting $O(\tau_c^2)$ terms)

† Note that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x)g(y)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\delta(x-y) dx$ should be evaluated as -f'(y)g(y), and not $-\frac{\partial}{\partial y}[f(y)g(y)]$. ‡ We are not Taylor-expanding the Green function since we plan to set $\eta = 0$, where we have $G(\boldsymbol{x}, t | \boldsymbol{q}, \tau) = \delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{q}) \,\Theta(t - \tau).$

We recall that neglecting $O(\tau_c)$ terms and setting $\eta = 0$, one can write (equations 4.16 and 4.2)

$$\frac{\partial B_a}{\partial t} = \epsilon_{abc} \left(-\frac{H}{6} \partial_b \overline{B}_c - \frac{E}{3} \epsilon_{cde} \partial_b \partial_d \overline{B}_e \right) \,. \tag{F2}$$

Using this and dropping terms with more than one spatial derivative of \overline{B} , we write

$$\begin{split} \overline{\mathbf{\Psi}}_{i1_{i_{1}}} & \supseteq_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{\Psi}|1)\overline{B}_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{I}) \\ &= \overline{\mathbf{\Psi}}_{i1_{i_{1}}} \supseteq_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{\Psi}|1)\overline{B}_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x}^{(1)},t) \\ &- \overline{\mathbf{\Psi}}_{i1_{i_{1}}} \supseteq_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{\Psi}|1)\left(t^{(1)}-t\right)\epsilon_{i_{3}bc}\frac{H}{6}\frac{\partial\overline{B}_{c}(\mathbf{x}^{(1)},t)}{\partial x_{b}^{(1)}} \\ &= -\int_{t^{(1)}}\left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x},t)\frac{\partial u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x},t^{(1)})}{\partial x_{i_{2}}}\right\rangle \Theta(t-t^{(1)})\overline{B}_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x},t) \\ &- \int_{t^{(1)}}\left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x},t)u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x},t^{(1)})\right\rangle \Theta(t-t^{(1)})\frac{\partial\overline{B}_{i_{3}}(\mathbf{x},t)}{\partial x_{i_{2}}} \\ &- \frac{H}{6}\epsilon_{i_{3}bc}\int_{t^{(1)}}\left\langle u_{i}(\mathbf{x},t)\frac{\partial u_{i_{1}}(\mathbf{x},t^{(1)})}{\partial x_{i_{2}}}\right\rangle \Theta(t-t^{(1)})\left(t^{(1)}-t\right)\frac{\partial\overline{B}_{c}(\mathbf{x},t)}{\partial x_{b}} \,. \end{split}$$
(F3)

Assuming the velocity correlation is separable (equation 3.15), we write

$$\mathbf{\underline{H}}_{i1i_{1}} \overline{\partial}_{i_{2}}(\mathbf{\underline{H}}|1)\overline{B}_{i_{3}} = -\frac{1}{2}C_{ii_{1}i_{2}}\overline{B}_{i_{3}} - \frac{1}{2}C_{ii_{1}}\frac{\partial B_{i_{3}}}{\partial x_{i_{2}}} + \frac{\tau_{c}H}{12}\epsilon_{i_{3}bc}C_{ii_{1}i_{2}}\frac{\partial B_{c}}{\partial x_{b}}.$$
 (F5)

Using the results of appendix C.3, we then write the contribution to the EMF ($\mathcal{E}_k = \epsilon_{kij} \langle V_i B_j \rangle$) as

$$-\epsilon_{kij}\Upsilon_{ji_2i_1i_3}\left[\mathbf{\mathfrak{H}}_{i1}\mathbf{1}_{i_1}\right] \supset_{i_2}(\mathbf{\mathfrak{H}}|1)\overline{B}_{i_3}(1) = -\frac{H}{6}B_k + \left(\frac{E}{3} - \frac{H^2\tau_c}{36}\right)\epsilon_{kr_0r_1}B_{r_0,r_1} \tag{F6}$$

where we have used a comma to denote differentiation.

F.2. First higher-order term

Denoting $\oint \ldots \equiv \int d\tau_1 d\tau_2 \tau_3 \Theta(t - \tau_2) \Theta(\tau_2 - \tau_3) \Theta(\tau_3 - \tau_1)$; dropping terms involving more than one spatial derivative of \overline{B} ; † and assuming we are only interested in homogeneous

turbulence, we write

$$\begin{split} \overline{\mathbf{\Psi}_{i}}_{i1_{1}} & \supseteq_{j_{3}}(\mathbf{\Psi}|2) \ \underline{2_{i_{2}}}_{i_{3}} \ \supseteq_{i_{4}}(2|3) \supseteq_{i_{6}}(3|1) \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(1) \\ &= -\oint u_{i}^{(1)}(t) u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{4}}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j_{3}}} \left[\frac{\partial u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(\tau_{1}) \right] \\ &- \oint u_{i}^{(1)}(t) u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3}) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j_{3}}} \left[\frac{\partial^{2} u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{i_{6}} \partial x_{i_{4}}} \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(\tau_{1}) \right] \\ &- \oint u_{i}^{(1)}(t) u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3}) \frac{\partial^{2} u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{i_{6}} \partial x_{j_{3}}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{i_{4}}} \\ &- \oint u_{i}^{(1)}(t) u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{4}}} \frac{\partial^{2} u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{j_{3}}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} \\ &- \oint u_{i}^{(1)}(t) u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3}) \frac{\partial^{2} u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{i_{4}} \partial x_{j_{3}}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} \end{split}$$

where, since the position argument in all the terms of the final expression is x, we have not indicated it explicitly. Above, as long as one is willing to ignore $O(\tau_c^2)$ terms, one can replace the time arguments of all occurrences of \overline{B} by t. Assuming the correlation of the velocity field is separable (equation 3.15), we can write

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{\Psi}_{i1i_{1}} & \supset_{j_{3}}(\mathbf{\Psi}|2) \ \boxed{2_{i_{2}}3_{i_{3}}} \ \bigcirc_{i_{4}}(2|3) \bigcirc_{i_{6}}(3|1) \overline{B}_{i_{7}} \textcircled{1} \\ &= -\tau_{c}g_{2}C_{ii_{1}j_{3}i_{6}}C_{i_{2}i_{3}i_{4}}\overline{B}_{i_{7}} - \tau_{c}g_{2}C_{ii_{1}i_{6}}C_{i_{2}i_{3}i_{4}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}}{\partial x_{j_{3}}} \\ &- \tau_{c}g_{2}C_{ii_{1}j_{3}i_{6}i_{4}}C_{i_{2}i_{3}}\overline{B}_{i_{7}} - \tau_{c}g_{2}C_{ii_{1}i_{6}i_{4}}C_{i_{2}i_{3}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}}{\partial x_{j_{3}}} \\ &- \tau_{c}g_{2}C_{ii_{1}i_{6}j_{3}}C_{i_{2}i_{3}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}}{\partial x_{i_{4}}} - \tau_{c}g_{2}C_{ii_{1}j_{3}}C_{i_{2}i_{3}i_{4}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} \\ &- \tau_{c}g_{2}C_{ii_{1}i_{4}j_{3}}C_{i_{2}i_{3}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} \end{split}$$
(F8)

where g_2 is defined in equation B 1. Using expressions for the tensors $C_{ij...}$ from appendix C.3, we write the contribution to the EMF ($\mathcal{E}_k = \epsilon_{kij} \langle V_i B_j \rangle$) as

$$-\epsilon_{kij}\Upsilon_{i_{5}i_{6}i_{1}i_{7}}\Upsilon_{j_{j_{3}i_{2}j_{2}}}\Upsilon_{j_{2}i_{4}i_{3}i_{5}} \underbrace{\mathbf{\mathfrak{K}}_{i}1_{i_{1}}}_{9} \partial_{j_{3}}(\mathbf{\mathfrak{K}}|2) \underbrace{2_{i_{2}}3_{i_{3}}}_{2_{i_{4}}(2|3)\partial_{i_{6}}(3|1)\overline{B}_{i_{7}}}_{i_{7}(1)}$$

$$= -\left(\frac{2\tau_{c}ENg_{2}}{9} + \frac{\tau_{c}H^{2}g_{2}}{9}\right)\epsilon_{kr_{0}r_{1}}B_{r_{0},r_{1}} + \left(\frac{2\tau_{c}ELg_{2}}{9} + \frac{\tau_{c}HNg_{2}}{9}\right)B_{k}.$$
(F9)

F.3. Second higher-order term

Denoting $\oint \ldots \equiv \int d\tau_1 d\tau_2 \tau_3 \ \Theta(t - \tau_2) \ \Theta(\tau_2 - \tau_1) \ \Theta(\tau_1 - \tau_3) \ldots$; dropping terms with more than one spatial derivative of \overline{B} ; and assuming we are interested in homogeneous turbulence,

we write

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{F}_{i1_{i_{1}}} & \supset_{j_{3}}(\mathbf{F}|2) \ \boxed{2_{i_{2}}3_{i_{3}}} \ \bigcirc_{i_{4}}(2|1) \bigcirc_{i_{6}}(1|3) \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(3) \\ &= -\oint u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} u_{i}^{(1)}(t) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j_{3}}} \left[\frac{\partial u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{i_{4}}} \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(\tau_{3}) \right] \\ &- \oint u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) \frac{\partial^{2} u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{6}} \partial x_{i_{4}}} u_{i}^{(1)}(t) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j_{3}}} \left[u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(\tau_{1}) \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(\tau_{3}) \right] \\ &- \oint u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} u_{i}^{(1)}(t) \frac{\partial u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{j_{3}}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{4}}} \end{split}$$
(F 10)
$$&- \oint u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(t) u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3}) \frac{\partial^{2} u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{i_{4}} \partial x_{j_{3}}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} \\ &- \oint u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{4}}} u_{i}^{(1)}(t) \frac{\partial u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{j_{3}}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} \\ &- \oint u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{4}}} u_{i}^{(1)}(t) \frac{\partial u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{j_{3}}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} \\ &- \oint u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{4}}} u_{i}^{(1)}(t) \frac{\partial u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{j_{3}}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} \\ &- \oint u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{4}}}} u_{i}^{(1)}(t) \frac{\partial u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{j_{3}}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} \\ &- \oint u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{4}}}} u_{i}^{(1)}(t) \frac{\partial u_{i_{1}}^{(1)}(\tau_{1})}{\partial x_{j_{3}}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} \\ &- \oint u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{4}}}} u_{i}^{(1)}(t) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}^{(1)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} \\ &- \oint u_{i_{2}}^{(2)}(\tau_{2}) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{4}}}} u_{i}^{(1)}(t) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}^{(1)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} \\ &- \oint u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3}) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{4}}}} u_{i}^{(1)}(t) \frac{\partial u_{i_{3}}^{(1)}(\tau_{3})}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} \\ &- \oint u_{i_{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_{3}) \frac{\partial u_{i_$$

Above, as long as one is willing to ignore $O(\tau_c^2)$ terms, one can replace the time arguments of all occurrences of \overline{B} by *t*. Assuming the correlation of the velocity field is separable (equation 3.15), we can write

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{\Psi}_{i1i_{1}} & \supseteq_{j_{3}}(\mathbf{\Psi}|2) \ \underline{2_{i_{2}}3_{i_{3}}} \ \overline{\partial}_{i_{4}}(2|1) \overline{\partial}_{i_{6}}(1|3) \overline{B}_{i_{7}}(3) \\ &= -\tau_{c}g_{1}C_{i_{2}i_{3}i_{6}}C_{ii_{1}i_{4}j_{3}} \overline{B}_{i_{7}} - \tau_{c}g_{1}C_{i_{2}i_{3}i_{6}}C_{ii_{1}i_{4}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}}{\partial x_{j_{3}}} \\ &- \tau_{c}g_{1}C_{i_{2}i_{3}i_{6}i_{4}}C_{ii_{1}j_{3}} \overline{B}_{i_{7}} - \tau_{c}g_{1}C_{i_{2}i_{3}i_{6}i_{4}}C_{ii_{1}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}}{\partial x_{j_{3}}} - \tau_{c}g_{1}C_{i_{2}i_{3}i_{6}i_{4}}C_{ii_{1}j_{3}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}}{\partial x_{i_{4}}} \end{split}$$
(F11)
$$&- \tau_{c}g_{1}C_{ii_{1}i_{4}j_{3}}C_{i_{2}i_{3}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} - \tau_{c}g_{1}C_{i_{2}i_{3}i_{4}}C_{ii_{1}j_{3}} \frac{\partial \overline{B}_{i_{7}}}{\partial x_{i_{6}}} \end{split}$$

where g_1 is defined in equation B 1. Using expressions for the tensors $C_{ij...}$ from appendix C.3, we write the contribution to the EMF ($\mathcal{E}_k = \epsilon_{kij} \langle V_i B_j \rangle$) as

$$-\epsilon_{kij} \Upsilon_{i_5 i_6 i_3 i_7} \Upsilon_{j j_3 i_2 j_2} \Upsilon_{j_2 i_4 i_1 i_5} \textcircled{\clubsuit}_{i_1 1_{i_1}} \Im_{j_3} (\oiint|2) \boxed{2_{i_2} 3_{i_3}} \Im_{i_4} (2|1) \Im_{i_6} (1|3) \overline{B}_{i_7} (3)$$

$$= -\left(\frac{\tau_c H^2 g_1}{18}\right) \epsilon_{kr_0 r_1} B_{r_0, r_1} .$$
(F12)