



HAL
open science

A laboratory model for iron snow in planetary cores

Ludovic Huguet, Michael Le Bars, Renaud Deguen

► **To cite this version:**

Ludovic Huguet, Michael Le Bars, Renaud Deguen. A laboratory model for iron snow in planetary cores. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 2023, 50 (24), 10.1029/2023GL105697 . hal-04761020

HAL Id: hal-04761020

<https://cnrs.hal.science/hal-04761020v1>

Submitted on 30 Oct 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

A laboratory model for iron snow in planetary cores

Ludovic Huguet^{1,2}, Michael Le Bars², Renaud Deguen¹

¹¹ ISTerre, Université Grenoble Alpes, Université Savoie Mont Blanc, CNRS, IRD, Université Gustave Eiffel, 38000 Grenoble, France

²² CNRS, Aix Marseille Univ, Centrale Marseille, IRPHE, Marseille, France

Key Points:

- We have carried out an experimental study of the dynamics of iron snow.
- Our experiments present crystallization cycles, with intense solidification bursts separated by quiet periods.
- This cyclic pattern is controlled by thermal diffusion and by the amount of supercooling required for crystallization.

Corresponding author: Ludovic Huguet, ludovic.huguet@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

Abstract

Solidification of the cores of small planets and moons is thought to occur in the ‘iron snow’ regime, in which iron crystals form near the core-mantle boundary and fall until re-melting at higher depth. The resulting buoyancy flux may sustain convection and dynamo action. This regime is poorly known, having never been observed in the field or laboratory. Here we present the first laboratory experiments designed to model iron snow. We find that solidification happens in a cyclic pattern, with intense solidification bursts separated by crystal-free periods. This is explained by the necessity of reaching a finite amount of supercooling to re-initiate crystallization once the crystals formed earlier have migrated away. When transposed to planetary cores, our results suggest that crystallization and the associated buoyancy flux would be strongly heterogeneous in time and space, which eventually impacts the time variability and geometry of the magnetic field.

Plain Language Summary

In small planets or moons with iron core, solidification proceeds from the top down, producing solid iron crystals at the top of the core. These crystals then fall down until they melt at deeper depth, where the temperature is larger. By analogy with snow in the atmosphere, this regime is called iron snow. It creates motions in the liquid core and provides energy for generating a magnetic field. But the key aspects of this regime remain largely unknown. Using analog laboratory experiments, we have found that solidification happens in a cyclic pattern, with periods of intense crystal formation followed by quiet periods with no crystals. This happens because crystallization needs a certain amount of cooling below the solidification temperature to be triggered, while all crystals have raised and melt. Applied to planetary cores, it means that the iron snow would be heterogeneous in space and time, with intermittent and localized crystal falling. This would affect the shape and strength of the planet’s magnetic field.

1 Introduction

Solidification of planetary cores starts when and where the temperature first drops below the solidification temperature. Depending on the pressure range and core composition, the slope of the melting curve can be steeper or shallower than the actual temperature profile (Williams, 2009), which implies that solidification may start either at the planet’s center (as for Earth (Jacobs, 1953)), near the core-mantle boundary (CMB) (as for Moon (Jing et al., 2014), Ganymede (Hauck et al., 2006; Rückriemen et al., 2015), Mercury (Vilim et al., 2010; Chen et al., 2008; Dumberry & Rivoldini, 2015; Edgington et al., 2019), Mars (Stewart et al., 2007; Davies & Pommier, 2018), metallic asteroids (Scheinberg et al., 2016)), or at multiple core locations (as for Mercury (Chen et al., 2008; Dumberry & Rivoldini, 2015)).

In the situation where the solidification temperature is reached first at the CMB, solidification is thought to occur in the so-called “iron snow” regime, in which free iron crystals form near the CMB and fall until re-melting in a hotter, deeper region (Hauck et al., 2006). Solidification and melting affect the composition profile, and this is thought to result in a core structure consisting in a stably stratified layer near the CMB, where buoyantly unstable iron crystals crystallize and fall (i.e. the snow zone), and a deeper, convective layer with temperatures above the liquidus (Fig. 1a). The melting of crystals beneath the stratified layer provides a source of buoyancy for compositional convection (Breuer et al., 2015; Davies & Pommier, 2018), which can generate a magnetic field through dynamo action (Christensen, 2006, 2015).

The modeling of this scenario (Hauck et al., 2006; Davies & Pommier, 2018) relies on important assumptions: (i) the snow layer is in thermodynamic equilibrium, (ii) solid iron rapidly sinks and remelts (compared to the cooling rate) beneath the snow layer,

61 and (iii) crystallization and sinking of iron crystals do not lead to radial mixing, result-
 62 ing in compositional layering. A more general model allowing, for example, thermody-
 63 namic disequilibrium would require parameterization of all small-scale effects, which are
 64 still poorly understood (Loper, 1992). In addition, the interaction between reactive par-
 65 ticles (Huguet et al., 2020) and a stratified layer, as well as the collective behavior of iron
 66 crystals (Kriaa et al., 2022) and their effects on large-scale flow, can alter the picture of
 67 steady iron snow. While the heterogeneity of the flux at the core upper boundary (Amit
 68 et al., 2015) or the radial distribution of the buoyancy flux (Cao et al., 2014) modify the
 69 resulting magnetic field, dynamo simulations driven by iron snow have so far assumed
 70 a uniform and stationary buoyancy flux below the snow layer (Vilim et al., 2010; Chris-
 71 tensen, 2015).

72 Current models of core crystallization neglect any nucleation barrier. Yet, the su-
 73 percooling required for crystal nucleation could be of several hundred kelvins (Huguet,
 74 Van Orman, et al., 2018; Davies et al., 2019; Wilson et al., 2021; Sun et al., 2021; Wil-
 75 son et al., 2023). In the case of top-down crystallization, heterogeneous nucleation at the
 76 CMB could help reduce the nucleation barrier. The detachment of iron crystals from the
 77 CMB could then provide nucleation sites in the bulk and allow the development of iron
 78 snow (Huguet, Hauck, et al., 2018; Neufeld et al., 2019). However, geodynamic studies
 79 (Hauck et al., 2006; Davies & Pommier, 2018) have focused on the bulk production of
 80 crystals in a quasi-steady and equilibrium state.

81 Here, we present results from laboratory experiments that include the key ingre-
 82 dients of the “iron snow” — crystallization of free crystals, sedimentation, and re-melting.
 83 Experimental results and modeling allow us to understand the dynamics of this regime.
 84 We then discuss potential consequences on the evolution of planetary cores and magnetic
 85 field.

86 2 Experimental setup

87 Fig. 1(b,c) show schematics of our experimental setup. It is an upside-down ver-
 88 sion of iron snow crystallization, using water as an analog for the metal core: less dense
 89 ice crystals rise and melt above the liquidus, releasing fresh water. In a tank of $32 \times 32 \times$
 90 20 cm, we have poured about 17 liters of distilled water, and slowly injected at the bot-
 91 tom between 3 and 4 liters of salty water with a concentration of 24% (green area in Fig. 1b,c).
 92 This salty layer, with a low solidification temperature, avoids direct contact between the
 93 freshwater and the cold lower boundary, which would otherwise lead to strong cohesive
 94 forces between the ice and the cooled boundary. The tank has been carefully sealed with
 95 a 2 cm thick transparent plexiglass sheet (experiment (a)) or copper plate (experiment
 96 (b)). The top boundary and walls are insulated from the outside (which is about 25°C)
 97 with polystyrene sheets, except on the front and rear sides. The bottom boundary con-
 98 sists of a chrome-plated copper plate 3 cm thick and its temperature is set at about -18°C .
 99 After a few days of cooling from below, the first crystallization either occurs spontaneously
 100 or is triggered by the insertion of a metal rod at the bottom of the tank.

101 We monitored the temperature at both boundaries and the evolution of the dynam-
 102 ics of crystallization with several cameras. We used a Point-Grey camera at 1 frame per
 103 second from the front of the experiments. Diffusive backlighting has been used to illu-
 104 minate the tank at the rear of the experiment. A 1 W green laser has been used to cre-
 105 ate a horizontal (or vertical) laser plane at mid-height (or mid-width) in the tank. We
 106 visualized the ice crystals crossing the laser sheet by using a Nikon D80 recording video
 107 at 30 frames per second from above through the transparent top boundary (only for ex-
 108 periments (a)). With a vertical plane, PIV measurements have been performed in some
 109 of our experiments before the first crystallization. Note that the PIV particles we used
 110 do not affect the crystallization, as they do not act as nucleation sites.




Figure 1. (a) Schematic view of an iron snow regime in a planetary core. Iron crystals solidify in the liquid bulk close to the core-mantle boundary, and settle into the hotter and deeper part of the liquid core, where they melt. It induces compositional convection due to the release of an iron-rich melt. Note that the experiments are upside-down compared to the core (blue arrows). (b) Experimental setup at $t = 0$. The tank is cooled from below. The bottom salty layer (green) prevents the crystals from attaching to the bottom surface. (c) At $t > 0$, free crystals grow in a supercooled layer between the fluid/fluid interface and the liquidus isotherm. The buoyant crystals settle toward the top of the tank and melt once reaching the liquidus. The gray gradient zone indicates a slight salt stratification because of salt diffusion from the bottom layer.

3 Results

3.1 Description of the dynamics in the experiments

The evolution of the experiments consists of successive periods of crystallization, thereafter called burst, separated by quiescent periods without crystallization. Fig. 2a shows the horizontal average of the pixel intensity of images obtained with the front camera, as a function of time and depth in the tank. The presence of crystals decreasing the pixels' intensity, this gives a qualitative measure of the amount of suspended crystals. Here, each vertical gray strike corresponds to a burst of crystallization. We understand each cycle as follows. (1) Heat is removed through diffusion through the bottom boundary of the tank, resulting in the gradual cooling of the lower part of the tank and the supercooling of a layer at intermediate depth; this supercooled layer does not extend down to the bottom of the tank due to the presence of salt which acts as an antifreeze. (2) When the amount of supercooling exceeds some threshold, crystals nucleate in the supercooled layer. Crystallization releases latent heat which increases the temperature up to the liquidus, thus restoring thermodynamic equilibrium. (3) The buoyant ice crystals migrate upward and remelt when they reach a height at which the water temperature exceeds 0°C . Melting acts as a heat sink, decreasing the temperature at which the crystals melt. (4) The supercooling is partly suppressed by the latent heat released. In addition, cold water entrained by rising crystals is replaced by hotter water from above. As all nucleation sites have been removed, the burst of crystallization ends.

These cycles repeat periodically with a period τ (duration of the crystallization bursts plus quiet period) which is about $1440 \text{ s} \pm 400 \text{ s}$ and $1490 \text{ s} \pm 750 \text{ s}$ for the experiments (a, b) (Fig. 2b). The large variability in the period might be due to the stochastic nature of the nucleation, i.e., the nucleation initiation strongly depends on the presence of heterogeneous nucleation sites. The upper boundary of the snow region is the height where ice crystals remelt. In Fig. 2a (black dashed line), the highest height reached after each burst by the buoyant ice crystals increases roughly linearly with time, at a rate $V \simeq 2(\pm 0.5) \times 10^{-6} \text{ m.s}^{-1}$.




Figure 2. (a) Spatio-temporal diagram as a function of height and time after the first burst for experiment (a) (see Supporting Information Fig. S1(a) for temperature evolution). The dotted black line shows approximately the top boundary of the snow layer (about 0°C). The bursts of crystallization correspond to the dark vertical stripes interposed between quiet periods. (b) Evolution of the time interval between two bursts during two experiments (red dots and blue crosses). The red rectangle denotes the duration of the spatio-temporal diagram in (a).

139 Fig. 3 illustrates the sequence of one burst of crystallization. Nucleation occurs close
 140 to the fluid/fluid interface (and to the walls) where supercooling is the largest and het-
 141 erogeneity might ease ice crystal nucleation (blue box in the first image of Fig. 3). In a
 142 few hundred seconds, the crystallization propagates through the supercooled layer. The
 143 propagation of the nucleation events may be explained by collisional breeding, which cor-
 144 responds to the breaking of ice crystals into tiny particles due to their collisions during
 145 the advection (Svensson & Omstedt, 1994), which provides new nucleation sites in the
 146 supercooled layer. Here the advection is due to the positive buoyancy of the ice crystals.
 147 This phenomenon has been described for the crystallization of frazil-ice, which is formed
 148 in sea ice or supercooled river (Svensson & Omstedt, 1994; Rees Jones & Wells, 2018).
 149 Ice crystals rapidly grow and form almost 2D crystals, so-called platelet ice crystals. The
 150 smallest crystals rise slowly and melt almost instantly when crossing the liquidus. On
 151 the contrary, the larger ones have a larger velocity (see Supporting Information Fig. S2)
 152 and can overshoot the liquidus and melt at higher heights (dotted dashed line in Fig. 3).
 153

154 3.2 Diffusive model and heat budget

155 This sequence of crystallization results in a layered structure consisting of a lower
 156 layer with a diffusive temperature profile in which the crystallization bursts occur, an
 157 intermediate layer at a temperature near 0°C produced by the remelting of the ice crys-
 158 tals, and an upper layer in which the temperature gradually increases from 0°C to T_{top}
 159 at the upper boundary of the tank (see Fig. 4b). We developed a 1D model for temper-
 160 ature and chemical evolution using the two diffusion equations with $\kappa = 1.4 \times 10^{-7} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$
 161 and $D = 1 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ for the thermal and chemical diffusivities, respectively. We
 162 solved the diffusion equations using a no-flux boundary condition for the composition
 163 and set the temperature at each boundary to be equal to the time-dependent temper-
 164 atures measured in the experiments (see Supporting Information Fig. S1 for temper-
 165 ature evolution). Note that due to the maximum density of water around 4°C, which de-
 166 pends on the salt concentration, a layer with an unstable gradient exists (white area in
 167 Fig. 4b). Our diffusive model and PIV measurements before the crystallization (see Sup-
 168 porting Information Fig. S4) show that the convective layer translates toward the top
 169 of the tank due to the increase of the salt concentration above the salty layer, which sup-




Figure 3. Timeline of a burst crystallization. The crystallization phase starts along the right wall (blue box on the top-left picture) and ends when the last crystals melt while passing through the liquidus (blue box on the bottom-right row). The dotted black lines at $t = 400$ s denote the overshoot due to the presence of large crystals which have a rising velocity larger than the melting rate. This burst crystallization lasts about 1000 s. The white dashed line shows the top of the salty layer. The red line denotes the liquidus isotherm (0°C), based on the diffusive model developed below.

170 presses the unstable gradient. Our measured concentration profile at the end of the ex-
 171 periments shows that salt concentration is higher than predicted by the diffusive model
 172 (see Supporting Information Fig. S3), meaning that bursts of crystallization mix the salt
 173 into the top layer, which may suppress the convection layer. Fig. 4a shows the temper-
 174 ature evolution in the tank. After the first crystallization burst (red vertical line), the
 175 temperature and concentration profiles might be altered by the crystallization bursts,
 176 as they are not considered in our model. The position of the liquidus is well predicted
 177 by our model (about 11 cm height in Fig. 2a at the time of the first burst). Our model
 178 also predicts a significant supercooling of 6°C for the first burst, which agrees with the
 179 observation of a massive event of crystallization for the initial burst.

180 To estimate the amount of supercooling during a quiescent period and the max-
 181 imum quantity of ice crystal formed by a burst, we use the modeled temperature and
 182 concentration profiles at $t \sim 184000$ s (first burst of the experiment (a)). Then, we set
 183 the temperature at the liquidus in the supercooled layer, assuming that the first burst
 184 has reinstated thermal equilibrium (see solid black line in Fig. 4b). We then run our dif-
 185 fusive model and show the temperature profile after $\tau = 1500$ s. The supercooled layer
 186 is about 6 cm thick and the maximum supercooling is about 1.5°C (Fig. 4b). The en-
 187 ergy $E_{burst} = \rho c_p \int_0^H (T_m - T) dz \simeq 290 \times 10^3 \text{ J m}^{-2}$ for ($T < T_m$) stored in this layer
 188 would be converted to ice crystals once nucleation is initiated (gold area in Fig. 4b).

189 Our qualitative understanding can be tested by considering the energy balance dur-
 190 ing one cycle. Since all the crystals produced during a burst remelt before the next cy-
 191 cle, there is no contribution of latent heat to the energy budget when integrated over a
 192 period τ . It reduces to a balance between the change in internal energy and the amount
 193 of energy extracted from the tank. According to our thermal diffusion model, the amount
 194 of energy extracted from the bottom and injected from the top are $\Delta E_b = k \int_0^\tau \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \Big|_b dt \simeq$
 195 $250 \times 10^3 \text{ J m}^{-2}$ and $\Delta E_t = k \int_0^\tau \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \Big|_t dt \simeq 80 \times 10^3 \text{ J m}^{-2}$, respectively, with a net
 196 extracted energy $\Delta E \simeq 170 \times 10^3 \text{ J m}^{-2}$. We can indirectly estimate the change in
 197 internal energy from the evolution of the melting front, which migrates upward at a ve-
 198 locity V (Fig. 2). Since it materializes the 0°C isotherm, its migration must be associ-

199 ated with net cooling of the upper part of the tank. This should be the only significant
 200 source of change of internal energy because the temperature in the lower part of the tank
 201 is reset to the liquidus after each burst. Assuming that the temperature profile above
 202 the melting front is in a near steady state in a reference frame traveling with the bound-
 203 ary, then moving the 0°C isotherm by a distance $\delta h = V\tau$ comes down to replacing a
 204 layer of thickness δh at temperature T_{top} by a layer of the same thickness at tempera-
 205 ture 0°C . The associated change of internal energy is $\delta h \rho c_p (T_{top} - 0^\circ) \simeq 150 \times 10^3 \text{ J m}^{-2}$,
 206 which is indeed close to the energy ΔE extracted from the tank during a cycle.

207 The energy released in the form of latent heat during a burst, $E_{burst} \simeq 290 \times 10^3 \text{ J m}^{-2}$,
 208 is close to the energy extracted from the bottom, $\Delta E_b \simeq 250 \times 10^3 \text{ J m}^{-2}$. This is con-
 209 sistent with the idea that the evolution of the supercooling is controlled by diffusive cool-
 210 ing from the bottom. Note that although latent heat does not appear in the time-integrated
 211 energy budget, the freezing/melting process plays an important role in transporting en-
 ergy between the lower and upper parts of the tank.




Figure 4. (a) Temperature evolution is shown from the beginning of the experiment to the end. The vertical red line denotes the first crystallization event after ~ 2 days. The white area denotes the zone where the density gradient is unstable because of water specific equation of state (negative thermal expansion coefficient below 4°C , depending on the salt content). The dashed, and solid gray lines denote the liquidus and isotherm of the degree of supercooling, respectively. The dashed black line shows the initial thickness of the salty layer. (b) Temperature (red, black dashed, and solid lines; bottom x-axis) and concentration profile (blue line; top x-axis) as a function of height. The temperature profile evolves from the solid black line ($t = 0$ s after the first burst, i.e., the vertical red line in (a)) with a temperature equal to the liquidus in the snow layer. The black dashed line is the temperature profile after 1500 s, just before a burst event. The gold area is the amount of supercooling after a cooling period.

212

213

3.3 Crystal size distribution

214

215

We observed a wide range of sizes of crystals (between sub-millimeter to a few centimeters) and we measured the crystal size distribution by analyzing images from above.

216 For experiment (a), we analyzed 2 hours of video spanned over 7 hours, in which 8 bursts
 217 of crystallization occurs. By measuring the area of each crystal crossing the laser sheet
 218 over time, we have measured the distribution of the effective radius $r \sim \sqrt{S/\pi}$ (with
 219 S , the measured area). Most of the uncertainty concerns the smallest crystal radii (left
 220 side of the PDF, below 4×10^{-4} m in Fig. 5). However, the overall shape of the PDF
 221 is not affected by the threshold criterion used in the image analysis. Fig. 5a shows the
 222 probability density function (PDF) of the effective crystal radius. The distribution is well
 223 explained by a power law as $\text{PDF}(r) \propto r^{-D-1}$, where $D = 1.6$ is the fractal dimen-
 224 sion (Turcotte, 1997) (Fig. 5a). The fractal dimension being smaller than 2, the largest
 225 crystals dominate the total surface area of the crystals crossing the laser sheet (Turcotte,
 226 1997), even though most of the crystals have sub-millimeter radius.

227 We estimate the mass flux of ice crystals (Fig. 5b) using the following relationship
 228 between the effective radius and rising velocity of the crystals:

$$U = \sqrt{\frac{8rg\Delta\rho}{3\rho C_d}}, \quad (1)$$

229 where r , g , ρ , and $\Delta\rho$ are the radius, gravity, water density, and the difference of den-
 230 sity between ice and water. The drag coefficient C_d is a function of the Reynolds num-
 231 ber (Clift et al., 1978). We assume that the complex shapes of the crystals and the in-
 232 teraction between them do not change significantly the drag coefficient. Despite uncer-
 233 tainty in the velocity/radius relationship, we think that the shape of the distribution of
 234 mass flux is significant. As the largest crystals contribute more to the total area, they
 235 also contribute more to the total mass flux as they rise faster. The relatively wide range
 236 of crystal size (which may be limited by the size of the tank and the camera resolution)
 237 might lead to a complex two-way coupling between fluid and solid particles, meaning that
 238 fluid flow might impact smaller particles' behavior while larger ones might impact the
 239 large-scale flow (Balachandar & Eaton, 2010; Brandt & Coletti, 2022). The interactions
 240 between fluid and solid particles will depend on their size distribution and solid fraction
 241 (Harada et al., 2012), but also on the state of the environment: stratified or uniform (Deepwell
 242 & Sutherland, 2022). Therefore, assuming a single size of crystals is not realistic to model
 243 iron snow in planetary cores.

244 4 Discussion

245 Our experiments suggest that crystallization in the core of small planets may pro-
 246 ceed as crystallization bursts in a supercooled, stably stratified layer below the CMB.
 247 These bursts would lead to a wide range of iron crystal sizes. If the core is stably strat-
 248 ified below the CMB (owing to the release of light elements during previous crystalliza-
 249 tion events or to a subadiabatic temperature profile), then the evolution of its temper-
 250 ature is controlled solely by heat diffusion and the cooling rate, which is set by the heat
 251 flux at the CMB q_{CMB} . In this situation, starting at a given time $t = 0$ from a tem-
 252 perature in the vicinity of the CMB equal to the liquidus, the thickness δ of the super-
 253 cooled layer increases with time t as $\delta \sim \sqrt{\kappa t}$, while the supercooling ΔT at the CMB
 254 increases as (Carslaw & Jaeger, 1986)

$$\Delta T(t) = \frac{q_{CMB}}{k} \sqrt{\frac{4\kappa}{\pi}} t^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (2)$$

255 where k and κ are the thermal conductivity and diffusivity of liquid iron, respectively.
 256 Applied to a small planetary core (as Mars (Davies & Pommier, 2018) or Ganymede (Rückriemen
 257 et al., 2015)) with the typical values $q_{CMB} \sim 10 \text{ mW m}^{-2}$, $k = 40 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$, and
 258 $\kappa = 8 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, equation 2 predicts that a supercooling of 0.1 K, 1 K, 10 K would
 259 be built in 500 yr, 50 kyr, and 5 Myr, respectively. The corresponding thicknesses of the
 260 supercooled layer are about 0.3 km, 3 km, 30 km, respectively. The supercooling required




Figure 5. (a) Probability density function (PDF) of crystal effective radius. Gray and red dots denote the 8 bursts and the mean of the distribution, respectively. The black dashed line is a fit of a power law. (b) Estimated mass flux during a crystallization burst as function of the effective radius. Insert in (a) correspond to a top-view snapshot of the detected crystals (red outline) crossing the laser plane.

261 to nucleate crystals in this layer is not known: homogeneous nucleation requires a su-
 262 percooling of possibly a few hundred of Kelvin (Huguet, Van Orman, et al., 2018; Sun
 263 et al., 2021; Wilson et al., 2023), but the presence of nucleation sites could decrease it
 264 by several orders of magnitude. We can note, however, that the time needed to initiate
 265 a crystallization burst exceeds the magnetic diffusive timescale (~ 10 kyr) if the required
 266 supercooling is larger than $\simeq 0.5$ K. In this situation, an iron snow regime with such
 267 sparse crystallization bursts might result in intermittent convection and dynamo action,
 268 with periods of low and high-intensity magnetic field. On the other hand, negligible su-
 269 percooling is plausible if iron crystals are attached to the CMB, which might provide nu-
 270 cleation sites. This scenario may lead to the crystallization of large iron crystals, which
 271 will be detached by delamination of the crystal layer (Neufeld et al., 2019) or necking
 272 of iron dendrites (Huguet, Hauck, et al., 2018). These mechanisms would also imply vari-
 273 ability of the crystal flux in space and time.

274 On Earth, the large heterogeneity of heat flux at the CMB affects the geodynamo
 275 and the geomagnetic field (Olson, 2016; Nakagawa, 2020; Sahoo & Sreenivasan, 2020).
 276 On Mars, a strongly localized heat flux may explain the extinction of the magnetic field
 277 (Sreenivasan & Jellinek, 2012; Amit et al., 2015). Similarly, a heterogeneous “iron snow”
 278 regime likely impacts the core dynamics. However, the outcome in terms of magnetic field
 279 structure or intensity remains to be investigated. In the future, new simulations are re-
 280 quired to model snow experiments. This will require parameterizing the formation and
 281 melting of crystals, including the statistical aspect of nucleation.

5 Open Research Section

The numerical code used in this work is written in Matlab. Code and data to reproduce the figures are available here: <https://figshare.com/s/67fb2c6fc793db90b9c0> with a pre-allocated DOI [dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.24056916](https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.24056916). The color map, used in this study, prevent visual distortion of the data and exclusion of readers with color vision deficiencies (Crameri et al., 2020). PIV calculation has been performed using PIVlab Tool for MATLAB (Thielicke & Sonntag, 2021).

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant numbers 681835 and 716429). L.H. and M.LB designed the project. L.H. has carried out the experiments and performed the image and data analysis and modeling. All authors discussed the results and reviewed the manuscript. The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests.

References

- Amit, H., Choblet, G., Olson, P., Monteux, J., Deschamps, F., Langlais, B., & Tobie, G. (2015). Towards more realistic core-mantle boundary heat flux patterns: a source of diversity in planetary dynamos. *Prog. Earth Planet. Sci.*, *2*(1), 1–26.
- Balachandar, S., & Eaton, J. K. (2010). Turbulent dispersed multiphase flow. *Annual review of fluid mechanics*, *42*, 111–133.
- Brandt, L., & Coletti, F. (2022). Particle-laden turbulence: progress and perspectives. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics*, *54*, 159–189.
- Breuer, D., Rueckriemen, T., & Spohn, T. (2015). Iron snow, crystal floats, and inner-core growth: modes of core solidification and implications for dynamos in terrestrial planets and moons. *Progress in Earth and Planetary Science*, *2*(1), 39.
- Cao, H., Aurnou, J. M., Wicht, J., Dietrich, W., Soderlund, K. M., & Russell, C. T. (2014). A dynamo explanation for Mercury’s anomalous magnetic field. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *41*(12), 4127–4134. doi: 10.1002/2014GL060196
- Carslaw, H., & Jaeger, J. (1986). *Conduction of heat in solids. 2nd edition.* Clarendon Press.
- Chen, B., Li, J., & Hauck, S. A. (2008). Non-ideal liquidus curve in the Fe-S system and Mercury’s snowing core. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *35*(7).
- Christensen, U. R. (2006). A deep dynamo generating Mercury’s magnetic field. *Nature*, *444*(7122), 1056.
- Christensen, U. R. (2015). Iron snow dynamo models for Ganymede. *Icarus*, *247*, 248–259.
- Clift, R., Grace, J. R., & Weber, M. E. (1978). *Bubbles, drops, and particles.* Courier Corporation.
- Crameri, F., Shephard, G. E., & Heron, P. J. (2020). The misuse of colour in science communication. *Nature communications*, *11*(1), 5444.
- Davies, C. J., & Pommier, A. (2018). Iron snow in the martian core? *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *481*, 189–200.
- Davies, C. J., Pozzo, M., & Alfè, D. (2019). Assessing the inner core nucleation paradox with atomic-scale simulations. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *507*, 1–9.
- Deepwell, D., & Sutherland, B. R. (2022). Cluster formation during particle settling in stratified fluid. *Physical Review Fluids*, *7*(1), 014302.
- Dumberry, M., & Rivoldini, A. (2015). Mercury’s inner core size and core-crystallization regime. *Icarus*, *248*, 254–268.

- 333 Edgington, A., Vočadlo, L., Stixrude, L., Wood, I., Dobson, D., & Holmström, E.
 334 (2019). The top-down crystallisation of mercury’s core. *Earth and Planetary*
 335 *Science Letters*, *528*, 115838.
- 336 Harada, S., Mitsui, T., & Sato, K. (2012). Particle-like and fluid-like settling of a
 337 stratified suspension. *The European Physical Journal E*, *35*(1), 1.
- 338 Hauck, S. A., Aurnou, J. M., & Dombard, A. J. (2006). Sulfur’s impact on core evolu-
 339 tion and magnetic field generation on Ganymede. *Journal of Geophysical Re-*
 340 *search*, *111*(E9), 2156-2202. doi: 10.1029/2005je002557
- 341 Huguet, L., Barge-Zwick, V., & Le Bars, M. (2020). Dynamics of a reactive spheri-
 342 cal particle falling in a linearly stratified fluid. *Physical Review Fluids*(under
 343 review).
- 344 Huguet, L., Hauck, S., Van Orman, J., & Jing, Z. (2018). Implications of the ho-
 345 mogeneous nucleation barrier for top-down crystallization in mercury’s core.
 346 In *Mercury: Current and future science of the innermost planet* (Vol. 2047,
 347 p. 6101).
- 348 Huguet, L., Van Orman, J. A., Hauck, S. A., & Willard, M. A. (2018). Earth’s inner
 349 core nucleation paradox. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *487*, 9–20.
- 350 Jacobs, J. A. (1953). The Earth’s Inner Core. *Nature*, *172*(4372), 297-298. doi: 10
 351 .1038/172297a0
- 352 Jing, Z., Wang, Y., Kono, Y., Yu, T., Sakamaki, T., Park, C., ... Shen, G. (2014).
 353 Sound velocity of Fe-S liquids at high pressure: Implications for the Moon’s
 354 molten outer core. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *396*, 78-87.
- 355 Kriaa, Q., Subra, E., Favier, B., & Le Bars, M. (2022). Effects of particle size and
 356 background rotation on the settling of particle clouds. *Physical Review Fluids*,
 357 *7*(12), 124302.
- 358 Loper, D. (1992). A nonequilibrium theory of a slurry. *Continuum Mechanics and*
 359 *Thermodynamics*, *4*(3), 213–245.
- 360 Nakagawa, T. (2020). A coupled core-mantle evolution: review and future prospects.
 361 *Progress in Earth and Planetary Science*, *7*(1), 1–17.
- 362 Neufeld, J. A., Bryson, J. F., & Nimmo, F. (2019). The top-down solidification
 363 of iron asteroids driving dynamo evolution. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
 364 *Planets*, *124*(5), 1331–1356.
- 365 Olson, P. (2016). Mantle control of the geodynamo: Consequences of top-down regu-
 366 lation. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems*, *17*(5), 1935–1956.
- 367 Rees Jones, D. W., & Wells, A. J. (2018). Frazil-ice growth rate and dynamics in
 368 mixed layers and sub-ice-shelf plumes. *The Cryosphere*, *12*(1), 25–38.
- 369 Rückriemen, T., Breuer, D., & Spohn, T. (2015). The Fe snow regime in
 370 Ganymede’s core: A deep-seated dynamo below a stable snow zone. *Journal of*
 371 *Geophysical Research*, n/a-n/a. (2014JE004781) doi: 10.1002/2014JE004781
- 372 Sahoo, S., & Sreenivasan, B. (2020). Response of earth’s magnetic field to large
 373 lower mantle heterogeneity. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *549*, 116507.
- 374 Scheinberg, A., Elkins-Tanton, L. T., Schubert, G., & Bercovici, D. (2016). Core
 375 solidification and dynamo evolution in a mantle-stripped planetesimal. *Journal*
 376 *of Geophysical Research*, *121*(1), 2-20. doi: 10.1002/2015JE004843
- 377 Sreenivasan, B., & Jellinek, A. M. (2012). Did the tharsis plume terminate the mar-
 378 tian dynamo? *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *349*, 209–217.
- 379 Stewart, A. J., Schmidt, M. W., van Westrenen, W., & Liebske, C. (2007). Mars: A
 380 new core-crystallization regime. *Science*, *316*(5829), 1323-1325.
- 381 Sun, Y., Zhang, F., Mendeleev, M. I., Wentzcovitch, R. M., & Ho, K.-M. (2021).
 382 Two-step nucleation of the earth’s inner core. *arXiv*.
- 383 Svensson, U., & Omstedt, A. (1994). Simulation of supercooling and size distri-
 384 bution in frazil ice dynamics. *Cold regions science and technology*, *22*(3), 221–
 385 233.
- 386 Thielicke, W., & Sonntag, R. (2021). Particle image velocimetry for matlab: Ac-
 387 curacy and enhanced algorithms in pivlab. *Journal of Open Research Software*,

- 388 9(1).
389 Turcotte, D. L. (1997). *Fractals and chaos in geology and geophysics*. Cambridge
390 university press.
391 Vilim, R., Stanley, S., & Hauck, S. (2010). Iron snow zones as a mechanism for
392 generating Mercury's weak observed magnetic field. *Journal of Geophysical Re-*
393 *search*, 115(E11).
394 Williams, Q. (2009). Bottom-up versus top-down solidification of the cores of small
395 solar system bodies: Constraints on paradoxical cores. *Earth and Planetary*
396 *Science Letters*, 284(3), 564-569. doi: 10.1016/j.epsl.2009.05.019
397 Wilson, A. J., Alfè, D., Walker, A. M., & Davies, C. J. (2023). Can homogeneous
398 nucleation resolve the inner core nucleation paradox? *Earth and Planetary Sci-*
399 *ence Letters*, 614, 118176.
400 Wilson, A. J., Walker, A. M., Alfè, D., & Davies, C. J. (2021). Probing the nucle-
401 ation of iron in earth's core using molecular dynamics simulations of super-
402 cooled liquids. *Phys. Rev. B*, 103(21), 214113.