## 1 New runs

All runs have  $\mu_{50} = 10^6$ ,  $\tilde{\lambda}^{1/2} = 7 \times 10^{11}$ , and  $\nu = \eta = D = 5 \times 10^{-8}$ . Thus, we have

$$v_{\lambda} = \mu_{50} / \lambda^{1/2} = 1.4 \times 10^{-6},$$
 (1)

and

$$v_{\mu} = \mu_{50}\eta = 5 \times 10^{-2}, \tag{2}$$

corresponding to regime II.



Figure 1: pcomp\_D512\_1e5\_1e6\_49e22\_5em8a4

The difference between the four runs is the minimum wavenumber,  $k_1$ , available in the simulations (ideally, it should be  $\rightarrow 0$ ). Figure 1 shows the time traces for those runs. They are all reasonably similar, except for  $h_{\rm rms}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{\rm GW}^{\rm sat}$ , which drop significantly for large  $k_1$ .

The chiral chemical potential drops rapidly when the linear phase of the chiral plasma instability is over  $(t \approx 1.001)$ . It then levels off near 10<sup>5</sup>, which





Figure 2: EEGW\_vs\_EEKM

corresponds to the wavenumber where the magnetic energy spectra peak; see below.

Figure 2 compares  $\mathcal{E}_{M}^{max}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{GW}^{sat}$  with those of earlier runs. The efficiency of GW production is very low.



Figure 3: pspec\_sat\_D512\_1e5\_1e6\_49e22\_ 5em8a4\_k5e3

Figure 3 compares magnetic and GW energy spectra. As found in our 2021 paper, the GW energy spectra don't capture the lowest wavenumber and therefore the GW energies are not converged.

## 2 Next?

It would be useful to have a model of how  $\mu_5$  builds up.