NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Atomic Energy Commission, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

Thermal Relaxation of a Two Dimensional

Plasma in a dc Magnetic Field

Part I: Theory

by

Jang-Yu Hsu

University of Iowa

Iowa City, Iowa 52242, U. S. A.

David Montgomery*

Hunter College of the City University of New York

695 Park Avenue, N. Y., N. Y. 10021, U. S. A.

and

Glenn Joyce

University of Iowa

Iowa City, Iowa 52242, U. S. A.

January 1974

*On leave from the University of Iowa

MASTER

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

GG

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

ABSTRACT

A theory is presented for the rate of thermal relaxation of a two dimensional plasma in a strong uniform dc magnetic field. The Vahala - Montgomery kinetic description is completed by providing a cut off time for the time of interaction of two particles which contribute to the collision term. The kinetic equation predicts that thermal relaxation occurs as a function of the dimensionless time $(\omega_p t) (\omega_p / \Omega) (n_o \lambda_D^2)^{-1/2}$, where ω_p is the plasma frequency, Ω is the gyrofrequency, and $n_o \lambda_D^2$ is the number of particles per Debye square. By contrast, in the absence of an external magnetic field, a two dimensional plasma relaxes as a function of $(\omega_p t) (n_o \lambda_D^2)^{-1}$.

1. Introduction

Two dimensional electrostatic models of a plasma in a strong magnetic field have received considerable attention over the last three years (see, e.g., Taylor and McNamara 1971; Vahala and Montgomery 1971; Vahala 1972; Montgomery and Tappert 1972; Montgomery 1972 a,b; Joyce and Montgomery 1972; Taylor 1972; Joyce and Montgomery 1973). Much of the interest has revolved around the guiding centre model, in which particle positions are advanced by their self-consistent electrostatic $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ drifts. The present article, however, deals with the finite gyroradius case, in which the guiding centre approximation is not made.

Of primary concern is the rate of thermal relaxation of the model, a phenomenon which does not occur at all in the guiding centre limit (Vahala and Montgomery, 1971). In particular, we are interested in the dependence of the relaxation rate on the various dimensionless parameters of the problem such as the number of particles per Debye square and the ratio of gyrofrequency to plasma frequency. In this paper (Part I) various theoretical considerations relevant to the thermal relaxation process are developed. In the companion paper (Part II), these predictions are tested by numerical simulation.

2. The Basic Model

As usual, the particles are taken to be very long rods of length l , charge $-e$, mass m , which remain aligned parallel to a uniform dc magnetic field $\mathbf{B} = B\hat{b}$ that points in the z -direction.

The position $\underline{x}_i(t)$ of the i th rod is a two-component vector in the xy plane. The potential energy of interaction of two rods is taken to be $-(2e^2/\ell) \ln |\underline{x}_i(t) - \underline{x}_j(t)|$ at time t . A uniform immobile positive background charge provides overall charge neutrality. The equations of motion of the i th charge are $d\underline{x}_i(t)/dt = \underline{v}_i(t)$, $d\underline{v}_i(t)/dt = (-e/m)(\underline{E} + \underline{v}_i \times \underline{B}/c)$. $\underline{E} = -\partial\phi/\partial\underline{x}$ is the electric field and is determined through Poisson's equation and whatever boundary conditions may obtain.

Equivalently, the dynamics may be specified by the Klimontovich equation (see e.g., Dupree 1963, 1964; Montgomery, 1971):

$$\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \underline{v} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \underline{x}} - \frac{e}{m} (\underline{E} + \frac{\underline{v}}{c} \times \underline{B}) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \underline{v}} \right\} f \equiv \frac{Df}{Dt} = 0, \quad (1)$$

where the exact distribution f is

$$f = n_0^{-1} \sum_i \delta(\underline{x} - \underline{x}_i(t)) \delta(\underline{v} - \underline{v}_i(t)), \quad (2)$$

and n_0 is the average number of rods per unit area. $\underline{E}$ is given by the solution of

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \underline{x}} \cdot \underline{E} = -\frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial \underline{x}^2} = \frac{4\pi en_0}{\ell} \left[1 - \int f d\underline{v} \right]. \quad (3)$$

Even though the distribution function f has been introduced, there is as yet nothing of statistical mechanics in the formulation.

3. Statistical Formulation

Statistical mechanics may be introduced by considering the initial values of the $\underline{x}_i, \underline{v}_i$ ($\underline{x}_i(0) \equiv \underline{x}_{i0}, \underline{v}_i(0) \equiv \underline{v}_{i0}$, say) to be statistically distributed in their phase spaces according to some probability distribution law. (For equilibrium situations, this will be the canonical ensemble of Gibbs, but otherwise it will not be.) We indicate expectation values or ensemble averages by a bracket $\langle \rangle$, and write $f = \langle f \rangle + \delta f$, $\underline{E} = \langle \underline{E} \rangle + \delta \underline{E}$. For spatially uniform ensembles, we will have $\langle \underline{E} \rangle = 0$ and $\partial \langle f \rangle / \partial \underline{x} = 0$.

For spatially uniform and gyrotropic $\langle f \rangle$'s, $\underline{v} \times \underline{B} \cdot \partial \langle f \rangle / \partial \underline{v} = 0$, and ensemble averaging Eq. (1) will give

$$\frac{\partial \langle f \rangle}{\partial t} = \frac{e}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial \underline{v}} \cdot \langle \underline{E} f \rangle, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\underline{E} = - \frac{2n_0 e}{\ell} \int d\underline{x}' d\underline{v}' \frac{\underline{x} - \underline{x}'}{|\underline{x} - \underline{x}'|^2} f(\underline{x}', \underline{v}', t), \quad (5)$$

and the point $\underline{x} = \underline{x}'$ is to be omitted from the integral in Eq. (5).

It is clear that what is required for the evaluation of the right hand side of Eq. (4) is

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle ff' \rangle &= \langle f(\underline{x}, \underline{v}, t) f(\underline{x}', \underline{v}', t) \rangle \\
 &= \sum_{\substack{i,j \\ i \neq j}} \langle \delta(\underline{x} - \underline{x}_i(t)) \delta(\underline{v} - \underline{v}_i(t)) \delta(\underline{x}' - \underline{x}_j(t)) \delta(\underline{v}' - \underline{v}_j(t)) \rangle
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{6}$$

Eqs. (1) through (6) are exact, and it is well known that approximations and hypotheses must be made before Eq. (4) will lead to a significant or tractable kinetic description. By this we mean that the right hand side of Eq. (4) is expressed as a functional of $\langle f \rangle$ alone for which we may prove conservation laws, an H-theorem, and so forth. The program through which these hypotheses and approximations are developed is too lengthy to expose here, and reference may be made to textbooks for the relevant background (e.g., Montgomery 1967, 1971). All the approximations and assumptions we shall make are standard except one, and this one will be given special attention when it occurs in Section 4.

We shall be interested in the Fokker-Planck limit, or the limit in which the potential energy of interaction between two typical particles is taken to be much less than the average kinetic energy per particle, θ . This is, in effect, a perturbation expansion in the dimensionless ratio $e^2/\ell\theta$. It is justified by the smallness

of $(n_0 \lambda_D^2)^{-1}$ (Montgomery, 1972 b). The fact that the right hand side of Eq. (4) is of second order in this parameter implies that the evolution of $\langle f \rangle$ is very slow compared to the explicit time development of $\langle ff' \rangle$. Following what is essentially the Bogolyubov recipe (Bogolyubov 1946; Dupree 1961; Montgomery 1971), the asymptotic $t \rightarrow \infty$ form of $\langle Ef \rangle$ may be taken while holding $\langle f \rangle$ fixed. The weak coupling expansion implies that we insert the unperturbed (i.e., non-interacting) orbits into Eq. (1) and iterate, to find successive approximations to f . The Fokker-Planck equation results if we stop the iteration at the stage where the right hand side of Eq. (4) first fails to vanish. Ensemble averages $\langle \rangle$ are carried out by ignoring initial correlations:

$$\langle A \rangle = \int \prod_i \left\{ \frac{dx_{i0} dy_{i0}}{V} \langle f(\tilde{y}_{i0}) \rangle \right\} A \quad . \quad (7)$$

Here, A stands for any phase function (including ff' or $f\tilde{E}$), $V = L^2$ is the configuration-space volume, and the product $\prod_i$ runs over all the charges. Higher order corrections to $\langle ff' \rangle$ or $\langle f\tilde{E} \rangle$ are computed in the same way, with corrections to f and $\tilde{E}$ being calculated before the averages $\langle \rangle$ are performed.

4. The Kinetic Equation

The unperturbed orbits $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$, $\mathbf{v}_i(t)$ are

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}_i(t) &= \mathbf{x}_{i0} + \mathbf{v}_{i0} \frac{\sin \Omega t}{\Omega} \\ &\quad - \hat{\mathbf{b}} \times \mathbf{v}_{i0} \frac{\cos \Omega t - 1}{\Omega} \\ \mathbf{v}_i(t) &= \mathbf{v}_{i0} \cos \Omega t + \hat{\mathbf{b}} \times \mathbf{v}_{i0} \sin \Omega t, \quad (8)\end{aligned}$$

where $\Omega \equiv |e\mathbf{B}/mc|$. Use of Eq. (8) and Eq. (7) in Eqs. (6) and (4) leads, after some lengthy algebra, to the following kinetic equation for $\langle f \rangle$ (Vahala and Montgomery 1971; Vahala 1972):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \langle f \rangle}{\partial t} &= \\ &- \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}} \cdot \int d\mathbf{v}' \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}') \cdot \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}'} \right) \langle f(\mathbf{v}) \rangle \langle f(\mathbf{v}') \rangle \quad (9)\end{aligned}$$

where the dyadic $\mathbf{Q}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{Q} = -T_0 \frac{4\pi m_0 e^4}{m^2 \ell^2} \frac{(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}') \times \hat{\mathbf{b}} (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}') \times \hat{\mathbf{b}}}{|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}'|^2} \quad (10)$$

Eq. (9) has been written in standard Balescu-Lenard form.

The time T_0 is a cut off which has remained up to this point an undetermined, troublesome constant. (An H-theorem and conservation laws follow from Eq. (9) no matter what T_0 is, but relaxation times scale directly as T_0^{-1} .) T_0 has the physical significance of being the interaction time of two particles along their unperturbed trajectories. Because of the absence, in two dimensions, of motion parallel to the magnetic field, the unperturbed motions are strictly periodic and T_0 is infinite. Until now, a wholly satisfactory argument for assigning T_0 a finite value has been lacking (Vahala and Montgomery 1971; Montgomery 1972 b). We are now able to determine T_0 .

Detailed inspection of the multiple integrals which contribute to Q reveals that for T_0 large, the only regions of phase space which lead to contributions to Q are those which correspond to overlapping gyroradii. It is only because we have used a perturbation scheme based upon pairwise interactions that overlapping gyroradii continue to overlap for all time. For the true orbits, gyrocenters will slowly diffuse apart due to long wavelength electric field fluctuations of the Taylor-McNamara (1971) type. The effect of these can be introduced in a non-rigorous (but to us wholly convincing) way by determining T_0 to be that time required to diffuse two gyrocenters a thermal gyroradius apart:

$$D_{T.M.} = \frac{\theta}{m} \left(\frac{mc}{eB} \right)^2 \frac{1}{T_0} \quad (11)$$

where $D_{T.M.}$ is the Taylor-McNamara diffusion coefficient for one species:

$$D_{T.M.} = \frac{c\theta}{eB} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_0 \lambda_D^2}} \sqrt{\ell n(L/2\pi\lambda_D)} \quad (12)$$

$\lambda_D^2 \equiv \ell\theta/4\pi n_0 e^2$ is the square of the Debye length, and θ is the mean kinetic energy per particle. Eqs. (11) and (12) remove the ambiguities that existed in Eq. (9), for now

$$T_0 = \sqrt{n_0 \lambda_D^2} / (\Omega \sqrt{\ell n(L/2\pi\lambda_D)}) \quad (13)$$

Except for a weak (logarithmic) dependence on the plasma volume, the thermal relaxation is predicted to occur as a function of the dimensionless time

$$(\omega_p t)(\omega_p/\Omega) / \sqrt{n_0 \lambda_D^2},$$

where $\omega_p \equiv 4\pi n_0 e^2/m$ defines the plasma frequency. It is well known

and has been demonstrated numerically (Montgomery and Nielson, 1970) that the thermal relaxation of a two dimensional unmagnetized plasma occurs as a function of the dimensionless time

$$(\omega_p t)/n_o \lambda_D^2 .$$

(A theoretical discussion is due to Yoo and Abraham-Shrauner 1973.)

There are thus two clear-cut predictions for the rate at which thermal relaxation occurs for a strongly-magnetized plasma which differ from anything suggested previously: (1) the relaxation time is proportional to the magnetic field strength; and (2) the relaxation time is proportional to $\sqrt{n_o \lambda_D^2}$, the reciprocal of the square root of the plasma parameter. Both these predictions are tested numerically in Part II.

A condition for the validity of the use of the cut off (13) in Eqs. (9) and (10) is that two thermal particles shall separate in a time T_o which is short compared to a relaxation time for $\langle f \rangle$. It has been seen in the last paragraph that the latter time is of the order of $\omega_p^{-1} (\Omega/\omega_p) \sqrt{n_o \lambda_D^2}$. The relevant inequality is therefore

$$\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega_p} \right)^2 \gg \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n_o \lambda_D^2}} \quad (14)$$

which is satisfied for strong enough B .

5. Definition of Relaxation Times

Eqs. (9) and (13) imply a monotonic decrease of Boltzmann's $H(t) = \int dy \langle f \rangle \ln \langle f \rangle$ to a minimum value consistent with conservation of the initial values of $\int dy \langle f \rangle$, $\int dy \, y \langle f \rangle$, and $\int dy \, v^2 \langle f \rangle$. For an initial value of $\langle f \rangle$, $H(\infty)$ is uniquely determined and a relaxation time can be defined as the time required for $H(t)$ to reach some value between $H(0)$ and $H(\infty)$. It is by numerically simulating the particle dynamics and periodically computing H that relaxation times are measured in Part II and compared with these predictions. The $B = 0$ results were reported some time ago by Montgomery and Nielson (1970).

It will be seen in Part II that the predictions that the relaxation times scale as Ω/ω_p and $(n_o \lambda_D^2)^{+1/2}$ are quite well fulfilled above certain values of Ω/ω_p .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Part of this work was supported at the University of Iowa under NASA Grant NGL-16-001-043 and USAEC Grant AT(11-1)-2059.

We are indebted to Professor Harold Grad for valuable comments.

REFERENCES

- Bogolyubov, N. N. 1946 J. Phys. (U.S.S.R.) 10, 265.
- Dupree, T. H. 1961 Phys. Fluids 4, 696.
- Dupree, T. H. 1963 Phys. Fluids 6, 1714.
- Dupree, T. H. 1964 Phys. Fluids 7, 923.
- Joyce, G. and Montgomery, D. 1972 Phys. Letters 39A, 371.
- Joyce, G. and Montgomery, D. 1973 J. Plasma Phys. 10, 107.
- Montgomery, D. 1967 Kinetic Theory; Lectures in Theoretical Physics
Vol. 9c Ed. by W. Brittin et al, Gordon and Breach, New York
pp. 15-85.
- Montgomery, D. and Nielson, C. 1970 Phys. Fluids 13, 1405.
- Montgomery, D. 1971 Theory of the Unmagnetized Plasma Gordon and
Breach, New York.
- Montgomery, D. and Tappert, F. 1972 Phys. Fluids 15, 683.
- Montgomery, D. 1972a Phys. Letters 39A, 7.
- Montgomery, D. 1972b Lectures at the 1972 Les Houches Summer School
of Theoretical Physics to be published by Gordon and Breach.
- Taylor, J. B. and McNamara, B. 1971 Phys. Fluids 14, 1492.
- Taylor, J. B. 1972 Phys. Letters 40A, 1.
- Vahala, G. and Montgomery, D. 1971 J. Plasma Phys. 6, 425.
- Vahala, G. 1972 Ph. D. Thesis, University of Iowa.
- Yoo, M. Y. and Abraham-Shrauner, B. 1973 Physica 68, 133.