116
12/11/87

W.B.
PPPL-2458

UC20-G

(2)

(5)

DR 0349-Z

PPPL-2458

THE GENERALIZED BALESCU-LENARD COLLISION OPERATOR:
A UNIFYING CONCEPT FOR TOKAMAK TRANSPORT

By

H.E. Mynick

AUGUST 1987

PLASMA
PHYSICS
LABORATORY

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PREPARED FOR THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,
UNDER CONTRACT DE-AC02-76-CED-3073.

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.

THE GENERALIZED BALESCU-LENARD COLLISION OPERATOR:
A UNIFYING CONCEPT FOR TOKAMAK TRANSPORT

Harry E. Mynick
Princeton University, Plasma Physics Laboratory

P. O. Box 451
Princeton, New Jersey 08544 PPPL--2458
DE88 003471

ABSTRACT

The generalization of the Balescu-Lenard collision operator to its fully electromagnetic counterpart in Kaufman's action-angle formalism is derived and its properties investigated. The general form may be specialized to any particular geometry where the unperturbed particle motion is integrable, and thus includes cylindrical plasmas, inhomogeneous slabs with nonuniform magnetic fields, tokamaks, and the particularly simple geometry of the standard operator as special cases. The general form points to the commonality between axisymmetric, turbulent, and ripple transport, and implies properties (e.g., intrinsic ambipolarity) which should be shared by them, under appropriate conditions. Along with a turbulent "anomalous diffusion coefficient" calculated for tokamaks in previous work, an "anomalous pinch" term of closely related structure and scaling is also implied by the generalized operator.

MASTER

DISTRIBUTION OF

88

I. INTRODUCTION

The principal objective of this paper is the generalization of the Balescu-Lenard (B-L) collision operator^{1,2} from the uniform, unmagnetized, electrostatic context in which the standard B-L operator is derived, to its electromagnetic counterpart in the action-angle formalism initially developed by Kaufman.^{3,4} By specializing this one general (though explicit) form, one can obtain the appropriate B-L operator in the uniform, unmagnetized case, or the uniform but magnetized case for which Montgomery and Turner obtained the Landau operator,⁵ or the cases of a nonuniform magnetized slab, a cylindrical plasma, or a tokamak, basically by choosing the appropriate triplet of canonical invariants $\underline{J} \equiv (J_1, J_2, J_3)$.

The resultant collision operator in $\underline{J}$ -space permits one to view the effects on transport due to binary Coulomb collisions on the same formal footing as the effects due to longer-wavelength electromagnetic perturbations, either from internally generated fluctuations (producing "turbulent" transport), or from externally applied and/or coherent perturbations (for "ripple" transport). Thus, these three types of tokamak transport, normally considered separately, emerge as arising from the same process of diffusion (and drag) in action space. The manifest commonality encourages one to look for the counterparts of significant properties of one transport mechanism in the other two. For example, it is well known that axisymmetric ("neoclassical") tokamak transport⁶ is "intrinsically ambipolar," i.e., that the electron and ion particle fluxes are equal, independent of the strength of the radial electric field, and that like-particle collisions produce no net particle transport, a consequence of the fact that the binary Coulomb collision operator $C_b(p)$ conserves angular momentum $p_\perp$. Here, it will be shown that the generalized B-L operator $C(\underline{J})$ also conserves $p_\perp$, with the same

implications for the turbulent fluctuations whose effect it includes; turbulent tokamak transport due to a steady-state self-consistent spectrum should be intrinsically ambipolar. Further discussion of this and other implications for transport which may be drawn from general considerations of the structure of $C(\underline{j})$ will be given in Sec. V.

This work may be regarded as an additional step in the development of a more unified transport theory from the action-angle viewpoint, in which a number of steps have already been taken. Kaufman's original quasilinear diffusion tensor $\mathcal{D}(\underline{j})$ is adequate to study any collisionless diffusive tokamak transport problem where the perturbing fields are not self-consistent. Thus, it has been fruitfully applied to problems in collisionless ripple transport,⁷ and to transport in the presence of a background of non-self-consistent microturbulence.^{7,8}

More recently, the action-angle framework has been extended^{9,10} to incorporate collisional effects. There, the binary collision operator $C_b(\underline{j})$ in action-space is obtained simply by transforming the usual Landau form $C_b(p)$ to $\underline{j}$ -space. This formulation permitted the treatment of neoclassical transport in the action-angle formalism.

In Ref. 11, the basic commonality between the transport induced by external ripple and internally generated modes was stressed. This work shares with Refs. 9 and 10 a somewhat hybrid character; the action-angle representation is used to deal with the unperturbed motion efficiently, while collisions are included by transforming the binary operator $C_b(p)$ into $\underline{j}$ -space. The operator $C(\underline{j})$ derived in this work provides a basis for eliminating this hybrid feature, and for extending the range of transport mechanisms which may be viewed in a unified manner.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we

introduce some notation, and review the features of the action-angle formalism which are necessary for the work of the remaining sections. The interested reader is referred to Refs. 3 and 4 for further development of this formalism. The derivation of $C(\underline{J})$ is given in Sec. III, with the final result given in Eq. (43), supplemented by the definitions in Eqs. (35), (36), and (42). The derivation is quite analogous to the standard one, and the result (43) only slightly more complicated than the standard result, though it is a great deal more general. As explained in Sec. III, the key to making this generalization is using "natural" basis sets to represent the particle distribution functions, and the fields which mediate the particle interactions. In the final subsection of Sec. III, the general form is specialized to the uniform, unmagnetized, electrostatic case, and the standard B-L operator is recovered. Section IV explores the properties one expects of a collision operator, including conservation laws and an H-theorem. In Sec. V we indicate some of the ways in which $C(\underline{J})$ permits a unification of elements in transport theory normally regarded separately, and a number of additional implications for transport.

II. REVIEW OF NOTATION AND THE ACTION-ANGLE FORMALISM

We denote the set of variables specifying the position of a particle in its 6-dimensional phase space by $z \equiv \{z^i\}$ ($i = 1, \dots, 6$). Following Kaufman,^{3,4} we make the particular choice $z = (\underline{\theta}, \underline{J})$, where $\underline{J} \equiv (J_1, J_2, J_3)$ are the action invariants of the unperturbed motion, and $\underline{\theta} \equiv (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)$ are their conjugate angles. Because the J 's are constants of the unperturbed motion, the unperturbed Hamiltonian H_0 is independent of $\underline{\theta}$:

$$H(z) = H_0(\underline{J}) + h(\underline{\theta}, \underline{J}, t) \quad , \quad (1)$$

where h is the perturbing Hamiltonian. Thus, from Hamilton's equations,

$$\dot{\underline{\theta}} = \partial_{\underline{J}} H = \underline{\Omega}(\underline{J}) + \partial_{\underline{J}} h, \quad (2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{J} &= -\partial_{\underline{\theta}} H = -\partial_{\underline{\theta}} h(z, t) \\ &= - \sum_{\underline{k}} i \underline{k} h(\underline{k}, \underline{J}, t) e^{i \underline{k} \cdot \underline{\theta}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Here, $\partial_x \equiv \partial/\partial x$ denotes a partial derivative with respect to any variable x , and if x is a vector (e.g., $x = \underline{J}$), a gradient in the space of that vector is denoted. $\underline{\Omega} \equiv \partial_{\underline{J}} H_0$ is the unperturbed time-rate of change of $\underline{\theta}$, usually large compared with $\partial_{\underline{J}} h$ in Eq. (2). In the final form in Eq. (3), $h(z, t)$ has been written as a Fourier series in $\underline{\theta}$, with Fourier coefficients

$$h(\underline{k}, \underline{J}, t) \equiv (2\pi)^{-3} \oint d\underline{\theta} e^{-i \underline{k} \cdot \underline{\theta}} h(z, t), \quad (4)$$

and with $\underline{k}$ a three-component vector index. This is an advantageous representation, because for any function $g(\underline{J})$, $g(\underline{J}) e^{i \underline{k} \cdot \underline{\theta}}$ is an eigenfunction of the unperturbed Liouville operator¹² $L_0 \equiv \{H_0, \cdot\} \equiv \partial_{\underline{J}} H_0 \cdot \partial_{\underline{\theta}} - \partial_{\underline{\theta}} H_0 \cdot \partial_{\underline{J}}$,

$$L_0 g(\underline{J}) e^{i \underline{k} \cdot \underline{\theta}} = (i \underline{k} \cdot \underline{\Omega}) g(\underline{J}) e^{i \underline{k} \cdot \underline{\theta}}. \quad (5)$$

This property permits one to deal with unperturbed particle motion for complex geometries essentially as easily as for the unmagnetized case.

For nonrelativistic particle motion, the Hamiltonian is

$$H(\underline{r}, \underline{p}) = \frac{1}{2m} (\underline{p} - e/c \underline{A})^2 + e\phi \quad (6)$$

$$= H_0 + h + h_2 ,$$

with $\underline{r}$ the particle position, $\underline{p} \equiv M\underline{v} + (e/c)\underline{A}$ the canonical momentum, $\underline{v} \equiv \dot{\underline{r}}$ the particle velocity, $\underline{A}(\underline{r}, t)$ the vector potential, and $\phi(\underline{r}, t)$ the electrostatic potential. Writing $\underline{A} = \underline{A}_0(\underline{r}) + \underline{A}_1(\underline{r}, t)$, $\phi = \phi_0(\underline{r}) + \phi_1(\underline{r}, t)$, with $(\underline{A}_0, \phi_0)$ the unperturbed and $(\underline{A}_1, \phi_1)$ the perturbing potentials in Eq. (6), one arrives at the expansion in $(\underline{A}_1, \phi_1)$ given on the second line there, with

$$H_0(\underline{r}) = \frac{1}{2M} (\underline{p} - e/c \underline{A}_0)^2 + e\phi_0 , \quad (7)$$

$$H(\underline{r}, t) = -\frac{e}{c} \underline{v} \cdot \underline{A}_1 + e\phi_1 \equiv -\frac{e}{c} \underline{v} \cdot \underline{A}_1 , \quad (8)$$

and $h_2 = \frac{1}{2M} \left(\frac{e}{c}\right)^2 |\underline{A}_1|^2$, which is neglected as higher order in the perturbing potentials. In the final form for h in Eq. (8), we adopt 4-vector notation for compactness, and for ease of making gauge transformations: we write $r^\mu = (\underline{r}, r^4 \equiv ct)$, $v^\mu \equiv dr^\mu/dt = (\underline{v}, c)$, $A^\mu = (\underline{A}, \phi)$, with metric $(1, 1, 1, -1)$, so that $A_\mu = (\underline{A}_1, -\phi)$ and $\underline{v} \cdot \underline{A} \equiv v^\mu A_\mu \equiv \underline{v} \cdot \underline{A} - c\phi$.

The expressions given are all that are needed for the derivation of $C(\underline{j})$. However, it is useful to be able to attach some physical significance to the variables $(\underline{q}, \underline{j})$. For a uniform, unmagnetized plasma, $\underline{j} = \underline{p} \equiv m\underline{v}$ and $\underline{q} = \underline{r}$. For a plasma slab, with magnetic field $\underline{B}(x) = \hat{z}B(x) = \hat{z}\partial_x A_y(x)$ and plasma variation in the $\hat{x}$ -direction alone (this includes a uniform magnetized plasma as a particularly simple special case), the invariants are $\underline{j} =$

(J_g, p_y, p_z) , and their conjugate coordinates $\underline{q} = (\theta_g, Y, z)$. Here, $J_g \equiv Mv_{\perp}^2/2\Omega$ is Mc/e times the usual magnetic moment μ , with $\Omega \equiv eB/Mc$ the particle gyrofrequency (species label suppressed), and e and M the particle charge and mass, respectively. θ_g is the gyrophase. $p_y \equiv Mv_y + (e/c) A_y(x) \equiv (e/c) A_y(X)$ the canonical y -momentum, conjugate to guiding-center y -coordinate Y , and defining the guiding-center x -coordinate X . The pair $(z, p_z \equiv Mv_z)$ have their usual meaning.

As a last example, for a tokamak one may choose⁴ $\underline{J} = (J_g, J_b, p_{\zeta})$ and $\underline{q} = (\theta_g, \theta_b, \zeta_0)$, where J_b is the longitudinal invariant (the "bounce-action"), θ_b the bounce phase, and ζ_0 the bounce-averaged value of the toroidal azimuth ζ . The other variables have meanings already introduced. Dotting Hamilton's equation $\underline{p} = M\dot{\underline{y}} + (e/c) \underline{A}$ with the covariant basis vector $\underline{e}_{\zeta} \equiv R\hat{\zeta}$, one has

$$p_{\zeta} = Mv_{\zeta} + \frac{e}{c} A_{\zeta}(r) \equiv \frac{e}{c} A_{\zeta}(r_b) \quad , \quad (9)$$

where $v_{\zeta} \equiv \underline{e}_{\zeta} \cdot \dot{\underline{y}} = R\dot{\zeta}$. In the last form in Eq. (9), we define a minor radial variable, the "banana-center" $r_b(p_{\zeta})$ of a particle, in analogy to the definition for the guiding-center position $X(p_y)$ made above for the slab example. As there, the definition serves to emphasize the predominantly spatial character of diffusion in p_{ζ} (or p_y); change in p_{ζ} corresponds to change in the bounce-averaged minor radius of a particle, related by the conversion factor

$$\partial p_{\zeta} / \partial r_b = \frac{e}{c} \partial A_{\zeta} / \partial r \Big|_{r_b} \approx - \frac{e}{c} R B_p \Big|_{r_b} \quad , \quad (10)$$

with B_p the poloidal field.

III. DERIVATION OF $C(\underline{j})$

We follow the Fokker-Planck approach¹³ to deriving C . As usual, the first two Fokker-Planck coefficients may be manipulated so that the Fokker-Planck equation (truncated after the second coefficient) reads

$$a_{\underline{t}} f_0(\underline{j}) = C f_0(\underline{j}) \quad , \quad (11)$$

where f_0 is the $\underline{q}$ -average ($\underline{q} = \underline{Q}$ -component) of f , and

$$C f_0(\underline{j}) \equiv a_{\underline{j}} \cdot \left[\underline{D}(\underline{j}) \cdot a_{\underline{j}} f_0 - \underline{F}(\underline{j}) f_0 \right] \quad . \quad (12)$$

The diffusion tensor $\underline{D}$ is defined as

$$\underline{D}(\underline{j}) \equiv \int_0^\infty d\tau \langle \dot{\underline{j}}(\tau) \dot{\underline{j}}(t-\tau) \rangle \quad , \quad (13)$$

where $\langle \rangle$ denotes an ensemble average and $\dot{\underline{j}}(t)$ means $\dot{\underline{j}}(z(t), t)$. The friction term $\underline{F}$ is given by

$$\underline{F}(\underline{j}) \equiv \langle \dot{\underline{j}}^P(t) \rangle \quad , \quad (14)$$

where $\dot{\underline{j}}^P(t) \equiv \dot{\underline{j}}^P(z(t), t)$ means that portion of $\dot{\underline{j}}$ due to the "polarization fields" which the test particle, moving along its unperturbed trajectory at $z(t) \equiv (\underline{q}(t), \underline{j})$, induces. $\dot{\underline{j}}^P$ is negligible in $\underline{D}$.

A. Calculation of $\underline{D}$

We first evaluate $\underline{D}$. We use Eq. (3) in (13), writing $h(\underline{q}, \underline{j}, t)$ as the Fourier integral $(2\pi)^{-1} \int d\omega h(\underline{q}, \underline{j}, \omega) e^{-i\omega t}$, and using $\underline{q}(t-\tau) = \underline{q}(t) - \underline{q}\tau$.

The τ -integration can then be done, and using Placzek's formula, one obtains

$$D(\underline{J}_1) = \sum_{\underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_3} \underline{k}_1 \underline{k}_3 \int \frac{d\omega_1}{2\pi} \frac{d\omega_3}{2\pi} \pi \delta(\omega_3 - \underline{k}_3 \cdot \underline{Q}_1) \\ \times \langle h^*(\underline{k}_1, \underline{J}_1, \omega_1) h(\underline{k}_3, \underline{J}_1, \omega_3) e^{i(\omega_1 - \omega_3)t} e^{-i(\underline{k}_1 - \underline{k}_3) \cdot \underline{Q}_1(t)} \rangle. \quad (15)$$

Here, $\underline{Q}_1 \equiv \underline{Q}(\underline{J}_1)$, and in general the subscript "1" refers to the particle or phase point being scattered.

The ensemble average includes an average over $\theta_1(t)$, yielding a $\delta(\underline{k}_1 - \underline{k}_3)$ in Eq. (15). [Here, $\delta(\underline{k})$ denotes a Dirac- δ for those components k_i of $\underline{k}$ whose θ_i has an infinite domain (e.g., $\theta_i \rightarrow z$ for a slab), and Kronecker- δ when θ_i has domain $[0, 2\pi]$ (e.g., $\theta_i \rightarrow \theta_g$).] Thus,

$$D(\underline{J}_1) = \sum_{\underline{k}_1} \underline{k}_1 \underline{k}_1 \int \frac{d\omega_1}{2\pi} \frac{d\omega_3}{2\pi} \pi \delta(\omega_3 - \underline{k}_1 \cdot \underline{Q}_1) \\ \times \langle h^*(\underline{k}_1, \underline{J}_1, \omega_1) h(\underline{k}_1, \underline{J}_1, \omega_3) e^{i(\omega_1 - \omega_3)t} \rangle. \quad (16)$$

Assuming in addition that the fluctuation levels $h(\omega_1)$, $h(\omega_3)$ in Eq. (15) have randomly correlated phases unless $\omega_1 = \omega_3$, the ensemble average includes an additional $2\pi \delta(\omega_1 - \omega_3)$, resulting in

$$D(\underline{J}_1) = \sum_{\underline{k}_1} \underline{k}_1 \underline{k}_1 \int \frac{d\omega_1}{2\pi} \pi \delta(\omega_1 - \underline{k}_1 \cdot \underline{Q}_1) \langle |h(\underline{k}_1, \underline{J}_1, \omega_1)|^2 \rangle. \quad (17)$$

In the quasilinear calculation of Ref. 4, where this standard random-phase assumption is made for a discrete set of normal modes a , the integral $(2\pi)^{-1} \int d\omega$, in Eq. (17) is replaced by a discrete sum $\sum_a$. For the present B-L calculation, this random-phase assumption must be justified from computing the

fluctuation spectrum, which we now undertake.

1. Fluctuations

The fluctuation level $h(1,t) \equiv h(z_1,t)$ at phase point $z_1 \equiv (q_1, j_1)$ is the sum of the contributions $h(1,t|i)$ from each particle i in the plasma,

$$h(1,t) = \sum_i h(1,t|i) \quad (18)$$

By the linearity of Fourier transforms, an analogous relation holds for $h(1,\omega)$ and for $h(\underline{x}_1, \underline{j}_1, \omega)$.

From the definition (8) of h , one sees that we need the contribution $A_{1\mu}(\underline{r}_1, \omega|i)$ to the 4-potential $A_{1\mu}(\underline{r}_1, \omega)$ arising from particle i . This requires inverting Maxwell's equations to obtain the fields $A_{1\mu}$ from the sources $j^\nu \equiv (j, \rho)$. To make maximal use of existing results, we choose a gauge in which $\phi_1 = 0$, so $A_{1\mu} = (A_1, 0)$. After performing the inversion, we then will transform back to arbitrary gauge. Alternatively, it is not difficult to generalize the existing 3-vector expressions needed for the derivation given here to be valid for arbitrary gauge, arriving at the same result Eq. (29) or (32) for $h(1,\omega|i)$. However, doing this brings in a significant amount of extra notation associated with a relativistic formulation, extraneous to the main issues considered here, and so we will follow the present 3-vector, special gauge route.

With this choice of gauge, Maxwell's equations may be written⁴

$$\underline{\Delta}(\underline{x}, \omega) \cdot \underline{A}_1(\underline{x}, \omega) = - \left(\frac{c}{\omega}\right)^2 \frac{4\pi}{c} j_{\text{ext}}(\underline{x}, \omega) \quad (19)$$

where $\underline{\Delta}$ is defined by

$$\underline{A}(\underline{x}, \omega) \cdot \underline{A}(\underline{x}) \equiv \underline{A}(\underline{x}) + \int d\underline{x}' \underline{\chi}(\underline{x}, \underline{x}', \omega) \cdot \underline{A}(\underline{x}') - \frac{c^2}{\omega} \underline{\nabla} \times \underline{\nabla} \times \underline{A} \quad (20)$$

The susceptibility $\underline{\chi} = \underline{\chi}_{ss}$ in Eq. (20) (s is the species label) is derived within the action-angle framework in Ref. 4. The result given there is missing a term, however,¹⁴ arising from calculating the contribution $\underline{v}_0 f_1$ to the current density, but overlooking the ("adiabatic") contribution $\underline{v}_1 f_0 \equiv - (e/Mc) \underline{A}_1 f_0$. With this missing term restored, the result is

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\chi}_{ss}(\underline{x}, \underline{x}', \omega) \equiv & - \frac{\omega_s^2(\underline{x})}{\omega^2} \underline{I} \delta(\underline{x} - \underline{x}') \\ & - \frac{4\pi}{\omega^2} (2\pi)^3 \int_{\underline{z}_2} \int d\underline{z}_2 \underline{j}^*(\underline{x} | \underline{z}_2, \underline{j}_2) \frac{\underline{z}_2 \cdot \underline{z}_2 \underline{j}_2 f_{s0}}{\underline{z}_2 \cdot \underline{\Omega}_2 - \omega} \underline{j}(\underline{x}' | \underline{z}_2, \underline{j}_2) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $\omega_s(\underline{x}) \equiv (4\pi n_{os}(\underline{x}) e_s^2 / M_s)^{1/2}$ is the local plasma frequency of species s , $\underline{j}(\underline{x} | \underline{z}_2) \equiv \underline{j}(\underline{x} | \underline{z}_2) \equiv e_2 \underline{v}(2) \delta(\underline{x} - \underline{r}_2)$ is the current density at observation point $\underline{x}$ due to a particle at phase point $\underline{z}_2 \equiv (\underline{r}_2, \underline{p}_2) = (\underline{\theta}_2, \underline{j}_2)$, and $\underline{j}(\underline{x} | \underline{z}_2, \underline{j}_2)$ is its Fourier transform with respect to $\underline{\theta}_2$. The adiabatic contribution is the first term on the right-hand side of Eq. (21).

The inversion of Eq. (19) to obtain $\underline{A}_1(\underline{x}, \omega | i)$ in terms of the external current $\underline{j}_{ext}(\underline{x}, \omega) = \underline{j}(\underline{x}, \omega | i)$ due to particle i may be achieved by Green's function methods. We seek the tensor Green's function $\underline{G}$ satisfying

$$\underline{A}(\underline{x}, \omega) \cdot \underline{G}(\underline{x}, \underline{x}', \omega) = \underline{I} \delta(\underline{x} - \underline{x}') \quad (22)$$

i.e., $\underline{G}$ is the operator inverse of $\underline{A}$. Then

$$\underline{A}_1(\underline{x}, \omega | i) = - \frac{c^2}{\omega^2} \frac{4\pi}{c} \int d\underline{x}' \underline{G}(\underline{x}, \underline{x}', \omega) \cdot \underline{j}(\underline{x}', \omega | i) \quad (23)$$

We write

$$j(\underline{x}', \omega | i) = \int d2 \, j(\underline{x}' | 2) f(2, \omega | i) \quad , \quad (24)$$

where again, 2 denotes phase point z_2 and $f(2, \omega | i)$ is the contribution to $f(2, \omega)$ from particle i [cf. Eq. (31)]. Putting Eq. (24) into Eq. (23), one finds

$$\begin{aligned} h(1, \omega | i) &= - \frac{e_1}{c} \underline{v}(1) \cdot \underline{A}_1(\underline{r}_1, \omega | i) \\ &= \frac{4\pi c^2}{\omega^2} \int d2 \, \frac{e_1}{c} \underline{v}(1) \cdot \underline{G}(\underline{r}_1, \underline{r}_2, \omega) \cdot \frac{e_2}{c} \underline{v}(2) f(2, \omega | i) \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Kaufman and Nakayama¹⁵ have given an explicit solution of Eq. (22) for the case of a one-dimensional, purely electrostatic, inhomogeneous plasma. Assuming, as there, that $\underline{G}(\omega)$ is analytic except at simple poles at the eigenfrequencies ω_a of the plasma, the generalization of their result to the present three-dimensional case may be written

$$\underline{G}(\underline{x}, \underline{x}', \omega) = \sum_a \underline{E}_a(\underline{x}) [G_a(\omega)/N_a] \underline{E}_a^*(\underline{x}') \quad . \quad (26)$$

Here, $\underline{E}_a(\underline{x})$ is the electric field of the plasma normal modes, which have eigenfrequencies ω_a , and are mutually orthogonal.¹⁵ $N_a \equiv \int d\underline{x} |\underline{E}_a(\underline{x})|^2$ is a normalizing factor, defined so that the $G_a(\omega)$, proportional to $(\omega - \omega_a)^{-1}$, are the eigenvalues of $\underline{G}$,

$$\underline{G} \cdot \underline{E}_a(\underline{x}) \equiv \int d\underline{x}' \, \underline{G}(\underline{x}, \underline{x}', \omega) \cdot \underline{E}_a(\underline{x}') = G_a(\omega) \underline{E}_a(\underline{x}) \quad . \quad (27)$$

The crucial structural feature of expression (26) is that, by representing any $E(\underline{x}, \omega) = (i\omega/c) \underline{A}(\underline{x}, \omega)$ in terms of the basis set $E_a(\underline{x})$ of normal modes, $\underline{G}$ and its inverse $\underline{A}$ are brought into "diagonal" form, making the inversion of $\underline{A}$ simple. Thus, in this representation, $\underline{A}$ may be written in a form analogous to Eq. (26), with eigenvalues $G_a(\omega)$ in Eq. (26) replaced by

$$\underline{A}_a(\omega) \equiv G_a^{-1}(\omega) \quad . \quad (28)$$

This choice of a natural basis set $E_a(\underline{x})$ for the fields, taken in order to permit inversion of the Maxwell operator $\underline{A}$, is conceptually analogous to the use of the phase-space eigenfunctions $g(\underline{j})e^{i\underline{j} \cdot \underline{\theta}}$, already discussed, which permit the inversion of the operator $(\partial_t + L_0)$ arising in the Vlasov equation. In the uniform, unmagnetized context in which the usual B-L operator is derived, translational invariance implies that the spatial dependence of the basis functions for the fields and the distribution function are the same, $\underline{A}(\underline{x}) \sim f(\underline{x}) \sim \exp i\underline{k} \cdot \underline{x}$. This "degenerate" situation is no longer true for the much more general case considered here, and the resultant expression for $C(\underline{j})$ is accordingly a bit (though not much) more complicated, as will be seen.

Using Eqs. (26) and (28) in Eq. (25), one finds

$$h(1,1|i) = 4\pi \int_a \int d2 \, h(1,\omega|a) [N_a \underline{A}_a(\omega)]^{-1} h^*(2,\omega|a) f(2,\omega|i) \quad , \quad (29)$$

where $h(1,\omega|a) \equiv - (e_1/c) \underline{y}(1) \cdot \underline{A}_a(\underline{r}_1, \omega)$ is the perturbing Hamiltonian due to vector potential $\underline{A}_a \equiv (c/i\omega) \underline{E}_a$. At this point we may transform back to arbitrary gauge, leaving Eq. (29) unchanged.

Fourier transforming

$$f(2, t|i) \equiv \delta(z_2 - z_1(t)) \equiv \delta(j_2 - j_1) \delta[\theta_2 - \theta_1(0) - \Omega_1 t] \quad (30)$$

in time, and Fourier decomposing in θ_2 , one has

$$f(2, \omega|i) = \delta(j_2 - j_1) (2\pi)^{-3} \int_{\theta_2} e^{i\theta_2 \cdot (\theta_2 - \theta_1(0))} 2\pi \delta(\omega - \Omega_2 \cdot \Omega_2) \quad (31)$$

Inserting this into Eq. (29), one finds

$$h(1, \omega|i) = 4\pi \sum_a \sum_{j_1, j_2} \alpha(j_1, j_1, j_2, j_1, \omega, a) e^{i\theta_1 \cdot \theta_1} e^{-i\theta_2 \cdot \theta_1(0)} 2\pi \delta(\omega - \Omega_2 \cdot \Omega_1) \quad (32)$$

where

$$\alpha(j_1, j_1, j_2, j_2, \omega, a) \equiv \frac{h(j_1, j_1, \omega|a) h(j_2, j_2, \omega|a)}{N_a \Delta_a(\omega)}$$

measures the effectiveness of mode a in coupling particles 1 and 2. From Eq. (32) the Fourier coefficients $h(j_1, j_1, \omega|i)$ of $e^{i\theta_1 \cdot \theta_1}$ required by Eq. (16) may be read off.

Paralleling the usual argument, summing $h(j, j, \omega|i)$ from Eq. (32) over particle index i (or j) and using this in Eq. (16), the expression in angular brackets there involves

$$\sum_{a,b} \sum_{j_2, j_4} \sum_{i,j} \langle e^{i\theta_2 \cdot \theta_i(0)} e^{-i\theta_4 \cdot \theta_j(0)} \delta(\omega_1 - \Omega_2 \cdot \Omega_i) \delta(\omega_3 - \Omega_4 \cdot \Omega_j) \rangle$$

The δ -functions may be taken outside the ensemble average, $\langle ee\delta\delta \rangle = \langle ee \rangle \delta\delta$.

The average over $g_{i,j}(0)$ yields zero result unless $i=j$ and, since the particles determine the wave phases, unless mode indices a and b are equal, i.e., $\langle g \rangle = \delta_{ij} \delta_{ab} \delta(\underline{k}_2 - \underline{k}_4)$. This leaves $\delta\delta = \delta(\omega_1 - \underline{k}_2 \cdot \underline{n}_1) \delta(\omega_3 - \underline{k}_2 \cdot \underline{n}_1) = \delta(\omega_1 - \omega_3) \delta(\omega_1 - \underline{k}_2 \cdot \underline{n}_1)$. Thus, the same factor $\delta(\omega_1 - \omega_3)$ provided in quasilinear theory by the random-phase assumption, necessary for the step from Eq. (16) to Eq. (17), holds here as well. Finally, the remaining single sum over particles i is replaced by an integral over phase space, $\sum_i \rightarrow \int dz_2 f_0(z_2) = (2\pi)^3 \int dJ_2 f_0(J_2)$, resulting in

$$\langle h^*(\underline{k}_1, J_1, \omega_1) h(\underline{k}_1, J_1, \omega_3) e^{i(\omega_1 - \omega_3)t} \rangle = 2\pi \delta(\omega_1 - \omega_3) \quad (33)$$

$$\times (4\pi)^2 (2\pi)^3 \sum_{\underline{k}_2} \int dJ_2 f_0(J_2) 2\pi \delta(\omega_1 - \underline{k}_2 \cdot \underline{n}_2) \sum_a |\alpha(\underline{k}_1, J_1, \underline{k}_2, J_2, \omega_1, a)|^2.$$

Inserting this expression for the spectrum into Eq. (16), one obtains, finally

$$D(J_1) = \int dJ_2 Q(J_1, J_2) f_0(J_2). \quad (34)$$

Here,

$$Q(J_1, J_2) \equiv \sum_{\underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2} \underline{k}_1 \underline{k}_1 Q(\underline{k}_1, J_1, \underline{k}_2, J_2), \quad (35)$$

where

$$Q(\underline{k}_1, J_1, \underline{k}_2, J_2) \equiv (4\pi)^2 (2\pi)^3 \pi \delta(\underline{k}_1 \cdot \underline{n}_1 - \underline{k}_2 \cdot \underline{n}_2) \sum_a |\alpha|^2 \Big|_{\omega_1 = \underline{k}_1 \cdot \underline{n}_1}. \quad (36)$$

B. Calculation of $\bar{E}$

We now generalize the expression for the dynamic friction $\underline{F}$ in similar fashion. From Eqs. (3) and (14), one has

$$\underline{F}(\underline{j}_1) = \langle -i \sum_{\underline{l}_1} \underline{l}_1 e^{i \underline{l}_1 \cdot \underline{\Omega}_1(t)} h^{(p)}(\underline{l}_1, \underline{j}_1, t) \rangle \quad (37)$$

Here, $h^{(p)}$ is the "polarization" portion of h , i.e., that part of h generated by the particle 1 being acted on. Thus, in the notation of Eq. (25) or (32), $h^{(p)}(\underline{l}_1, \underline{j}_1, t) \equiv h(\underline{l}_1, \underline{j}_1, t | i=1)$. Reading off the Fourier transform $h(\underline{l}_1, \underline{j}_1, \omega_1 | i=1)$ of this from Eq. (32), Eq. (37) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{F}(\underline{j}_1) &= \langle -i \sum_{\underline{l}_1} \underline{l}_1 4\pi \sum_{\underline{a}} \int \frac{d\omega_1}{2\pi} 2\pi \delta(\omega_1 - \underline{l}_3 \cdot \underline{\Omega}_1) \\ &\quad \times e^{i(\underline{l}_1 \cdot \underline{\Omega}_1 - \omega_1)t} e^{i(\underline{l}_1 - \underline{l}_3) \cdot \underline{\Omega}_1(0)} \frac{h(\underline{l}_1, \underline{j}_1, \omega_1 | \underline{a}) h^*(\underline{l}_3, \underline{j}_1, \omega_1 | \underline{a})}{N_{\underline{a}} \Delta_{\underline{a}}(\omega_1)} \rangle \\ &= -4\pi i \sum_{\underline{a}} \sum_{\underline{l}_1} \underline{l}_1 \frac{|h(\underline{l}_1, \underline{j}_1, \omega_1 | \underline{a})|^2}{N_{\underline{a}} \Delta_{\underline{a}}(\omega_1)} \Big|_{\omega_1 = \underline{l}_1 \cdot \underline{\Omega}_1} \quad (38) \end{aligned}$$

This may be compared with the corresponding expression for the unmagnetized electrostatic case:

$$\underline{F}(\underline{p}_1) = -4\pi i \int \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \mathbf{k} \frac{e_1^2}{k^2 \epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \omega_1)} \Big|_{\omega_1 = \underline{k} \cdot \underline{v}_1},$$

to which Eq. (38) reduces with the appropriate specializations (cf. Sec. III.C).

In Eq. (38), we divide $\Delta_{\underline{a}}$ into its real and imaginary parts, $\Delta_{\underline{a}} \equiv \Delta_{\underline{a}}' + i\Delta_{\underline{a}}''$. As usual, only the imaginary part contributes to $\underline{F}$:

$$\underline{F}(\underline{j}_1) = -4\pi \sum_{\underline{a}} \sum_{\underline{l}_1} \underline{l}_1 \frac{|h(\underline{l}_1, \underline{j}_1, \omega_1 | \underline{a})|^2}{N_{\underline{a}} \Delta_{\underline{a}}''(\omega_1)} \Big|_{\omega_1 = \underline{l}_1 \cdot \underline{\Omega}_1} \quad (39)$$

As outlined in Refs. 3, and 4, we correspondingly divide Δ into its Hermitian (reactive) and anti-Hermitian (dissipative) parts, $\Delta = \Delta' + i\Delta''$, and assume that Δ'' may be treated as a perturbation on Δ' . Then the eigenfrequencies ω_a are nearly real, and Δ'' comes from the dissipative part χ'' of χ in Eq. (20). Thus,

$$N_a \Delta''(\omega) \equiv \int d\underline{x} d\underline{x}' E_a^*(\underline{x}) \cdot \Delta''(\omega) \cdot E_a(\underline{x}') \quad (40)$$

$$= \int d\underline{x} d\underline{x}' E_a^*(\underline{x}) \cdot \chi''(\underline{x}, \underline{x}', \omega) \cdot E_a(\underline{x}')$$

$$= -(4\pi)(2\pi)^3 \sum_{\underline{J}_2} \int d\underline{J}_2 \underline{J}_2 \cdot \partial_{\underline{J}_2} f_0 \pi \delta(\omega - \underline{J}_2 \cdot \underline{\Omega}_2) |h(\underline{J}_2, \underline{J}_2, \omega|a)|^2,$$

where Eq. (21) has been used in obtaining the final, explicit form in Eq. (40). Using this in Eq. (39), we find, finally

$$F(\underline{J}_1) = \int d\underline{J}_2 Q_F(\underline{J}_1, \underline{J}_2) \cdot \partial_{\underline{J}_2} f_0(\underline{J}_2), \quad (41)$$

where

$$Q_F(\underline{J}_1, \underline{J}_2) \equiv \sum_{\underline{J}_1', \underline{J}_2'} \underline{J}_1 \underline{J}_2 Q(\underline{J}_1, \underline{J}_1', \underline{J}_2, \underline{J}_2') \quad (42)$$

and Q is given by Eq. (36). Using expressions (34) and (41) in Eq. (12) yields the principal result of this paper:

$$Cf_0(\underline{J}_1) = \partial_{\underline{J}_1} \cdot \int d\underline{J}_2 (Q_D \cdot \partial_{\underline{J}_1} - Q_F \cdot \partial_{\underline{J}_2}) f_0(\underline{J}_1) f_0(\underline{J}_2), \quad (43)$$

with Q_D and Q_F given by Eqs. (35) and (42). Species indices s_1 and s_2 of the scattered and scattering distributions may be restored in the obvious manner.

C. Recovery of the Standard B-L Operator

Insight into the physical content of the generalized operator in Eq. (43) is obtained by specializing it to specific physical situations. The standard B-L operator $C(p)$ is derived in a uniform, unmagnetized plasma, considering electrostatic fluctuations only. Thus, we set $A_{1\mu} = (Q, \phi_1)$ in Eq. (8), yielding $h(z, t) = e\phi_1(r, t)$, and make the replacements $z \equiv (q, j) + (r, p)$ already noted in Sec. II for the unmagnetized case. The normal mode label a is replaced by a corresponding wavevector k , $\phi_a(x) + \phi_k(x) = \bar{\phi}_k \exp i k \cdot x$, with amplitude $\bar{\phi}_k$ having arbitrary normalization. Correspondingly, $\int_a$ is replaced by $\int dk$. Then one easily finds

$$N_k \equiv \int dx |E_k(x)|^2 = k^2 |\bar{\phi}_k|^2 (2\pi)^3 \delta(0) , \quad (44)$$

$$\Delta_k(\omega) = \epsilon(k, \omega) \equiv k \cdot [I + \chi(k, \omega)] \cdot k , \quad (45)$$

and

$$h(q_1, p_1, \omega_1 | k) = e_1 \bar{\phi}_k \delta(q_1 - k) . \quad (46)$$

In Eq. (44), $\delta(0) \equiv \delta(k)|_{k=0}$, and in Eq. (45), $\epsilon(k, \omega)$ is the usual longitudinal plasma dielectric. Thus, the $|a|^2$ term in Eq. (36) becomes

$$|a|^2 = (2\pi)^{-6} \delta(k - q_1) \delta(k - q_2) \left| \frac{e_1 e_2}{k^2 \epsilon(k, \omega_1)} \right|^2 \left[\frac{\delta(k - q_1) \delta(k - q_2)}{\delta^2(0)} \right] . \quad (47)$$

The term in square brackets here is zero unless $\underline{k} = \underline{k}_1 = \underline{k}_2$, in which case it equals unity. Thus, the value of expression (47) is the same in both cases if the term in brackets is omitted. (These manipulations with δ functions may be more rigorously performed using the familiar limiting arguments in which a finite plasma volume is allowed to approach infinity.) Putting Eq. (47) into Eq. (36) for Q , and using this in Eqs. (35) and (42), replacing the sums over $\underline{k}_1$ and $\underline{k}_2$ there by integrals, one obtains

$$Q_D(p_1, p_2) = Q_F(p_1, p_2) \\ = (4\pi)^2 \int \frac{d\underline{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \underline{k} \underline{k} \pi \delta(\underline{k} \cdot \underline{v}_1 - \underline{k} \cdot \underline{v}_2) \left| \frac{e_1 e_2}{k^2 \epsilon(\underline{k}, \underline{k} \cdot \underline{v}_1)} \right|^2, \quad (48)$$

the standard result. One notes the degenerate nature, already mentioned, for the natural basis sets for the modes and particles in the homogeneous unmagnetized case, through the δ -function in expression (46) for the wave-particle coupling coefficients. These δ -functions eliminate the extra sums over $\underline{k}_1$ and $\underline{k}_2$ which exist in the general form, and cause Q_D to equal Q_F , a relation not true in general.

IV. PROPERTIES OF $C(J)$

We now consider some of the standard properties one expects collision operators to possess, namely, the appropriate set of conservation laws, and an H-theorem.

As usual, particle conservation for C holds simply because C in Eq. (12) or Eq. (43) is a divergence in action space.

The proof of energy conservation is a bit more involved. One has

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \dot{H}_0 \rangle_J &\equiv a_t \int dJ_1 H_0(J_1) f_0(1) = \int dJ_1 H_0(J_1) C f_0(1) \\ &= - \int dJ_1 \Omega_1 \cdot [D \cdot a_{J_1} - E] f_0(1) \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

$$= - \int dJ_1 dJ_2 \sum_{\Omega_1, \Omega_2} Q(1,2) \Omega_1 \cdot [\Omega_1 \Omega_1 \cdot a_{J_1} - \Omega_1 \Omega_2 \cdot a_{J_2}] f_0(1) f_0(2) ,$$

where for the moment we abbreviate $Q(\Omega_1, J_1, \Omega_2, J_2)$ by $Q(1,2)$ and $f_0(J_1)$ by $f_0(1)$, and we have used the Hamilton's equation $a_{J_1} H_0(J_1) = \Omega(J_1) \equiv \Omega_1$. We now interchange the dummy variables 1 and 2 in the second term (arising from E) in Eq. (49), and use the symmetry, evident from Eq. (36), that $Q(1,2) = Q(2,1)$, finding

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \dot{H}_0 \rangle_J &= - \int dJ_1 dJ_2 \sum_{\Omega_1, \Omega_2} Q(1,2) (\Omega_1 \cdot \Omega_1 - \Omega_2 \cdot \Omega_2) \Omega_1 \cdot a_{J_1} f_0(1) f_0(2) \quad (50) \\ &= 0 . \end{aligned}$$

The final equality holds because the $\delta(\Omega_1 \cdot \Omega_1 - \Omega_2 \cdot \Omega_2)$ in $Q(1,2)$ is nonzero only where the factor $(\Omega_1 \cdot \Omega_1 - \Omega_2 \cdot \Omega_2)$ explicitly appearing in Eq. (50) equals zero.

We defer conservation of the canonical momenta J to the last subtopic of this section, as it is less standard, and take up the H-theorem now. The entropy is defined in the usual manner as

$$S \equiv - \int dJ_1 f_0 \ln f_0 . \quad (51)$$

Following standard manipulations, involving the interchange of indices 1 and 2 (this time for both the E and D terms), one finds the following positive-

definite form for $\dot{S}$:

$$\dot{S} = \frac{1}{2} \int d\underline{J}_1 d\underline{J}_2 \sum_{\underline{z}_1, \underline{z}_2} Q(1,2) f_0(1) f_0(2) \{(\underline{z}_1 \cdot \underline{a}_{\underline{J}_1} - \underline{z}_2 \cdot \underline{a}_{\underline{J}_2}) \ln[f_0(1) f_0(2)]\}^2 . \quad (52)$$

For the special case of a Maxwellian f_0 , $f_0 \sim e^{-H_0/T}$ one has

$$(\underline{z}_1 \cdot \underline{a}_{\underline{J}_1} - \underline{z}_2 \cdot \underline{a}_{\underline{J}_2}) \ln[f_0(1) f_0(2)] = (\underline{z}_2 \cdot \underline{a}_{\underline{J}_2} - \underline{z}_1 \cdot \underline{a}_{\underline{J}_1})/T .$$

As in the proof of H_0 -conservation, in conjunction with the δ -function in $Q(1,2)$, this factor yields $\dot{S} = 0$ for Maxwellian distributions.

Finally, we turn to considering the conservation of $\underline{J}$. With manipulations similar to those used for computing $\langle \dot{H}_0 \rangle_J$ and $\dot{S}$, one finds

$$\langle \dot{\underline{J}}_1 \rangle_J \equiv \underline{a}_t \int d\underline{J}_1 \underline{J}_1 f_0(1) \quad (53)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= - \int d\underline{J}_1 d\underline{J}_2 \sum_{\underline{z}_1, \underline{z}_2} Q(1,2) (\underline{z}_1 - \underline{z}_2) \underline{z}_1 \cdot \underline{a}_{\underline{J}_1} f_0(1) f_0(2) \\ &= - \frac{1}{2} \int d\underline{J}_1 d\underline{J}_2 \sum_{\underline{z}_1, \underline{z}_2} Q(1,2) (\underline{z}_1 - \underline{z}_2) (\underline{z}_1 \cdot \underline{a}_{\underline{J}_1} - \underline{z}_2 \cdot \underline{a}_{\underline{J}_2}) f_0(1) f_0(2) . \end{aligned}$$

While this vanishes for Maxwellians $f_0(1), f_0(2)$ of the same temperature, for the same reason that $\dot{S} = 0$ under these circumstances, expression (53) does not vanish, in general. The reason is that the interaction Hamiltonian $h(1|2) = h(2|1)$ between two particles at $\underline{z}_1$ and $\underline{z}_2$ in general depends on $\underline{z}_1$ and $\underline{z}_2$ separately, and not only on their difference $(\underline{z}_1 - \underline{z}_2)$. Unless this is the case, there is no momentum conservation law for the two-particle system governed by Hamiltonian

$$H(1,2) \equiv H_0(I_1) + H_0(I_2) + h(1|2) \quad . \quad (54)$$

This microscopic origin of the nonconservation of J becomes apparent from deriving $C(J)$ from the alternate BBGKY hierarchy method.¹³ C involves the two-point correlation function $G(1,2)$, whose evolution equation involves

$$\left[a_{\theta_1} h(1|2) \cdot a_{J_1} + a_{\theta_2} h(1|2) \cdot a_{J_2} \right] f(1)f(2) \quad , \quad (55)$$

where the first operator in brackets gives rise to D , and the second to E . The operator in brackets is just the perturbed portion of the Liouville operator $[, H]$ for the two-particle system described by Eq. (54).

While $C(J)$ does not conserve J in general, it does conserve those momenta J_i conjugate to coordinates θ_i for which there is translational symmetry, since then $h(1|2)$ does depend only on $(\theta_{1i} - \theta_{2i})$. For tokamaks, such a coordinate is the (bounce-averaged) toroidal azimuth ζ_0 . The coupling coefficients $h(\underline{k}, J, \omega | a)$ appropriate for a tokamak are given in Refs. 7 and 11, for both toroidally trapped and passing particles, and for fluctuations of both turbulent and ripple-like character. For present purposes, the essential feature of all these particular limits is that, analogous to the δ -function appearing in the coupling coefficient in Eq. (46), the axisymmetry in a tokamak implies that

$$h(\underline{k}, J, \omega | a) \propto \delta(\ell_{\zeta} - n_a) \quad ,$$

where n_a is the toroidal mode number of mode a , and p_{ζ} is the third component of $\underline{k} \equiv (\ell_a, \ell_b, \ell_{\zeta})$, corresponding to ζ_0 . Thus, from (36),

$$Q = \sum_a \delta(l_{1z} - n_a) \delta(l_{2z} - n_a) = \delta(l_{1z} - l_{2z}) \sum_a \delta(l_{1z} - n_a) .$$

Therefore, the z_0 -component of expression (53) contains $(l_{1z} - l_{2z}) Q(1,2) = (l_{1z} - l_{2z}) \delta(l_{1z} - l_{2z}) = 0$, and p_z is accordingly conserved.

V. DISCUSSION

The goal of this paper has been the derivation of the generalization $C(\underline{j})$ of the standard B-L operator, and the demonstration of some of its important properties. The application of $C(\underline{j})$ to a range of tokamak transport problems seems indicated, but is outside the scope of this work. In this final section, we discuss some of the general features of $C(\underline{j})$ which have significant implications for transport, and sketch some of the directions in which the theory developed here might be usefully applied.

An obvious but advantageous feature of using $C(\underline{j})$ is that it may be trivially decomposed into a sum of "binary" and "turbulent" collision terms,

$$C(\underline{j}) = C_b(\underline{j}) + C_t(\underline{j}) , \quad (56)$$

a decomposition achieved simply by dividing the full spectrum of contributing modes a into those with short wavelength ($\lambda < \lambda_D$) for C_b , and longer wavelength ($\lambda > \lambda_D$) for C_t . Both terms individually possess all the properties proved for the full C in Sec. IV.

The diffusion in p_z induced by C_b alone is what produces axisymmetric collisional transport, while that induced by C_t (sometimes in concert with C_b) produces turbulent and ripple transport. The identical structure of C_b and C_t provides a useful conceptual bridge between the different physical notions used to think about the transport arising from them. For example, it is usual

to think of ripple transport as due to the axisymmetry-breaking effect of perturbations of strength h , each causing p_z to vary in accordance with Eq. (3),

$$\dot{p}_z = -inh(\underline{z}_1, J, \omega_a) \exp(i\underline{z}_1 \cdot \underline{\theta} - i\omega_a t) \quad (57)$$

From this follows the 3-3 or p_z - p_z component of the quasilinear diffusion tensor. From Eq. (17), this tensor is ⁴

$$\hat{D}^{ql}(\underline{J}_1) = \hat{S}_{ql} \underline{z}_1 \underline{z}_1 \pi \delta(\omega_a - \underline{z}_1 \cdot \underline{\Omega}_1) |h|^2 \quad (58)$$

where

$$\hat{S}_{ql} \equiv \sum_a \sum_{\underline{z}_1}$$

is the summation operator appropriate for quasilinear theory. If the perturbations are internally generated, yielding transport from either self-consistent ripple, turbulence, or collisions, then from Eq. (32) one sees that h in Eqs. (57) and (58) is replaced by a sum over contributions $4\pi\alpha$ from scatterers at $(\underline{z}_2, J_2)$. From Eqs. (34) - (36), the B-L diffusion tensor may be written in a form analogous to Eq. (58):

$$\hat{D}^{BL}(\underline{J}_1) = \hat{S}_{BL} \underline{z}_1 \underline{z}_1 \pi \delta(\underline{z}_2 \cdot \underline{\Omega}_2 - \underline{z}_1 \cdot \underline{\Omega}_1) |4\pi\alpha|^2 \quad (59)$$

with

$$\hat{S}_{BL} \equiv \sum_a \sum_{\underline{z}_1} (2\pi)^3 \sum_{\underline{z}_2} \int dJ_2 f_o(\underline{J}_2)$$

the summation operator appropriate to $\hat{p}^{BL}$. Thus, collisional transport may be regarded as a particular ripple-transport problem, with a superposition $\hat{S}_{BL}$ of electrostatic ripple components, each of strength $4\pi\alpha \sim (4\pi e_1 e_2 / k^2)$, breaking the axisymmetry.

Following this structural correspondence in the opposite direction, just as performing the sum $\hat{S}_{BL}$ for short-wavelength perturbations yields the binary collision frequency $\nu_b \propto n_{o2} e_1^2 e_2^2 \ln \Lambda$, performing the sum indicated by Eqs. (58) or (59) for a turbulent or ripple spectrum will yield a turbulent collision frequency ν_t , where the particular form of ν_t depends upon the set of contributing modes considered.

One example where making explicit this connection between the "ripple" versus the "collisional" pictures should aid in unifying (and thereby simplifying) theory lies in the banana-drift "branch" of ripple transport. It is well known that the diffusion coefficients of the collisionless (D_{st}) and highest collisionality (D_{rp}) regimes (the "stochastic"¹⁶ and "ripple-plateau"¹⁷ regimes, respectively) are equal, up to a numerical constant of order unity. Moreover, the intuitive physical arguments used to describe the two transport mechanisms are similar, except that the decorrelation frequency in the random walk process, approximately equal to bounce frequency Ω_b in both cases, has a collisionless origin for D_{st} , but a collisional one for D_{rp} . Though the derivation methods in Refs. 16 and 17 are very different, from this underlying physical commonality, it seems likely that using the decomposition (56) of $C(j)$, these two regimes may be derived as a single result, with C_t providing the effective collisionality for D_{st} that C_b does for D_{rp} .

It has already been noted in the Introduction that a consequence of the fact that $C(j)$ conserves p_z is that turbulent transport in an axisymmetric

tokamak with a steady-state, self-consistent spectrum should be intrinsically ambipolar; an electron can change its "banana center" $r_b(p_z)$ by an amount dr_b only if an ion changes its r_b by $Z^{-1}dr_b$ (Z is the atomic number of the ion). As a result, as for collisional axisymmetric ("neoclassical") transport, calculations of turbulent transport in non-self-consistent fields (i.e., where only $\bar{D}$ is kept, and $\bar{E}$ dropped) may grossly overestimate the expected particle flux (but not the energy flux) of the species which would escape faster in the non-self-consistent theory.

Unlike the special case of collisional transport, however, it should be noted that the p_z -conservation property proved in Sec. IV is radially nonlocal; nonlocal turbulent fluctuations mediating the exchange of an increment dp_z of p_z can transfer dp_z from a particle on one flux surface to a second on a different surface.

The conservation of p_z , and the self-consistent character of the B-L operator, depend critically on the presence of the dynamic friction term $\bar{E}$ in C. As for axisymmetric transport, conservation of p_z holds because of the intimate structural relation between $\bar{E}$ and $\bar{D}$, resulting in an exact balance between the p_z -component $F_z f$ of $\bar{E}f$ and the diffusive flux $(\bar{D} \cdot \nabla_J f)_z = D_{zi} \nabla_{Ji} f$ (summation over i implied). In the action-angle formulation, $\bar{E}$ represents a drag (i.e., a "pinch") in action space, and in particular, F_z is a pinch in the predominantly minor radial variable p_z or r_b . Since the turbulent portion of $\bar{D}$ is what is usually expected to produce anomalous diffusion in r_b , the turbulent portion of F_z represents an "anomalous pinch" in r_b , with size and scalings closely related to those of the anomalous diffusive term. The relationship between this theoretically indicated anomalous pinch, and the anomalous pinch experimentally observed^{18,19} on a number of tokamaks awaits investigation.

As for the standard B-L operator, the derivation given here for the generalized operator is limited by the assumption of a stable background plasma. As a result, the fluctuation spectrum of Eq. (33), driven solely by shielded test particles, will be inadequate to explain the turbulent spectrum of realistic tokamaks. However, the validity of many of the properties of the operator $C(\underline{j})$ derived here are considerably more robust than the precise form of $C(\underline{j})$. For example, the conservation of p_t , and its implications for transport, should hold purely by virtue of the axisymmetry of the wave-plasma system, and the presence of the "anomalous pinch" term $\underline{F}$ to make the wave-plasma interaction self-consistent should also be independent of the details of the spectrum. Moreover, as the work of this paper indicates, generalization of the present $C(\underline{j})$ to one valid for a fully turbulent spectrum should be achievable, with only slightly more difficulty than that accompanying previous turbulent generalizations²⁰ of the standard B-L operator in the unmagnetized, electrostatic context.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to C.F.F. Karney and J.A. Krommes for useful discussions. This work supported by U.S. Department of Energy Contract No. DE-AC02-76-CH03073.

REFERENCES

- ¹R. Balescu, Phys. Fluids 3, 52 (1960).
- ²A. Lenard, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 10, 390 (1960).
- ³A.N. Kaufman, Phys. Fluids 14, 387 (1971).
- ⁴A.N. Kaufman, Phys. Fluids 15, 1063 (1972).
- ⁵D. Montgomery and L. Turner, Phys. Fluids 17, 954 (1974).
- ⁶F.L. Hinton and R.D. Hazeltine, Rev. Mod. Phys. 48, Part 1, 239 (1976).
- ⁷H.E. Mynick and J.A. Krommes, Phys. Fluids 23, 1229 (1980).
- ⁸R.D. Hazeltine, S.H. Mahajan, and D.A. Hitchcock, Phys. Fluids 24, 1164 (1981).
- ⁹I.B. Bernstein and K. Molvig, Phys. Fluids 26, 1488 (1983).
- ¹⁰R.H. Cohen, K. Hizandis, K. Molvig, and I.B. Bernstein, Phys. Fluids 27, 377 (1984).
- ¹¹H.E. Mynick, Nucl. Fusion 26, 491 (1986).
- ¹²H.R. Lewis and K.R. Symon, J. Math. Phys. 20, 413 (1979).
- ¹³See, for example, S. Ichimaru, "Basic Principles of Plasma Physics - A Statistical Approach" (W.A. Benjamin, Inc., Reading, MA, 1973).
- ¹⁴A.N. Kaufman (private communications).
- ¹⁵A.N. Kaufman and T. Nakayama, Phys. Fluids 13, 956 (1970).
- ¹⁶R.J. Goldston, R.B. White, and A.H. Boozer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 47, 647 (1981).
- ¹⁷A.H. Boozer, Phys. Fluids 23, 2283 (1980).
- ¹⁸J.D. Strachan, N. Bretz, E. Mazzucato, C.W. Barnes, D. Boyd, S.A. Cohen, J. Hovey, R. Kaita, S.S. Medley, G. Schmidt, G. Tait, and D. Voss, Nucl. Fusion 22, 1145 (1982).
- ¹⁹K.W. Gentle, B. Richards, and F. Waelbroeck, University of Texas Report FRC #290 (1986).
- ²⁰T.H. Dupree, Phys. Rev. Lett. 25, 789 (1970).