PPPL-1338

MARCH 1977

PPPL-1338

DRIFT-TEARING INSTABILITIES DUE
TO TRAPPED ELECTRONS

BY

LIU CHEN, P. H. RUTHERFORD, AND
W. M. TANG

MASTER

PLASMA PHYSICS
LABORATORY

531 3000

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

This work was supported by U. S. Energy Research and Development Administration Contract E(11-1)-3073. Reproduction, translation, publication, use and disposal, in whole or in part, by or for the United States Government is permitted.

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.

NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Energy Research and Development Administration, 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.

Printed in the United States of America.

Available from
National Technical Information Service
U. S. Department of Commerce
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, Virginia 22151

Price: Printed Copy \$ * ; Microfiche \$3.00

<u>*Pages</u>	<u>NTIS Selling Price</u>
1-50	\$ 4.00
51-150	5.45
151-325	7.60
326-500	10.60
501-1000	13.60

Drift-Tearing Instabilities due to Trapped Electrons

Liu Chen, P. H. Rutherford, and W. M. Tang

Plasma Physics Laboratory, Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

PPPL-1338

March 1977

NOTICE
This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Energy Research and Development Administration, 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.

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED *ef*

Drift-Tearing Instabilities due to Trapped Electrons^{*}

Liu Chen, P. H. Rutherford, and W. M. Tang

Plasma Physics Laboratory, Princeton University

Princeton, New Jersey 08540

ABSTRACT

It is shown that the collisional detrapping of magnetically trapped electrons in tokamaks can excite drift-tearing modes with high azimuthal mode numbers. For normal temperature gradients ($d \ln T_e / d \ln n > 0$), the modes are unstable in the collisional regime ($\nu_{\text{eff}} > \omega_{*e}$), but stable in the collisionless regime ($\nu_{\text{eff}} < \omega_{*e}$).

The parameters of present and future generations of tokamaks lie in the trapped-electron regime, in which the trapped-electron bounce frequency exceeds the effective collision frequency. Electrostatic micro-instabilities of the drift-wave type (in particular, trapped-electron modes¹), which are driven unstable by the expansion free-energy associated with the density and temperature gradients, have been studied in some detail, because of their possible contribution to the anomalous cross-field transport processes. In this letter, we show that the same free-energy can also drive a tearing² or, more precisely, a drift-tearing instability.³ This new instability, which we call the dissipative trapped-electron drift-tearing mode, will cause the formation of magnetic islands. In this way, the new instability could have a significant effect on cross-field transport, by mechanisms different from those involving only electrostatic trapped-electron modes.

The wave equation for this mode is derived following fairly standard procedures.⁴ For tokamaks with $\beta \equiv 8\pi p/B^2 \lesssim \epsilon/q^2 \ll 1$, the compressional Alfvén wave can be ignored, and the perturbed magnetic vector potential is given by $\underline{A} = A_{\parallel} \underline{B}/B$. Here, $\epsilon = r/R$, and $q = rB_T/RB_P$ is the safety factor. The other perturbation field quantity is the electric potential ϕ . We then have $\underline{E} = -\nabla\phi - \frac{\partial \underline{A}}{c \partial t}$ and $\underline{b} = \nabla \times \underline{A}$.

The perturbed electron distribution function is determined by the drift-kinetic equation:

$$f_e = e\phi f_{e0} / T_e + h_e \quad (1)$$

$$(\omega - \omega_D - iC + iv_{\parallel} \nabla_{\parallel}) h_e = -(ef_{e0}/T_e)(\omega - \omega_*^T)(\phi - v_{\parallel} A_{\parallel}/c) \quad (2)$$

Here $\omega_*^T = \omega_{*e} [1 - \eta_e (3/2 - \bar{v}^2)]$, $\bar{v} = v/v_{Te}$, $v_{Te} = (2T_e/m_e)^{1/2}$,

$\eta_e = d \ln T_e / d \ln n$, ω_* is the electron diamagnetic drift, and ω_D is the combined electron ∇B and curvature drift. For the collision operator C , we assume a number-conserving, velocity-dependent Krook model; in this model, number conservation is satisfied by including in the equation for the untrapped electrons a Maxwellian source term equal to the number of electrons scattered out of the trapped region. For trapped electrons, Eq. (2) then gives

$$h_e^t = - \frac{ef_{e0}}{T_e} \frac{(\omega - \omega_*^T) A_{\parallel}}{ck_{\parallel}} + \hat{h}_e^t \quad (3)$$

$$\hat{h}_e^t = - \frac{ef_{e0}}{T_e} \frac{\omega - \omega_*^T}{\omega - \langle \omega_D \rangle + i\nu_e(v)} \left(\phi - \frac{\omega A_{\parallel}}{ck_{\parallel}} \right) \quad (4)$$

In Eq. (4), and in the following analysis, we neglect terms of order ω_D/ω ; we keep ω_D only in denominators such as the one in Eq. (4), where it can give rise to resonance contributions, especially at small ν_e . For untrapped electrons, we obtain

$$h_e^u = - \frac{ef_{e0}}{T_e} \frac{\omega - \omega_*^T}{\omega - k_{\parallel} v_{\parallel}} \left(\phi - \frac{v_{\parallel} A_{\parallel}}{c} \right) + \frac{if_{e0}}{\omega - k_{\parallel} v_{\parallel}} \frac{\int_t \nu_e(v) \hat{h}_e^t d^3 v}{n_o [1 - (2\epsilon)^{1/2}]} \quad (5)$$

Here, $\langle \omega_D \rangle \simeq \epsilon \omega_* \frac{\bar{v}^2}{\bar{v}} = \bar{\omega}_D \frac{\bar{v}^2}{\bar{v}}$ is the bounce-averaged ∇B and curvature drift frequency of the trapped electrons, and $\nu_e(v) = \nu_{\text{eff}} / \bar{v}^3$. In deriving Eqs. (3) - (5), our treatment of the collision operator is formally represented by $Ch_e^t = -\nu_e(v) \hat{h}_e^t$ and $Ch_e^u = f_{e0} \int_t \nu_e(v) \hat{h}_e^t d^3 v / n_o [1 - (2\epsilon)^{1/2}]$. In addition, we have made no distinction between ϕ and $A_{\parallel}$ and their bounce-averaged values, i. e., we have neglected the variation of ϕ and $A_{\parallel}$ along the field lines.

For the ions, we may neglect trapping and collisional effects. In the small Larmor radius limit, we obtain

$$n_i = \frac{n_o e}{T_e} \left[\frac{\omega_*}{\omega} + \left(1 + \frac{\omega_*}{\omega \tau} \right) \rho_s^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right] \phi \quad (6)$$

Here $\tau = T_e / T_i$, $v_s = (T_e / m_i)^{1/2}$, $\rho_s = v_s / \Omega_i$, and we have ignored ion temperature gradients and ion curvature drifts. We have also assumed that $|\partial^2 \phi / \partial x^2| \gg k_y^2 \phi$ (slab geometry), as is appropriate for tearing modes for which the electrostatic part of the perturbation is confined to a narrow "singular layer".

From f_e and f_i , we obtain density and current perturbations to be substituted into the quasi-neutrality condition and Ampere's law, which then yield

$$\left(1 + \frac{\omega_*}{\tau\omega}\right) \rho_s^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} = F(x) \left(\phi - \frac{\omega A_{\parallel}}{ck_{\parallel}} \right) \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 A_{\parallel}}{\partial x^2} = \frac{4\pi n_o e^2 \omega}{T_e ck_{\parallel}} F(x) \left(\phi - \frac{\omega A_{\parallel}}{ck_{\parallel}} \right) \quad (8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= 1 - \frac{\omega_*}{\omega} - \int_t \frac{f_{e0}(\omega - \omega_*^T)}{\omega - \langle \omega_D \rangle + i\nu_e(v)} d^3v - \int_u \frac{f_{e0}(\omega - \omega_*^T)}{\omega - k_{\parallel} v_{\parallel}} d^3v \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{1 - (2\epsilon)^{1/2}} \int_u \frac{f_{e0} d^3v}{\omega - k_{\parallel} v_{\parallel}} \int_t \frac{i\nu_e(v) f_{e0}(\omega - \omega_*^T)}{\omega - \langle \omega_D \rangle + i\nu_e(v)} d^3v \\ &= \left[1 - (2\epsilon)^{1/2} + \xi Z(\xi) - \xi Z\left(\frac{\xi}{(2\epsilon)^{1/2}}\right) \right] \\ &\quad \cdot \left[\left(1 - \frac{\omega_*}{\omega}\right) (1 + B_1) - \frac{\eta_e \omega_*}{\omega} B_2 \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{\eta_e \omega_*}{\omega} \xi \left[\xi + \left(\xi^2 - \frac{1}{2}\right) Z(\xi) - \frac{\xi}{(2\epsilon)^{1/2}} - \left(\frac{\xi^2}{2\epsilon} - \frac{1}{2}\right) Z\left(\frac{\xi}{(2\epsilon)^{1/2}}\right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Here, $\xi = \omega / |k_{\parallel}| v_{Te}$, Z is the usual plasma dispersion function, and

$$\begin{pmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{i(2\epsilon)^{1/2}}{1 - (2\epsilon)^{1/2}} \frac{4}{\pi^{1/2}} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{\nu_{\text{eff}}}{\bar{v}} \frac{\exp(-\bar{v}^2) d\bar{v}}{\omega - \bar{\omega}_D \bar{v}^2 + i\nu_{\text{eff}}/\bar{v}^3} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \bar{v}^2 - \frac{3}{2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

In deriving the second form of Eq. (9), we have made use of relations such

as:

$$\int_u \frac{f_{e0} \omega d^3 v}{\omega - k_{\parallel} v_{\parallel}} = \int_0^{\infty} 2\pi v dv \int_{-v}^v \frac{f_{e0} \omega}{\omega - k_{\parallel} v_{\parallel}} dv_{\parallel} - \int_0^{\infty} 2\pi v dv \int_{-v(2\epsilon)^{1/2}}^{v(2\epsilon)^{1/2}} \frac{f_{e0} \omega}{\omega - k_{\parallel} v_{\parallel}} dv_{\parallel} \quad (11)$$

$$= -\xi Z(\xi) + \xi Z\left(\frac{\xi}{(2\epsilon)^{1/2}}\right)$$

The expression F is a function of x , the distance from the singular surface, and this function is given by setting $k_{\parallel} = k'_{\parallel} x$; we assume that this dependence on $k_{\parallel}$ provides the only significant x -dependence of F . In deriving Eq. (8), we have noted that the parallel current is carried almost entirely by the untrapped electrons. The influence of the trapped-electron dynamics enters through the collisional trapping and detrapping effects, which are proportional to ν_{eff} .

For tearing modes, we may assume that the radial component of the magnetic field perturbation (in our case, $A_{\parallel}$) is approximately constant within a narrow singular layer around $x=0$. With this approximation, the first step is to solve Eq. (7) for the electrostatic perturbation ϕ within the singular layer.

In the case of the drift-tearing mode, there are two singular layers. In the outer singular layer, we may assume that $|x| \gg \omega / |k'_{\parallel}| v_{Te}$. Denoting the solution in this outer singular layer by ϕ_O , Eq. (7) may be written

$$\frac{\partial^2 \phi_O}{\partial x^2} = \Gamma \left(\phi_O - \frac{\omega A_{\parallel}}{ck'_{\parallel} x} \right), \quad (12)$$

where $\Gamma = F(\infty) / [\rho_s^2 (1 + \omega_*/\tau \omega)]$, with $F(\infty) = [1 - (2\epsilon)^{1/2}] [(1 - \omega_*/\omega)(1 + B_1) - \eta_e (\omega_*/\omega) B_2]$. The solution of Eq. (12) that properly connects to the external MHD solution, i.e., that has $\phi_O \rightarrow \omega A_{\parallel} / ck'_{\parallel} x$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, is given by

$$\phi_O = \frac{\omega A_{\parallel} \Gamma^{1/2}}{ck'_{\parallel}} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{\sin(k \Gamma^{1/2} x)}{1+k^2} dk. \quad (13)$$

As $x \rightarrow 0$, this solution has the asymptotic form $\phi_O \sim -(\omega A_{\parallel} \Gamma / ck'_{\parallel}) x \ln |\Gamma^{1/2} x|$. The outer singular layer has a width given by the typical scale of the solution ϕ_O , namely $x \sim x_O \sim |\Gamma|^{-1/2}$. In order of magnitude, we have $|\phi| \sim |\omega A_{\parallel} / ck'_{\parallel} x_O|$ throughout this region; physically, this is the region within which the parallel electric field is significant.

There is also, however, an inner singular layer, in which $|x| \sim \omega / |k'_{\parallel}| v_{Te}$. In this region, we have $|\phi| \ll |\omega A_{\parallel} / ck'_{\parallel} x|$, so that we may drop the term in ϕ on the right-hand side of Eq. (7). The resulting equation will have a unique solution, which we denote by ϕ_I , that properly connects to the solution in the outer singular layer, i.e., that has $\phi_I \sim -(\omega A_{\parallel} \Gamma / ck'_{\parallel}) \times x \ln |\Gamma^{1/2} x|$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. However, the detailed form of this solution is not needed. The inner singular layer has a width given by $x \sim x_I \sim \omega / |k'_{\parallel}| v_{Te}$; physically the electrons can be readily accelerated by the parallel electric field only if $\omega \gtrsim k_{\parallel} v_{Te}$, so that most of the perturbed current lies within this inner region.

The dispersion relation can now be obtained in the usual way, by equating $[\partial A_{\parallel} / \partial x] / A_{\parallel}$ to the quantity Δ' obtained from the external MHD solutions. Here, $[]$ denotes the jump across the singular layer. The quantity Δ' depends on the detailed form of the radial current profile⁵; for our present purposes, we may simply regard it as a known quantity. The jump $[\partial A_{\parallel} / \partial x]$ is obtained by integrating Eq. (8) over the entire singular layer. However, it is clear from the x -dependence of the right-hand side of Eq. (8) that the dominant contribution to the integral comes from the inner singular layer. As we have noted above, we have $|\phi| \ll |\omega A_{\parallel} / ck'_{\parallel} x|$ in this region, so that the term in ϕ may be dropped from the right-hand side of Eq. (8). Thus, we obtain

$$\Delta' = \frac{[\partial A_{\parallel} / \partial x]}{A_{\parallel}} = - \frac{4\pi n e^2 \omega^2}{T_e c^2 k_{\parallel}^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{F(x)}{x^2} dx. \quad (14)$$

We substitute for $F(x)$ from Eq. (9). The integral on the right in Eq. (14) can easily be evaluated analytically, by contour integration over x , leading to the dispersion relation:

$$(\omega - \omega_*)(1 + B_1) - \eta_e \omega_* \left(\frac{1}{2} + B_2 \right) = \frac{i\gamma_T}{1 - 2\epsilon} \quad (15)$$

where $\gamma_T = \Delta' |k'_{\parallel}| v_A^2 \rho_s^2 / \pi^{1/2} v_{Te}$ is the growth rate of the usual "collisionless" tearing mode.⁶

To estimate the importance of the trapped-electron terms in Eq. (15), we must compare the magnitudes of ω_* and γ_T . We find that

$\gamma_T/\omega_* = (2\Delta' r_n / \pi^{1/2} \beta_e)(\rho_s/L_s)(m_e/m_i)^{1/2}$ where $\beta_e = 8\pi n T_e/B^2$, and L_s is the shear length. Typical tokamaks have $\rho_s/L_s \sim 2 \times 10^{-4}$ and $\beta_e \sim 10^{-2}$; for these parameters, we find $\gamma_T/\omega_* \sim 5 \times 10^{-4} (\Delta' r_n)$. Since $\Delta' r_n \lesssim 10^2$, we have $\gamma_T/\omega_* \lesssim 5 \times 10^{-2}$. It follows that the term on the right in Eq. (15) can be treated as a small correction, so that the dispersion relation becomes

$$\omega \simeq \omega_* \left(1 + \frac{\eta_e}{2} \frac{1+2B_2}{1+B_1} \right) + \frac{i\gamma_T}{(1+B_1)(1-2\epsilon)} \quad (16)$$

In the limit $\omega \ll \nu_{\text{eff}}$, we find

$$B_1 \simeq \frac{(2\epsilon)^{1/2}}{1-(2\epsilon)^{1/2}} \left(1 + \frac{4i\omega}{\pi^{1/2} \nu_{\text{eff}}} \right); \quad B_2 \simeq \frac{(2\epsilon)^{1/2}}{1-(2\epsilon)^{1/2}} \frac{6i\omega}{\pi^{1/2} \nu_{\text{eff}}} \quad (17)$$

giving

$$\omega \simeq \omega_* \left\{ 1 + 0.5 \eta_e [1 - (2\epsilon)^{1/2}] \right\} \quad (18)$$

$$\gamma = \frac{2(2\epsilon)^{1/2}}{\pi^{1/2}} \frac{\eta_e \omega_* \omega}{\nu_{\text{eff}}} [2 + (2\epsilon)^{1/2}] + \frac{\gamma_T}{1 + (2\epsilon)^{1/2}}.$$

Thus, for $\eta_e > 0$, the trapped-electron effects are destabilising in the more collisional regime. On the other hand, for $\omega \gg \nu_{\text{eff}}$, we find

$$B_1 \simeq \frac{(2\epsilon)^{1/2}}{1-(2\epsilon)^{1/2}} \frac{4i\nu_{\text{eff}}}{3\pi^{1/2} \omega} \ln \left| \frac{\omega}{\nu_{\text{eff}}} \right|; \quad B_2 \simeq -\frac{3}{2} B_1 \quad (19)$$

giving

$$\omega \simeq \omega_* (1 + 0.5 \eta_e) , \quad (20)$$

$$\gamma \simeq - \frac{8(2\epsilon)^{1/2}}{3\pi^{1/2}[1-(2\epsilon)^{1/2}]} \frac{\eta_e \omega_* \nu_{\text{eff}}}{\omega} \ln \left| \frac{\omega}{\nu_{\text{eff}}} \right| + \frac{\gamma_T}{(1-2\epsilon)} .$$

Thus, for $\eta_e > 0$, the trapped-electron effects are stabilizing in the less collisional regime. We might also note that the ∇B -drift resonances do not play a major role here; at most, they cause a small modification of the real part of the frequency.

The destabilizing contribution in the more collisional regime arises from the term B_2 , while B_1 contributes a small stabilizing term. In the less collisional regime, both B_1 and B_2 are stabilizing. More precisely, we find that $\text{Im} B_2$ peaks at $\omega/\nu_{\text{eff}} \simeq 0.1$ and vanishes at $\omega/\nu_{\text{eff}} \simeq 0.8$. Thus, the largest growth rate occurs at $\omega/\nu_{\text{eff}} \simeq 0.1$, and modes with $\omega/\nu_{\text{eff}} > 0.8$ are stable. Moreover, the asymptotic expressions given in Eqs. (17) and (18) are approximately valid for $\omega/\nu_{\text{eff}} < 0.1$. It may be noted that the destabilizing mechanism introduced by the trapped electrons does not depend on Δ' ; thus, the trapped-electron tearing modes can be unstable even if $\Delta' < 0$.

Finally, we must confirm the validity of our assumptions regarding the inner and outer singular layers, and of the "constant- $A_{\parallel}$ " approximation. In the more collisional regime where the instabilities occur, the width of the outer singular layer is given by $x_O \sim \rho_s [(1 + \omega_*/\tau\omega)/F(\infty)]^{1/2} \sim \rho_s \left\{ 1 + 2(1 + T_i/T_e)/\eta_e [1 - (2\epsilon)^{1/2}] \right\}^{1/2}$. For $T_e \geq T_i$ and $\eta_e \sim 1$, this is

somewhat larger than ρ_i , so that the small Larmor radius approximation is justified for the ions. The width of the inner singular layer is given by

$$x_I \sim \omega / |k'_\parallel| v_{Te} \sim \left\{ 1 + 0.5 \eta_e [1 - (2\epsilon)^{1/2}] \right\} (L_s / r_n) (m_e / m_i)^{1/2} \rho_s. \quad \text{Thus, for}$$

$\eta_e \simeq 1$, the condition $x_O > x_I$ becomes $r_n / L_s > (m_e / m_i)^{1/2}$, a condition

that is usually satisfied in tokamaks. [However, for typical parameters

($\eta_e \simeq 1$, $L_s / r_n \simeq 15$, $\epsilon \sim 1/4$, and $T_e / T_i \simeq 2$) we find that $x_I \lesssim \rho_i$,

so that the small Larmor radius approximation may not be valid for the inner

singular layer. On the other hand, we did not find it necessary to calculate

the detailed solution for ϕ in the inner singular layer, so that our general

conclusion would be unaltered if this region were handled with a finite

Larmor radius treatment.] The "constant- $A_\parallel$ " approximation requires

that $x_O > |\omega (1 + \omega_* / \tau \omega)^{1/2} / k'_\parallel v_A|$. Substituting for ω from Eq. (18),

this condition becomes

$$\beta_e < \frac{4}{[1 - (2\epsilon)^{1/2}] \eta_e \left\{ 1 + 0.5 \eta_e [1 - (2\epsilon)^{1/2}] \right\}} \left(\frac{r_n}{L_s} \right)^2. \quad (21)$$

This condition does not present a very severe limitation on the validity

of our analysis; for $\eta_e \simeq 1$, $\epsilon \simeq 1/4$, and $L_s / r_n \sim 15$, it only limits

us to β_e less than about 4%.

One of the more interesting conclusions to be drawn from our analysis is that trapped-electron drift-tearing modes can arise with high azimuthal mode numbers. This is in contrast to magnetically driven

tearing modes, which are usually stable (i. e., $\Delta' < 0$) for azimuthal mode numbers $m > 3$. For high m , the external MHD solutions must decay away from the singular surface at r_s like $\exp(-m|r - r_s|/r_s)$. Accordingly, for these modes, we have $\Delta' \simeq -2m/r_s$. The trapped-electron drift-tearing modes for these high m -values will be unstable provided the trapped-electron contribution to the growth rate exceeds the (stabilizing) contribution γ_T . For $\omega/\nu_{\text{eff}} \lesssim 0.1$, we can use the expression given in Eq. (18) for the trapped-electron contribution to γ and, in this case, the instability condition is independent of m : for $\eta_e \simeq 1$ and $\epsilon \simeq 1/4$, it can be written $\beta_e > 0.3 (r_n^2 / qRL_s) \nu_{e*}$, where $\nu_{e*} = \nu_{\text{eff}} (qR/\epsilon^{1/2} v_{Te})$. For typical device parameters ($L_s/r_n \sim qR/r_n \sim 15$) this condition becomes $\beta_e > 1.3 \times 10^{-3} \nu_{e*}$, which is generally satisfied in tokamaks with relatively collisionless plasma parameters. For $0.1 \lesssim \omega/\nu_{\text{eff}} \lesssim 0.8$, the trapped-electron term is still destabilizing, although its contribution to γ is smaller than that given in Eq. (18). However, if $\beta_e \gg 0.3 (r_n^2 / qRL_s) \nu_{e*}$, as is usually the case, the stabilizing contribution γ_T is relatively very small compared with the trapped-electron contribution to γ , with the result that instability will still occur over much of the range $0.1 \lesssim \omega/\nu_{\text{eff}} \lesssim 0.8$.

We conclude that trapped-electron drift-tearing modes should be unstable for quite high m -values, up to a limit given roughly by $\omega \lesssim 0.8 \nu_{\text{eff}}$; for our typical parameters, this becomes $k_y \rho_s \lesssim \nu_{e*}$.

Useful discussions with E. A. Frieman and C. S. Liu are acknowledged.

REFERENCES

* Work supported by United States Energy Research and Development Administration Contract E(11-1)-3073.

¹ B. B. Kadomtsev and O. P. Pogutse, Sov. Phys. -Doklady 14, 470 (1969); [Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 186, 553 (1969)]; C. S. Liu, M. N. Rosenbluth, and W. M. Tang, Phys. Fluids 19, 1040 (1976); J. C. Adam, W. M. Tang, and P. H. Rutherford, Phys. Fluids 19, 561 (1976).

² H. P. Furth, J. Killeen, M. N. Rosenbluth, Phys. Fluids 6, 459 (1963).

³ B. Coppi, Phys. Fluids 7, 1501 (1964); P. H. Rutherford and H. P. Furth, Proc. Conf. on Plasma Theory (Kiev, 1971), p. 159; [Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory Report MATT-872 (1971)]; R. D. Hazeltine, D. Dobrott, and T. S. Wang, Phys. Fluids 18, 1778 (1975); J. F. Drake and Y. C. Lee, to be published.

⁴ W. M. Tang, C. S. Liu, M. N. Rosenbluth, P. J. Catto, and J. D. Callen, Nucl. Fusion 16, 191 (1976).

⁵ H. P. Furth, P. H. Rutherford, and H. Selberg, Phys. Fluids 16, 1054 (1973).

⁶ G. Laval, R. Pellat, and M. Vuillemin, in Plasma Physics and Controlled Nuclear Fusion Research (IAEA, Vienna, 1965), Vol. II, p. 259.