29th EPS Conference on Plasma Phys. and Contr. Fusion Montreux, 17-21 June 2002 ECA Vol. **26B**, P-5.008 (2002)

Excitation of Magnetic Fields Correlated with Large Amplitude Lower–Hybrid Waves in Plasmas

S. I. Popel[1] and K. Elsässer
Institut für Theoretische Physik 1, Ruhr–Universität Bochum, D–44780 Bochum, Germany

Y. Takeda
Department of Physics, College of Science and Tech., Nihon University, Tokyo, Japan

H. Inuzuka
Department of Elect. Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Shizuoka University, Hamamatsu, Japan

1. The experiments in a high–current linear plasma discharge carried out at the Nihon University [1] have shown the possibility of the excitation of magnetic field perturbations related to intense lower–hybrid turbulence. The value of the magnitude of the perturbations is $|\delta\mathbf{B}| \approx 10$ G and $|\delta\mathbf{B}|/|\mathbf{B}_0| \approx 0.01$, where $\mathbf{B}_0$ is the unperturbed magnetic field. The characteristic features of the observations are: 1) the magnetic field perturbations are excited in the experiments mostly in the paramagnetic sense; 2) there is a correlation between the magnetic field perturbations and the electron density perturbations; 3) the power spectrum of the associated electric field fluctuations shows widely broadened profile and has multiple peaks around the lower–hybrid (LH) frequency.

All the results show that the excitation of the magnetic field perturbations can be associated with the development of the magneto–modulational processes [2]. We check this assumption. For this purpose, we derive the equation describing the relationship between the quasistationary magnetic field perturbations and the fields of the LH waves. The results obtained on the basis of this equation are compared with the experimental results.

2. The theoretical investigation of the magneto–modulational processes with the participation of LH waves has been performed for tokamak plasmas [3, 4]. The conditions of the laboratory experiments [1] differ strongly from those of tokamak plasmas. In particular, in the case of the laboratory experiments [1] the electron plasma frequency ω_{pe} is far higher than the electron gyrofrequency ω_{Be}, while for the case of tokamak plasmas we have the relationship $\omega_{pe} < \omega_{Be}$. The equation for the magneto–modulational processes given in Refs. [3, 4] assume that the inequality $\omega_{pe} < \omega_{Be}$ is fulfilled. Here we present the main steps of the derivation of the equation for the magneto–modulational perturbations caused by LH waves in general case.

Although LH waves are "almost" electrostatic, we are interested in the modulational excitation of the magnetic field perturbations. This means that we have to take into account low–frequency (with the frequencies much less than those of LH waves) transversal

[1]Permanent Address: Institute for Dynamics of Geospheres, Leninsky pr. 38, bld.6, 117334 Moscow, Russia

fields which can appear in process of the modulational interactions. We start here from Maxwell's equations, which in Fourier representation take the form (see, e.g., [2])

$$\left[\frac{\omega^2}{c^2}\varepsilon_{ij} + k_i k_j - \delta_{ij}\mathbf{k}^2\right] E_{k,j} = -\frac{4\pi i\omega}{c^2}\left(j^{(2)}_{k,i} + j^{(3)}_{k,i} + ...\right), \tag{1}$$

where $j^{(2)}$, $j^{(3)}$, ... are the quadratic, cubic, etc. (in LH electric field $\mathbf{E}$) currents, respectively, $\varepsilon_{ij}(\omega, \mathbf{k})$ is the dielectric permittivity tensor, the subscript $k = \{\omega, \mathbf{k}\}$ is a four–vector characterizing the Fourier component, ω is the frequency, $\mathbf{k}$ is the wave vector, δ_{ij} is the Kronecker symbol, and c is the velocity of light.

To denote the low–frequency fields we use the symbol tilde. The direction of the unperturbed magnetic field $\mathbf{B}_0$ is chosen along the axis Oz. Assuming that the low–frequency fields obey the inequality $\tilde{\omega} \ll \tilde{k}_z v_{Te}$, taking into account only the quadratic current $j^{(2)}$, and using the following relationship for the components of ε_{ij} under the condition $\omega \ll k_z v_{Te}$ [5]

$$\varepsilon_{xx} = \varepsilon_{yy} = 1, \quad \varepsilon_{zz} \approx 1 + \frac{\omega_{pe}^2}{k_z^2 v_{Te}^2}, \quad \varepsilon_{xy} = \varepsilon_{yx} = \varepsilon_{xz} = \varepsilon_{zx} = \varepsilon_{yz} = \varepsilon_{zy} = 0, \tag{2}$$

we find the relationship

$$\mathbf{E}_{\tilde{k}} = \frac{4\pi i}{\tilde{\omega}}\left[\frac{\tilde{\omega}^2 \mathbf{j}^{(2)}_{\tilde{k},\perp}}{\tilde{\mathbf{k}}^2 c^2} - \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{k}}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}\cdot\mathbf{j}^{(2)}_{\tilde{k}}\right)}{\tilde{k}_z^2 \varepsilon_{zz}} + \frac{\tilde{\omega}^2 \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_\perp\left(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_\perp\cdot\mathbf{j}^{(2)}_{\tilde{k},\perp}\right)}{\tilde{k}_z^2 \tilde{\mathbf{k}}^2 c^2}\right]. \tag{3}$$

Here v_{Te} is the electron thermal velocity, the subscript $\perp$ denotes the vector component perpendicular to the unperturbed magnetic field. Thus if $\mathbf{j}^{(2)}_{\tilde{k},\perp} \neq 0$ then the presence of LH waves results in the excitation of magnetic field perturbations

$$\delta\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{k}} = \frac{c}{\tilde{\omega}}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{k}} \times \mathbf{E}_{\tilde{k}}\right). \tag{4}$$

To determine $\mathbf{j}^{(2)}_{\tilde{k},\perp} \equiv -e\int \mathbf{v}_\perp f_{\tilde{k}} d\mathbf{p}/(2\pi)^3$ the kinetic equation for the electron distribution function $f(t, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p})$ is used (as it can be shown by direct calculations, the ion contribution to the magneto–modulational processes with participation of LH waves is negligibly small in comparison with the electron one). Here, $-e$ is the electron charge, $\mathbf{p}$ ($\mathbf{v}$) is the electron momentum (velocity). The distribution function f is normalized as follows $n_e = \int f(t, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}) d\mathbf{p}/(2\pi)^3$, where n_e is the electron density. We assume that LH wave frequency ω_0 is much less than ω_{Be}.

We solve the kinetic equation using the theory of perturbations in powers of LH wave electric field and following the standard procedure of separation of high–frequency electric fields (which are associated with LH field) and low–frequency those [2]. We find the following expressions for the components of the current $\mathbf{j}^{(2)}_{\tilde{k},\perp}$

$$j^{(2)}_{\tilde{k},x} \approx \frac{i}{4\pi}\frac{c\omega_{pe}^2}{|\mathbf{B}_0|\omega_0^2}\int\Big(k_{1,z}E^+_{k_1,y}E^-_{k_2,z} + k_{1,z}E^-_{k_2,y}E^+_{k_1,z}$$

$$+k_{2,z}E^{+}_{k_1,y}E^{-}_{k_2,z} + k_{2,z}E^{-}_{k_2,y}E^{+}_{k_1,z}\Big)\,\delta(\tilde{k} - k_1 - k_2)dk_1dk_2, \tag{5}$$

$$j^{(2)}_{\tilde{k},y} \approx -\frac{i}{4\pi}\frac{c\omega_{pe}^2}{|\mathbf{B}_0|\omega_0^2}\int \Big(k_{1,z}E^{+}_{k_1,x}E^{-}_{k_2,z} + k_{1,z}E^{-}_{k_2,x}E^{+}_{k_1,z}$$

$$+k_{2,z}E^{+}_{k_1,x}E^{-}_{k_2,z} + k_{2,z}E^{-}_{k_2,x}E^{+}_{k_1,z}\Big)\,\delta(\tilde{k} - k_1 - k_2)dk_1dk_2, \tag{6}$$

where the superscripts $+$ and $-$ denote the positive– and negative–frequency parts of the electric field, respectively.

Using (3), (5), and (6), we obtain from (4) the equation determining the amplitude of the quasistationary magnetic field perturbations $\delta\mathbf{B}$ excited by intense LH waves of a given frequency ω_0

$$\Delta\delta\mathbf{B} = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B}_0|}\frac{\omega_{pe}^2}{\omega_0^2}\nabla\times\nabla\times(\mathbf{E}_\perp(\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbf{E}^*) + \mathbf{E}^*_\perp(\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbf{E})), \tag{7}$$

where Δ is the Laplace operator; $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{B}_0/|\mathbf{B}_0|$ is a unit vector along the unperturbed magnetic field; $\mathbf{E}$ is the complex amplitude of LH field, the field itself is $\mathrm{Re}(\mathbf{E}\exp\{-i\omega_0 t\})$; the asterisk stands for the complex conjugate. Equation (7) is valid for the case $\omega_0 \ll \omega_{Be}$. This means that for the case of LH waves, when $\omega_0 \sim \omega_{LH} \equiv \omega_{pi}/\sqrt{1+\omega_{pe}^2/\omega_{Be}^2}$ (ω_{pi} is the ion plasma frequency), Eq. (7) is valid for arbitrary relationship between ω_{pe} and ω_{Be}.

3. Here we compare the results obtained on the basis of Eq. (7) with the data of the experiments [1].

In general, Eq. (7) describes the excitation of the magnetic field perturbations which have the components both parallel and perpendicular to the unperturbed magnetic field $\mathbf{B}_0$. Let us find the condition of the excitation of the magnetic field perturbations mostly in the paramagnetic sense, i.e., when the perturbations are "almost" parallel to $\mathbf{B}_0$. We denote

$$\mathbf{a}_\perp \equiv \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B}_0|}\frac{\omega_{pe}^2}{\omega_0^2}(\mathbf{E}_\perp(\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbf{E}^*) + \mathbf{E}^*_\perp(\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbf{E})). \tag{8}$$

Eq. (7) have solutions obeying the relationship

$$\nabla\delta B_z = \frac{\partial\mathbf{a}_\perp}{\partial z}. \tag{9}$$

This means that δB_z does not depend on z, while

$$\frac{\partial\delta B_z}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial a_x}{\partial z}, \quad \frac{\partial\delta B_z}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial a_y}{\partial z}. \tag{10}$$

Using the fact that $\partial\delta B_z/\partial z = 0$ and the relationships (10) we find from Eq. (7)

$$\Delta\delta\mathbf{B}_\perp = \mathbf{i}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left[\frac{\partial a_y}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial a_x}{\partial y}\right] - \mathbf{j}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left[\frac{\partial a_y}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial a_x}{\partial y}\right], \tag{11}$$

where $\mathbf{i}$ and $\mathbf{j}$ are unit vectors in the directions of the axes Ox and Oy, respectively. Using Fourier representation we find

$$\frac{\partial a_y}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial a_x}{\partial y} \propto \int d\mathbf{k}_1 d\mathbf{k}_2\left(E_{k_1}E^*_{k_2}e^{i(\mathbf{k}_1-\mathbf{k}_2)\cdot\mathbf{r}} + E^*_{k_1}E_{k_2}e^{i(\mathbf{k}_2-\mathbf{k}_1)\cdot\mathbf{r}}\right)[k_{2y}k_{1x} - k_{1y}k_{2x}], \tag{12}$$

where we take into account the longitudinal character of LH waves ($E_{k,i} = (k_i/|\mathbf{k}|)E_k$, $E^*_{k,i} = (k_i/|\mathbf{k}|)E^*_k$). If for two arbitrary LH waves with the wave vectors $\mathbf{k}_1$ and $\mathbf{k}_2$ the relationship

$$k_{1y}/k_{1x} = k_{2y}/k_{2x} \tag{13}$$

is fulfilled, then the excitation of the magnetic field perturbations in the direction perpendicular to the unperturbed magnetic field is negligible, and the magnetic field perturbations can be excited in the paramagnetic sense. This realationship means that LH wave spectrum consists of the waves propagating in one plane. In this case we obtain

$$\delta B_z \sim \frac{\omega_{pe}^2}{\omega_0^2}\frac{|\mathbf{E}|^2}{|\mathbf{B}_0|^2}\cos^2\theta_0, \tag{14}$$

where $\cos\theta_0 = k_z/|\mathbf{k}|$. For the data of the experiments [1] (the characteristic frequency $f \approx 55$ MHz, $\omega_0 = 2\pi f \approx 3.46 \cdot 10^8$ s^{-1}, $|\mathbf{E}| \sim 10$ kV/cm, $|\mathbf{B}_0| \approx 1.2$ kG, the electron density $n_e \sim 10^{12}$ cm^{-1}) under the assumption that $\cos\theta_0$ takes the typical (for LH waves) magnitude $\cos\theta_0 \sim \sqrt{m_e/m_i}$, we get from Eq. (14): $\delta B_z \sim 18$ G for hydrogen plasmas; $\delta B_z \sim 9$ G for deuterium plasmas. We see a good agreement of this estimate with the experimental data ($\delta B_z \sim 10$ G).

The electron density perturbations δn_e are related to the usual development of the modulational processes with the participation of LH waves. They appear in the places of LH field localization (see, e.g., [2]). The estimate (14) is valid for the spectrum which is rather broad and/or consists of several peaks. The width of LH wave spectrum in **k**–space determines the characteristic wave vector of the low–frequency magnetic field perturbations.

4. Thus the theory developed here allows us to explain the main experimental results [1] under the assumption that LH wave spectrum consists of the waves propagating in one plane. The most probable reason for the excitation of the magnetic field perturbations in these experiments is the development of the magneto–modulational processes.

One of the authors (S.I.P.) is grateful to the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation for the fellowship.

References

[1] Y. Takeda, H. Inuzuka, and K. Yamagiwa, Phys. Rev. Letters **74**, 1998 (1995); Y. Takeda and H. Inuzuka, Phys. Lett. A **265**, 282 (2000); Y. Takeda and H. Inuzuka, in Proc. 2000 Int. Congress Plasma Phys. (Quebec City, Canada, 2000).

[2] S.V. Vladimirov, V.N. Tsytovich, S.I. Popel, and F.Kh. Khakimov, *“Modulational Interactions in Plasmas”*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht (1995).

[3] V.N. Tsytovich and S.A. Bel’kov, Comments Plasma Phys. Controlled Fusion **5** 79 (1980).

[4] S.I. Popel and K. Elsässer, Comments Plasma Phys. Controlled Fusion **16** 79 (1994).

[5] E.M. Lifshitz and L.P. Pitaevskii, *“Physics Kinetics”*, Nauka, Moscow (1979) (in Russian).