

# 2019 GPAP School on Plasma Physics for Astrophysicists

## Take-away questions and answers

1. What is the Debye length? How is an ideal plasma defined in terms of it, and what does this say about the importance of collective electrostatic interactions versus binary collisions?

The Debye length is given by

$$\lambda_D \doteq \sqrt{\frac{T_e}{4\pi e^2 n_e}};$$

it measures the distance over which electrostatic effects due to charge separation persist in a plasma (or, equivalently, the characteristic e-folding distance beyond which charges are screened). Another acceptable answer, which takes into account the possible mobility of ions on plasma-frequency timescales, is

$$\lambda_D \doteq \sqrt{\frac{T_{\text{eff}}}{4\pi e^2 n_e}}, \quad \text{where} \quad T_{\text{eff}} \doteq \left( \frac{1}{T_e} + \frac{Z_i n_i}{n_e} \frac{Z_i}{T_i} \right)^{-1}$$

and  $Z_i$  is the ion charge in units of  $e$ . A plasma is defined by  $n_e \lambda_D^3 \gg 1$  – i.e., the number of electrons per Debye sphere is very large. In this case, collective electrostatic interactions dominate over binary collisions.

2. Give a rough comparison ( $\ll$ ,  $<$ , or  $\sim$ ) of the ion Larmor radius  $\rho_i$ , the collisional mean free path  $\lambda_{\text{mfp}}$ , and the characteristic scale  $\ell$  in the following plasmas: (i) the intracluster medium (cooling radius  $\ell \sim 100$  kpc), (ii) the solar wind ( $\ell \sim 1$  au), (iii) the warm phase of the interstellar medium ( $\ell \sim 100$  pc), and (iv) the Galactic center (Bondi radius  $\ell \sim 0.01$  pc).

(i)  $\rho_i \ll \lambda_{\text{mfp}} < \ell$ , (ii)  $\rho_i \ll \lambda_{\text{mfp}} \sim \ell$ , (iii)  $\rho_i \ll \lambda_{\text{mfp}} \ll \ell$ , (iv)  $\rho_i \ll \lambda_{\text{mfp}} \sim \ell$

3. Write down formulae for the  $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$  drift velocity, the  $\nabla B$  drift velocity, and the curvature drift velocity. In an ion-electron plasma, which of these drifts give rise to a current?

With  $\mathbf{E}$  being the electric field and  $\mathbf{B}$  being the magnetic field,

$$\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}} = -\frac{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}{\Omega} \times \frac{q\mathbf{E}}{m} = \frac{c\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}}{B^2}, \quad \mathbf{u}_{\nabla B} = \frac{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}{\Omega} \times \frac{\mu \nabla B}{m}, \quad \mathbf{u}_{\text{curv}} = \frac{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}{\Omega} \times \frac{mv_{\parallel}^2 (\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \nabla) \hat{\mathbf{b}}}{m},$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{b}} \doteq \mathbf{B}/B$  is the unit vector in the magnetic-field direction,  $\Omega \doteq qB/mc$  is the Larmor frequency, and  $\mu \doteq mv_{\perp}^2/2B$  is the magnetic moment. The subscripts  $\parallel$  and  $\perp$  denote the directions parallel and perpendicular to the magnetic field. The  $\nabla B$  and curvature drifts give rise to currents since the sign of the drift velocity is charge-dependent.

4. State all of the assumptions made in deriving the (nonrelativistic) ideal, single-fluid MHD equations.

Quasineutrality ( $k\lambda_D \ll 1$ ), no displacement current ( $v/c \ll 1$ ), scalar pressure (i.e., Maxwell distribution to all orders:  $\lambda_{\text{mfp}} \ll L$ ), magnetized ( $\rho_i \ll L$ ), infinite conductivity,  $u_{\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}}/v_{\text{th}} \sim 1$

5. Give the dispersion relation for a parallel-propagating Alfvén wave. Explain what physics drives the propagation of this wave.

The frequency of a parallel-propagating Alfvén wave is  $\omega = \pm \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}_A$ , where  $\mathbf{k}$  is the wavevector and  $\mathbf{v}_A \doteq \mathbf{B}/\sqrt{4\pi\rho}$  is the Alfvén velocity. (Also acceptable is  $\omega = \pm k_{\parallel} v_A$ , where  $k_{\parallel}$  is the parallel component of the wavevector.) Alfvén waves result from a competition between magnetic tension, which provides the restoring force, and plasma inertia, which causes the magnetic-field perturbations to overshoot the equilibrium by virtue of flux-freezing. Oscillation ensues.

6. What are the physical set-ups that give rise to the Rayleigh-Taylor, Kelvin-Helmholtz, and magnetorotational instabilities? In each case, what is the free-energy source driving the instability and how does the growth rate scale with this free-energy source?

**RTI:** heavy fluid on top of light fluid in a gravitational field. Growth rate  $\gamma = \sqrt{|k|g\Delta}$ , where  $k$  is the horizontal wavenumber,  $g$  is the gravitational acceleration, and  $\Delta \doteq (\rho_{\text{top}} - \rho_{\text{bot}})/(\rho_{\text{top}} + \rho_{\text{bot}})$ . Free energy is the gravitational potential energy. **KHI:** fast fluid neighboring slow fluid, with an inflection point in the shear flow. For a discontinuous  $x$ -jump in  $y$ -velocity from 0 to  $U$ ,  $\gamma \propto |k_x|U(1 \pm i)$ . Free energy is the shear flow. **MRI:** outwardly decreasing angular velocity in a rotating fluid.  $\gamma \propto -d\Omega^2/d\ln R$ , where  $\Omega = \Omega(R)$  is the angular velocity and  $R$  is the radial coordinate in cylindrical coordinates. Free energy is the differential rotation.

7. Define the Lundquist number  $S$ . How does the reconnection rate in the Sweet-Parker model scale with  $S$ ? Why is this a problem for explaining reconnection in most astrophysical plasmas?

The Lundquist number  $S \doteq v_A L/\eta$ , where  $v_A = B/\sqrt{4\pi\rho}$  is the Alfvén speed,  $L$  is some characteristic (magnetic) lengthscale, and  $\eta$  is the magnetic resistivity. The reconnection rate in the Sweet-Parker model  $\propto S^{-1/2}$ . This is a problem for explaining reconnection in most astrophysical plasmas because most astrophysical plasmas have  $S \gg 1$ . Physically, larger current density (i.e. a thin sheet) gives faster reconnection due to the larger free energy; but, in the Sweet-Parker model, this implies a narrow nozzle through which the exhaust escapes. The result is a slow reconnection rate.

8. State the assumptions used in Kolmogorov’s theory of hydrodynamic turbulence. Use them to derive the energy spectrum  $E(k)$ , where  $E = \int dk E(k)$ .

Assumptions are constant energy flux throughout the inertial range of the cascade from small to large wavenumbers (i.e., large to small scales), isotropy of the cascade ( $\mathbf{k} \rightarrow k = 2\pi/\ell$ ), and locality of interactions. Then the energy spectrum is uniquely determined by dimensional analysis. The energy flux through scale  $\ell$  is  $\sim u_\ell^2/\tau_\ell \sim u_\ell^2/(\ell/u_\ell) = u_\ell^3/\ell$ . This being constant implies  $u_\ell \sim \ell^{1/3}$ . The energy at scale  $\ell$  is thus  $u_\ell^2 \sim \ell^{2/3}$ , and so  $E(k) \sim u_k^2/k \sim k^{-5/3}$ .

**9.** Describe the line of reasoning that leads to the Iroshnikov-Kraichnan ( $k^{-3/2}$ ) and Goldreich-Sridhar ( $k_{\perp}^{-5/3}$ ) spectra of MHD turbulence in the presence of a strong mean magnetic field. State all assumptions (namely, presence or absence of isotropy, relative magnitude of linear and nonlinear timescales). Why is the MHD turbulence spectrum not uniquely determined by purely dimensional considerations?

Define the Alfvén time  $\tau_A \doteq \ell_{\parallel}/v_A$  and the strain (or “eddy”) time  $\tau_s \doteq \ell/u_{\ell}$ . **IK:** counterpropagating Alfvén wavepackets interact weakly ( $\tau_A \ll \tau_s$ ), the relevant timescale being the Alfvén time. As in K41, isotropy of the cascade ( $\ell_{\parallel}/\ell_{\perp} \sim 1$ ) and locality of interactions are assumed. **GS:** anisotropic cascade with comparable linear and non-linear frequencies,  $k_{\parallel}v_A \sim k_{\perp}u_{\perp}$  (“critical balance”). The principal difference with the hydrodynamic case is that the cascade time is no longer a dimensional inevitability, since two physical timescales are associated with each wave packet ( $\tau_A$  and  $\tau_s$ ). Put differently, there are three (rather than two) dimensionless combinations in the problem, and so further physics input is needed.

**10.** The magnetic moment of a particle  $\mu \doteq mw_{\perp}^2/2B$ , where  $w_{\perp}$  is the component of the particle’s peculiar (“thermal”) velocity perpendicular to the magnetic field  $\mathbf{B}$ . State under what conditions  $\mu$  is an adiabatic invariant.

$\mu$  is an adiabatic invariant if the particle sees a small change in the magnetic-field strength during a gyroperiod, whether that change is due to temporal or spatial variations in  $B$  (*viz.*,  $|d \ln B/dt| \ll \Omega$ ).

**11.** What is Landau damping, and why is it not included in the MHD plasma description?

Landau damping is a resonant mechanism that collisionlessly damps electrostatic fluctuations, leading to the formation of small-scale structure in the velocity distribution function of the plasma particles. This small scale structure can eventually be smoothed by collisions, leading to irreversible heating. In any fluid description, the large rate of particle–particle collisions prevents the individual particles from resonating with the wave field.

**12.** Departures from an isotropic Maxwellian velocity distribution can lead to *kinetic instabilities*. What are the three kinds of departures that were discussed, and what are some linear instabilities that are generated by these departures?

Beams (i.e. well-separated populations with disparate velocities), bumps (i.e. overlapping or non-monotonically decreasing thermal distributions), and biases (i.e. anisotropies in the thermal motions of particles with respect to a particular direction). Beams lead to streaming instabilities; bumps to resonant instabilities; and biases to Weibel, Alfvén ion-cyclotron, firehose, and mirror instabilities.

**13.** What is the Stefan–Boltzmann Law? When does it apply and how is it derived?

The Stefan–Boltzmann Law,  $\sigma T^4$ , where  $\sigma$  is the Stefan–Boltzmann constant, describes the power emitted from a blackbody. Note that it is only dependent on temperature. A blackbody radiator emits at every frequency and radiates isotropically. It is derived from Planck’s Law by integrating over all frequencies and angles.

**14.** As a beam of radiation interacts with matter, its radiation intensity,  $I_{\lambda}$ , is modified. Describe the change in  $I_{\lambda}$  as the beam moves into the matter. How does this depend on the optical depth?

The radiation is absorbed or scattered by the matter. The amount of radiation “removed” from the beam depends on the wavelength of the radiation  $\lambda$ , the distance traveled  $s$ , the density of the matter  $\rho$ , and the opacity  $\kappa_{\lambda}$ . The optical depth is defined as  $\tau_{\lambda} = \rho s \kappa_{\lambda}$ . Each optical depth the beam moves into the matter the radiation intensity decreases by a factor of  $1/e$ .

Recommended textbooks and lecture notes for introductory plasma physics:

- Alex Schekochihin, <http://www-thphys.physics.ox.ac.uk/people/AlexanderSchekochihin/KT/2015/KTLectureNotes.pdf>
- Mike Brown, <http://plasma.physics.swarthmore.edu/brownpapers/index.html>
- Krall & Trivelpiece, *Principles of Plasma Physics*
- Dwight Nicholson, *Introduction to plasma theory*
- Hazeltine & Waelbroeck, *The Framework of Plasma Physics*
- Paul Bellan, *Fundamentals of Plasma Physics*
- Gurnett & Bhattacharjee, *Introduction to Plasma Physics*
- Paul Drake, *High Energy Density Physics*

Recommended textbooks and lecture notes for introductory plasma astrophysics and space physics:

- Matthew Kunz, <https://www.astro.princeton.edu/~kunz/Site/AST521/>
- Russell Kulsrud, *Plasma Physics for Astrophysics*
- Verscharen *et al.*, Living Review in Space Physics: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1902.03448.pdf>

Recommend textbooks for fluid dynamics:

- D. J. Acheson, *Elementary Fluid Dynamics*
- Uriel Frisch, *Turbulence*