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Measurements of energetic ion distributions produced from CD$_2^+$ and CH$_2^+$ targets are compared with a numerical model. The model describes the ambipolar expansion of hot electrons and two relatively cold ion species from a pressure gradient. For CD$_2^+$ the plasma expansion is adequately represented by a single ion species, whereas for CH$_2^+$ two ion fluids are required to account for the energy and the relative behavior of the high energy ion species.
HIGH ENERGY ION EXPANSION IN
LASER-PLASMA INTERACTIONS

Historically, the high energy ions in a laser-produced plasma are
defined as a small group of ions transporting a significant fraction of
the absorbed laser energy. Most expansion models\textsuperscript{1,2} indicate that the
energetic ions are the direct consequence of the presence of high
energy electrons. Most plasma simulations\textsuperscript{1,3} use a single ion species
to model the ion expansion. Here we show that, although
the hot electron expansion can account for the energy content of the
fast ions, a multi-ion species description is usually required to
reproduce the measured high energy ion distributions. Ion energy
distributions measured from CD\textsubscript{2} targets, where both predominant
species, C\textsuperscript{+5} and D\textsuperscript{+}, have the same charge-to-mass ratio, are adequately
represented by a single-ion species expansion. For CH\textsubscript{2} targets,
however, a two-ion species description is required to reproduce the
qualitative features of the ion expansion.

Typical single-shot energy distributions of high energy ions
measured from the Nd-laser irradiation (75 psec, \textasciitilde 10^{18} W/cm\textsuperscript{2} with an
f/2 lens) of a CD\textsubscript{2} and CH\textsubscript{2} target are shown in Figs. 1 and 2
respectively. The gross variation between the charge collector
oscilloscope traces such as shown in Figs. 1b and 2b are due mainly to
the different viewing angle between the target normal and the analyzer
axis. For both cases the analyzer axis was at 35\textdegree{} with respect to the
laser axis but the target normal in Figs. 1 and 2 were 35\textdegree{} and 22\textdegree{}.

Note: Manuscript submitted November 23, 1977.
respectively from the laser axis toward the analyzer. The high energy electrostatic ion analyzer used has twelve channels with 10 species and energy resolution. Since this analyzer cannot resolve C\(^{+5}\) from D\(^{+}\) ions, the C\(^{+5}\) ions were removed by allowing them to charge exchange with a nitrogen gas background (1.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ Torr}) in the target chamber before entering the ion analyzer. The lowered ionization stages, originally C\(^{+5}\), can then be differentiated from D\(^{+}\) ions. The ion energy distribution is finally reconstructed from the summation of the recombination products. For either CH\(_2\) or CD\(_2\) targets no ionization stages lower than C\(^{+5}\) and only a small fraction of C\(^{+5}\) appeared under good vacuum conditions (8 \times 10^{-7} \text{ Torr}).

The multipeak structures on the H\(^{+}\) and D\(^{+}\) energy distributions were always observed but were nonreproducible in detail.\(^4,5\) The main difference between the two targets is in the relative behavior of the C\(^{+5}\) ion energy distribution with respect to the H\(^{+}\) or D\(^{+}\) ion distribution. For the CD\(_2\) target, the ratio of the number of D\(^{+}\) to C\(^{+5}\) ions remains approximately constant with increasing E/Z (energy divided by the charge). For the CH\(_2\) target, however, little correlation was found between the C\(^{+5}\) and H\(^{+}\) peaks but the average ratio of H\(^{+}\) to C\(^{+5}\) ions was increasing with E/Z. In fact, above 50 kev/Z, more than half the fast ion energy was transported by H\(^{+}\) ions.

Figure 1 suggests that the plasma expansion from the CD\(_2\) target behaves like a single ion species during the acceleration phase of the expansion. The relative behavior of D\(^{+}\) and C\(^{+5}\) ions should therefore be predictable from a single particle model. From the equation of
motion of an ion accelerated in an electric field $E$ the rate of change of ion kinetic energy ($E_i = \frac{1}{2} m_i v_i^2$) is given by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{E_i}{Z_i} = \frac{Z_i e^2}{A_i m_p} \cdot E^2 t,$$

where $A_i$ and $Z_i$ are respectively the atomic number and charge state of the ion. From Eq. 1, only the ion species with the same $A/Z$ acquire the same $E/Z$ regardless of the electric field spatial or temporal dependence. Both $C^{+5}$ and $D^+$ have an $A/Z$ of 2. Figure 1 also shows that $CD_2$ targets yield $C^{+5}$ and $D^+$ ions with the same $E/Z$ behavior. This leads to the conclusion that most of the carbon ions were already fully ionized before the acceleration phase. A mixture of ionization stages lower than $C^{+5}$ could not give the same $E/Z$ for $C^{+5}$ and $D^+$ ions if the carbon ions were stripped during or after acceleration. A $CD_2$ target can therefore be adequately represented by a single ion species.

For a $CH_2$ target, Eq. 1 can be used for the case of different ion species accelerated through a static potential sheet for different acceleration times, i.e., $t \propto (A_i/Z_i)^{\frac{3}{2}}$. Under this assumption, $C^{+5}$ and $H^+$ should still have the same $E/Z$ behavior. Figure 2, however, contradicts the static potential assumption since an important fraction of the $H^+$ ions is accelerated to an $E/Z$ larger than the $C^{+5}$ ions. A second approach is to assume that the expansion of the faster $H^+$ ions decreases the electric field strength such that the acceleration time and the electric field are essentially the same for both $C^{+5}$ and $H^+$ ions. The final energy relationship between $C^{+5}$ and $H^+$ ions is then ideally given by
\[
\frac{E_i}{Z_i} \frac{A_i}{Z_i} = \text{const.}
\] 

Equation 2 basically says that $H^+$ ions are expected at a higher $E/Z$ than the $C^{+6}$ ions, in qualitative agreement with the experimental results (Fig. 2).

For a CH$_2$ target a multi-fluid description of the plasma expansion is more appropriate than the single particle model discussed earlier. Therefore, we model a 1-D ambipolar plasma expansion with a hot electron background and two relatively cold ion fluids. The ion density profiles for our initial value problem are shown in Fig. 3a (dashed lines). Both $C^{+6}$ and $H^+$ density profiles have initially the same exponential scale length and a velocity negligible with respect to the final velocities. The three species, one electron and two ions, are described by the standard set of fluid equations. Each ion fluid satisfies a continuity equation. The momentum equation for the hot electrons is a stress balance between the electron pressure and the ambipolar electric field. We also assume that the density gradient scale length is much greater than the electron Debye length and therefore replace the Poisson equation for the ambipolar potential by a quasineutrality condition $n_e = Z_{11} n_1 + Z_{22} n_2$.

The only interaction between the two ion species is through the self-consistent electric field in the momentum equations for the ions. No collisional effects have been included in this model. The electron-ion collision can be neglected due to the high electron temperature.
An initial ion temperature of a few hundred eV also makes the viscosity term \( \propto T_i^{-3/2} \) negligible with respect to the ambipolar electric field.\(^8,9\) The ion temperature, although high enough to neglect viscosity, remains relatively small compared to the electron temperature, so that the ion pressure can also be neglected.

An assumption about the electron temperature and the heat flow is required to close the moment equations. For the case presented in Fig. 3, a uniform electron temperature throughout the expansion region was assumed, i.e., the heat is allowed to flow without inhibition. The left boundary in Fig. 3a is an impenetrable wall. The total energy is then conserved by reducing the electron temperature according to the rate of change of ion kinetic energy. Other heat flow assumptions such as an adiabatic expansion\(^2\) or a strongly inhibited heat transport (flux limiter)\(^1\) have also been used, yielding no fundamental differences in the qualitative features that will be discussed below. Our two-fluid model is therefore not a strong test of the validity of the isothermal expansion assumption.\(^3,10\)

The set of fluid equations has been solved numerically using an FCT algorithm\(^11\) on a sliding-zone grid. Figure 3a shows the evolution of the ion density profiles for a CH\(_2\) plasma after 3.6 \( \tau \) (where \( \tau \) is the density gradient scale length divided by the hydrogen ion sound speed). As can be seen from Fig. 3b-c, most of the ion expansion energy is contained in a small fraction of the ions with energies higher than the initial electron temperature. About 75\(\%\) (Fig. 3c) of the electron thermal energy remains after 3.6 \( \tau \) but, because of the much weaker
density gradient, ion acceleration by the ambipolar electric field is
greatly reduced. The ion acceleration time is therefore approximately
the same for both C$^+$ and H$^+$ ions. The remaining thermal energy will
be dissipated via channels other than fast ion production.

The asymptotic energy distribution, calculated from Fig. 3, is
shown in Fig. 4 assuming an initial electron temperature of 30 keV. The
ratio of H$^+$ to C$^+$ ions is increasing with ion energy, in qualitative
agreement with the measured energy distributions. Other initial density
profiles have also been tried in the model which affected the detailed
shape of the asymptotic ion energy distribution. However, in all cases,
a significant fraction of the H$^+$ ions was always observed at higher E/Z
than the C$^+$ ions. From Fig. 3, one can see that, although the ion
acceleration time was about the same for both ion species, the electric
field was not. The H$^+$ ions, being faster, can get to the stronger
electric field region and take advantage of the pressure gradient set
up by the slower moving C$^+$ ions. Since the accelerating electric
field is different for the two species Eq. 2 is not quite valid and more
H$^+$ ions are found at higher EA/Z$^2$ than C$^+$ ions in Fig. 4.

Typical ion acceleration time scale for an initial electron
temperature of ~ 30 keV and scale length of a few microns is a few
tens of picoseconds. This relatively high electron temperature has
then to be maintained for only a short time and is therefore a peak
temperature consistent with other simulations.\textsuperscript{1,7,12} The multipeak
structure on the ion energy distributions is not reproduced by our
model. However, temporal variations of the pressure gradient on the
time scale mentioned above could give bursts of ions of decreasing energies.

In summary, the electron pressure gradient model can account for the energy and the relative behavior of high energy ion species. Furthermore, it was also shown that for some plasmas (CD$_2$ for example) a single ion species description is quite adequate to simulate the plasma expansion although, for others, a multi-species description is required. The determining criterion is whether all the ions have the same A/Z during the expansion. A CH$_n$ target can never have the same A/Z. Caution should also be used with targets made from higher Z material (glass, Al, etc.) of unknown degree of ionization during the expansion. The mixture of different ion species results into a preferential acceleration of the lower A/Z ions by the higher A/Z ions.
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Fig. 1 - (a) High energy ion distribution from a CD$_2$ planar target. The number of H$^+$ ions is consistent with a 3% hydrogen concentration measured in the CD$_2$ material. (b) Oscilloscope trace from a biased charge collector showing the portion of the trace sampled by the ion analyzer.
Fig. 2 - (a) High energy ion distribution from a CH$_2$ target (b) oscilloscope trace from a biased charge collector showing the portion of the trace sampled by the ion analyzer.
Fig. 3 - Ion densities, ion energies and energy densities versus distance at \( t = 3.6 \tau \). The dashed lines represent the initial density profiles. The ion densities are normalized to the initial \( H^+ \) plateau density. The non-dimensional units are: \( \tau = \ell / c_s \), \( c_s = \left( kT_{eo} / m_p \right)^{1/2} \), where \( T_{eo} \) is the initial electron temperature and \( \ell \) the initial density gradient scale length. The percentage in parenthesis gives the energy partition.
Fig. 4 - Asymptotic high energy ion distribution calculated from Fig. 3 using a 30 keV initial electron temperature.
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