AD-A066 0	45 AUS INT NOV	TIN RE TERACTI 78 W	SEARCH ONS OF E DRUI -331	ASSOCI	ATES I VISTIC J R TH	NC TE	D PART	ICLE BE	AMS. (U F49620) -76-C-I	F/6 20/	8
1 OF 4 AD 083045	Sensity get 8				Antonio I Alterio I Martinia		Transformer Transformer Ministration Ministr			Annual Annu		
			A second			$M_{\rm eff} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} +$			A second		<text></text>	
							The second secon				Antonio (Constantino) antonio (Constantino)	
The second secon		 Anticipation of the second seco		 A second W A second W	Antonio de la constante de la				- Constant of the second secon		1 1000000000000000000000000000000000000	
				A second se	The second secon	A discussion of the discussion		A second	$\label{eq:states} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 &$			
										• Martine and the second secon	$\begin{array}{c} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n}$	
\mathbb{R}^{n} . The second secon										1044		
							-					

6045



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A



(ARA - 331, 1-ARA-78-U-78 (ARA-331) Austin Research Associates Inc. TX. 1901 Rutland Drive - Austin, Jexas 78758 - Phone (512) 837-6623 INTERACTIONS OF RELATIVISTIC CHARGED PARTICLE BEAMS. by 10 W. E./Drummond, DC J. R. /Thompson, H. V. /Wong, MAR 21 1979 G. I./Bourianoff B. N./Moore M. L. Sloan Final Scientific Report, 1 Jul 76-30 Sep 78, for AFOSR Contract F49528-76-C-8082 16/2301/4 Air Force Office of Scientific Research Bolling Air Force Base, D.C. 286p. November 1978 This document has been approved for public release and salo; its distribution is unlimited. 403703 03 16 0

REFORT DOCUMENTATION	PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS
REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION	NO. 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
TITLE (and Subtitie)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
Interactions of Belativistic Cha	reed Particle	Final Scientific Report
Beams		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
AUTHOR(a)		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
W. E. Drummond, et al.	· neg	F49620-76-C-0002 W
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRES	is	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK
Austin Research Associates		2301/A7
1901 Rutland Drive		61102F
Austin, lexas /0/50		612300
Air Force Office of Scientific R	esearch	November 1378
ATTN: Captain Gullickson/NP, Bu Bolling Air Force Base, D.C. 20	111ding 410 1332	13. NUMBER OF PAGES
4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II differ	ent from Controlling Offic) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		UNCLASSIFIED
the state of the later was all the but		15. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
Approved for Public Releas	e; Distribution d in Block 20, 11 different	Unlimited from Report)
Approved for Public Releas	e; Distribution	Unlimited from Report)
Approved for Public Releas 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetract entere 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	e; Distribution	Unlimited from Report)
Approved for Public Releas	e; Distribution din Block 20, 11 different	Unlimited from Report)
Approved for Public Releas	e; Distribution din Block 20, 11 different	Unlimited (rom Report)
Approved for Public Releas 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetrect entered 5. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 1. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aids if necessary Nonneutral Relativistic Electr Collective Ion Acceleration Limiting Currents Auto-Resonant Acceleration	erid identify by block num on Beam Bea Unn Lin	Unlimited from Report) ber) m-Plasma Heating eutralized Beam Equilibrium earized Beam Eigenmodes
Approved for Public Releas Approved for Public Releas D. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered S. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Nonneutral Relativistic Electr Collective Ion Acceleration Limiting Currents Auto-Resonant Acceleration Electron Cyclotron Wave	e; Distribution d in Block 20, 11 different - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Unlimited Trom Report) ber) m-Plasma Heating eutralized Beam Equilibrium earized Beam Eigenmodes
Approved for Public Releas Approved for Public Releas O DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered S. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Nonneutral Relativistic Electric Collective Ion Acceleration Limiting Currents Auto-Resonant Acceleration Electron Cyclotron Wave ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary of ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary of the ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary of the ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary of the ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary of t	end identify by block num on Beam Bea Unn Lin	Unlimited from Report) ber) m-Plasma Heating eutralized Beam Equilibrium earized Beam Eigenmodes
Approved for Public Releas Approved for Public Releas DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered Supplementary notes Nonneutral Relativistic Electric Collective Ion Acceleration Limiting Currents Auto-Resonant Acceleration Electron Cyclotron Wave ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary of During the performance perior September 1978, we made substantion of high energy beams of charged po- tail the interactions which may on	and identify by block num on Beam Bea Unn Lin and identify by block numb d on this contra al progress in c articles. We in cour between a m	Unlimited Trom Report) ber) m-Plasma Heating eutralized Beam Equilibrium earized Beam Eigenmodes er) act, from 1 July 1976 through : bur research on the interaction hvestigated in considerable des relativistic electron beam and
Approved for Public Releas Approved for Public Releas DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered ACCOLOGY (Continue on reverse elds if necessary Nonneutral Relativistic Electric Collective Ion Acceleration Limiting Currents Auto-Resonant Acceleration Electron Cyclotron Wave ASSTRACT (Continue on reverse elds if necessary During the performance period September 1978, we made substantion of high energy beams of charged patail the interactions which may on less dense species of ions, which ion acceleration. We found that influences this interaction. A numerical Necessary of the sector of the s	end identify by block num of in Block 20, if different on Beam Bea Unn Lin and identify by block numb d on this contra al progress in co articles. We in cour between a r is highly relev the lack of char umber of mechani fied. We found	Unlimited Trom Report) ber) m-Plasma Heating eutralized Beam Equilibrium earized Beam Eigenmodes er) Act, from I July 1976 through in bur research on the interaction the interaction the interaction beam and can to schemes for collective ige neutrality importantly sms by which wave growth may be that for cyclotron wave
Approved for Public Releas Approved for Public Releas DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered Supplementary notes Nonneutral Relativistic Electric Collective Ion Acceleration Limiting Currents Auto-Resonant Acceleration Electron Cyclotron Wave During the performance perior September 1978, we made substantion of high energy beams of charged put tail the interactions which may out less dense species of ions, which ion acceleration. We found that influences this interaction. A mit During the performance perior September 1978, we made substantion Limiting control wave During the performance perior September 1978, we made substantion of high energy beams of charged put tail the interactions which may out tail the interactions which may out less dense species of ions, which ion acceleration. We found that influences this interaction. A mit D 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 15 0654	and identify by block num of in Block 20, if different of in Block 20, if different on Beam Bea Unn Lin and identify by block numb d on this contra al progress in c articles. We in cour between a r is highly relev the lack of char umber of mechani fied. We found OLETE SECURITY C	Unlimited Trom Report) ber) m-Plasma Heating eutralized Beam Equilibrium earized Beam Eigenmodes er) act, from I July 1976 through : bur research on the interaction twestigated in considerable de- relativistic electron beam and vant to schemes for collective rge neutrality importantly sms by which wave growth may be that for cyclotron wave UNCLASSIFIED CLASSIFIED

I

I

Participant of

and a second

-

Contraction of the second seco

- - ----

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

20. (Abstract--Continued)

interactions, transverse effects tend to be dominant, and it appears that such ion-electron interactions are (i) probably unsuitable as a wave growth/ion loading mechanism, but (ii) unlikely to disrupt the process of collective acceleration. A stability analysis of a two-dimensional sheet beam of electrons was completed. We have also determined accurately the limiting currents for magnetized injection of an unneutralized relativistic electron beam into a cylindrical drift tube. The previously cited interpolation formula was found to underestimate the true limiting current by over 20% in some cases, and the corresponding expression for the axial electron energy sometimes overestimates the ture limiting energy by more than an order of magnitude. The influence of a spatial variation in γ on the structure of the relativistic electron beam cyclotron mode was examined, and found to increase the peakedness of the radial electric fields near the beam edge when $\gamma(r)$ increases. The influence of this radial variation in γ on the longitudinal plasma mode was also examined in the strong magnetic field limit. Previous results, that the plasma wave phase velocity could only be made small (for ion loading, prior to collective acceleration) by increasing the beam current nearly to the limiting current, were extended from the pencil beam regime to arbitrary values of beam and waveguide radii and arbitrary density profiles. The plasma wave eigenfunctions were found to have increased peakedness near the beam axis as the limiting current conditions are approached. An iterative calculation was performed of the slowly precessing fluid beam equilibrium which is achieved by a θ -symmetric, steady state, initially solid electron beam injected into a cylindrical waveguide along a finite magnetic guide field. This calculation incorporates the space charge slowing associated with the waveguide injection, as well as the acquisition of precessional motion and associated diamagnetism, centrifugal and Coriolis forces. A generalization of the limiting current formula was obtained to incorporate the finite axial magnetic field effects--reducing Bz increases IL. Several small parameters were isolated during the equilibrium calculation, which may be used to quantify the validity of the common assumptions of (i) infinite magnetic fields, or (ii) ultrarelativistic electron beams. An examination of linearized collective beam waves was completed for the important case in which the parameter characterizing centrifugal and Coriolis forces, and plasma-cyclotron mode coupling, was retained in the analysis. The resulting fourth-order radial eigenvalue problem was solved in terms of Bessel functions, and the mode coupling effects on the dispersion relation were examined. This general theoretical framework allows the inclusion of longitudinal beam compression effects upon cyclotron waves, and the inclusion of transverse gyroeffects upon plasma waves. An analysis was completed of the effect of a finite thermal spread in the axial beam velocity on the electron cyclotron wave. A fairly nonrestrictive sufficient condition was obtained such that the cyclotron modes may propagate undamped by kinetic effects. Finally, we reviewed some previous work on relativistic electron beam-plasma heating, wherein we found that very high density plasmas may be heated with reasonably efficiency by high quality, ultrarelativistic electron beams via the primary beam-plasma streaming interaction.

UNCLASSIFIED SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS iv

SECTION

0

I

I

1

Surveyore a

Contraction of the

I	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF	
	RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHED	1
II	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTED PAPERS	31
III	TECHNICAL APPENDICES	32
APPEN	DIX	
A	> NONLINEAR EFFECTS IN QUTO-RESONANT	
	ACCELERATION (contains 74 pages)	35
в	STABILITY OF SLAB ELECTRON BEAM	
	EQUILIBRIA; (contains 9 pages)	36
с	LIMITING CURRENTS OF AN UNNEUTRALIZED	
	MAGNETIZED ELECTRON BEAM IN A CYLINDRICAL	
	DRIFT TUBE (contains 6 pages)	37
D	TNELUENCE OF SPATTAL VARIATION IN CON THE	
D	PELATIVISTIC ELECTRON BEAM CYCLOTRON MODE	
	(contains 24 pages)	38
	(concarns 24 pages)	20
E	RELATIVISTIC E-BEAM PLASMA HEATING	
	(contains 25 pages)	39
F	LETTER SUMMARY OF BEAM-PLASMA HEATING	
	RESEARCH AND COMPARISON OF RESULTS WITH	
	THOSE OF THODE, ET AL. (contains 14 pages) . I	40
	S next page	
	iv	

APPENDIX	2	Page
G	SELF CONSISTEN EQUILIBRIA OF UNNEUTRALIZED RELATIVISTIC ELECTRON BEAMS; (contains 6 pages)	.41
н	LINEAR THEORY OF COLLECTIVE WAVES SUPPORTED BY AN UNNEUTRALIZED RELATIVISTIC ELECTRON BEAM; (contains 34 pages)	.42
I S	LINEAR THEORY OF PLASMA WAVES SUPPORTED BY A RADIALLY VARYING ELECTRON BEAM IN A MAGNETIZED WAVEGUIDE (contains 27 pages)	.43
Jand	THE EFFECTS OF FINITE THERMAL SPREAD ON THE ELECTRON CYCLOTRON BEAM MCDE3. (contains 16 pages)	. 44



ACT IT

v

0

]

1

1

1

SECTION. I

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHED

This research program concerns very high energy, high power beams of charged particles and the interactions which they may have with one another, with other species of charged particles, or with surrounding waveguide-diode structures via external or self-consistent electromagnetic fields. The potential of such beams for rapidly transporting energy may prove to have a number of important applications for the Air Force. One ultimate possibility is the creation of advanced new charged particle weapons for the Air Force. A more immediate goal, which has received significant attention in recent years, is the possibility of generating ion beam pulses at relativistic (i.e., GeV) ion energy by utilizing the powerful collective electromagnetic fields which may be sustained by relativistic electron beams. This research

program is aimed at supporting, among other things, the development of such collective ion accelerators.

The research problems of central importance to this objective focus generally on obtaining a good understanding of the stable behavior of unneutralized or partially neutralized electron and ion beams, the interaction of such electron beams with ions, and the interaction of such beams with background plasmas. The study of these beam interactions is naturally prerequisite to achieving the beam control required by the various schemes for ion acceleration. The interactions are predominately collisionless, within an environment without gross charge neutrality, and occur via powerful electromagnetic fields which are frequently influenced appreciably by the presence of both passive external waveguide structures and active charge or current sources (e.g., guide magnetic field coils).

We initiated our investigation of these problems of relativistic electron and ion beam interactions under our previous AFOSR Contract F44620-72-C-0071, which

terminated on June 30, 1976. A technical description of this initial research is given in reference 1. Work in this area then continued under AFOSR Contract No. F49620-76-C-0002, which began on July 1, 1976 and terminated on September 30, 1978. This research is summarized in this final report. Some additional research is also included for completeness, which was not accomplished under this contract, as is noted in the remainder of this section. We believe that substantial progress was achieved in this research on the interactions of high energy, charged particle beams, as described more fully below.

A problem of considerable relevance to schemes for collective ion acceleration concerns the interactions which may occur between a relativistic electron beam and

^{1.} W. E. Drummond, J. R. Thompson, et al., "Turbulent Heating of Plasmas by High Energy Particle Beams," Final Scientific Report for AFOSR Contract No. F44620-72-C-0071, August 1976. I-ARA-76-U-80.

a less dense species of ions. The motivation for considering this problem is severalfold. Of primary importance to ion acceleration schemes is the fact that such interactions between the subject ions and the background electron beam will occur during the process of acceleration, when the interactions have no desired purpose, but must be assessed to determine how disruptive they are on the electron beam and on the process of acceleration. On the other hand, interaction between the electron beam and the subject ions is also of interest as a possible mechanism for both wave growth and ion loading into the wave, provided that the growth saturates via ion trapping. This possibility has been considered by Indykul, et al. (reference 2), whose analysis was supported by a one-dimensional, single wave computer calculation of the nonlinear ion dynamics. Finally,

2. V. P. Indykul, I. P. Panchenko, V. D. Shapiro, and V. I. Shevchenko, JETP Letters 20, 65 (1974).

such electron-ion interactions stimulate the growth of unstable eigenmodes on the electron beam, which may eventually achieve large amplitudes before nonlinear effects cause saturation of the growth. Consequently, the electron-ion interaction problem is a handy vehicle for the study of large wave, nonlinear effects, which in turn are crucial to the determination of the maximum accelerating electric field amplitudes which may be sustained by the electron beam.

Reference 1 contains a discussion and references to our early work on this problem, including both work sponsored under AFOSR Contract F44620-72-C-0071 and also work sponsored under Contract F29601-75-C-0029 on the Auto-Resonant acceleration scheme. One finds that the ions may interact with either of two "negative energy" electron modes: longitudinal electron plasma oscillations or electron cyclotron interactions. The former interactions, in general, are much better understood from the vast amount of prior research conducted across the country on beam-plasma interaction via plasma waves. We have

concentrated our research on the latter cyclotron interactions, which will tend to be the faster growing when the electron beam is sufficiently energetic and intense that $(\Omega_e/\gamma_e \omega_p)^{1/3} < 1$. [Here $\Omega_e = eB_z/\gamma_e mc$ is the relativistic cyclotron frequency, $\omega_{pe} = (4\pi N_e e^2/\gamma_e m)^{1/2}$ is the relativistic plasma frequency, and $(\gamma_e - 1)mc^2$ is the electron kinetic energy per particle.]

The work on these ion-electron cyclotron interactions which we did prior to the July 1, 1976 beginning of this contract was primarily concerned with the linear theory of the interactions in waveguide geometry. One important change from the usual charge-neutral linear theory is that the ion response is strongly influenced by the radial ion bouncing which occurs in the self electric field of the electron beam, at frequency $\omega_{B_{\perp}} = (2\gamma_{e}m/M)^{1/2}\omega_{pe}$. In fact, when the ion density is low enough that the growth rate of the interaction falls below $\omega_{B_{\perp}}$, then this bouncing will be crucial to the interaction, and the wave phase velocity will be proportional to $\omega_{B_{\perp}}$ and independent of the ion density.

Research on the nonlinear phase of these ionelectron cyclotron interactions was begun under Contract F29601-75-C-0046 on the Auto-Resonant Accelerator experiment, and was continued in the early months of this AFOSR Contract F49620-76-C-0002. An internal ARA report on these nonlinear effects was compiled in September, 1976 and is included as Appendix A, herein, in its entirety, for the benefit of the reader. However, it should be noted that the material in Sections III, V, and a portion of VII of Appendix A was sponsored under Contract F29601-75-C-0046, and has been previously published in reference 3. The rest of Appendix A describes the AFOSR-sponsored nonlinear work. This material in Appendix A was also presented in Paper 2T3 of the 18th Annual Meeting of the Division of Plasma Physics of the American Physical Society in November, 1976.

3. W. E. Drummond, et. al. "Conceptual Design of an Auto-Resonant Accelerator Experiment," Final Report for Contract F29601-75-C-0046, May 1976. I-ARA-76-U-44.

The chief results of this research on the nonlinear phase of ion-electron cyclotron interactions were the identification of a number of mechanisms by which the wave growth could be saturated. Some were electron effects, such as a nonlinear shift in the frequency of the cyclotron wave, and some were ion effects, such as an evolution of the ion trajectories in perpendicular (x_1, v_1) phase space to a point where the ions ceased to gain energy. As shown in Eq. (75) of Appendix A, the negative energy cyclotron mode can only grow so long as the ions also gain energy. As summarized in Eq. (78), the nonlinear effects are important for short wavelength modes at lower wave amplitudes than for long wavelength modes, and hence the longer wavelength (e.g., small k₁) modes should achieve the largest amplitudes if their growth is otherwise allowed. One of the most important results of this analysis (which is also confirmed by the two-dimensional computer simulations which were performed) is that for a wide range of parameters, nonlinear effects associated with the transverse electron or ion dynamics in the cyclotron wave enter to saturate the wave amplitude before it becomes large enough

for longitudinal ion trapping. Hence, the intuition gained from the study of plasma wave interactions does not extend to cyclotron wave interactions, where transverse effects tend to dominate. The neglect of such transverse effects in the Indykul analysis (reference 2) therefore appears to be a serious deficiency. Our own calculations support the general conclusion that ionelectron cyclotron interactions tend to saturate at wave amplitudes too low for longitudinal ion trapping, and before there is catastrophic disruption of the electron beam. Therefore, it appears that such interactions are (i) probably unsuitable as a wave growth/ion loading mechanism, but (ii) unlikely to disrupt the acceleration process itself. We believe that this research on the interactions between a sparse ion species and the cyclotron modes of an electron beam, which was sponsored about 50% under these AFOSR Contracts F44620-72-C-0071 and F49620-76-C-0002, represents a significant research contribution in this field.

A second problem attacked under this AFOSR contract was a stability analysis of a two-dimensional sheet beam of electrons, in a magnetic field in a conducting waveguide. This calculation is included as Appendix B herein. It is common practice in the theoretical analysis of problems concerning unneutralized electron beams within waveguides, to employ both cylindrical and cartesian (slab) geometry. For certain analyses, the trigonometric eigenfunctions which apply for slab geometry afford a measure of convenience compared to cylindrical Bessel eigenfunctions, and yet there is usually little difference in the underlying physical interactions. Nevertheless, there is a constant need for vigilance and comparison, to insure that the slab analyses overlook no important effects which might be rooted in cylindrical geometry. To this end, the slab geometry stability calculation is important, and it may be compared with the previous calculation we have published for cylindrical geometry (reference 4).

4. H. V. Wong, M. L. Sloan, J. R. Thompson, and A. T. Drobot, Physics of Fluids <u>16</u>, 902 (1973).

Naturally, it is crucial to understand the conditions under which the electron beam itself will be stable, before addressing more complex questions of beam interaction.

For this analysis, we also imposed a restriction to two dimensional perturbations, assuming that one coordinate is ignorable for both equilibrium and perturbed quantities. Although this limits the generality of our result, such a restriction is appropriate to twodimensional slab geometry computer codes which have been frequently employed to examine relativistic electron beam phenomena.

The approach of the calculation is to compute the second order quantity $\int d^3x \quad \underline{J}_1 \cdot \underline{E}_1$, which drives the electromagnetic field energy in time according to Maxwell's equations. Under our assumptions, it is possible to employ the linearized Vlasov equation to express this quantity as a total time derivative, thereby obtaining an energy constant of the motion. This in turn leads to an energy principle for the stability of a common class of slab equilibria. One finds that $N_e b/\gamma_e B_z$ must be bounded

11

above to insure stability, where N is the beam density and b is the half-width of the conducting waveguide. This scaling agrees with the previous cylindrical result.

Another task we have undertaken for this AFOSR contract is to determine accurately the limiting currents for magnetized injection of an unneutralized relativistic electron beam into a cylindrical drift tube. This problem has been extant for years, but so far only the nonrelativistic solution (reference 5) and an approximate interpolation formula (reference 6) for the relativistic solution have been published. Our work is included as Appendix C herein, in the form of an article appearing in the November, 1978 issue of <u>The Physics</u> of Fluids. A portion of this work was also supported

5. L. P. Smith and P. L. Hartman, Journal of Applied Physics <u>11</u>, 220 (1940).

6. L. S. Bogdankevich and A. A. Rukhadze, Soviet Physics Uspekhi, <u>14</u>, 163 (1971).

under Contract DASG60-76-C-0045 by the Ballistic Missile Defense Advanced Technology Center.

This problem is to calculate the steady state, propagating beam equilibrium for a laminar, unneutralized, cylindrical relativistic electron beam, which is initially solid and monoenergetic at the anode plane. The beam, of radius a and initial kinetic energy $(\gamma_0 - 1)mc^2$ is injected along a very strong axial magnetic guide field into a coaxial drift tube of radius $b \ge a$, and length L >> b. The tube end-effects and beam-front transients are neglected. As the beam electrons propagate into the drift tube, the central electrons are axially slowed by space charge effects more than the edge electrons, so that the beam density n(r) becomes peaked on axis while the relativistic factor $\gamma(r)$ becomes hollowed on axis. For given values of γ_{a} and b/a, the injected current is a peaked function of $\gamma_{c} = \gamma(r = 0)$, as illustrated in Fig. 1

of Appendix C. It is desired to know the value of the peak, or limiting current I_L which may be injected into the drift tube, as well as the corresponding factor γ_{cL} of the center electrons, as a function of the parameters γ_0 and b/a.

Previously published relativistic analyses have essentially ignored the radial dependence of the axial density compression which occurs, and have considered only the special cases of needle beams (ln b/a > > 1) or ultrarelativistic beams (γ_0 > > 1). The interpolation formula (from reference 6) which is widely cited is

$$I_{L} = \frac{mc^{3}}{e} \frac{(\gamma_{0}^{2/3} - 1)^{3/2}}{1 + 2 \ln b/a}$$

and the corresponding value of γ_c is $\gamma_{cL} = \gamma_0^{-1/3}$. The more exact analysis which we have performed indicates that this interpolation formula underestimates the true limiting current by over 20 percent in some cases. Furthermore, the corresponding expression for the axial electron energy overestimates the true "limiting energy" by more than an order of magnitude in some cases. For

example, in the limit of a fat (i.e., $3 + 2 \ln b/a < < \gamma_0^{2/3}$), ultrarelativistic electron beam, we find $\gamma_{cL} \sim \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \left(\ln \gamma_0 + 1 + 2 \ln \frac{b}{a} \right)} < < \gamma_0^{1/3}$.

Since this limiting current problem is of such broad relevance to various electron beam applications, we feel that our theoretical analysis under this AFOSR contract, supplemented by numerical calculations and ultrarelativistic theory under contract DASG60-76-C-0045, will be considered an important contribution to this field of research. For example, schemes have recently been proposed by Miller, et. al. at AFWL, Kirtland AFB, New Mexico for the collective acceleration of ions which rely on the controlled motion of a virtual cathode (where $\gamma_c = 1$ and some center electrons are reflected) created in an intense relativistic electron beam. Since virtual cathode formation occurs due to excess space charge slowing soon after $I > I_{r}$, and since the incremental distance to formation of the virtual cathode is dependent on γ_{cL} , it is desired to know both I_{L} and γ_{CL} accurately in designing the motion of the virtual cathode. We believe that our calculations fill this need, and we have in fact been

informed by Miller that good agreement has been observed between our predictions for the limiting current threshold and relativistic particle simulations of virtual cathode formation. Our work on this problem appears to complement similar work at AFWL which has been based on a different approach, and has focused more on the case of hollow electron beams.

A fourth problem which we have pursued under this AFOSR contract is the radial structure of linear beam eigenmodes in waveguide geometry. We have begun with a theoretical examination of the influence which a radial dependence in the relativistic factor $\gamma(r)$ has on the structure of the relativistic electron beam cyclotron mode, and this calculation is included as Appendix D herein. Such a radial dependence in $\gamma(r)$ may be created by the above mentioned space charge slowing which occurs non-uniformly when a beam is injected into a waveguide. Knowledge of the radial eigenmode structure is important to almost any application which would exploit the cyclotron waves, including particularly the ion acceleration and microwave generation schemes based on these waves.

It is found in Appendix D that a variational principle can be formulated which allows an accurate determination of the eigenvalues of k a, where 'a' is the radius of a beam bounded by a conducting wall. These eigenvalues are found to increase significantly as $\gamma(r)$ varies from being uniform (as at the anode) to having the asymptotic radial dependence approached far down the waveguide. For instance, the value of k,a for the lowest (no nodes) cylindrically symmetric eigenmode increases from 2.95 to 5.77. Accompanying this increase in k_ia is an evolution in the field profiles toward more peakedness at the beam edge. This is particularly true of the radial electric fields and the perturbed perpendicular electron velocities. However, the axial electric fields of the wave do not have a significantly altered radial structure due to the $\gamma(r)$ dependence.

One reason that this calculation is important, is that the larger the eigenvalue $k_{\perp}a$, the closer is the cyclotron motion of the electrons to resonance with the oscillating fields of the corresponding eigenmode. Hence, the $\gamma(r)$ dependence may significantly alter the threshold

for the onset of nonlinearities, and may impose somewhat more stringent restrictions on the beam "temperature" threshold at which Landau damping effects become important. In addition, of course, for many applications the eigenmode structure is relevant in and of itself.

Appendices E and F contain material describing research on relativistic electron beam-plasma heating, which was conducted under our previous AFOSR Contract F44620-72-C-0071 and was reviewed under this present AFOSR Contract F49620-76-C-0002. The material in Appendix E is some previously unpublished lecture notes summarizing some of our conclusions on relativistic electron beam-plasma heating. These notes were compiled for a July 1974 presentation by Dr. Drummond at the Fourth National School on Plasma Physics, Novosibirsk, which was mentioned in reference 1. Appendix F is comprised of three letters in which this beam-plasma heating research is reviewed and in which our conclusions are compared in some respects to those of Thode, et al. (as described in several references listed in the third letter of Appendix F). The primary result is that we

seem to be in agreement that very high density plasmas may be heated with reasonable efficiency by high quality (low angular scatter), high- γ (ultrarelativistic) electron beams, via the primary beam-plasma longitudinal streaming interaction.

In Appendix G we reexamine the problem of the selfconsistent equilibria which exist for an unneutralized, relativistic electron beam injected into a cylindrical waveguide along an external magnetic guide field. One objective of this equilibrium analysis is to determine the selfconsistent radial profiles of all equilibrium quantities, including the electromagnetic fields and the number density and flow velocity of the electron beam. These equilibrium properties are in turn needed to determine the linearized eigenmodes (or waves) which may be supported upon the electron beam.

In order to self-consistently compute the various equilibrium quantities, assumptions about the nature of the beam equilibria are required, since many different equilibria are possible in general. It is most accurate to make these assumptions about the conditions of creation of the beam at

the cathode, with conservation equations then utilized to complete determination of the equilibrium quantities in the downstream region of the waveguide where the beam energy is to be extracted for the application of interest. In this way the problem of mating the beam to the waveguide is addressed, and the accessibility of the equilibrium is included in the calculation--which would not be the case if ad hoc assumptions were instead made about the downstream equilibrium.

The use of equations for the conservation of particle number, particle energy, and particle canonical angular momentum--which will be valid for all steady state, θ symmetric electron beams--allows the downstream equilibrium to be linked to the known cathode conditions while avoiding the chore of computing the actual beam trajectories all the way downstream from the cathode. However, even with the aid of such conservation equations, the complete set of equations which determine the beam equilibrium is highly nonlinear in general and mathematically tractable only to numerical computer solution. Fortunately, there exist a number of small

parameters which are exploited in Appendix G to obtain an iterative analytical solution for the equilibrium, and these parameters remain small throughout the parameter space anticipated for many electron beam applications. These same small parameters also permit the simplification of the linear theory of waves supported by the electron beam equilibrium. These parameters, and the underlying physical phenomena which they reflect are itemized below.

(1)
$$\varepsilon_1 \approx \left[\frac{I_e(kA)}{5 B_z(kG) a(cm) \gamma \beta_z} \right]^2$$
 --Axial Diamagnetism,
Relativistic Beam
Frame Precession

Because of the electromagnetic self-fields produced by the space charge and current of the unneutralized electron beam, an axial magnetic guide field must be present for equilibrium and the beam must precess in this field with an angular velocity $\beta_{\theta}(r)c$ to create a $\beta_{\theta}B_{z}$ pinch force. However, this θ -precession causes a diamagnetic reduction in the strength of the B_{z} field with the electron beam, and the relative magnitude of this reduction is characterized by

 ε_1 . Also, in the beam frame of reference, $\beta_{\theta B}(a) \simeq \varepsilon_1^{1/2}$, so that $\varepsilon_1^{1/2}$ characterizes effects of relativistic precession in the beam frame.

(2)
$$\beta_{\theta}(a) \simeq \frac{\epsilon_{1}^{1/2}}{\gamma} - \beta_{\theta} \times \underline{\tilde{B}}$$
 Forces, $\beta_{\theta} = \tilde{n}$ Current
Density Sources, $\frac{\beta_{\theta}}{r} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}$
Convective Derivative Terms

Because the beam equilibrium contains a zero order θ -velocity, the linearized equations which describe the waves supported by the equilibrium will have a number of complicating terms traceable to this velocity. These terms reflect such physical phenomena as perturbed $\hat{\theta}$ skin currents on the beam, and they can permit resonances at the laboratory frame frequencies of interest which involve $\hat{\theta}$ fluting modes (i.e., $\ell \neq 0$).

(3)
$$\varepsilon_2 \simeq \left[\frac{I_e(kA)}{0.7 B_z^2(kG) a^2(cm)\gamma\beta_z} \right]$$
 --Centrifugal and Coriolis Forces

Because of the precession of the electron beam, there are outward radial centrifugal forces $\gamma m \beta_{\theta}^2/r$ which must be

contained to achieve an equilibrium, and in the linearized equations of motion, there are both centrifugal and Coriolis forces which influence the nature of the waves. Furthermore $\varepsilon_2 \simeq 2\omega_{pe}^2/\gamma^2 \Omega_e^2$, where ω_{pe} is the relativistic plasma frequency and Ω_e is the relativistic cyclotron frequency. Consequently, $(\varepsilon_2/2)^{1/2}$ characterizes the ratio of the longitudinal plasma frequency ω_{pe}/γ to the cyclotron frequency, and hence characterizes the degree of coupling which exists between these linear eigenmodes.

(4)
$$\gamma^{-2} - \tilde{\beta}_z$$
, $1 - \beta_z$ Longitudinal Beam Compression

When this parameter is small, the beam is ultrarelativistic in the laboratory frame of reference, and the difference between the beam velocity $\beta_z c$ and the speed of light c may be neglected. If β_{ϕ} is also small, there can be no longitudinal compression of the beam within linear theory.

(5)
$$\frac{\Delta\gamma}{\gamma} \simeq \frac{2\epsilon_1}{\epsilon_2} \simeq \frac{I_e(kA)}{17 \gamma\beta_z}; \frac{\Delta\beta_z}{\beta_z} \simeq \frac{\Delta\gamma}{\gamma^3\beta_z^2} --$$
 Space Charge Limitations

These parameters characterize the relative magnitude of the radial variation in γ and β_z of the beam, which arises when the central electrons are preferentially slowed by the space charge forces which oppose the propagation of the beam into a conducting waveguide. If these parameters are too large, it is even possible for a virtual cathode to be established in the waveguide, from which electrons may be axially reflected.

In Appendix G, analytical expressions for the beam equilibrium quantities are derived through an iterative process in which the parameters of (1), (2), (3), and (5) are treated as small but finite. Expressions are obtained which describe many of the features discussed above. One interesting result is a generalization of the pencil beam limiting current formula to the case in which the magnetic guide field is not infinite:

$$I_{L} \simeq \frac{mc^{3}}{e} \frac{(\gamma_{O}^{2/3} - 1)^{3/2}}{1 + 2 \ln \frac{b}{a} - \frac{1}{4} \epsilon_{1}(\gamma = \gamma_{O}^{1/3})}$$

This result suggests that the limiting current should increase somewhat as the magnetic field is decreased, which agrees with reported observations from numerical simulations of this problem. However, so long as the parameter ϵ_1 is small, this effect should be weak, and consequently the infinite magnetic field limiting current results of Appendix C should retain their validity so long as $\epsilon_1 << 1$.

The phenomena represented by the above five parameters can also significantly effect the linear waves supported by an unneutralized electron beam. Two limits which have often been invoked in prior calculations are the infinite magnetic limit (for studying plasma waves) and the ultrarelativistic limit (for studying cyclotron waves). In the infinite magnetic field limit, the parameters ϵ_1 , β_0 , and ϵ_2 are neglected, and the perturbed velocities $\tilde{\beta}_0$, $\tilde{\beta}_r$ also tend to zero. Hence the perturbed electron motion is strictly axial in this case, and plasma modes are allowed.

By comparison, in the ultrarelativistic limit, the parameters γ , B_z , and I_e are tended to infinity in

such a way that the ratio of any two of these quantities remains finite. In this way, the relativistic cyclotron and plasma frequencies (Ω_e and ω_{pe}) remain finite, but longitudinal mass terms and precessional terms tend to zero. In this limit the parameters ε_1 , β_{θ} , ε_2 , and γ^{-2} all are neglected, and the perturbed velocity $\tilde{\beta}_z$ also tends to zero. Hence the perturbed electron motion is strictly transverse in this case, and cyclotron modes are allowed.

In either the ultrarelativistic or the infinite magnetic field limits, there is no coupling between the cyclotron and plasma modes. Also, in neither of these limits are the $\Delta\gamma$ space charge effects intrinsically small, and the radial dependence which they entail greatly complicates the mathematical eigenvalue problem within linear theory. Consequently, we have examined these space charge effects in separate calculations. In Appendix D the space charge effects on the electron cyclotron wave are considered within the ultrarelativistic limit, while in Appendix I the space charge effects on the longitudinal

plasma wave are considered within the infinite magnetic field limit.

In Appendix H, the linear theory of collective waves supported by an unneutralized relativistic electron beam is examined in the limit that the parameters ϵ_1 , β_{β} , $\Delta\gamma/\gamma$, and $\Delta\beta_{\gamma}/\beta_{\gamma}$ are negligible, but the parameters ϵ_2 and γ^{-2} remain finite. This allows the linear theory to be solved in terms of relatively simple eigenfunctions (i.e., Bessel functions), while retaining the effects of longitudinal compression, centrifugal and Coriolis forces, which are significant for many applications. In this way, the dispersion relation for plasma and cyclotron waves may be derived which retains the coupling effect between these waves. Either the ultrarelativistic or the infinite magnetic limits may still be taken if desired, but at a later stage in the calculation. For both plasma waves and cyclotron waves, the coupling to the other mode is characterized by the ε_2 parameter. For example, the dispersion relation for the negative energy cyclotron wave, subject to certain orderings discussed in Appendix H, may be approximately given by

$$\mu - k_{z}\beta_{z}c \simeq - \left[\frac{k^{4}c^{4}\left(\Omega_{e}^{2} - \frac{2\omega^{2}}{\gamma^{2}}\right)}{(k^{2}c^{2} + \omega_{pe}^{2})^{2}} + \frac{\omega_{pe}^{2}}{\gamma^{2}}\frac{k_{z}^{2}}{k^{2}}\right]^{1/2}$$

where $k^2 = k_{\perp}^2 + k_{z}^2$. Here the $2\omega_{pe}^2/\gamma^2$ correction term reflects the centrifugal and Coriolis forces, while the $\omega_{pe}^2 k_{\perp}^2/\gamma^2 k^2$ correction reflects the longitudinal beam compression. These longitudinal plasma wave corrections are in opposite directions, and upon expanding the square root, their net size relative to the cyclotron frequency is seen to be about $\frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_2$.

In Appendix I, the $\Delta\gamma$ space charge effects on the longitudinal plasma wave are considered in the infinite magnetic field limit. Previous calculations⁷ in the pencil beam limit $\gamma_0^{2/3} \ll 1 + 2 \ln b/a$ had suggested that the normalized plasma wave phase velocity $\beta_{\phi} \equiv \omega/k_z c$ could only be made small (as desired for ion loading in a Converging Guide Accelerator) by increasing the electron current extremely close to the limiting current which can be

7. R. J. Briggs, Phys. Fluids 19, 1257 (1976).
propagated without virtual cathode formation. In this Appendix I, we found through both analytical and numerical calculations, that this unfortunate result appears to also hold for more realistic nonpencil beam geometries where the radial variation in the equilibrium quantities γ , β_z , N_e is significant. The plasma wave eigenfunctions were also examined, and found to be somewhat more peaked near the beam axis when the limiting current conditions were approached.

Finally, in Appendix J we have examined the effect of a finite thermal spread in the axial beam velocity on the dispersion relation for the electron cyclotron beam mode in the ultrarelativistic limit. The calculation is performed in slab geometry, and the equilibrium distribution function is taken to be a δ -function in energy with a spread in transverse momentum. This approximates the thermal spread acquired by a relativistic electron beam upon passage through an anode foil. The result which was found is that if the transverse velocity scatter \overline{v} is low enough so that

29

$$\overline{\mathbf{v}}^2 < \frac{2 \Omega}{\mathbf{k}^2 \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{p}}^2} \approx \frac{2 \omega^2}{\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{p}}^2}$$

and if finite Larmor radius effects can be neglected

$$\overline{\mathbf{v}}^2 < \frac{\Omega^2}{\mathbf{k}_1^2}$$

then the electron cyclotron beam modes will propagate undamped by kinetic effects.

We believe that the results produced under this contract have been substantial, and have relevance to a moderately broad spectrum of problems of interest to the Air Force. We believe that this research has helped to raise the level of understanding of beam interactions to a point that will soon permit the practical and efficient realization of a number of applications, such as collective ion acceleration and microwave generation.

SECTION II

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTED PAPERS

Some of the research accomplished under this contract was included in the following talks and papers:

- "Nonlinear Effects on the Cyclotron Mode of a Relativistic Electron Beam,"--Poster Paper 2T3 presented by H. V. Wong, G. I. Bourianoff, and J. R. Thompson at the 18th Annual Meeting of the Division of Plasma Physics of the American Physical Society, San Francisco, California, November 1976.
- "Ion-Electron Beam Interactions and Nonlinear Effects"--an invited seminar presented by J. R. Thompson at The University of Texas at Austin, Texas, February 28, 1977.
- 3. "Limiting Currents of An Unneutralized Magnetized Electron Beam in a Cylindrical Drift Tube," J. R. Thompson and M. L. Sloan, Phys. Fluids <u>21</u>, 2032 (1978). This material was also presented as Poster Paper 5A8 by J. R. Thompson and M. L. Sloan at the 19th Annual Meeting of the Division of Plasma Physics of the American Physical Society, Atlanta, Georgia, November 1977. In addition it was published in the Proceedings of the 2nd International Topical Conference on High Power Electron and Ion Beam Research and Technology, Cornell University, Vol. II, 729 (1977).
- "A High Current Collective Ion Accelerator,"--Invited Paper R10.5 presented by J. R. Thompson at the Fifth Conference on the Application of Small Accelerators, Denton, Texas, November 1978.

SECTION III

TECHNICAL APPENDICES

-

A. <u>Nonlinear Effects in Auto-Resonant Acceleration</u> (This appendix was an internal ARA report, compiled in September 1976. It is included in its entirety, for the benefit of the reader; however, the material in Sections III, V, and a portion of VII of this appendix was sponsored under Contract F29601-75-C-0046, and has been previously published. The rest of this appendix describes the AFOSR-sponsored nonlinear work. This material was also presented in Paper 2T3 of the 18th Annual Meeting of the Division of Plasma Physics of the American Physical Society in November 1976.)

B. Stability of Slab Electron Beam Equilibria

C. Limiting Currents of An Unneutralized Magnetized Electron Beam In a Cylindrical Drift Tube

32

(This appendix is the journal publication: J. R. Thompson and M. L. Sloan, Phys. Fluids <u>21</u>, 2032 (1978). The material was also published in Proceedings of the 2nd International Topical Conference on High Power Electron and Ion Beam Research and Technology, Cornell University, Vol. II, 729 (1977). The work was partly supported under Contract DASG60-76-C-0045.)

D. Influence of Spatial Variation in γ on The Relativistic Electron Beam Cyclotron Mode

E. Relativistic E-Beam Plasma Heating

(This material consists of previously unpublished lecture notes compiled for a July 1974 presentation at the Fourth National School on Plasma Physics, Novosibirsk, U.S.S.R. The work was sponsored under our previous AFOSR Contract F44620-72-C-0071, and is included here since it was reviewed under this present contract and is referenced in the following Appendix F.)

F. Letter Summary of Beam-Plasma Heating Research and Comparison of Results with those of Thode, et al. (This material consists of three letters: Brendan B. Godfrey to James R. Thompson, James R. Thompson to Richard L. Gullickson, and James R. Thompson to Brendan B. Godfrey. It contains a review and comparison, accomplished under this contract, of prior beam-heating research.)

G. <u>Self Consistent Equilibria of Unneutralized Relativistic</u> <u>Electron Beams</u>

H. Linear Theory of Collective Waves Supported by an Unneutralized Relativistic Electron Beam

1

I. Linear Theory of Plasma Waves Supported by a Radially Varying Electron Beam in a Magnetized Waveguide

J. <u>The Effects of Finite Thermal Spread on the Electron</u> Cyclotron Beam Modes

I-ARA-76-U-87 ARA-242

APPENDIX A

-

I

I

1

-

П

,

NONLINEAR EFFECTS IN AUTO-RESONANT ACCELERATION

by

W. E. Drummond J. R. Thompson H. V. Wong G. I. Bourianoff

Partially supported by

Air Force Office of Scientific Research

and

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA)

Monitored by

Air Force Weapons Laboratory (DYS) Kirtland Air Force, Base, New Mexico

September 1976

(Appendix A Contains 74 Pages)

35

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1

1

I

I

I

I

I

1

11

1

Ι.	INTRODUCTION
11.	APPROXIMATIONS AND LINEAR THEORY 9
III.	BREAKDOWN OF LINEAR ELECTRON BEHAVIOR
IV.	BREAKDOWN OF LINEAR ION BEHAVIOR
v.	GROWTH SATURATION VIA NONLINEAR
	ELECTRON FREQUENCY SHIFT
VI.	GROWTH SATURATION VIA PHASE MIXING OF NONLINEAR ION TRAJECTORIES
VII.	RESULTS OF TWO-DIMENSIONAL SLAB
	COMPUTER CALCULATIONS
VIII.	CONCLUSIONS

i

NONLINEAR EFFECTS IN AUTO-RESONANT ACCELERATION

by

W. E. Drummond J. R. Thompson H. V. Wong G. I. Bourianoff

Austin Research Associates, Inc.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, a number of collective ion acceleration methods have been proposed. In 1973, a passively controlled method (known as Auto-Resonant acceleration) of collectively accelerating ions within the potential troughs of a negative energy mode of the electron beam was suggested, 1,2which appears to afford the possibility of producing up to kiloamperes of ion current, at relativistic ion energy, with pulse durations which might be an appreciable fraction of the electron beam pulse duration. Among the attractive features of this concept are the following:

> (i) the collective feature allows fairly large accelerating electric fields of order MV/cm,

> > -1-

permitting reasonably short accelerators; in addition the collective fields of the electron beam permit substantial ion currents in the range of 0.1 - 1 percent of the electron current to be produced without unacceptable performance degradation;

- (ii) the use of a travelling body wave of the electron beam, rather than a localized potential depression, permits the acceleration of a quasi-continuous train of ions throughout a major portion of the electron beam pulse duration; in addition, the electron beam pulse duration; in addition, the ion energy per particle can be raised to a level bounded theoretically only by the ion-to-electron mass ratio times the electron energy per particle;
- (iii) the passive method of controlling the acceleration of the wave (and ions) avoids technological switching difficulties; and
- (iv) the negative energy feature of the wave permits the electron beam to automatically supply power both for accelerating the ions and for sustaining

-2-

the electric potential of the travelling wave as it accelerates the ions. Although one or another of these features are common to various other schemes of ion acceleration, in combination they seem to be unique to Auto-Resonant acceleration.

The negative energy electron beam mode which was selected for Auto-Resonant acceleration was the lower (slower) electron cyclotron eigenmode. This mode was selected because it alone seemed to possess the desired characteristics of a phase velocity which could be varied from a value much less than c (the speed of light) to near the beam velocity, as well as a simple method of passively controlling the phase velocity: flaring the guide magnetic field to spatially reduce its strength.

Although the central features of this accelerator concept are embodied in a single "accelerator section" wherein the magnetic field strength is reduced to accelerate the cyclotron wave, a number of other sections or components will be necessary to complete a practical accelerator system. These components may be conceptually itemized as follows:

-3-

- (1) High-voltage power supply
- (2) Electron-beam diode
- (3) Beam-compression/tailoring section (optional)
- (4) Cyclotron wave-growth section
- (5) Ion loading section
- (6) Ion-wave accelerator section
- (7) Accelerator termination

Since these components are intrinsically interrelated, a program of theoretical support for the construction of such a system must encompass each of these areas. We describe herein the results of only a small portion of such theoretical research, concerning nonlinearities in the cyclotron wave amplitude, which may affect the central components (4), (5), and (6).

Naturally much of the early calculations of the Auto-Resonant Accelerator have been based upon linear analysis of the electron cyclotron mode, which is valid when the mode amplitude is sufficiently small. For example, the detailed investigation of various means of growing the cyclotron eigenmode has been conducted within linearized theory, as has the analysis of ion loading and acceleration. However, it is of interest to determine the mode amplitude level at which nonlinear effects first become important for a number of reasons:

- the successful functioning of the accelerator for nonlinear wave amplitudes has not yet been theoretically established (or disproven);
- (2) nonlinear effects may well cause saturationof the linear growth mechanisms, establishing anupper bound to the achievable mode amplitude;
- (3) theoretical knowledge of such nonlinear saturation amplitudes and mechanisms is needed for comparison with computational and experimental investigations; and
- (4) knowledge of the magnitude and parameter scaling of nonlinear mode amplitudes is a valuable design tool, since this information bears heavily on the required length of both the growth and acceleration sections of the accelerator.

Therefore we have examined situations where the amplitude of the electron cyclotron mode increases, such as

for an electron-ion instability or an electron-waveguide instability, to determine the amplitude level at which nonlinearities become important. The latter case may include either a resistive liner interaction, where the resistance allows the negative energy cyclotron mode to grow in amplitude, or else an interaction between beam modes and modes supported by some form of surrounding slow wave structure. Such interactions are relevant as possible growth mechanisms for the cyclotron mode prior to ion loading and wave acceleration.

On the other hand, interaction between the electron beam and the subject ions is also of interest as possible mechanism for both wave growth and ion loading, provided that the growth saturates via ion trapping. This possibility has been considered by Indykul, et al.,³ whose analysis was supported by a one-dimensional, single wave computer calculation of the nonlinear ion dynamics. In addition, electron-ion interaction will also occur during the process of acceleration, when it has no desired purpose, but must be assessed to determine how disruptive the interaction is on the electron beam and on the acceleration process. This electron-ion

-6-

interaction problem has been selected as the vehicle of our detailed nonlinear calculations, although some of the results are also relevant when the cyclotron mode is excited in a different fashion.

The influence of nonlinear effects may be broadly characterized in two different ways, and our results have been divided into the resulting four categories as shown on the chart below:

- ver nativet batween vers-	Electron Effects	Ion Effects
Violation of primary conditions for linearity	Section III	Section IV
Growth saturation without violating primary linearity conditions	Section V	Section VI

The first division separates nonlinearities which influence the electron-wave dynamics from those which influence the ion-wave dynamics. For example, the Indykul calculation

-7-

would encompass only ion nonlinearities since the electrons were "legislated" to obey linear theory; likewise, an electron-waveguide instability can manifest only electron nonlinearities.

The second division separates those cases where it is possible to construct a nonlinear theory which retains its validity to the point of growth saturation, so that the saturation amplitudes are known precisely, from cases for which linear approximations breakdown before a saturation mechanism appears. In this latter circumstance, experience frequently suggests a correlation between wavegrowth saturation and the breakdown of linear approximations, which can often be substantiated by computer simulations or by experiment.

Before describing our analytical results, we first describe briefly our approximations and the linear theory of the electron cyclotron wave.

-8-

II. APPROXIMATIONS AND LINEAR THEORY

Below are definitions of the symbols and notation which has been used:

I

Í

I

I

1

1

1

x,y,z)	= coordinates of slab geometry
ź	= unit vector in the axial direction
Ŷ	= unit vector in the radial direction, normal to the beam and waveguide boundaries
Ŷ	= unit vector in the transverse, ignorable direction
Ъ	<pre>= radius (half-width) of the conducting waveguide</pre>
c	* speed of light
Boz	= external magnetic guide field
E _{ox}	= DC self electric field of the electron beam
воу	= DC self magnetic field of the electron beam
•	= DC self electric potential of the electron beam
^{`Ē} x, ^Ē y, ^Ē z ⁾ [c	<pre>pr(E_,E_,E_)] = perturbed components of the wave</pre>
^B _x , ^B _y , ^B _z)[α	<pre>pr(B,B,B)] = perturbed components of the wave magnetic field</pre>

$\tilde{A}^{\pm}(\text{or }A^{\pm})$	= certain linear combinations of \tilde{E}_{x} , \tilde{E}_{y} , \tilde{B}_{x} , \tilde{B}_{y}
$ ilde{\Phi}(ext{or} \ ilde{\Phi})$	= perturbed electric potential function
k _z (or k _o)	= axial component of the wave vector
κ^+ (or k_{\perp})	= radial component of the wave vector
k²	$= k_{\perp}^2 + k_{o}^2$
w(or w _o)	= frequency of the electron cyclotron wave
-e, m	= electron charge, mass
no	= mean electron number density
a	= electron beam radius
$u_{o} = \beta_{o}c$	= DC electron axial flow velocity
Yo	= $(1 - \beta_0^2)^{-1/2}$ = DC electron y-factor
v _{oy} (x)	<pre>= mean transverse electron drift for radial equilibrium</pre>
φ	= $(4\pi n e^2/\gamma m)^{1/2}$ = relativistic electron plasma frequency
Ω	<pre>= (e B / Y mc) = relativistic electron cyclotron frequency</pre>
δω	= $\Omega \omega_p^2 / k^2 c^2$ = width of cyclotron resonance
ñ	= perturbed electron density
x	= perturbed radial electron coordinate
β _x c	= perturbed radial electron velocity
β _z c	= perturbed axial electron velocity
Ŷ	= perturbed electron v-factor

1

I

I

-

1

1

0

1

I

I

Contraction *

-

-10-

- your and

1

e,M	= ion charge, mass
$N_{i}(\underline{x},t)$	= total ion number density
n _{oi}	= mean ion number density
a _i	= radius of ion distribution
×oi	= radial coordinate of equilibrium ion motion
vox	= radial velocity of equilibrium ion motion
^w в	= $(4\pi n e^2/M)^{1/2}$ = radial bounce frequency of an ion the self electric field E of the electrons ox
^w Bz' ^w Bx	= k, $k_{\perp} [e\tilde{\Phi}(0)/M]^{1/2}$ = axial, radial bounce frequency of ion in the wave electric field
. ^w pi	= $(4\pi \bar{n} e^2/M)^{1/2}$ = ion plasma frequency
Ω _i	= (e B $/Mc$) = ion cyclotron frequency
ñ _i (or n _i)	= perturbed ion density
<i>x</i> i	= perturbed radial ion coordinate
⊽ _x	= perturbed radial ion velocity
ν̈́z	= perturbed axial ion velocity
J̃(or J)	= perturbed total current density
p̃(or p)	= perturbed total charge density
Г	= linear growth rate of electron cyclotron wave
Δω	<pre>= nonlinear frequency shift of the electron cyclotron wave</pre>
Perturbed	quantities with a tilde (e.g., \mathbf{E}_{-}) are representa-

t

ſ

-

I

I

I

I

Γ

0

0

-

tions in the usual configuration space, while those without

-11-

1

the tilde (e.g., E_x) are representations of the Fourier coefficients for the basis functions $\exp(-i\omega t + ik_z z)$. Also, the quantities ω , k_z , κ^+ are the frequency/ wavenumber components for a general wave, while w_0 , k_0 , k_\perp are the particular values existing for a pure electron cyclotron mode.

As a basis for the nonlinear calculations to be described later, we first consider a slab model equilibrium in which a cold relativistic electron beam of uniform density n_0 propagates with uniform velocity $u_0 \rightarrow c$ along a uniform guide field B_{02} in the z-direction, and interacts with a sparse group of ions whose axial velocity is zero. For ready reference, a number of the approximations or restrictions which underlie this calculation are listed below.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} = 0$$
 for equilibrium (1)

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y} = 0$$
 for both equilibrium and waves (2)

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\mathbf{z}}(-\mathbf{x}) \tag{3}$$

-12-

$$\begin{split} w_{0}^{2} < k_{0}^{2}c^{2} = \Omega^{2} & (4) \\ k_{0}^{2} a^{2} + \frac{w_{p}^{2} a^{2}}{2c^{2}} = \frac{\Omega^{2} a^{2}}{c^{2}} + \frac{w_{p}^{2} a^{2}}{2c^{2}} \leq 0(1) < k_{1}^{2} a^{2} & (5) \\ \frac{b - a}{a} < 1 & (6) \\ \frac{\partial n}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial Y_{0}}{\partial x} = 0 & (7) \\ Y_{0} > 1, \quad \beta_{0} \approx 1, \quad \tilde{\beta}_{z} < 1 & (8) \\ \frac{w_{p}^{2}}{Y_{0} \Omega c} < 1 & (9) \\ \frac{w_{p}^{2}}{Y_{0}^{2} \Omega^{2}} < 1 & (10) \\ \frac{\bar{n}}{n_{a}} < Y_{0}^{-2} & (11) \end{split}$$

d

and the second

I

I

Γ

-

-13-

$$\frac{\Gamma}{\omega_{\rm B}} \sim \left[\frac{\left(\frac{\bar{n}_{\rm oi}/n_{\rm o}}{8 \left(\gamma_{\rm o} \, m/M \right)^{1/2} \left(\Omega/\omega_{\rm p} \right)} \right]^{1/2}}{8 \left(\gamma_{\rm o} \, m/M \right)^{1/2} \left(\Omega/\omega_{\rm p} \right)} \right]^{1/2} < 1$$
(12)

-

-

I

I

?

1

1

...

1

$$\frac{2\omega_{\rm B}}{\Omega} = 2\left(\gamma_{\rm o} m/M\right)^{1/2} \left(\omega_{\rm p}/\Omega\right) < 1$$
(13)

$$\frac{\Omega_{i}}{\omega_{B}} = (\gamma_{0} m/M) (\Omega/\omega_{p}) < 1$$
(14)

$$\frac{\Gamma}{\delta \omega} \sim \left[\frac{\left(\frac{\bar{n}_{oi} / n_{o}}{0} \right)}{8 \left(\frac{M}{\gamma_{o} m} \right)^{1/2} \left(\Omega^{3} \omega_{p} / k^{4} c^{4} \right)} \right]^{1/2} < 1$$
(15)

$$\frac{\Gamma(\text{axial ion response})}{\Gamma} \sim \left[\frac{0.08 \left(\gamma_{o}^{\text{m/M}} \right)^{1/2} \left(\Omega^{5} a^{4} / w_{p} c^{4} \right)}{\left(\overline{n}_{o1} / n_{o} \right)} \right]^{1/6} < 1$$
(16)

(It is desired that these inequalities be well satisfied.)

-14-

Ser at

Both the electron beam and the ions are assumed to be infinite in the z- and y-directions, but are bounded by conducting plates at $x = \pm b \approx \pm a$; Eq. (6) avoids the need for a multiple region calculation.

The electron beam dynamics is described by the cold fluid equations:

 $\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{n} \, \overline{\mathbf{n}}) = 0$

and a second

 $\frac{d}{dt} m(\gamma \underline{v}) = -e \underline{E} - \frac{e}{c} (\underline{v} \times \underline{B})$ (17)

with closure obtained through the usual Maxwell equations. The velocities and electromagnetic fields of the beam equilibrium are

$$\underline{\mathbf{v}}_{\mathbf{o}} = \left(0, \ \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{o}\mathbf{y}} = \frac{4\pi \ \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{o}} \ \mathbf{e} \ \mathbf{c} \ \mathbf{x}}{B_{\mathbf{o}\mathbf{z}} \ \mathbf{\gamma}_{\mathbf{o}}^{2}} \rightarrow 0, \ \mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{o}}\right)$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{E}}_{\mathbf{0}} = \left(\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{0}\mathbf{X}} = -4\pi \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{e}\mathbf{x}, 0, 0 \right)$$
(18)

$$\underline{B}_{o} = \left(0, B_{oy} = -\frac{4\pi n_{o} e u x}{c}, B_{oz}\right)$$

The electrons are assumed ultrarelativistic, according to Eqs. (8) - (10), which allow neglect of the transverse drift velocity v_{oy} as well as the diamagnetic corrections to the guide magnetic field. The electron equilibrium is assumed uniform, as indicated in Eq. (7).

If we subject this equilibrium to small amplitude perturbations, electron beam-cyclotron modes propagate along the beam. These cyclotron modes will be largely decoupled from the longitudinal plasma modes due to the high- γ assumptions, and they are the subject of this linear analysis. Let us define the new variables

$$\tilde{A}^{\pm} = \tilde{E}_{x} \pm i \tilde{E}_{y} \pm i \frac{u_{o}}{c} (\tilde{B}_{x} \pm i \tilde{B}_{y})$$

From Maxwell's equations, we obtain the following equation for \tilde{A}^{\pm} .

$$\left(\nabla^{2} - \frac{1}{c^{2}} \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial t^{2}}\right) \tilde{A}^{\pm} = 4\pi \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \pm i \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\right) \left(\tilde{\rho} - \frac{u_{o}}{c^{2}} \tilde{J}_{z}\right)$$
$$+ \frac{4\pi}{c^{2}} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \pm u_{o} \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\right) \left(\tilde{J}_{x} \pm i \tilde{J}_{y}\right)$$
(19)

-16-

where the boundary conditions on \tilde{A}^{\pm} at $x = \pm a$ are:

$$\tilde{A}^+ = \tilde{A}^-$$
(20)

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{A}^{+}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \tilde{A}^{-}}{\partial x} = 8\pi \left(\tilde{p} - \frac{\alpha}{c^{2}} \tilde{J}_{z} \right)$$

If we restrict the analysis to perturbation with no variations in $y(\partial/\partial y = 0)$, and consider perturbations of the form $exp(-i\omega t + i k_z z)$, then from Eq. (17) and Eq. (19), we obtain:

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \mathbf{x}^2} + \kappa^{\pm 2}\right) \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{O}}^{\pm} = 0$$
 (21)

where

land and

1

1

-

$$x^{\pm 2} = -k_{z}^{2} + \frac{w^{2}}{c^{2}} - \frac{w_{p}^{2}(w - k_{z} u)}{c^{2}(w - k_{z} u \pm \Omega)}$$
(22)

Assumption (8) allows neglect of the perturbations in the axial electron velocity because of the large longitudinal mass. Likewise, the electron high- γ_0 assumptions imply that $\tilde{\rho}_e - (u_0/c^2) \tilde{J}_{ze} \rightarrow 0$ and may be neglected.

-17-

Solving Eq. (21) subject to assumptions (4), (5), and the boundary conditions (20), yields the dispersion relation for the electron beam cyclotron mode ($\omega = \omega_0$, $k_z = k_0$, $\kappa^+ = k_\perp$) symmetric in E_z :

$$w_{0} = k_{0} u_{0} - \frac{\Omega k^{2} c^{2}}{(k^{2} c^{2} + w_{0}^{2})}$$

$$k^{2} = k_{0}^{2} + k_{\perp}^{2}$$
(23)

$$\tan k_{\perp}a = -k_{\perp}a$$

Here assumption (4) for nonrelativistic wave speed tends to be justified for these interactions with ions, and permits simplification of the cyclotron eigenfunctions by decoupling the light modes. Assumption (5) implies strong decoupling of the positive and negative energy cyclotron modes, which also simplifies the cyclotron eigenfunctions.

For the lowest modes, $\kappa^+ a = k_{\perp} a \approx 2$, 4.9, 8, . . . The eigenfunctions are

-18-

$$A_{O}^{+}(\mathbf{x}) = A_{O} \sin \kappa^{+} \mathbf{x}$$

$$A_{O}^{-}(\mathbf{x}) = A_{O} \frac{\sin \kappa^{+} a}{\sin \kappa^{-} a} \sin \kappa^{-} \mathbf{x}$$
(24)

$$\approx A \frac{x}{a} \sin \kappa^{+} a$$

Letting $A_0 = |A_0| e^{i\varphi}$, it may be shown that the perturbed electric potential function is

$$\tilde{\Phi}(\underline{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{t}) \simeq -\left(\frac{\mathbf{k}_{\perp} \mathbf{c}^2 |\mathbf{A}_{0}|}{\Omega^2}\right) \operatorname{ask}_{\perp} \mathbf{x} \operatorname{ask}(\mathbf{k}_{0} \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{w}_{0} \mathbf{t} + \mathbf{\omega}) \quad (25)$$

so that

l

I

-

I

1

1

I

-

$$\left|\frac{e\tilde{\Phi}(0)}{\gamma_{o}mc^{2}}\right| = \left|\frac{k_{\perp}eA_{o}}{\gamma_{o}m\Omega^{2}}\right|$$
(26)

and the corresponding perturbed electric fields are

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\mathbf{z}} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\mathbf{x}} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}$$
 (27)

As indicated by assumption (3) we are considering only those waves symmetric in $\tilde{E}_{z}(x)$. Qualitatively similar results may easily be derived for the antisymmetric waves.

If a small fraction of ions with mean density \bar{n}_{oi} is introduced into the electron beam, electron-ion streaming instabilities occur due to coupling of electron beam-cyclotron modes to the ion motion. Assumption (11) insures that the equilibrium is not appreciably affected by the ions, and we obtain for A^{\pm} :

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \kappa^{\pm 2}\right) A^{\pm} \approx 4\pi e \frac{\partial}{\partial x} n_{i}(x)$$
(28)

where $n_i(x)$ is the perturbed ion density.

Equation (28) may be solved by first order perturbation expansion about the cyclotron mode. Let

$$A^{\pm}(\mathbf{x}) = A_{0}^{\pm} + A_{1}^{\pm} + \dots$$
$$\omega = \omega_{0} + \omega_{1}$$
$$\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}$$

-1

where

z

$$A_{1}^{\pm} < A_{0}^{\pm}$$
, $w_{1} < w_{0}$, $k_{1} < k_{0}$,

and A_0^{\pm} is given by Eq. (24).

0

The most stringent condition for the convergence of this perturbation expansion is obtained from the perturbation

-20-

of the quantity κ^{+2} , defined in Eq. (22). This convergence condition eventually leads to Eq. (15) that the growth rate Γ be less than $\delta \omega \equiv \Omega \omega_p^2/k^2 c^2$.

1

By subtracting Eq. (21) from Eq. (28), and forming a Rayleigh-Ritz integral to avoid solving for the first order eigenfunctions A_1^{\pm} , we obtain

$$\int_{-a}^{+a} dx A_{0}^{+*}(x) \left[w_{1} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_{0}} \kappa^{+2} + k_{1} \frac{\partial}{\partial k_{0}} \kappa^{+2} \right] A_{0}^{+}(x)$$

$$+a$$

$$\approx 4\pi e \int dx \left[A_{0}^{+*}(x) + A_{0}^{-*}(x) \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial x} n_{i}(x)$$
(29)

To complete the dispersion relation, we need the perturbed ion density $n_{i}(x)$.

-a

Since the ions will be non-relativistic in the laboratory frame of the calculation, the dominant forces on the ions are those due to the electric fields, and in the limit of Eq. (5), $\kappa^{+2} \equiv k_{\perp}^2 > k_{z}^2$, and the E_x-component is the largest. Thus, we obtain for the ion dynamics:

-21-

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = v_x$$

$$\frac{dv}{dt} = -w_B^2 x + \frac{e}{M} \tilde{E}_x(x,z,t)$$

where the term $-\omega_{\rm B}^2 x$ is the radial restoring force due to the self-electric field $E_{\rm ox}$ of the electron beam, and the perturbed electric field is $\tilde{E}_{\rm x}$ of Eq. (27).

(30)

For sufficiently high ion density and for low magnetic field strength, the growth rate of these ion-electron cyclotron interactions can exceed the perpendicular bounce frequency $w_{\rm B}$ and these equilibrium oscillations may be ignored. However, for electron beam and magnetic field parameters typical of state of the art experimental facilities, this may require ion loading corresponding to kiloamperes of output ion current. Hence, we shall not discuss this regime herein, but will address the more likely regime of lower ion density, where the growth rate is below $w_{\rm B}$ as in Eq. (12), and the perpendicular ion oscillations are very important. However, it will also generally be true that 2 $w_{\rm B} < \Omega$ as in Eq. (13), so that the cyclotron wave phase velocity is non-relativistic

-22-

and the wave number k_0 is not much perturbed from the value $\Omega/\beta_0 c$. In addition, $\Omega_i < w_B$ as in Eq. (14), so that the ion coupling to the guide field is truly negligible.

From the linearized Vlasov equation for the ions, we determine the perturbed ion density, assuming it to be dominated by the transverse ion dynamics. After substitution in the right hand side of Eq. (29), we obtain the dispersion relation

$$(1 + \alpha x^{2} k_{\perp}a) \frac{k^{2} c^{2}}{\omega_{p}^{2} \Omega} \left[- w_{1} + k_{1} u_{0} \right]$$

$$= -\frac{4\pi^{2} e^{2} k_{\perp}^{2}}{M k_{0}^{2}} \int d\alpha \frac{\partial g_{0}}{\partial \alpha} \frac{\ell J_{\ell}^{2}(k_{\perp}\alpha)}{w_{1}}$$
(31)

where

a

Ŀ

$$\alpha^2 = x^2 + \frac{w^2}{w^2_B} ,$$

and the equilibrium ion distribution function is

 $F_0 = g_0(\alpha) \delta(v_y) \delta(v_z)$. To satisfy the condition for resonant interaction between the ion modes and the cyclotron mode, one selects $w_0 = \ell w_B$, where ℓ is an even integer, and

-23-

 $\begin{array}{l} k_{0} \ u_{0} \approx \left[\left(k^{2}c^{2}\right) / \left(k^{2}c^{2} + w_{p}^{2}\right) \right] \ \Omega + \ell w_{B} & \text{from the zero order} \\ \\ \text{dispersion relation (23).} \end{array}$

An equilibrium ion distribution for which all ions have the same energy and the same radial turning points is given by

$$g_{0}(\alpha) = \frac{2 \bar{n}_{0i} a_{i}}{\pi w_{p}} \delta(\alpha^{2} - a_{i}^{2})$$
(32)

1

Province of

where \bar{n}_{oi} is the average ion density, and $a_i \leq a$ is the amplitude of the equilibrium ion trajectory. The equilibrium ion density function will be peaked near the turning points $x = \pm a_i$.

From Eq. (31),

$$w_{1} - k_{1}u_{0} \approx - \frac{2 \ell w_{pi}^{2} w_{p}^{2} J_{\ell}(k_{\perp}a_{i}) J_{\ell}'(k_{\perp}a_{i})}{w_{1} w_{B} \Omega k_{\perp}a(1 + \alpha x^{2} k_{\perp}a)}$$

$$= - \frac{\Lambda_0^2}{\omega_1} J_{\ell}(k_1a_1) J_{\ell}'(k_1a_1)$$

where

$$\Lambda_{O}^{2} = \frac{2 \ell w_{pi}^{2} w_{p}^{2}}{w_{B} \Omega k_{\perp} a (1 + \alpha v^{2} k_{\perp} a)}$$

For maximum growth, $k_1 = 0$, and

$$\Gamma \equiv \operatorname{Im} w_{1} = \Lambda_{0} \left[J_{\ell} (k_{\perp} a_{i}) J_{\ell}' (k_{\perp} a_{i}) \right]^{1/2}$$
(33)

An alternate choice for the equilibrium ion distribution, for which the ion density is parabolic in x, peaked about the beam center, is

$$g_{o}(\alpha) = \frac{2 \tilde{n}_{oi}}{\pi \omega_{B} a_{i}} \Theta(a_{i} - \alpha)$$
(34)

where Θ is the unit step function. For this distribution, the maximum growth rate is given by

$$\Gamma = \Lambda_{o} \left[\frac{J_{\perp}^{2} (k_{\perp} a_{\perp})}{k_{\perp} a_{\perp}} \right]^{1/2}$$
(35)

which is fairly close to the prior result.

The assumption that the interaction of the ions is dominated by the transverse ion response rather than the axial response is quantified in Eq. (16) for the case $a_i \simeq a$ -which insures that the axial response yield a smaller growth rate. This inequality bounds the magnetic field strength from above and the ion density from below, contrary

-25-

to most of the other restrictions, and tends to require smaller magnetic fields than Eq. (14).

Conditions (5) and (13) will also insure that $\Omega = \frac{\omega_B a^2}{i} < 4c^2$ so that the influence of $v = \frac{\omega_B}{ox}$ forces on the axial ion motion will not affect the interaction appreciably.

In addition to the ion-electron cyclotron interactions which we are considering, there may be longitudinal ion-electron plasma interactions and transverse Weibel-like interactions which can occur for $k_z \rightarrow 0$. However, assumption (10) that the longitudinal electron plasma frequency be below the electron cyclotron frequency, assures that the plasma and cyclotron modes are well decoupled, and also that the plasma oscillations occur in the "magnetized" regime. Consequently the large transverse k_{\perp} -component indicated in Eq. (5) is sufficient for electromagnetic effects to stabilize the fastest longitudinal plasma oscillations for which $k_z \beta_o c \simeq w_p / \gamma_0$. There will remain much slower, longer wavelength plasma oscillations with $k_z \beta_o c \simeq w_{pi}$, but the growth rate of these modes will be

-26-

below the cyclotron mode growth rate under the given assumptions.

For magnetic field strengths large enough to obey Eq. (13) well, the transverse Weibel interactions also appear to be stabilized by the w_B -oscillations of the ions. Only for smaller magnetic fields would these interactions be unstable with significant growth rates.

Therefore, for the equilibrium conditions and assumptions which have been set forth herein, the fastest ion-electron interaction occurs between modes of transverse ion oscillation in the beam electric field and electron cyclotron modes. To determine the wave amplitude at which nonlinearities become significant, we shall focus on the electron cyclotron dynamics and the ion $\omega_{\rm B}$ -oscillations.

III. BREAKDOWN OF LINEAR ELECTRON BEHAVIOR

In this section, a brief survey is presented of a number of nonlinear electron effects, in which one or another of the primary conditions for linearity is violated. Rough estimates are given of the magnitude and scaling of the mode amplitude level at which these effects become important. Many of the effects may be seen to be related to one another. Although care has been taken to preserve the numerical coefficients, which are presented here for the case of slab geometry, the very nature of these formulae is merely to indicate the level at which linear approximations lose their validity, and this occurs gradually rather than sharply as a function of amplitude. The correlation between the breakdown of linear approximations and wave growth saturation must remain inferential, pending the accumulation of additional theoretical or computational evidence.

In addition to the cyclotron eigenmode structure, which was presented in Eqs. (24) through (27), one may derive from linear theory the expression for the perturbed radial coordinate of an electron:

-28-
$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{k^2 c^2}{w_p^2} \frac{e \tilde{\Phi}(0)}{v_o m c^2} \frac{\sin k_\perp \mathbf{x}}{k_\perp}$$
 (36)

which is the magnitude of the perturbation amplitude--with the z, t phase information supressed. Likewise $\tilde{\Phi}(0)$ is the magnitude of the perturbed electric potential amplitude at the beam axis x = 0. This expression characterizes the electron particle dynamics in the wave, and shows that electrons near the beam edge are the most strongly perturbed for the broadest perpendicular eigenmode (for which $k_{\perp} \simeq 2/a$).

The various conditions wherein nonlinear effects become significant are listed below for ready comparison with one another; a discussion of the different nonlinear effects follows.

$$\frac{\tilde{n}}{n_{o}} \simeq \frac{k^{2}c^{2}}{w_{p}^{2}} \stackrel{e}{\rightarrow} \frac{\tilde{\Phi}(0)}{\gamma_{o}} \approx 1$$
(37)

$$k_{\perp}\tilde{x}_{\max} \simeq \frac{k_{\perp}c\beta_{\chi}}{\Omega} \simeq \left|\frac{\partial\tilde{x}}{\partial x}\right|_{0} \simeq \frac{\tilde{n}}{n_{0}} \ge 1$$
 (38)

$$\frac{\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{x}}(0)}{E_{\mathbf{ox}}(0)} \simeq k_{\perp} a \frac{\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{x}}}{E_{\mathbf{ox}}(a)} \simeq \frac{(k_{\perp}a)^2}{2} \frac{\tilde{\Phi}(0)}{\Phi_{\mathbf{o}}(a)} \simeq \frac{k_{\perp}^2}{k^2} \frac{\tilde{n}}{n_{\mathbf{o}}} \ge 1 \quad (39)$$

-29-

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\mathbf{x}} \simeq \frac{\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{z}}}{\mathbf{k}_{\perp}} \left| \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{x}}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right|_{O} \ge 1$$
(40)

$$\frac{\tilde{\gamma}}{\gamma_{0}} \simeq \tilde{\beta}_{x} \frac{E_{0x}(a)}{B_{0z}} \left[1 + \left(\frac{k_{1}a}{k^{2}a^{2}}\right)^{2}\right]$$

$$\simeq \left(\frac{w_p^2 a^2}{k_1 a c^2}\right) \left[1 + \left(\frac{k_1 a}{k^2 a^2}\right)^2\right]^{1/2} \frac{\tilde{n}}{n_0} \ge 1$$
(41)

$$\frac{\delta_{\gamma} \left| w - k_{z} c \beta_{z} + \Omega \right|}{\delta w} \simeq \frac{k^{2} c^{2}}{w_{p}^{2}} \frac{\tilde{\gamma}}{\gamma_{o}} \simeq \left[\left(\frac{k^{2} a^{2}}{k_{\perp} a} \right)^{2} + 1 \right]^{1/2} \frac{\tilde{n}}{n_{o}} \ge 1$$

$$(42)$$

$$\frac{\delta_{\beta} | \boldsymbol{\omega} - \boldsymbol{k}_{z} c \beta_{z} + \Omega |}{\delta \boldsymbol{\omega}} \simeq \frac{\left[\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{Y}_{o} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{p}^{2} \boldsymbol{a}^{2}}{\boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} \boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{c}^{2}} \right)^{2} + 1 \right]^{1/2}}{\boldsymbol{Y}_{o}^{2}} \left(\frac{\tilde{n}}{n_{o}} \right)$$

$$+ \frac{k_{z}^{2}}{k^{2}} \frac{c^{2}}{2 w_{p}^{2} a^{2}} \left(\frac{k^{2} a^{2}}{k_{\perp} a} \frac{\tilde{n}}{n_{o}} \right)^{2} \ge 1 \quad (43)$$

I

Condition (37) prescribes the wave amplitude level at which the electron density fluctuations due to the wave

-30-

become comparable with the mean electron density. These density fluctuations will be strongest on axis for this equilibrium where n_0 and γ_0 are uniform in x, and at this wave amplitude the electron density will vary from near zero to around twice the ambient density.

Condition (37) also indicates that these density nonlinearities will be come important at an amplitude level smaller by ω_p^2/k^2c^2 from that for which longitudinal trapping of the electrons by the wave potential would occur.

Condition (38) indicates three other nonlinear effects which enter at the same wave amplitude level. The first of these is the condition that the radial displacement of an electron by the wave be as large as the scale length k_{\perp}^{-1} characterizing the perpendicular eigenmode structure. This is judged to be more accurate than the criterion for dis.. placements as large as the beam radius, which requires higher wave amplitudes. Equation (36) indicates that the displacements will be largest at about 0.8 times the beam radius. One physical consequence of radial displacements as large as $k_{\perp}^{-1} \simeq a/2$ is that wall collisions might occur unless a sufficiently wide vacuum gap was available. The

-31-

second condition in Eq. (38) is that finite electron gyroradius effects become important because of the perpendicular kinetic energy excited by the wave. The third condition is that the radial motion of the electrons becomes nonlaminar by virtue of radial "crossings" of electron trajectories. This may be easily seen to occur when $|\partial \tilde{x}/\partial x|$ exceeds 1, which occurs first for particles on axis. These last two conditions in Eq. (38) are symptomatic of the breakdown of the fluid nature of the wave due to nonlinear turbulence.

Condition (39) prescribes when the perpendicular wave electric field exceeds the self radial field of the beam, which tends to occur first on axis. This requires a wave amplitude larger than that for density nonlinearity by only k^2/k_1^2 . Condition (39) also reveals the connection between these various criteria of nonlinearity and the measurable ratios such as $\tilde{E}_{x \max}/E_{ox}(a)$ which are conveniently extracted from computer simulations as a diagnostic. One physical consequence of the nonlinearity suggested by Eq. (39) is the possibility of electron field emission at the conductor walls. The self-field E_{ox} is typically much

-32-

larger than the threshold amplitude required for field emission, but is in the wrong direction. One might think that if the wave fields became larger than the self-field and had the opposite radial sense, then field emission might result. However, this is a deception of the linear theory which is breaking down, since Poisson's equation shows that even for nonlinear waves, the electrostatic portion of the electric field must always point toward a region of net negative charge. Hence, the only possibility of field emission is due to the inductive or electromagnetic portion of the electric field, which is small for nonrelativistic phase velocity, or else to the presence of the ions whose density might locally exceed the nonlinearly reduced electron density. Although this criterion for field emission is not quantified herein, we anticipate that the required ion density will be a significant fraction of the electron density, since the electron wave fields are geometrically reduced below their peak value at the walls, and the peak value does not exceed the self-field until $(\tilde{n}/n) \ge k^2 a^2/k_1 a$ according to Eq. (39).

-33-

Condition (40) for the radial electron oscillations in the wave to become relativistic will be stronger than condition (38) only if k_z exceeds k_\perp . It is possible that this might be modestly true in the growth section and at the beginning of the accelerator section, but toward the end of the accelerator section k_z will be below k_\perp and $\tilde{\beta}_v \ll 1$.

The significance of the $\tilde{\beta}_{\chi} \ge 1$ nonlinearity is that it implies a significant fluctuation $\tilde{\gamma}$ in the electron γ -factor as shown in condition (41). This occurs because the electrons are perturbed by the wave to move with or against the radial self-field of the beam. At the beginning of the accelerator where $\tilde{\beta}_{\chi}$ is largest, $E_{0\chi}(a)/B_{0Z}$ is smallest and may be somewhat less than 1. The net product of these terms yields an expression, also shown in Eq. (41), which indicates that $\tilde{\gamma}/\gamma_0$ is generally somewhat less than \tilde{n}/n_0 .

However, condition (42) indicates that the variation $\tilde{\gamma}/\gamma_0$ is magnified by k^2c^2/w_p^2 to produce a variation in the fluid electron cyclotron resonance $|w - k_z c\beta_z + \Omega|$ which may be comparable to its ambient value (i.e., δw). This

-34-

nonlinear spreading of the cyclotron resonance occurs due to the γ -dependence of Ω ; it is sometimes called "resonance broadening." It is also symptomatic of the breakdown of fluid theory and the conversion of the cyclotron mode to a kinetic regime due to nonlinear turbulence. Condition (42) indicates that this nonlinear resonance broadening effect is felt at wave amplitudes somewhat below those for density nonlinearity, and hence is the most sensitive nonlinear effect yet discussed. Experience would suggest that this resonance broadening would reduce the wave growth rate when the wave amplitude reaches the level given by Eq. (42).

Condition (43) gives the corresponding resonance broadening which occurs due to changes in the axial electron velocity. The first terms of Eq. (43), which are linear in the wave amplitude \tilde{n}/n_o , are relatively unimportant as usual for $\gamma_o >> 1$. However, the last term of Eq. (43), which is quadratic in the wave amplitude, may be seen to be more (or less) important than the $\tilde{\gamma}/\gamma$ resonance broadening, depending on whether $k_z^2 c^2/2k^2 w_p^2 a^2$ is greater (or less) than 1. This quadratic term in the wave amplitudes

-35-

reflects the perturbation in $\tilde{\beta}_z$ due to linear perturbations in $\tilde{\beta}_i$, according to

$$\tilde{\beta}_{z} \simeq -\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\beta}_{\perp}^{2} + \text{linear terms}$$

+ other quadratic terms (44) which follows immediately from a perturbation expansion of $\gamma(\beta)$.

The square brackets in conditions (41) through (43) are hybrid representations in which the dominant first term reflects the influence of transverse electromagnetic fields on the electrons, such as $\tilde{\beta}_{x} E_{ox}$, while the smaller second term shows the influence of the perturbed axial electric field \tilde{E}_{x} .

The mode amplitude at which these nonlinear effects appear is reduced for higher values of k^2 , and consequently the higher-k modes should saturate in growth at lower amplitudes than the lower-k modes. Hence, when exciting or growing the cyclotron wave, care should be taken (as in designing computer simulations) that the lowest k mode is not discriminated against by any frequency or wavenumber selection which may be imposed.

-36-

Although this list of electron nonlinearities includes a variety of effects, it is by no means complete. As just one further example, the possibility of a nonlinear threewave decay of the electron cyclotron wave was examined and found to be disallowed by the coupling selection rules.

1

I

-

IV. BREAKDOWN OF LINEAR ION BEHAVIOR

As in the previous section, we here present estimates of the perturbation amplitude level at which certain primary conditions of ion linearity cease to be valid. As before, these estimates are rough, and the inference of wave growth saturation at these wave amplitude levels will again be tentative pending additional theoretical or computational evidence.

The radial ion motion is described by Eq. (30); the zero order ion motion is seen to be simple harmonic oscillation at frequency $\omega_{\rm B}$, with uniform amplitude $x_{\rm oi} = a_{\rm i}$ for the distribution of Eq. (32). Any ion distribution symmetric in x will be carried by the zero order particle motion into an equivalent state during one-half bounce pexiod, or $\pi/\omega_{\rm B}$. If this time also equals an integral number of wave periods, then the perturbed wave quantities will have also returned to their initial state. Consequently $\ell \omega_{\rm B}$ are the resonant frequencies of the linear ion-electron cyclotron interaction, where $\ell = 2, 4, 6, \ldots$.

-38-

Equation (30) may also be solved for the perturbed ion motion, and the result for the simplest $\ell = 2$ interaction is

$$\frac{\tilde{\nabla}}{\omega_{\rm B}} = \tilde{X}_{\rm imax} = \frac{k_{\rm i}^2 c^2}{4 \Gamma \omega_{\rm B}} \frac{e \tilde{\Phi}(0)}{Mc^2} a_{\rm i} \qquad (45)$$

The axial ion motion is described by $dv_z/dt \simeq$ (e/M) $\tilde{E}_z(x, z, t)$ since conditions (5) and (13) render the $v_{ox} B_{oy}$ forces unimportant. This equation may be solved to yield the perturbed axial ion motion

1

I

$$\frac{\tilde{v}_{z}}{c} = \frac{2 k c}{\omega_{o}} \frac{e \tilde{\Phi}(0)}{Mc^{2}} \simeq \frac{\Omega}{\omega_{B}} \frac{e \tilde{\Phi}(0)}{Mc^{2}} . \qquad (46)$$

Based upon an examination of the ion dynamics, the following conditions for primary ion nonlinearity may be derived.

$$\frac{\omega_{Bx}^{2}}{\omega_{B}^{2}} = \frac{\tilde{E}_{x}(0)}{E_{ox}(0)} = \frac{k_{\perp}^{2}}{4\pi} \frac{\tilde{\Phi}(0)}{e_{0}} = \frac{k_{\perp}^{2}}{k^{2}} \frac{\tilde{n}}{n_{o}} \ge 1$$
(47)

$$k_{\perp}\tilde{x}_{i \max} = \frac{k_{\perp}\tilde{v}_{x}}{\omega_{B}} = \frac{k_{\perp}a_{i}}{4} \frac{\omega_{Bx}^{2}}{\Gamma \omega_{B}} \ge 1$$
(48)

$$\frac{\omega_{BZ}^{2}}{\omega_{B}^{2}} = \frac{k^{2}}{k^{2}} - \frac{\tilde{n}}{n_{O}} \ge 1$$
(49)

$$\frac{k \tilde{v}}{\Gamma} = \frac{\omega_{Bz}^{2}}{\Gamma \omega_{B}} \ge 1$$
(50)

where according to Eqs. (33) or (35), the magnitude of the l = 2, $a_i = a$ growth rate is about

$$\Gamma \simeq \frac{\omega_{\rm pi} \omega_{\rm p}}{\sqrt{3 \,\Omega \,\omega_{\rm B}}} \tag{51}$$

The first two conditions (47) and (48) relate to the transverse ion dynamics, while the latter conditions (49) and (50) relate to the axial dynamics. In addition, conditions (48) and (50) are sensitive to the ion density through Γ , while conditions (47) and (49) are not.

-40-

Condition (47) prescribes the wave amplitude level at which the radial ion bouncing near the axis is influenced by the wave fields as much as by the DC self-field of the electron beam. Quantitatively this condition is exactly the same as condition (39). Since the ion-electron interaction is strongly affected by the resonance with DC ion bouncing, one suspects that this wave amplitude would completely alter the coherence of the interaction.

Condition (48) is that the radial displacement of an ion be as large as the scale length k_{\perp}^{-1} of the perpendicular eigenmode. At this amplitude level, which may be fairly low when Γ is small, one would expect the growth rate to decline as it might when the ions had a transverse "temperature."

Condition (49) is that some ions be longitudinally trapped by the wave. This is the growth saturation mechanism appealed to in the one-dimensional calculation of Indykul, et al.³ However, it may be seen here to require fairly large wave amplitudes, particularly when k_z is This is because at low ion density, the frequency

-41-

 \bar{n}_{oi} through w_{pi} and are instead determined by the frequency w_{B} of radial bouncing. Hence the wave speed does not approach closer and closer to the ion speed as \bar{n}_{oi} is reduced. Condition (49) will occur before or after condition (47) according to the ratio k_{p}/k_{\perp} .

Condition (50) prescribes the wave amplitude level at which the perturbed axial velocity of the ions broadens the resonance at $w \approx 2w_B$ by an amount comparable to its ambient value (i.e., Γ). This effect will be felt at a wave amplitude lower than that required for longitudinal ion trapping by Γ/w_B . However, it will not occur before condition (48) so long as the usual ordering $k_z < k_1$ is obeyed.

Compared to some of the electron nonlinearities, these ion conditions are not quite as sensitive to high k-values, but two of the ion conditions are sensitive to low ion density and hence can occur in some cases well before the electron nonlinearities.

-42-

V. GROWTH SATURATION VIA NONLINEAR ELECTRON FREQUENCY SHIFT

In this section, we discuss the effects of nonlinearities in the electron response which produce a nonlinear shift in the wave frequency of the electron beam-cyclotron mode. We expect nonlinear frequency shifts will influence the time evolution of the beam cyclotron mode since growth is determined by resonant coupling to the bounce motion of the ions.

It is assumed throughout that a fluid description of the electron beam is adequate. In evaluating the nonlinear frequency shift, the procedure is to calculate the nonlinear generation of the zeroth and second harmonic components of the fundamental mode. The nonlinear interaction of the fundamental with these harmonics then leads to corrections to the linear dispersion relation.

The details of this calculation will not be presented here. The result obtained for the frequency shift Δw is

-43-

$$\Delta \omega \approx -\frac{\Omega}{8} \frac{k^2 c^2}{\omega_p^2} \left| \frac{e k_\perp A_0}{m \gamma_0 \Omega^2} \right| \left[4.15 + 3.33 \frac{k^2 c^2}{\omega_p^2} \right]$$
$$= -\Delta |A_0|^2$$
(52)

where the fundamental is taken to be the lowest beam cyclotron mode with $k_{\perp}a \approx 2$. In deriving Eq. (52), which is insensitive to the method of exciting the electron cyclotron mode, we have assumed the primary linearity condition

$$\left|\frac{e \quad \tilde{\Phi}(0)}{\gamma_{o} \quad mc^{2}}\right| = \left|\frac{e \quad k_{\perp} \quad A_{o}}{m \quad \gamma_{o} \quad \Omega^{2}}\right| < \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{k^{2}c^{2}}$$
(53)

as well as the frequency ordering

$$|\Delta w| < \delta w = \Omega w^2 / k^2 c^2 \qquad (54)$$

Condition (53) is just the reverse of the nonlinear condition (37), while condition (54) is a time-ordering criterion invoked to allow calculation of the "slow" shift in the wave frequency.

If we denote the complex mode amplitude A by A = $\alpha e^{i\varphi}$, and insert this nonlinear electron frequency shift into the equations describing the growth of the ion-electron cyclotron instability, then we obtain the following equation for the time evolution of the mode amplitude

1

Π

$$\frac{d}{dt} \alpha e^{i\varphi} = \Gamma^2 \int \alpha e^{i\varphi} dt' + i \Delta \alpha^3 e^{i\varphi}$$
(55)

where Γ is the linear growth rate of Eqs. (33) or (35), and Δ is the frequency shift coefficient of Eq. (52).

Decomposing this equation into its real and imaginary parts, we obtain:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} \alpha}{\mathrm{d} t^{2}} - \left(\frac{\mathrm{d} \varphi}{\mathrm{d} t}\right)^{2} \alpha = \Gamma^{2} \alpha - \Delta \alpha^{3} \frac{\mathrm{d} \varphi}{\mathrm{d} t}$$
(56)

$$2 \frac{d\omega}{dt} \frac{d\alpha}{dt} + \alpha \frac{d^2\omega}{dt^2} = 3 \Delta \alpha^2 \frac{d\alpha}{dt}$$
(57)

The first integral of Eq. (57) is

$$a^2 \frac{d\omega}{dt} - \frac{3}{4} \Delta a^4 = C \equiv \text{constant}$$
(58)

Asserting the initial condition $d_{\phi}/dt = 0$ when a = 0, we obtain C = 0. Finally, substituting d_{ϕ}/dt from Eq. (58) into Eq. (56) yields

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^2 \alpha}{\mathrm{d} t^2} = \Gamma^2 \alpha - \frac{3}{16} \Delta^2 \alpha^5 \equiv -\frac{\mathrm{d} V_1}{\mathrm{d} \alpha} (\alpha)$$
 (59)

Eq. (59) is the equation of motion of a "particle" in a "potential well" $V_1(a)$, illustrated in Figure 1 below. It describes the time evolution of a from given initial conditions a(0) and da/dt(0).



Figure 1. "Potential Well" $V_1(a)$

For small $a[i.e., a < (\Gamma/\Delta)^{1/2}]$, a contains a component growing exponentially with the linear growth rate Γ . However, when $\Delta^2 a^4/16 \simeq \Gamma^2$, da/dt = 0, and growth ceases. Thereafter the amplitude decreases and then may continue to oscillate in time, depending upon the precise choice of initial conditions. The maximum amplitude attained is given by

$$\frac{e \tilde{\Phi}_{\max}(x=0)}{\gamma_{o} mc^{2}} = \frac{e k_{\perp} \alpha_{\max}}{m \gamma_{o} \Omega^{2}} = \left[\frac{32}{\left(4.15+3.32 \frac{\Omega^{2}}{\omega_{p}^{2}}\right)} \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{k^{2}c^{2}} \frac{\Gamma}{\Omega}\right]^{1/2}$$

$$(60)$$

which corresponds to

-

-

I

[

$$\left|\frac{\tilde{E}_{x \max}}{E_{ox}(a)}\right| = \frac{k_{\perp}^2 C_{\max}}{k_{o}^2 4\pi n_{o}^2 ea} = \left[\frac{32}{\left(4.15 + 3.32 \frac{\Omega^2}{\omega_p^2}\right)}\right]^{1/2} \frac{C}{a_{w}} \left[\frac{\Gamma}{\Omega}\right]^{1/2}$$

$$\approx \frac{1.9 \frac{c}{a\Omega} \left(\frac{\overline{n}_{oi}}{n_{o}}\right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{\gamma_{o}}{M}\right)^{1/8} \left(\frac{\Omega}{w_{p}}\right)^{1/4}}{\left[\frac{\Omega^{2}}{w_{p}^{2}} + 1.25\right]^{1/2}} , \quad (61)$$

where the growth rate has been inserted for the interaction with $a_i = a \simeq 2/k_{\perp}$ and $\ell = 2 = w_0/w_B$. It may be observed that this maximum wave amplitude is lower than the lowest amplitude for electron resonance broadening [given in Eqs. (42) and (43)] by about (2 to 6) $\sqrt{\Gamma/\delta w}$, which tends to be small due to assumptions (15) and (54). 1

-

-

1

1

-34-

VI. GROWTH SATURATION VIA PHASE MIXING OF NONLINEAR ION TRAJECTORIES

In this section, we discuss the effects of nonlinearities in the ion response on the time evolution of the unstable electron beam-cyclotron mode.

We again treat the ions as a small perturbation and evaluate the nonlinear trajectories of the ions in the wavefields of the electron beam-cyclotron mode. Substituting

$$\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{t}) = -\frac{k_{\perp}^{2}}{k_{o}^{2}} \alpha \sin k_{\perp} \mathbf{x} \cos (k_{z}^{2} + \varphi - \omega_{o}^{2})$$

in Eq. (30), and defining the new variables α , ξ , τ ,

$$x = \alpha \sin (\omega_B t + \xi)$$

$$v_x = \alpha w_B \cos (w_B t + \xi)$$

(62)

$$T = \frac{\ell}{w_{\rm B}} \frac{k_{\perp}^3 e}{\frac{M k_{\perp}^2}{M c}} \int_{0}^{t} \alpha dt'$$

we obtain from Eq. (30)

I

-49-

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}p}{\mathrm{d}\tau} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial H}$$

 $\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\tau} = - \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}$

where

$$H = J_{\ell} \left(\sqrt{2p} \right) \cos \left(q + \varphi \right)$$

$$p = \frac{(k_{\perp} \alpha)^2}{2}$$

 $q = k_0 z + \ell \xi$

 $w_{\rm D} = \ell w_{\rm B}$, and ℓ is even.

In Eq. (63), we have neglected terms which are oscillatory in t. These equations describe the slow variation of α and ξ due to the resonant interaction of the ions with the oscillatory electric field.

Assuming that φ is independent of τ [see Eq. (67)], H is a constant of the motion. Since p and q must vary such that $J_{\ell}(\sqrt{2p})$ and αg (q + φ) never pass through zero, the variations of p and q are bounded.

(63)

1

Figure 2 shows a sketch of the ion trajectories in the polar coordinate phase space $(\sqrt{2p}, q)$ due to resonant coupling to modes with frequency $w_0 = 2w_B$. The points given by $J'_2(k_\perp \alpha_s) = 0$, $\sin(q_s + \varphi) = 0$, (i.e. $k_\perp \alpha_s \approx$ 3, 6.7, . . ; $q_s + \varphi = 0$, π) are stable stationary points. The dashed circles have radii $k_\perp x_a$ given by $J_2(k_\perp x_a) = 0$, i.e., $k_\perp x_a \approx 5.1$, 8.4, . . . The ion trajectories indicated by the solid lines, are restricted to regions bounded by the dashed circles. The initial equilibrium ion distribution of Eq. (32) would be a circle of radius $\sqrt{2p} = k_\perp a_{\downarrow}$, while that of Eq. (34) would be the interior of the same circle. The conducting boundary is a circle of radius $\sqrt{2p} = k_\perp a$.

If all the ions initially have energy such that $k_{\perp}x_{\perp} < k_{\perp}a$, 5.1:

- (a) The ion trajectories eventually intersect the wall due to interaction with the lowest beam cyclotron mode k, a = 2;
- (b) A small fraction of the ion trajectories intersects the wall when k_ia = 4.9;

-51-



Figure 2. Ion Trajectories in the Polar Coordinate Phase Space $\left[\sqrt{2p} = k_{\perp} \alpha, q + \varphi\right]$

1

1

-52-

(c) The ion trajectories do not intersect the wall when $k_{\perp}a = 8$, or for higher k_{\perp} modes. From Eq. (63), we obtain for p:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}}{\mathrm{d}\tau} = \pm \left[\mathbf{J}_{\underline{\ell}}^{2} (\sqrt{2\mathbf{p}}) - \mathbf{Q}^{2} \right]$$
(64)

where $Q \equiv \text{constant}$. This equation can be solved by quadrature with the initial conditions

 $p = p_0 \equiv \frac{(k_\perp \alpha_0)^2}{2}$, $q = q_0 \equiv k_0 z + \ell \xi_0$

at "time" $\tau = 0$.

.

- and -

Since $g_0 = g_0[\alpha_0(x, v_x)]$ is the initial ion distribution of the ions, the ion density at time t is given by

$$N_{i}(x, z, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dv_{x} g_{o} \left[v_{ox}(x, z, v_{x}, t), x_{o}(x, z, v_{x}, t) \right]$$

$$(65)$$

where (x, v_0) is the point in phase space at time t = 0which arrives at (x, v_0) at time t. The contribution of the perturbed ion density to the right hand side of Eq. (29) is given by

$$Ha = \frac{L}{2} T$$

$$I = \pounds 4\pi e \alpha \int dx \sin k_1 x \int \frac{dz}{L} \int \frac{dt}{T}$$

$$L \rightarrow \infty \qquad -a \qquad -\frac{L}{2} \qquad 0$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} i \omega_{o} t - i k_{o} z - i \varphi \\ e & \frac{\partial}{\partial x} N_{i}(x, z, t) \end{array} \right\}$$

(66)

$$= -4\pi e k_{\perp} w_{B} \alpha \int_{0}^{a} d\alpha_{0} \alpha_{0} q_{0}(\alpha_{0}) \int_{0}^{a} dq_{0}$$

$$\int_{l}^{a} (\sqrt{2p}) \left[cos (q + \varphi) - i sin (q + \varphi) \right]$$

where

$$p = p(p_0, q_0, \tau), q = q(p_0, q_0, \tau)$$

are the solutions of Eq. (63). $\int_{0}^{1} dt/T$ is a time averaging operator, where $1/\Gamma > T > 1/w_{o}$.

Equating the real and imaginary parts of Eq. (29), using Eq. (66), we obtain

$$\alpha \frac{d\varphi}{d\tau} = 0 \tag{67}$$

1	AD-A066 045			AUSTIN RESEARCH ASSOCIATES INC TEX F/G 20/8 INTERACTIONS OF RELATIVISTIC CHARGED PARTICLE BEAMS.(U) NOV 78 W E DRUMMOND, J R THOMPSON, H V WONG F49620-76-C-0002 ARA-331 NL										
		2 of 44 AD 83045	For For an and a second	$\begin{array}{c} (0,0) = (1,0) \\ (0,0) =$		name Statestics States	Paulikaus(2): Santa S			⁴ Second States of Least 1 Second States of Second States 1 Second States of Second States 1 Second States of Second States 1 Second Stat	A CONTRACTOR OF		A Provincia de la compara de l	And the second s
	A second							Nanayan Davitatio		The second secon	Hand Hand State S	Annual and an annual and an annual and an annual annual an annual annual an annual an annual an an an an an an an an an an an an an a	A Conservation Source	i marije Marije Marije Marije Marije Marije Marije Marije Marije Marije Marije
		nin and a second	an territoria esta territori esta territoria esta territoria esta territoria esta territoria e											
	<text></text>						- Tables - Tables - Aggletoren et - Aggletoren - Aggletor	ingenti dan si Sagarta dan si Sagarta dan si Sagarta dan si Sagarta dan si Sagarta dan si Sagarta dan si	A de la companya de l	12 minut 12 min				
	-	La contrata de la con					Annual of the second se			A second se			<text><text><text><text></text></text></text></text>	Advancement of the second seco
													 To a sum of a first state sta	
								North States		The second secon				
1.	1												_	./



$$\frac{d^2\tau}{dt^2} = \Lambda_0^2 G(\tau) \equiv -\frac{dV}{d\tau} (\tau)$$
(68)

where

1

1

1

Í

1

1

$$G(\tau) = -\frac{k_{\perp} w_{B}}{2 \overline{n}_{0i}} \int_{0}^{a} d\alpha_{0} \alpha_{0} g_{0}(\alpha_{0}) \int_{l}^{2\pi} dq_{0} J_{l}(k_{\perp}\alpha) \sin (q + \varphi)$$

$$o \qquad (69)$$

Equation (68) is the equation of motion of a "particle" moving in a "potential well" $V_2(\tau)$, and it describes the time evolution of a, which is proportional to $d\tau/dt$. For small values of $\tau < 1$,

 $J_{\ell}(k_{\perp}\alpha) \sin (q+\phi) \approx J_{\ell}(k_{\perp}\alpha_{0}) \sin (q_{0}+\phi)$

$$-\tau \frac{J_{\ell}(k_{\perp}\alpha_{o}) J_{\ell}'(k_{\perp}\alpha_{o})}{k_{\perp}\alpha_{o}}$$
(70)

and it follows from Eqs. (68) through (70) that the amplitude a grows exponentially with the linear growth rate.

It is apparent from Eq. (63) that nonlinear modifications to the exponential linear growth of the instability occur when $\delta q > \pi/2$, that is

$$\frac{e \tilde{\Phi}(0)}{\gamma_{o} mc^{2}} = \frac{e k_{\perp} \alpha}{m \gamma_{o} \Omega^{2}} > 2\pi \frac{\Gamma}{\ell \omega_{B}} \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{k_{\perp}^{2} c^{2}}$$
(71)

or

$$\frac{\frac{E}{x \max}}{\frac{E}{e_{ox}(a)}} > \frac{2\pi}{k_{\perp}a} \frac{\Gamma}{\ell \omega_{B}}$$
(72a)

~ 0.1
$$\left(\frac{\overline{n}_{oi}}{n_{o}}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{M}{m_{V_{o}}}\right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{w_{p}}{\Omega}\right)^{1/2}$$
, (72b)

for $k_{\perp}a = k_{\perp}a_{\perp} = 2 = \mu$. These conditions (71) and (72) will occur for wave amplitudes smaller than those given in the primary electron nonlinearity conditions (37) through (39) by the factor $\Gamma/\ell w_{\rm B} < 1$. However, the wave amplitudes of (71) and (72) are only higher by a numerical factor of about $\pi/2$ from the nonlinear ion condition (48), since this condition addresses the same physical effects. A detailed description of the nonlinear time evolution of c requires the evaluation of $V_2(\tau)$, which is analytically arduous. However, a representation of the nonlinear time evolution of c which has immediate physical significance and can be related to the nonlinear ion trajectories of Figure 2, can be obtained as follows.

We begin by verifying that the linear dispersion relation for unstable growth, as well as the generalization to include the effects of nonlinear ion dynamics, is consistent with energy conservation:

$$\frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int \frac{d^3 r}{v} \left(E^2 + B^2 \right) + 4\pi \int \frac{d^3 r}{v} \underline{J} \cdot \underline{E} = 0$$
(73)

The electron contribution is

$$4\pi \int \frac{d^3 r}{V} \frac{J}{e} \cdot \underline{E} = -\frac{\omega_0 k^4 c^4}{2 \Omega^3 \omega_p^2} (1 + \omega^2 k_1 a) c \frac{\partial d}{\partial t}$$

$$-\frac{k^4 c^4}{2 \Omega^4} (1 + \alpha v^2 k_1 a) \alpha \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial t}$$

-57-

The ion contribution is:

$$4\pi \int \frac{d^3r}{V} \underline{J}_{i} \cdot \underline{E} = 4\pi \int \frac{d^3r}{V} \int d^3v \ e \ \underline{E}_{x} \ v_{x} \ f_{i}(\underline{x}, \underline{v}, t)$$
$$= 4\pi \frac{d}{dt} \int \frac{d^3r}{V} \int d^3v \ \frac{M}{2} \frac{v_{x}^2}{2} f_{i}(\underline{x}, \underline{v}, t)$$

$$= -2\pi \alpha \frac{e \, \ell w_B^2 c^2}{k_\perp a \, \Omega^2} \int dq_0 \int dp_0$$

$$\left\{ g_{o}(\alpha_{o}) \; J_{\ell}(\sqrt{2p}) \sin (q + \varphi) \right\}$$

1

I

I

T

1

-

1

1

1

where $w_0 = lw_B$, and l is an even integer.

The field contribution is

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int \frac{d^3 r}{V} (E^2 + B^2) = \frac{k_\perp^4 c^4}{2 \Omega^4} (1 + \Omega r^2 k_\perp a) \ \alpha \ \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial t}$$

V is the volume of integration in the above expressions.

Thus from Eq. (73)

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha^2}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{8\pi \ \Omega^3 \ \omega_p^2}{\ell \omega_p k_\perp^4 \mathrm{c}^4 \ (1 + \alpha s^2 \ k_\perp a)} \quad \text{st} \quad \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int_{L \to \infty}^{L} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{\mathrm{d}z} \int_{L} \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}x} \int_{-\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}x}} \mathrm{d}v_x \\ -\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{\mathrm{d}z} \quad -a \quad -\infty \quad \left\{ \frac{M \ v_x^2}{2} \ g_i \ (x, z, v_y, t) \right\}$$

$$= -\frac{\alpha \ 8\pi \ e \ \Omega \ w_{p}^{2} \ w_{B}}{k_{\perp}^{3}c^{2} \ a \ (1 + \alpha s^{2} \ k_{\perp}a)} \int_{0}^{a} d\alpha_{0} \ \alpha_{0} \ g_{0}(\alpha_{0}) \int_{0}^{2\pi} dq_{0}$$

$$\left\{ J_{\ell}(k_{\perp}\alpha) \ \sin \ (q + \varphi) \right\}$$
(74b)

(74a)

N. W. S. S.

which is identical to Eq. (68).

I

I

T

1

Eq. (74) can be integrated in time, using the version (74a), to yield

$$\left|\frac{\tilde{E}_{x \max}}{E_{ox}(a)}\right|^{2} = \left(\frac{k_{\perp}^{2} a(t)}{k_{o}^{2} 4\pi n_{o}^{2} e a}\right)^{2}$$

$$= \frac{\bar{n}_{oi}}{n_{o}} \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{\ell \omega_{B} \Omega} \Delta e_{i}$$
(75)

where $a(0) \simeq 0$, and

$$\Delta e_{i} = \frac{1}{\bar{n}_{oi} w_{B}^{2} a^{2} (1 + \alpha s^{2} k_{a})} \int \frac{dz}{L} \int \frac{dx}{a} \int dv_{x} -\frac{L}{2} -a -\infty$$

$$\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{x}}^{2} \left\{ \left[\mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z},\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{x}}^{t})} - \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{o}}^{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{x}}^{t})} \right] \right\}$$
(76)

Consequently, the increase in the wave amplitude is directly related to the transverse energy gained by the ions in the interaction.

We expect the "coarse gained" ion distribution function will evolve to a state where it is flattened (i.e., made uniform by phase mixing) in the region of phase space $(k_{\perp} \alpha, q)$ traversed by the ions. For example, in the case where the ion trajectories do not intersect the wall, and with reference to Figure 2, if the initial ion distribution is that of Eq. (34), where

$$g_{o}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = g_{o}(\alpha_{o}) = \frac{2 \pi_{oi}}{\pi \omega_{B} a_{i}} \Theta(\mathbf{a}_{i} - \alpha),$$

with $k_{\perp}a_{\perp} < 5.1$, $w_{0} = 2w_{B}$, $k_{\perp}x_{a} = 5.1$, $k_{\perp}a = 8$, then the predicted final state distribution would be

-60-

$$g_{i}(t \rightarrow \infty) \rightarrow \frac{2 \overline{n}_{oi} a_{i}}{\pi \omega_{B} x^{2}} \Theta(x_{a} - \alpha)$$

Thus

I

-

-

PL CONTRACT

$$\Delta e_{i} \approx \frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{a_{i}}{a^{3}} \quad \frac{(x^{2} - a^{2})}{(1 + c x^{2} + a)}$$

and substitution in Eq. (75) yields an estimate of the final wave amplitude

$$\frac{\tilde{E}_{x} (x = 0, t \to \infty)}{E_{ox}(0)} \simeq k_{1} a \left| \frac{\tilde{E}_{x \max}(t \to \infty)}{E_{ox}(a)} \right|$$

$$\simeq \frac{\Gamma}{2 \omega_{\rm B}} \left[\frac{k_{\perp}^2 a_{\rm i} \sqrt{x_{\rm a}^2 - a_{\rm i}^2}}{2} \right]$$
(77)

where Γ is the linear growth rate of Eq. (35). This differs from the prior estimate of Eq. (72a) only by $1/2\pi$ times the square bracket term, which may vary from 0 to 1.03 depending on the size of a_i/x_a . Here the final state amplitude approaches zero as $a_i \rightarrow x_a$ simply because it is not possible

-61-

for the ions to increase their net energy by much if they are initially filled approximately to the boundary of allowed phase space trajectories. As remarked earlier, the RHS of Eq. (77) contains the small factor $\Gamma/2w_B$ which may produce a result below the various other conditions of nonlinearity. If not, then such other nonlinearities might prevent the approach to this phase-mixed final state. In addition, it must be recognized that this "final" state may also be unstable, since perturbations of the outermost ions may place them on new trajectories outside the "boundary at x_a.

-62-
VII. RESULTS OF TWO-DIMENSIONAL SLAB COMPUTER CALCULATIONS

During the past year or so, we have been running and improving large computer simulation codes, which are fully electromagnetic and fully relativistic, and operate in a two-dimensional slab configuration space. We have applied these codes to the problems of ion-electron streaming interactions and resistive growth interactions in an external magnetic field, and have observed the growth of the electron beam cyclotron mode. For these runs in which an instability is computed from the initial noise levels, periodic boundary conditions are applied in the axial dimension and conducting boundary conditions are applied in the radial dimension. The gross charge is non-neutral, since even for the cases of ion-electron interaction, the ion density is much below that of the relativistic electron beam. For a number of reasons described below, we have not yet been able to put the previously described theory of nonlinearities to a good test, and so we do not claim that this theory is substantiated by the computer results. Nevertheless, we

-63-

wish to describe some of the significant general features of the computer runs, in which behavior characteristic of the transverse dynamical effects which we have analyzed is in fact manifested.

In order to achieve a good simulation test of the nonlinear theory, it is necessary to design a run in which most of the essential conditions (1) to (16) are obeyed, together with a number of practical constraints for completing a numerically stable and accurate simulation within an affordable period of time. Although we have accumulated about a half dozen large and lengthy (i.e. many thousand time steps with many thousand particles) simulation runs during the past year, most of these failed to satisfy some of the important conditions (1) to (16). This was partly because the initial computer runs were designed before the desired theoretical constraints were known. In addition, the instability domain has proved to be rich with variations, so that in several runs in which certain inequalities were only weakly obeyed, several competing effects are believed to have been present -- complicating the interpretation of results. For example when γ_{o} is not too large (i.e.,

-64-

 $\gamma_{0} \sim 3$), then some longitudinal plasma mode effects will be coupled into the electron cyclotron mode behavior.

It has been necessary to devote significant attention during the simulation effort to curing certain purely numerical instabilities that are unique to relativistic, electromagnetic codes. Central among these is the numerical Cherenkov instability, in which the finite differencing of Maxwell's equations allows light modes with wavelengths on the order of the cell size to have phase velocities below c, so that they may interact unstably with electron beam modes. These may be cured by filtering out the shortest wavelength modes, and arranging for the wavelengths of physical interest to be many cell lengths.

The simulation runs which have been completed, although violating some of the theoretical constraints, have shown the following common behavior. When the electrons and ions are released in approximate conditions of equilibrium, modes at the predicted axial wavenumber $k_{z} \sim \Omega/c$, and with low transverse wavenumber components, grow from noise for a few e-folds at a rate generally faster than the

-65-

theoretical estimate of the linear growth rate. However, this initial growth phase terminates with the mode amplitude well within the bounds of linear theory [e.g., $\tilde{\Phi}/\Phi_{o} \sim$ few x 10⁻³], and is usually followed by a phase of growth at a rate from 1 to 0.2 times the estimate of the linear growth rate, with the growth rate declining in time in several cases. In some runs the wave growth saturated, with the amplitude in one case ranging up to $\tilde{\Phi}/\Phi_{a} \sim 7\%$, while in other cases the run was terminated with $\tilde{\Phi}/\Phi_{
m c}$ a few percent but still slowly growing. For the runs which showed amplitude saturation, rough theoretical estimates suggested that nonlinearities such as electron cyclotron resonance broadening should have been felt at amplitudes about a factor of two below the observed saturation. For the runs which did not saturate, rough theoretical estimates indicate that nonlinearities should not have been felt for an additional 1 to 2 e-foldings.

Rather than attach any significance to the degree of quantitative agreement between these runs and the only partly relevant theoretical estimates of growth rates and

-66-

saturation amplitudes, we would emphasize the following qualitative results:

- The desired electron cyclotron mode was excited to significant amplitudes, and the expected transverse electron dynamics were visible in the phase space diagnostics--as shown in Figure
 (where y is the axial coordinate).
- (2) The radial ion bouncing in the electric fields of the beam and wave clearly dominated the ion dynamics, and no significant axial motion of the ions was detectable. In no case were the ions "trapped" longitudinally by the wave.
- (3) In those cases where the wave approached the "nonlinear" amplitude level, symptoms of the breakdown of the electron fluid nature were evident--such as trajectory crossings and other significant phase space distortions. However, in no case were the distortions so severe that the electrons were "ripped apart," or reflected in the axial direction, etc.

-67-



Figure 3. Configuration Space of Electrons and Ions at Late Time

-68-

We are presently involved in constructing runs in which a very quiet equilibrium state is established, with a number of diagnostics added to verify all of the linear wave characteristics. Then we will proceed to a run in which this nonlinear theory may be tested.

Ł

Number of

-

1

R

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

We have calculated herein certain nonlinear effects which appear when the amplitude of the cyclotron eigenmode of a relativistic electron beam is increased sufficiently. We have used as the vehicle of this calculation, the streaming interaction which arises between relativistic electrons and a sparse group of ions which are axially at rest in the reference frame of the calculation. Both electron and ion nonlinear effects were isolated, and the electron nonlinearities are generally relevant for other situations without ions, where the cyclotron wave is excited via some other beam-waveguide type of interaction.

These calculations were completed subject to a number of parameter restrictions, including those of conditions (1) to (16), which are generally appropriate to an Auto-Resonant ion acceleration device. Under these restrictions, the negative energy cyclotron wave is well decoupled from the longitudinal plasma modes, light modes, and the positive energy cyclotron mode, and the interaction of the

-70-

ions with the cyclotron mode is faster than any other ion-electron interactions. The ion density was assumed small enough that the ion coupling to the cyclotron wave could be calculated via perturbation theory, and small enough that the growth rate of the interaction was below both the perpendicular ion bounce frequency $w_{\rm B}$, and the width of the electron cyclotron resonance $\delta w = \Omega w_{\rm D}^2/k^2c^2$.

The estimates of nonlinear effects were evaluated in detail for the specific case where a single unstable eigenmode dominated the wave spectrum, with the axial wave electric field symmetric in the transverse coordinate x, with the lowest perpendicular wave number $k_{\perp} \simeq 2/a > k_{z}$, and with the lowest resonant wave frequency $w_{0} = 2w_{\rm B} < k_{z}c$.

A hybrid expression which summarizes the chief results of the various calculations of the wave amplitude required for strong nonlinearity is

$$\frac{\tilde{\Phi}_{\max}(\mathbf{x}=0)}{\Phi_{O}(\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{a})} \ge \frac{1}{\mathbf{k}^{2}\mathbf{a}^{2}} \left\{ \frac{\left[D_{1}, D_{2}(\Gamma/\delta w)^{1/2} \right]_{1} \text{esser}}{\left[\mathbf{k}^{2}\mathbf{a}^{2} + D_{4} \frac{\Omega^{2}}{w_{p}^{2}} \right]^{1/2}}, D_{3} \frac{\Gamma}{w_{B}} \right\}_{1} \text{esser}$$

(78)

-71-

where $[e \Phi_0(a)/\gamma_0 mc^2] \simeq w_p^{-2} a^2/2c^2$ in slab geometry. The coefficients D_1 , D_2 , D_3 , D_4 are of order unity and will generally vary somewhat for different eigenmode characteristics k_{\perp} , l, etc. The D_1 term represents the primary electron nonlinearities, of which the most sensitive is cyclotron resonance broadening. The D_2 term represents the nonlinear electron frequency shift effect, which is important when $\Gamma/\delta w$ is very small. The D_3 term represents the ion nonlinearities due to transverse phase space trajectories or to axial resonance broadening (depending on whether k_{\perp} or k_z dominates the k^{-2} coefficient), and these ion effects are important when Γ/w_p is very small.

The nonlinear effects become important for short wavelength, high-k modes at lower wave amplitudes than are needed for the low-k modes. Hence if the low-k modes are not discriminated against in the parameter selection, one may expect them to grow to the largest amplitudes before nonlinear growth saturation occurs.

Both the theoretical analysis and the twodimensional computer simulations indicate that these

-72-

ion-electron cyclotron interactions saturate at wave amplitudes too low for longitudinal ion trapping, and generally before there is catastrophic disruption of the electron beam. Therefore for Auto-Resonant ion acceleration, it appears that ion-electron cyclotron interactions are (i) probably unsuitable as a wave growth/ion loading mechanism, but (ii) unlikely to disrupt the acceleration process itself.

REFERENCES

1

-

and the second second

- M. L. Sloan and W. E. Drummond, Phys. Rev. Letters <u>31</u>, 1234 (1973).
- M. L. Sloan and W. E. Drummond, "The Autoresonant Accelerator Concept," <u>Proc. IX International Con-</u> <u>ference on High Energy Accelerators</u> (Springfield, Virginia: National Technical Info. Serv., U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1974), p. 283ff.
- 3. V. P. Indykul, I. P. Panchenko, V. D. Shapiro, and V. I. Shevchenko, "Theory of Resonance Ion Acceleration by a Strong-Current Relativistic Beam," <u>JETP</u> <u>Lett.</u>, Vol. 20, No. 3, Aug. 5, 1974, pp. 65-67.

APPENDIX B

STABILITY OF SLAB ELECTRON BEAM EQUILIBRIA

I

1

1

1

[

(Appendix B Contains 9 Pages)

APPENDIX B

STABILITY OF SLAB ELECTRON

BEAM EQUILIBRIA

In this report, the stability of a certain class of slab electron beam equilibria is discussed. These equilibria would describe relativistic electron sheet beams propagated between parallel conducting plates along a uniform guide field. Such equilibria have been utilized in some numerical simulations to investigate a variety of electron beam phenomena. A sufficient condition is determined for stability of the slab equilibria to twodimensional perturbations which vary across the slab and along the direction of propagation. The restriction to two-dimensional perturbations is a significant limitation in the analysis, but this limitation is relevant for the problem of constructing stable equilibria for twodimensional computer simulation, for which the third coordinate is ignorable.

Equilibrium

I

It is convenient to move to a frame of reference moving with the electron beam. The electron slab equilibrium is assumed to be uniform in z and y, extending from $z = -\infty$ to $z = +\infty$, $y = -\infty$ to $y = +\infty$, and is bounded in x by conducting plates at $x = \pm b$. The electrons gyrate around an externally imposed magnetic guide field in the z-direction.

There are three constants of the electron motion:

$$H_{O} = \frac{1}{2} mv^{2} - e\Phi_{O}(x)$$

$$P_{OY} = mv_{Y} - \frac{e}{c} A_{OY}(x)$$

$$P_{OZ} = mv_{Z}$$

where the motion in the beam frame is considered to be nonrelativistic. \underline{v} is the electron velocity, Φ_0 is the scalar potential, A_{oy} is the y-component of the vector potential.

The distribution function $f_0(x, \underline{v})$ for the slab equilibria can be expressed in terms of the constants of the electron motion.

-64-

The stability analysis will be restricted to distribution functions of the form

$$f_{o}(x, \underline{v}) = F_{o}\left(H_{o} + \frac{\alpha}{2m}P_{oy}^{2}\right)$$
(1)

where α is a parameter which characterizes the magnitude of the mean electron velocity in the y-direction. The equilibrium charge and current densities are

$$M_{o}(x) = d^{3}v F_{o}$$

$$J_{ox} = -e \int d^{3}v v_{x} F_{o} = 0$$

$$J_{oy} = -e \int d^3 v \, v_y \, F_o$$
$$= -N_o(x) \, \frac{\alpha}{(1 + \alpha)} \, \frac{e^2}{mc} \, A_{oy}$$
$$\equiv -N_o e \, \langle v_y \rangle$$

Joz

= 0

$$\frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial x^2} = 4\pi e N_0$$
 (2)

$$\frac{\partial^2 A}{\partial^2 x} = \frac{4\pi N e^2}{mc^2} \frac{\alpha}{(1+\alpha)} A_{oy} \qquad (3)$$

The equilibrium electric and magnetic fields, \underline{E}_0 and \underline{B}_0 , are given by

$$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}_{\mathbf{O}} = \left(-\frac{\partial \Phi_{\mathbf{O}}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} , 0, 0 \right)$$
$$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{B}}}_{\mathbf{O}} = \left(0, 0, \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{O}\mathbf{Y}}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right)$$

Stability

-

I

I

I

[]

1

1

1

The equilibrium is subjected to time dependent perturbations which vary only in x and z:

 $\underline{\underline{E}} = \underline{\underline{E}}_{0}(x) + \underline{\underline{E}}_{1}(x, z, t)$

$$\underline{B} = \underline{B}_{0}(x) + \underline{B}_{1}(x, z, t)$$
$$f = f_{0}(x, \underline{v}) + f_{1}(x, z, \underline{v}, t)$$

In terms of the perturbed scalar potential $\Phi(x, z, t)$ and vector potential $\underline{A}_{1}(x, z, t)$:

$$\underline{\mathbf{E}}_{1} = -\nabla \Phi_{1} - \frac{1}{c} \quad \frac{\partial \underline{\mathbf{A}}_{1}}{\partial t}$$
$$\underline{\mathbf{B}}_{1} = \nabla \times \underline{\mathbf{A}}_{1}$$

where

$$\nabla \cdot \underline{A}_1 + \frac{1}{c} \quad \frac{\partial \Phi_1}{\partial t} = 0$$

The perturbed distribution function f_1 is determined by the linearized Vlasov equation:

$$\frac{df_{1}}{dt} = \frac{e}{m} \left(\underline{E}_{1} + \frac{\underline{v} \times \underline{B}_{1}}{c} \right) \cdot \frac{\partial F_{o}}{\partial \underline{v}}$$
$$= -\alpha \frac{e}{mc} P_{oy} \frac{\partial F_{o}}{\partial W} \frac{dA_{1y}}{dt} + e \underline{E}_{1} \cdot \underline{v} \frac{\partial F_{o}}{\partial W} \qquad (4)$$

-

where d/dt is the time derivative following the equilibrium trajectory and

$$W = H_{o} + \frac{\alpha}{2m} P_{oy}^{2}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2} m \left(v_{x}^{2} + v_{z}^{2} + s^{2} \right) - e \Phi_{o}$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\alpha}{(1 + \alpha)} \frac{e^{2}}{mc^{2}} A_{oy}^{2}$$

$$s = (1 + \alpha)^{1/2} \left(v_{y} - \frac{\alpha}{1 + \alpha} \stackrel{e}{mc} A_{oy} \right)$$

Thus,

I

[

I

I

I

I

- market

0

1

1

[]

$$\int d^{3}r \ \underline{J}_{1} \cdot \underline{E}_{1} = -e \int d^{3}r \ \int d^{3}v \ \underline{E}_{1} \cdot \underline{v}f_{1}$$

$$= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int d^{3}r \ d^{3}v \left\{ \frac{\left(f_{1} + \alpha \ \underline{e}_{mc} \ P_{oy}A_{1y} \ \overline{\partial w}\right)^{2}}{2(-\partial F_{o}/\partial W)} - \frac{\alpha \ \underline{e}_{2mc^{2}} \ v_{y}P_{oy}A_{1y}^{2} \ \overline{\partial W} \right\} . (5)$$

Since $\int d^3r \ \underline{J}_1 \cdot \underline{E}_1$ has now been expressed as a total time derivative, it is possible to obtain from Maxwells equations the following energy constant K:

$$K = \int d^{3}r \left(\frac{E_{1}^{2}}{8\pi} + \frac{B_{1}^{2}}{8\pi}\right)$$
$$+ \int d^{3}r d^{3}v \frac{\left\{f_{1} + \frac{\alpha e}{c} A_{1y} \frac{\partial F_{0}}{\partial W} - \frac{s}{(1 + \alpha)^{1/2}}\right\}^{2}}{2(-\partial F_{0}/\partial W)}$$

$$-\int d^{3}r d^{3}v \frac{\alpha}{(1+\alpha)} \frac{e^{2}}{2c^{2}} A_{1y}^{2} s^{2} \frac{\partial F_{0}}{\partial W}$$

$$-\int d^{3}r \ \frac{\alpha}{(1 + \alpha)} \ \frac{e}{4\pi mc} \ A_{oy}A_{ly} \ \nabla \cdot \underline{E}_{l}$$

This constant K may in turn be bounded below by the quantity

$$= \int d^{3}r \ d^{3}v \quad \frac{\left(f_{1} + \frac{\alpha e}{c} \ A_{1y} \ \frac{\partial F_{0}}{\partial W} \ \frac{s}{(1 + \alpha)^{1/2}}\right)^{2}}{2(-\partial F_{0}/\partial W)}$$

$$+ \int d^{3}v \left[\frac{E_{1}^{2}}{8\pi} + \frac{B_{1}^{2}}{8\pi} + \frac{N_{0}^{\alpha}}{(1 + \alpha)} \ \frac{e^{2}}{2c^{2}} \ A_{1y}^{2}\right]$$

$$- \frac{1}{2}\int d^{3}r \ \frac{\alpha}{(1 + \alpha)} \ \frac{e}{4\pi mc^{2}} \left\{ \left|A_{0y}\right| \left(\left|E_{1x}\right|^{2} + \left|B_{1z}\right|^{2}\right) + \left|B_{1z}\right|^{2}\right) \right\}$$

$$+ \left|B_{0z}\right| \ b \left(\left|E_{1x}\right|^{2} + \frac{\left|A_{1y}\right|^{2}}{b^{2}}\right) \right\} .$$

$$(6)$$

Finally, if

С

$$\frac{\partial F_{o}}{\partial W} < 0 \tag{7}$$

.

The second s

and

I

1

1

0

I

I

1

0

[]

[]

1

1

and a second way of a

$$1 > \left\{ \left| \frac{\langle \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle}{c} \right| + \left| \frac{\mathbf{b}}{c} \frac{\mathbf{d}}{\mathbf{dx}} \langle \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle \right| \right\}_{\max}$$
(8)

the state of the s

then

and all the perturbed quantities must remain infinitessimal in order for K to stay constant at its initially infinitessimal value.

Equations (7) and (8) are, therefore, the sufficient conditions for stability to two-dimensional perturbations of slab equilibria described by $F_0(W)$ and bounded by parallel conducting plates.

Examination of the equilibrium expressions for $\langle v_y \rangle$ reveals that the RHS of Eq. (8) contains a term proportional to $N_{OL} b/\gamma B_{OOZ}$, which must, therefore, not be too large if this equilibrium condition is to be guaranteed. (Here N_{OL} is the beam density as seen in the lab frame of reference.)

APPENDIX C

T

1

I

0

1

1

1

LIMITING CURRENTS OF AN UNNEUTRALIZED MAGNETIZED ELECTRON BEAM IN A CYLINDRICAL DRIFT TUBE

(Appendix C contains 6 Pages)

Limiting currents of an unneutralized magnetized electron beam in a cylindrical drift tube

J. R. Thompson and M. L. Sloan

Austin Research Associates, Austin, Texas 78758 (Received 30 August 1977; final manuscript received 2 May 1978)

Results of an investigation of the steady state injection of a uniform unneutralized, magnetized, relativistic electron beam into a cylindrical drift tube are presented. The space-charge-limited current and the asymptotic kinetic energy of electrons on axis is determined both numerically and analytically as a function of the input kinetic energy $(\gamma_0 - 1)mc^2$ and of the ratio of beam -to-wall radii. A previously cited "interpolation formula" is obtained in the pencil beam limit, but more accurate limiting current expressions are developed for other cases (such as the fat beam limit) where the interpolation formula is as much as 20% in error. The corresponding axial electron energy is also found to be significantly smaller than the previously cited value of $(\gamma_0^{1/3} - 1)mc^2$ except in the strong pencil beam limit.

I. INTRODUCTION

Significant advances of recent years in high voltage, pulsed power technology have stimulated the exploitation of high current electron accelerators for varied applications. For many such cases, the determination of spacecharge-limited currents is of high interest and has been repeatedly discussed in the literature [cf. Ref. 1 and the bibliography given there]. We consider herein a small but relevant subclass of the general limiting current problem.

Specifically, we restrict our attention to the following:

(i) A cold, cylindrically symmetric, unneutralized electron beam of radius *a* propagating in steady-state interior to an evacuated waveguide of radius *b* along an axial magnetic guide field which is sufficiently large to render the equilibrium precessional velocity and radial excursions of the beam negligible.

(ii) The beam is injected through an anode which is grounded to the cylindrical drift tube. At the anode plane, the electron number density n_0 , the axial velocity β_0c , and the particle energy $(\gamma_0 - 1)mc^2$ are assumed independent of radius r.

(iii) The ratio of the length to radius of the drift tube is very large, so that end effects are negligible.

Here we consider only those limitations on beam current which derive from the conditions for propagation in a steady-state equilibrium subject to the preceding assumptions. We do not, for example, consider limitations derived from stability considerations, although we note that previous work² has indicated that such an electron beam in a cylindrical waveguide is absolutely stable for a sufficiently large magnetic guide field.

The exact numerical solution of this limiting current problem was obtained long ago³ for nonrelativistic $(\beta_0 \ll 1)$ beams, but relativistic solutions have only been published for the special cases of pencil beams $(\ln b/a \gg 1)$ or ultra-relativistic beams $(\gamma_0 > 1)$ for which the radial variations in the downstream quantities γ , β , nare unimportant. A generalization [see Eq. (17a)] of the pencil beam result has been presented⁴ as an "interpolation formula" for the limiting current and has been widely employed in related calculations in the literature. Although this formula indicates the correct zero-order parameter scaling of the limiting current, it is found to be quantitatively in error by over 20% in some cases. Furthermore, the expression for the axial electron energy [see Eq. (17b)] which is commonly associated with this interpolation formula is grossly incorrect (i.e., by more than an order of magnitude) in some cases.

We describe relativistically correct analytical approximations to the limiting current problem for arbitrary values of b/a and compare the results to exact numerical solutions. The parameter range of validity of these approximations is delineated.

II. GOVERNING EQUATIONS AND NATURE OF NUMERICAL SOLUTIONS

Adopting the usual cylindrical coordinates r, θ , z, we consider the anode injection plane to be located at z = 0. The injected beam current density is then given by

$$J(r, 0) = \begin{cases} -n_0 e \beta_0 c \hat{z} , r \le a , \\ 0 , r > a , \end{cases}$$
(1)

where e is the magnitude of the electron charge.

Since the injection anode plane is grounded to the conducting waveguide, the potential function $\phi(r, z)$. attains the boundary values

$$\phi(r, 0) = \phi(b, z) = 0$$
; (2)

we note that $\phi(r,z) \leq 0$.

The large magnetic guide field approximation implies that the radius of each electron is fixed. For steadystate flow, the space charge in the drift tube will create fields to reduce the energy of each beam electron, such that

$$y \equiv \gamma(r, z) = \gamma_0 + \frac{e}{mc^2} \phi(r, z)$$
(3)

with a corresponding beam charge density

$$\rho(r, z) = -n_0 e \beta_0 \gamma / (\gamma^2 - 1)^{1/2} , \qquad (4)$$

where
$$\gamma_0 = (1 - \beta_0^2)^{-1/2}$$
.

Phys. Fluids 21(11), November 1978

2032

0031-9171/78/2111-2032\$00.90

Far downstream of the injection plane $(z \gg b)$, the variation in ϕ is purely radial and is described by the radial Poisson equation, which, from Eq. (3), may be expressed in terms of $\gamma(r)$:

$$\frac{1}{r}\frac{d}{dr}r\frac{d\gamma}{dr} = \begin{cases} \frac{4\nu}{a^2}\frac{\gamma}{(\gamma^2 - 1)^{1/2}}, & r \le a \end{cases}, \qquad (5a)$$

with boundary conditions that $\gamma(0)$ be regular and $\gamma(b) = \gamma_0$. The parameter ν is defined

$$r = \frac{\pi n_0 e^2 a^2 \beta_0}{mc^2} = \frac{I_e}{mc^3/e} = \frac{I_e}{17 \, kA} \tag{6}$$

which differs by a factor of β from the usual Budker parameter, so that ν is constant in r, z and proportional only to the current.

By integrating Eq. (5b) through the vacuum region, and applying the boundary condition $\gamma(b) = \gamma_0$, one may contend only with the single beam-region Eq. (5a) subject to the mixed boundary condition

$$\left(\gamma + \ln\left(\frac{b}{a}\right)r\frac{d\gamma}{dr}\right)_{r=0} = \gamma_0 \quad . \tag{7}$$

For given values of γ_0 and b/a, it is desired to determine the largest value of ν (and hence I_e) for which a solution to Eq. (5a) exists, subject to the boundary condition, Eq. (7). This largest value is called ν_i and the corresponding electron current is called the limiting current.

The increase in the right-hand side of Eq. (5a), which occurs as γ is reduced, reflects the axial density compression due to electron slowing. Equation (5a) (with boundary conditions) requires that $\gamma(\gamma)$ be monotonically





2033 Phys. Fluids, Vol. 21, No. 11, November 1978

TABLE I. Numerical solutions for v_1/γ_{cl} .

	$\gamma_0 = 2$	$\gamma_0 = 5$	$\gamma_0 = 7$	$\gamma_0 = 100$		
b = 1	0.553	3.12	4.98	97.06		
a	1.12	1.26	1.31	1.68		
6-2	0.221	1.27	2.05	40.61		
a	1.14	1.31	1.37	1.74		
b_5	0.118	0.695	1.12	22.90		
a	1.18	1.41	1.48	1,89		
6 - 20	0.069	0.407	0.659	13, 75		
a - 20	1.21	1.50	1.61	2.14		

increasing, indicating that the electrons on axis are slowed the most below their injection velocity. The previous relativistic treatments of this limiting current problem have essentially ignored the radial dependence of this axial density compression, approximating the right-hand side of Eq. (5a) as a constant.

In principle, if one specifies a value for the γ of the electrons at the center of the beam, $\gamma_c \equiv \gamma(0)$, then Eq. (5a) determines $\gamma(\gamma)$ throughout the beam as a function of γ_c , ν , a. Applying the boundary condition, Eq. (7), then allows one to solve for ν as a function of γ_c , γ_0 , b/a. The resulting dependence of ν on γ_c for fixed values of γ_0 , b/a is illustrated in Fig. 1. The maximum value of ν is the desired ν_i , and the corresponding value of γ_c is γ_{ci} . The value of ν at $\gamma_c = 1$ is denoted ν_0 . One may show from Eqs. (5a) and (7) that $\gamma_{ci} > 1$ and $\nu_i > \nu_0$. Thus, Fig. 1 is qualitatively correct for all cases.

It is of interest in some applications to know γ_{cl} as well as ν_l , with a fair degree of accuracy. For example, schemes have recently been proposed⁵ for collective acceleration of ions which rely on the controlled motion of a virtual cathode, created in an intense relativistic electron beam by approaching the limiting current conditions. If the motion of the virtual cathode is to be well controlled, the limiting current conditions must be known precisely.

It should also be noted that both the accessibility and the stability of steady-state injection is questionable for the branch of Fig. 1, where $1 < \gamma_e < \gamma_{el}$. However, the branch $\gamma_{el} < \gamma_e < \gamma_0$ may be traversed by slowly increasing the diode current from zero while holding the voltage constant.

A set of scaled equations based upon Eqs. (5a) and (7), which allow very efficient numerical determination of the limiting current parameters, is presented in the Appendix. A representative spectrum of the numerical solutions obtained via these equations is listed in Table I. The monotonic dependence of ν_1 and γ_{cl} on separate variations of γ_0 or b/a may be observed.

III. APPROXIMATE ANALYTICAL SOLUTIONS

2

In this section we describe several theoretical approaches to the limiting current problem, which yield approximate solutions that are useful in different regions of parameter space.

A. Iteration of integral equation

Equations (5) and (7) may be combined into a single integral equation, which may be written in iterative form as

$$\gamma^{(N)}(x) = \gamma_0 - 4\nu \ln\left(\frac{b}{a}\right) \int_0^1 \frac{dy \, y}{\beta^{(N-1)}(y)} - 4\nu \int_x^1 \frac{dw}{w} \int_0^\infty \frac{dy \, y}{\beta^{(N-1)}(y)} ,$$
(8)

where x = r/a, $\beta = (1 - \gamma^{-2})^{1/2}$, and the superscripts in parentheses indicate the order of the iteration. If $\gamma^{(0)}(x)$ is chosen to be constant, the iteration may be readily carried out to second order, yielding the following equations:

$$\gamma^{(0)}(x) = \gamma_k , \qquad (9)$$

$$\gamma^{(1)}(x) = \gamma_c + (\gamma_e - \gamma_c)x^2 , \qquad (10)$$

$$\frac{1}{\nu} [\gamma_0 - \gamma^{(2)}(x)] (\gamma_e - \gamma_e) = 2(\gamma_e \beta_e - \gamma_e \beta_e) \ln \frac{b}{a} + [\gamma_e \beta_e - \gamma^{(1)}(x) \beta^{(1)}(x)] + \gamma_e \ln \frac{\gamma_e(\beta_e + 1)}{\gamma^{(1)}(x) [\beta^{(1)}(x) + 1]} - \gamma_e \beta_e \ln \frac{\gamma_e \gamma_e(\beta_e \beta_e + 1) - 1}{\gamma_e \gamma^{(1)}(x) [\beta_e \beta^{(1)}(x) + 1] - 1}, \qquad (11)$$

where

$$\gamma_e \equiv \frac{\gamma_0 + 2\gamma_c \ln(b/a)}{1 + 2\ln(b/a)} , \qquad (12)$$

and

$$\nu = \beta_{\mu}(\gamma_{e} - \gamma_{c}) \quad (13)$$

Here and in the following text, the γ 's and β 's with like subscripts or superscripts are related in an obvious manner.

There remains the freedom to specify the constant γ_{k} . For example, if one selects $\gamma_{k} = \gamma_{0}$, then Eqs. (12) and (13) yield

$$\nu = \frac{\beta_0(\gamma_0 - \gamma_c)}{1 + 2\ln(b/a)}$$
(14)

and hence

$$\nu_{i} = \nu_{0} = \frac{\beta_{0}(\gamma_{0} - 1)}{1 + 2\ln(b/a)} , \qquad (15a)$$

 $\gamma_{et} = 1 \tag{15b}$

which is a previously published result.⁶

Another possibility is to select $\gamma_{k} = \gamma_{c}$ to obtain

$$\nu = \frac{\beta_c(\gamma_0 - \gamma_c)}{1 + 2\ln(b/a)}$$
(16)

and hence

$$\nu_{I} = \frac{(\gamma_{0}^{2/3} - 1)^{3/2}}{1 + 2\ln(b/a)}, \qquad (17a)$$

 $\gamma_{el} = \gamma_0^{1/3}$, (17b)

 $\nu_0 = 0$. (17c)

Equation (17a) is the previously mentioned and widely cited interpolation formula.⁴ The corresponding value of γ_{cl} in Eq. (17b) has also been previously published.⁷

The results of Eqs. (14)-(17) are essentially firstorder iterations, since no use was made of the second order Eq. (11). Consequently, they can be expected to have only limited accuracy. The two examples may be expected to bracket the correct solutions, since they represent the two extreme choices for γ_{k} , and indeed this is found to be the case.

An example which contains second-order accuracy is to let γ_k be such that $\gamma^{(2)}(1) = \gamma_e$. From Eqs. (11) and (12), one obtains

$$\nu = \frac{(\gamma_{e} - \gamma_{c})^{2}}{(\gamma_{e}\beta_{e} - \gamma_{c}\beta_{c})} = \left(\frac{\gamma_{0} - \gamma_{c}}{1 + 2\ln(b/a)}\right)^{2} \\ \times \left\{ \left[\left(\gamma_{c} + \frac{\gamma_{0} - \gamma_{c}}{1 + 2\ln(b/a)}\right)^{2} - 1 \right]^{1/2} - (\gamma_{c}^{2} - 1)^{1/2} \right\}^{-1}$$
(18)

and hence

V

$$0 = \frac{(\gamma_0 - 1)^{3/2}}{[1 + 2\ln(b/a)][\gamma_0 + 1 + 4\ln(b/a)]^{1/2}} .$$
(19)

Although Eq. (18) is sufficiently complex so that it does not yield closed form algebraic solutions for ν_i and γ_{el} , it is still fairly useful since it may be numericall maximized in minutes on the presently available scientific hand calculators. Also, Eq. (19) provides a lower bound on ν_i .

Equation (18) may further be used to determine the bounds of validity of Eq. (16). If one assumes the usual pencil beam limit $\gamma_e - \gamma_c \ll \gamma_c$ (i.e., the fractional variation in γ across the beam is small), Eq. (18) reduces to Eq. (16). This pencil beam ansatz specifically requires the ordering $\gamma_0^{2/3} \ll 1 + 2 \ln b/a$ for validity. Therefore, Eqs. (16)-(17) are essentially accurate only in the pencil beam limit, which is the lower left-hand portion of Table I.

Another example containing second-order accuracy is to let γ_k be such that $\gamma^{(2)}(0) = \gamma_c$. Then, Eq. (11) gives the result (also obtained independently elsewhere)⁶:

$$\nu = (\gamma_e - \gamma_e)^2 \left[(\gamma_e \beta_e - \gamma_e \beta_e) + \left(\frac{\gamma_e}{1 + 2 \ln(b/a)} \right) \times \left(\ln \frac{\gamma_e(\beta_e + 1)}{\gamma_e(\beta_e + 1)} - \beta_e \ln \frac{\gamma_e \gamma_e(\beta_e \beta_e + 1) - 1}{2(\gamma_e^2 - 1)} \right) \right]^{-1}$$
(20)

with γ_e specified by Eq. (12). Therefore,

$$\nu_{0} = [1 + 2\ln(b/a)]^{-1}(\gamma_{0} - 1)^{2} \left[[\gamma_{0}^{2} - 1 + 4(\gamma_{0} - 1)\ln(b/a)]^{1/2} + \ln\left(1 + \frac{[\gamma_{0}^{2} - 1 + 4(\gamma_{0} - 1)\ln(b/a)]^{1/2} + \gamma_{0} - 1}{1 + 2\ln(b/a)} \right)^{-1}$$
(21)

and as before ν_0 provides a lower bound on ν_1 , but Eq. (20) must be numerically maximized to accurately determine ν_1 and γ_{cl} . Equation (20) may also be seen to have the pencil beam limit of Eq. (16).

If Eq. (20) is expanded in the limit $\gamma_e \gg \gamma_c \gg 1$, so that the variation in γ across the beam is large, one obtains

2034

Phys. Fluids, Vol. 21, No. 11, November 1978

3

J. R. Thompson and M. L. Slean 2034

$$\nu \simeq \left[1 + 2\ln\left(\frac{b}{a}\right)\right]^{-1} \left[\gamma_0 - \gamma_c - \frac{1}{2\gamma_c} \left(\ln\frac{\gamma_c}{\gamma_c} + 2\ln\left(\frac{b}{a}\right)\right)\right] + \cdots (22)$$

and

$$2\gamma_{cl}^2 \simeq \ln(\gamma_{cl}/\gamma_{cl}) + 1 + 2\ln(b/a) + \cdots$$
 (23)

The expansion ansatz specifically requires that $1 + 2\ln(b/a) \ll \gamma_0^{2/3}$ (hereafter, denoted the fat beam limit) which is the upper right-hand portion of Table I.

In summary, Eqs. (18) and (20) are accurate secondorder representations of fairly wide validity; both equations have the correct pencil beam limit, and Eq. (20)also has the correct fat beam limit.

B. Variational principle

A variation principle which generates the differential Eq. (5a) and the boundary condition (7) is

$$I[\gamma(x)] = \int_{0}^{1} dx \, x \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d\gamma}{dx} \right)^{2} + 4\nu (\gamma^{2} - 1)^{1/2} \right] \\ - \frac{\gamma(x) [2\gamma_{0} - \gamma(x)]}{2 \ln(b/a)} \bigg|_{x=1}, \qquad (24)$$

where *I* is a functional of $\gamma(x)$, which is to be extremized with respect to possible trial functions $\gamma(x)$. One expects that fairly high accuracy may be achieved on the limiting current with only a modestly accurate guess at the trial function $\gamma(x)$.

A trial function of modest accuracy is that of Eq. (10), which contains the two free parameters γ_c and γ_e . These two parameters are then chosen to render the variational principle, Eq. (24), stationary. Carrying out this procedure and using the fact that $\nu_1(\gamma_c, \gamma_0, b/a)$ is itself an extremum at $\gamma_c = \gamma_{cl}$, one obtains the following parametric solution for the limiting current parameters.

$$\nu_{i} = (\gamma_{el} - \gamma_{cl})^{3} \left[\gamma_{el} (\gamma_{el} \beta_{el} - \gamma_{cl} \beta_{cl}) - \gamma_{cl} \beta_{cl} (\gamma_{el} - \gamma_{cl}) - \ln \frac{\gamma_{el} (\beta_{el} + 1)}{\gamma_{cl} (\beta_{cl} + 1)} \right]^{-1} , \qquad (25)$$

$$Q = \frac{2\nu_{i}(\gamma_{ei}\beta_{ei} - \gamma_{ci}\beta_{ci})}{(\gamma_{ei} - \gamma_{ci})^{2}}, \qquad (26a)$$

$$\left[\ln\left(\frac{b}{a}\right)\right]^{-1} = (3-Q)^{2} \left(3 - \frac{2\nu_{I}}{\beta_{cI}(\gamma_{eI} - \gamma_{cI})}\right)^{-1} - 3 + 2Q$$
$$- \frac{2\nu_{I}}{\beta_{eI}(\gamma_{eI} - \gamma_{cI})} , \qquad (26b)$$

$$\gamma_{0} = \gamma_{el} + Q(\gamma_{el} - \gamma_{cl}) \ln(b/a) . \qquad (27)$$

These equations may be solved by first specifying trial values for γ_{cl} and γ_{el} , subject only to $\gamma_{el} > \gamma_{cl} > 1$, and then solving Eqs. (25)-(27) sequentially for the corresponding values of ν_i , b/a, γ_0 . Trial values of γ_{cl} and γ_{el} which result in b < a must be rejected. One may again be forced to make several calculations on a hand calculator to generate the desired values of γ_0 and b/a. The resulting solutions are found to be quite accurate except in the fat beam regime.

C. Ultrarelativistic perturbation expansion

If we restrict our attention to the case of a sufficiently highly relativistic beam where $\gamma_0 \gg 1$ and $2\gamma_{cl}^2 \gg 1$, so that we may use the expansion

$$1/\beta = \gamma(\gamma^2 - 1)^{-1/2} = 1 + 1/2\gamma^2 + \cdots, \qquad (28)$$

Eq. (5a) may be solved iteratively to yield

$$\gamma(r) = \gamma_c + \frac{\nu r^2}{a^2} + \frac{1}{2\gamma_c} \ln\left(1 + \frac{\nu r^2}{\gamma_c a^2}\right) + \cdots \qquad (29)$$

Then, the boundary condition, Eq. (7), gives

$$= \gamma_{e} + \nu \left[1 + 2 \ln(b/a) \right]$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2\gamma_{e}} \left[\ln \left(1 + \frac{\nu}{\gamma_{e}} \right) + \frac{2\nu}{\nu + \gamma_{e}} \ln \left(\frac{b}{a} \right) \right] + \cdots$$
(30)

The peak value of ν (i.e., ν_l) may be found by differentiating Eq. (30) with respect to γ_c and setting $\partial \nu / \partial \gamma_c = 0$, to obtain

$$2\gamma_{ci}^{2} = \ln\left(1 + \frac{\nu_{i}}{\gamma_{ci}}\right) + \frac{\nu_{i}}{\nu_{i} + \gamma_{ci}} \left[1 + 2\ln\left(\frac{b}{a}\right)\right] + \frac{2\nu_{i}\gamma_{ci}}{(\nu_{i} + \gamma_{ci})^{2}}\ln\left(\frac{b}{a}\right) + \cdots$$
(31)

Equations (30) and (31) may now be solved simultaneously to determine the limiting current parameters v_i and γ_{cl} .

1. Pencil beam case

Y

For this limit, we assume the ordering

$$2\ln(b/a) \gg \gamma_0^{2/3} \gg 1$$
 (32)

and make the ansatz $v_1 \ll \gamma_{cl}$. We then obtain

$$y_{el} = \gamma_0^{1/3} - \frac{1}{2} \gamma_0^{-1/3} - \frac{\gamma_0}{4 \ln(b/a)} + \dots$$
(33)

$$\nu_{I} = \frac{\gamma_{0} - \frac{3}{2} \gamma_{cI} + \dots}{2 \ln(b/a)} = \frac{\gamma_{0} - \frac{3}{2} \gamma_{0}^{1/3} + \dots}{2 \ln(b/a)}$$
(34)

which agrees with the pencil beam results of Eq. (17), when the latter are expanded under the pencil beam ordering of Eq. (32). This ordering is also sufficient to validate the ansatz $\nu_i \ll \gamma_{el}$. As we noted previously, the pencil beam regime is the lower left-hand portion of Table I; however, Eqs. (33) and (34) also require $\gamma_0^{2/3} \gg 1$ for validity, implying a shift toward the lower center of Table I.

2. Fat beam case

3

For this limit we assume the ordering

$$+2\ln(b/a) \ll \gamma_0^{2/3}$$
 (35)

and make the ansatz $v_1 \gg \gamma_{cl}$. Then, Eq. (31) becomes

$$2\gamma_{e1}^{2} = \ln(\nu_{1}/\gamma_{e1}) + 1 + 2\ln(b/a) + \dots$$
(36)

while Eq. (30) implies

$$\gamma_{i} = \frac{\gamma_{0} - 2\gamma_{ci} + 1/(2\gamma_{ci}) + \dots}{1 + 2\ln(b/a)} .$$
(37)

To obtain γ_{el} , Eq. (37) may be inserted in Eq. (36), which may then be solved iteratively. Carrying the iteration to second order for improved accuracy, one obtains

2035

J. R. Thompson and M. L. Sloan 2035

$$\gamma_{el} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left\{ \ln \left[\sqrt{2} \gamma_0 \left\{ \ln \left(\frac{\gamma_0 - \frac{3}{2}}{1 + 2 \ln(b/a)} \right) + 1 + 2 \ln \left(\frac{b}{a} \right) \right\}^{-1/2} - 2 + \left\{ \ln \left(\frac{\gamma_0 - \frac{3}{2}}{1 + 2 \ln(b/a)} \right) + 1 + 2 \ln \left(\frac{b}{a} \right) \right\}^{-1/2} + 1 + 2 \ln(b/a) - \ln(1 + 2 \ln(b/a)) \right\}^{1/2} .$$
(38)

Once γ_{ei} has been computed from Eq. (38), then ν_i may be determined from Eq. (37). One finds that the ordering of Eq. (35) is sufficient to validate the ansatz $\nu_i \gg \gamma_{ei}$ It may also be seen that Eqs. (22) and (23) agree with Eqs. (36) and (37) for the fat beam limit.

When $\gamma_0 \gg 1$, the value of γ_{cl} given by Eq. (38) for the fat beam limit may be seen to be considerably less than the value given by Eqs. (17b) or (33) for the pencil beam limit. Consequently, it would be grossly inaccurate to assume that these pencil beam equations for γ_{cl} have a general validity as has been ascribed to the interpolation formula for ν_l , Eq. (17a).

D. Accuracy of the analytical approximations

Exact numerical solutions which have been obtained and which are illustrated in Table I may be used to gauge the accuracy of the various analytical approximations. Comparisons for several test cases are illustrated in Table II.

It may be seen that the second-order iteration solutions of Eqs. (18) and (20) bracket the numerical results much more tightly than do the first order iteration solutions of Eqs. (15) and (17). In particular, the "interpolation formula" Eq. (17a) is observed to significant underestimate the limiting current, while the corresponding Eq. (17b) grossly overestimates γ_{cl} .

The results of the variational calculation are seen to be the most accurate overall, except in the ultra-relativistic fat beam limit illustrated in the last column. There, the expansion formulae of Eqs. (37) and (38) are best, with the second-order iteration Eq. (20) also being fairly accurate. The ultra-relativistic pencil beam expansions are accurate only for very large values of b/a, as assumed in Eq. (32), and so they have been omitted from Table II.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFSC), Contract F49620-76-C-0002, and by the Ballistic Missile Defense Advanced Technology Center, Contract DASG60-76-C-0045.

APPENDIX: EQUATIONS FOR A NUMERICAL INVESTIGATION OF LIMITING CURRENT

A simple computational procedure may be used to investigate Eq. (5a) and directly determine the value of ν_l , γ_{cl} . More precisely, in this computational procedure we choose γ_{cl} , b/a and determine ν_l , γ_0 therefrom. Using the change of variables $y = (\nu r^2/a^2)$, Eq. (5a) may be written

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y} y \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial y} = \frac{\gamma}{(\gamma^2 - 1)^{1/2}} \quad . \tag{A1}$$

By requiring that γ be regular at the origin and attain the value $\gamma(0) = \gamma_c$, Eq. (A1) may be integrated numerically to generate a single parameter family of solutions $\gamma(y, \gamma_c)$. Using the boundary condition Eq. (7) and evaluating y at $\gamma = a$ (i.e., $y = \nu$), we obtain

$$\gamma_0 = \left(\gamma + 2\ln\left(\frac{b}{a}\right)y \frac{\partial\gamma}{\partial y}\right)\Big|_{y=v} . \tag{A2}$$

Thus, given b/a and γ_c , the direct integration of Eq. (A1) with the subsidiary condition, Eqs. (A2), yields the general solution $\gamma_0(b/a, \gamma_c, \nu)$.

	$\gamma_0 = 5$, $b/a = 2$			$\gamma_0 = 7$, $b/a = 4.985$			$\gamma_0 = 100$,	b/a = 1
	v,	Yci	Yel	v,	Yel	Yel	vi	Yel
Numerical computer results	1.273	1.313		1.125	1.480		97.06	1.676
Interpolation formula, Eqs. (17) (1st-order iteration)	1.12	1.71	3.09	1.03	1.91	3.12	93. 12	4.64
Equations (15) (1st-order iteration)	1.64	1.00	2.68	1. 41	1.00	2.42	99.00	1.00
Equation (18) (2nd-order iteration)	1.31	1.27	2. 83	1.13	1.47	2.78	98.28	1.15
Equation (20) (2nd-order iteration)	1.26	1.38	2.90	1.12	1.53	2, 83	96, 96	1.82
Equations (25) -(27) (varia- tional principle)	1.28	1.31	2.90	1.13	1, 49	2. 83	97.82	1.33
Equations (37) -(38) (ultra- relativistic fat beam)	1.35	1.11		1.09	1.39		97.13	1.59

TABLE II. Test of accuracy of analytical approximations

2036 Phys. Fluids, Vol. 21, No. 11, November 1978

In order to determine the limiting current ν_1 , we must determine the value of γ_e such that $\partial \nu / \partial \gamma_e = 0$. However, since $\gamma_0 = \gamma_0 (b/a, \gamma_e, \nu)$ we may write

$$0 = \frac{\partial \gamma_0}{\partial \gamma_c} + \frac{\partial \gamma_0}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial \gamma_c} \Big|_{\gamma_0}$$
 (A3)

Therefore, the condition of limiting current, $\partial \nu / \partial \gamma_c = 0$, corresponds to a determination of the parameters b/a, γ_c , ν such that $\partial \gamma_0 / \partial \gamma_c = 0$. From Eq. (A2) a straightforward differentiation yields

$$\frac{\partial \gamma_0}{\partial \gamma_c} = \left(T + 2\ln\left(\frac{b}{a}\right)y \frac{\partial T}{\partial y}\right)\Big|_{y=v}$$
(A4)

where

$$T \equiv \partial \gamma(y, \gamma_c) / \partial \gamma_c = T(y, \gamma_c) .$$

The equation governing T may be obtained similarly from Eq. (A1) by differentiation with respect to γ_c :

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left(y,\frac{\partial T}{\partial y}\right) = -\frac{T}{(\gamma^2 - 1)^{3/2}},$$
 (A5)

where T(y=0)=1 and T is regular at the origin.

Equations (A1) and (A5) may now be simultaneously integrated outward in y until a value $y = y_i$ is reached such that $(\partial \gamma_0 / \partial \gamma_c)$, as given by Eq. (A4), vanishes. The limiting current ν_i is then given by $\nu_i = y_i$, with γ_0 determined from Eq. (A2). The initially specified quantity γ_c , of course, corresponds to γ_{ci} for this value $y = y_i$ $= \nu_i$. It may be demonstrated that such a point $y_i > 0$ always exists for each choice of $\gamma_{ci} > 1$.

¹L. S. Bogdankevich and A. A. Rukhadze, Usp. Fiz. Nauk 103, 609 (1971) [Sov. Phys. Usp. 14, 163 (1971)].

²H. V. Wong, M. L. Sloan. J. R. Thompson, and A. T. Drobot, Phys. Fluids 16, 902 (1973).

- ³L. P. Smith and P. L. Hartman, J. Appl. Phys. 11, 220 (1940).
- ⁴L. S. Bogdankevich and A. A. Rukhadze, Usp. Fiz. Nauk 103, 617 (1971) [Sov. Phys. -Usp. 14, 167 (1971)].

⁵R. B. Miller, R. J. Faehl, T. C. Genoni, and W. A. Proctor, IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. NS-24, 1648 (1977).

⁶C. L. Olson and J. W. Poukey, Phys. Rev. A 9, 2631 (1974). ⁷R. J. Briggs, Phys. Fluids 19, 1257 (1976).

⁸W. A. Proctor and T. C. Genoni (private communication).

APPENDIX D

I

I

I

I

INFLUENCE OF SPATIAL VARIATION IN γ ON THE RELATIVISTIC ELECTRON BEAM CYCLOTRON MODE

(Appendix D Contains 24 Pages)

APPENDIX D

INFLUENCE OF SPATIAL VARIATION IN Y ON THE RELATIVISTIC ELECTRON BEAM CYCLOTRON MODE

I. Introduction

In a cold relativistic electron beam moving with velocity u + c in a vacuum along a uniform guide field B_{oz} in the z-direction, electron beam cyclotron modes can propagate with frequency

$$\omega = k_{z}u - \frac{\Omega}{\left(1 + \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{k^{2}c^{2}}\right)}$$

where

$$\Omega = \frac{eB}{m_{e}\gamma c}$$

$$\omega_{\rm p}^2 = \frac{4\pi \, {\rm N} {\rm e}^2}{{\rm m}_{\rm p} \gamma}$$

$$\gamma = \left(1 - \frac{u^2}{c^2}\right)^{-1/2}$$

$$k^2 = k_z^2 + k_\perp^2$$

and the beam density N together with γ are assumed constant.

In cylindrical geometry, there exists (for a given value of k_{z} and mode number m) an infinite denumerable set of modes having different values of k_{\perp} . For the cylindrically symmetric m = 0 mode, the lowest value of k_{\perp} is $k_{\perp}a \approx 2.95$, where a is the beam radius and the beam is bounded by conducting walls.

The perpendicular electron velocity perturbation v_{\perp} is proportional to $\left[1/\gamma\left(\omega - k_{z}u + \Omega\right)\right]$ and remains finite across the beam. If γ varies in magnitude from the inside to the outside of the beam:

$$\gamma = \gamma_0 \left[1 + \frac{\alpha \omega_{po}^2}{4c^2} (r^2 - a^2) \right]$$

spatial variations are introduced in $\left[1/\gamma\left(\omega - k_{z}u + \Omega\right)\right]$ which may not be negligibly small. In particular, for the case when the parameter $\alpha \sim 1$, the spatial variations are significant and must be included in the analysis of the electron cyclotron beam dispersion relation.

In this report, the propagation of electron beam cyclotron modes in the presence of spatial variations in γ is investigated. The eigenvalues are calculated using a variational approach. This obviates the necessity to obtain exact solutions of the eigenvalue equations. It is established that in comparison with constant γ , the corresponding eigenvalues (k_a) increase as the parameter α increases. The larger the eigenvalue (k₁a) the closer is the cyclotron motion of the electron to resonance with the oscillating fields of the corresponding eigenmode. In addition, the perpendicular perturbed currents and electric fields become more sharply peaked on the surface of the beam.

II. Electron Beam Cyclotron Mode

l

I

[

The electron beam dynamics is described by the cold fluid equations:

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{n}}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{n} \underline{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{0}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} m\gamma \underline{v} = - e\underline{E} - \frac{e}{c}(\underline{v} \times \underline{B})$$

and closure is obtained through Maxwell's equations:

$$\nabla \times \underline{\mathbf{E}} = -\frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \underline{\mathbf{B}}}{\partial t}$$

$$\nabla \times \underline{B} = \frac{1}{c} \quad \frac{\partial \underline{E}}{\partial t} + \frac{4\pi}{c} \underline{J}$$

 $\nabla \cdot \underline{\mathbf{E}} = 4\pi\rho$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{0}$$

where

$$\rho = - en$$

$$J = - env$$

$$\gamma = \left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)^{1/2}$$

The velocities and electromagnetic fields of the beam equilibrium are:

1

Π

1

1

1

Million and a state of

$$\underline{\mathbf{v}}_{\mathbf{O}} = \left(\mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{O}\theta} = \frac{2\pi N_{\mathbf{O}}^{\mathbf{er}}}{B_{\mathbf{O}z}^{\mathbf{Y}^{2}}} \neq \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{O}}\right)$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{E}}_{\mathbf{O}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{O}\mathbf{r}} = -2\pi\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{O}}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{r}, & 0, & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\underline{B}_{0} = \left(0, \quad \underline{B}_{0\theta} = -\frac{2\pi N_{0}eur}{c}, \quad \underline{B}_{0z}\right)$$

$$\gamma = \gamma_0 \left\{ 1 + \alpha \frac{\omega_{p0}^2}{4c^2} (r^2 - a^2) \right\} >> 1$$

The magnitude of the parameter α is a measure of the spatial variation in γ .

Let the perturbations be of the form $exp[-i\omega t + ik_{z} + im\theta]$. The following differential equations describe the electron beam cyclotron modes:

$$\frac{1}{\xi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \xi \frac{\partial A^{+}}{\partial \xi} - \frac{(m+1)^{2}}{\xi^{2}} A^{+} - q^{2} a^{2} A^{+}$$

$$+ \frac{4}{\alpha (Q - \xi^{2})} A^{+} = 0 \qquad (1)$$

$$\frac{1}{\xi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \xi \frac{\partial A}{\partial \xi} - \frac{(m-1)^2}{\xi^2} A^- - p^2 a^2 A^- = 0 \qquad (2)$$

where

1

1

 $q^2 = k_z^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}$

 $\xi = r/a$
$$p^{2} = q^{2} + \frac{\omega po^{2}}{2c^{2}}$$

$$Q = \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{2c}{\omega_{po}^{a}} \right) \left[\frac{\Omega_{o}}{k_{z}^{u} - \omega} - 1 \right] + 1$$

$$\mathbf{A}^{\pm} = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{r}} \pm \mathbf{i}\mathbf{E}_{\theta} \pm \mathbf{i} \frac{\mathbf{u}}{\mathbf{c}} \left(\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{r}} \pm \mathbf{i}\mathbf{B}_{\theta} \right)$$

It has been assumed that $\gamma > \omega_{po} / \Omega_{o}$ in order to neglect v_perturbations and that

-

I

I

1

1

1

1

$$\frac{\Omega_{o}}{k_{z}u - \omega} \sim 1 > \frac{\alpha}{4} \quad \frac{\omega_{po}^{2}a^{2}}{c^{2}}$$

The boundary conditions on the conducting wall at $\xi = 1$ are

 $A^+ = A^-$ (3)

$$\frac{1}{\xi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \xi \left(A^{+} + A^{-} \right) = 0$$
 (4)

Equations (1) and (2) are solved for A^+ , A^- , and after substitution in Eqs. (3) and (4), the eigenvalue equation for Q is obtained. In the low phase velocity limit $k_z^2 > \omega^2/c^2$, the frequency ω is given by

$$\omega = k_{z}u - \frac{\Omega_{o}}{\left(1 + \frac{\omega_{po}}{k^{2}c^{2}}\right)}$$
(5)

where

$$k^{2} = \frac{4}{\alpha (Q - 1)a^{2}} \qquad . \tag{6}$$

The smaller the magnitude of $\omega_{po}^{2}/k^{2}c^{2}$, the closer is the cyclotron motion of the electrons to strong coupling or resonance with the mode. In fact, it may be seen from Eqs. (1) and (6) that the radial location of the resonance is

$$\xi^{2} = \frac{r^{2}}{a^{2}} = Q = 1 + \frac{4}{\alpha k^{2} a^{2}}$$
(7)

which is just outside the beam edge.

8

The perturbed electron velocity and electromagnetic fields are:

$$E_{z} = \frac{i}{2\left(k_{z} - \frac{\omega u}{c^{2}}\right)a} \left[\frac{1}{\xi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \xi (A^{+} + A^{-}) + \frac{m}{\xi} (A^{+} - A^{-})\right]$$

$$E_{r} = -\frac{i}{\left(k_{z}u - \omega\right)} \left[\frac{u}{a} \frac{\partial E_{z}}{\partial \xi} - \frac{i\omega}{2} \left(A^{+} + A^{-}\right)\right]$$

$$E_{\theta} = \frac{1}{\left(k_{z}^{u} - \omega\right)} \left[\frac{mu}{a} \frac{E_{z}}{\xi} + \frac{i\omega}{2} \left(A^{+} - A^{-}\right)\right]$$

$$B_{z} = \frac{c}{2(k_{z}u - \omega)a} \left[\frac{1}{\xi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \xi (A^{+} - A^{-}) + \frac{m}{\xi} (A^{+} + A^{-}) \right]$$

1

1

対象となるという

$$B_{r} = -\frac{1}{\left(k_{z}^{u} - \omega\right)} \left[\frac{mc}{a} \frac{E_{z}}{\xi} + \frac{ik_{z}^{c}}{z} \left(A^{+} - A^{-}\right)\right]$$

$$B_{\theta} = -\frac{1}{\left(k_{z}^{u} - \omega\right)} \left[\frac{ic}{a} \frac{\partial E_{z}}{\partial \xi} + \frac{k_{z}^{c}}{2} \left(A^{+} + A^{-}\right)\right]$$

III. Eigenvalues

0

I

[

I

T

1

1

1

1

1

1

The solutions of Eqs. (1) and (2) for $\alpha = 0$ have been derived in previous reports. They are restated here for completeness and easy reference.

When $\alpha = 0$,

$$A^{T} = a J_{m+1}(\kappa a\xi)$$
$$A^{T} = b I_{m-1}(p\xi)$$

where

$$\kappa^2 = -k_z^2 + \lim_{\alpha \neq 0} \frac{4}{\alpha Qa^2}$$

 J_{m+1} and I_{m-1} are Bessel and modified Bessel functions, respectively.

The eigenvalue equation for κa , obtained after substituting these solutions in Eqs. (3) and (4), is

$$2 + \kappa a \frac{K_{m+1}(\kappa a)}{J_{m+1}(\kappa a)} + pa \frac{I_{m-1}(pa)}{I_{m-1}(pa)} = 0$$
(8)

where

$$J_{m+1}(\kappa a) = \frac{d}{d\kappa a} J_{m+1}(\kappa a)$$

Equation (5) determines the frequency with values of k given by

$$k^2 = \left(k_2^2 + \kappa^2\right)$$

If pa < 1, m = 0, Eq. (8) reduces

$$\kappa a \frac{J_{o}(\kappa a)}{J_{1}(\kappa a)} \approx -2$$

11

so that

ка = 2.95, 5.84 ...

If pa < 1, m = -1, Eq. (8) reduces to

$$a = \frac{J_1^{(\kappa a)}}{J_0^{(\kappa a)}} \approx 4$$

so that

 $\kappa a = 1.91, 4.60, \ldots$

There exists an infinite denumerable set of eigenvalues for each value of m.

When $\alpha \neq 0$, the solutions of Eq. (1) are not expressible in terms of simple functions. However, a variational approach may be adopted to estimate the eigenvalues, and exact solutions of Eq. (1) need not be known.

Let Eq. (1) be multiplied by $\xi A^{+*}(\xi)$ and integrated from $\xi = 0$ to $\xi = 1$. After imposing the boundary conditions at $\xi = 1$, namely, Eqs. (3) and (4), it may be verified that

$$- |b_{0}|^{2} I_{m-1}(pa) \left[2I_{m-1}(pa) + pa I_{m-1}(pa) \right] = \Lambda(A^{+*}, A^{+})$$
(9)

where

$$\Lambda (A^{+*}, A^{+}) \equiv \int_{0}^{1} \xi \left| \frac{\partial A^{+}}{\partial \xi} \right|^{2} d\xi + \int_{0}^{1} \frac{(m+1)^{2}}{\xi} \left| A^{+} \right|^{2} d\xi + q^{2} a^{2} \int_{0}^{1} \xi \left| A^{+} \right|^{2} d\xi - \frac{4}{\alpha} \int_{0}^{1} \frac{\xi \left| A^{+} \right|^{2}}{(Q - \xi^{2})} d\xi \quad (10)$$

I

and the solution $A^{-} = b I (pa\xi)$ of Eq. (2) has been utilized.

The first variation of the functional Λ with respect to A^+ is stationary, that is, $\delta\Lambda = 0$, if A^+ is a solution of Eq. (1)

Thus by selecting a trial function A^+ which satisfies the boundary conditions and for which $\delta \Lambda = 0$, an approximate dispersion relation can be obtained from Eq. (9).

Consider the following trial function which is suitable for estimating the eigenvalues of the lowest eigenmode:

 $A^{+} = \xi^{|m+1|} \left(g_{0} + g_{2}\xi^{2} + g_{4}\xi^{4} \right)$

From Eqs. (3) and (4),

$$g_{2} = b_{0} \left[-2g + \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \left(6 + |m + 1| \right) I_{m-1}(pa) + paI_{m-1}(pa) \right\} \right]$$

 $g_4 = b_0 \left[g - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \left(4 + |m + 1| \right) I_{m-1}(pa) + paI_{m-1}(pa) \right\} \right]$

where

[

I

I

I

T

1

0

1

1

1

 $g \equiv g_{o}/b_{o}$

 A^+ is, therefore, a trial function with one parameter g. Substituting for A^+ in $\Lambda(A^{+*}, A^+)$,

 $\Lambda = \left| b_0 \right|^2 \Lambda_0(m, \alpha, qa, pa, Q, g)$

The parameter $g = \hat{g}$ is chosen such that

$$\frac{\partial \Lambda_{o}(\hat{g})}{\partial \hat{g}} = 0 \qquad . \tag{11}$$

14

The eigenvalue equation for Q is then given by

$$\Lambda_{o}(m, \alpha, qa, pa, Q, \hat{g})$$

+ $I_{m-1}(pa) \left[2I_{m-1}(pa) + pa I_{m-1}(pa) \right] = 0$. (12)

Equation (12) is solved numerically to determine Q and hence the eigenvalue ka. Some representative solutions for the cylindrically symmetric m = 0 eigenmode with eigenfunction A^+ having no nodes are tabulated in Figures 1, 2, and 3.

Figures 1 and 2 display the increase in magnitude of the eigenvalue ka for given values of $\omega_{po}^{2}a^{2}/c^{2}$ and k_a as the parameter α increases.

Figure 3 displays the increase in magnitude of the eigenvalue ka for given values of $\omega_{po}^{2}a^{2}/c^{2}$ and α as k_{a} increases. It may be seen that $k_{\perp}a = \sqrt{k^{2}a^{2} - k_{z}^{2}a^{2}}$ increases strongly with increasing $k_{z}a$ for $\alpha = 1$.

The accuracy of the variational calculation may be judged by comparison with analytic solutions of Eq. (1)

α	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.7	1.0
ka	2.95	3.13	3.53	4.01	4.61	5.77

-

-

the second se

-

I

I

I

I

1

1

0

Figure 1. Eigenvalue $ka(\alpha)$ for m = 0,

 $\omega_{\rm po}^{2} a^{2}/c^{2} = 0.06, k_{\rm z}^{a} = 0.1$

α	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.7	1.0
ka	3.07	3.27	3.73	4.31	5.03	6.48

Figure 2. Eigenvalue $ka(\alpha)$ for m = 0,

 $\omega_{po}^{2}a^{2}/c^{2} = 1.0, k_{z} = 0.707$

· portaint

k a	0.0	0.707	1.871	2.916
ka	5.82	6.48	10.98	24.43

I

I

1

0

1

1

Figure	3.	Eigenvalue	ka(k_a)	for	m = 0,
		$\omega_{\rm po}^{2} a^{2}/c^{2} = 1$	$0, \alpha =$	1.0	

and and the

180

and (2). Thus for m = 0, $\omega_{po}^2 a^2/c^2 << 1$, $\omega^2 a^2/c^2 << k_z^2 a^2 << 1$, and $\alpha = 0.5$, the solution of Eq. (1) is

$$A^{\dagger} = a \xi (Q - \xi^2)$$

1

Ĩ

and the corresponding eigenvalue is ka = 4. The variational solution for m = 0, $\omega_{po}^2 a^2/c^2 = 0.06$, $k_z^2 a^2 = 0.01$, and $\alpha = 0.5$ is ka = 4.01. The eigenvalues obtained from the variational approach are indeed acceptable.

The trial function A^+ which minimize $\Lambda(A^{+*}, A^+)$ are plotted as functions of ξ in Figure 4. $A^+(\xi)$ is normalized so that $A^+(\xi = 1) = 1$. The associated fields $E_z(\xi)$ and $E_r(\xi)$, computed from the trial function $A^+(\xi)$, are plotted in Figures 5 and 6. The profiles of $A^+(\xi)$ and $E_z(\xi)$ are not appreciably altered with changes in the value of α . However, $E_r(\xi)$ becomes

18







more sharply peaked at $\xi = 1$ when $\alpha > 0.5$, its magnitude at $\xi = 1$ being proportional to $k^2 a^2$ which increases with α .

IV. Discussion

I

-

1

The spatial variation in γ was expressed in terms of the parameter α :

$$\gamma = \gamma_0^{\Gamma} 1 + \frac{\alpha \omega_{p0}^2}{4c^2} (r^2 - a^2)$$

where α was assumed to be in the range

$$\frac{4c^2}{a^2\omega_{po}^2} > 0$$

A relativistic electron beam of constant γ_0 entering a cylindrical waveguide bounded by conducting walls will produce a beam equilibrium having a spatial γ variation with $\alpha \sim 1$.

The magnitude of corresponding eigenvalues ka increases with increasing α . For m = 0, the value of ka $\left(\omega_{po}^{2} a^{2}/c^{2} < 1, k_{z}^{a} < 1 \right)$ for the lowest eigenmode (no nodes) increases from 2.95 to 5.77 as α increases from zero to unity. The larger the magnitude of ka the closer is the cyclotron motion of the electron to resonance with the oscillating fields of the corresponding eigenmode. Larger ka values impose somewhat more stringent restrictions on the temperature of the electron beam in order to avoid significant "Landau" damping, since Eq. (7) shows that the spatial location of the cyclotron resonance then occurs much closer to the beam surface. Hence, a finite energy spread would more easily allow a few particles to be in resonance with the wave.

Furthermore, $E_r(\xi)$ and consequently, the perturbed perpendicular electron velocities exhibit a transition in profile to one which is sharply peaked at $\xi = 1$ when $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$ (m = 0). The surface perturbations are then larger than the interior perturbations. The effect of nonlinearities are, therefore, likely to be more significant on the surface than in the interior of the beam.

1

1

l

Austin Research Associates, Inc.

I

5

I-ARA-74-U-114

1901 Rutland Drive Austin, Texas 78758 (512) 887-6623

APPENDIX E

RELATIVISTIC E-BEAM PLASMA HEATING

by

W. E. Drummond and J. R. Thompson

Notes for a 1/2 hour presentation at the Fourth National School on Plasma Physics, Novosibirsk

July 1974

(Appendix E contains 25 pages)

RELATIVISTIC ELECTRON BEAM PLASMA HEATING (20-30 min.)

A Synopsis

· I. Introduction (5-7 min.)

wherein the problem of heating $10^{14}-10^{16}$ density plasmas with beams is posed--and it is assumed that one gives a damn about efficient (or rapid) heating--as for single pass, θ -pinch geometry--and so optimization of the heating interactions is desired

- II. Return Current Heating (5-7 min.) wherein it is argued that return current heating goes to pot for $(n_p/n_B) \ge 100$
- III. Primary, hydrodynamical, beam-plasma interaction (10-15 min.) wherein the scaling obtained from computer runs is discussed, and it is argued that reasonable deposition efficiencies (>10%) can be obtained even for $(n_p/n_B)\sim 10^5$ provided that the beam quality assures a hydrodynamical interaction: $\theta_{\rm TMS} \lesssim 2(n_B/n_p)^{1/3}$ This quality may be easier to achieve than the MA/cm² current density required for return current heating.

RELATIVISTIC E-BEAM PLASMA HEATING

by

W. E. Drummond and J. R. Thompson

(Notes for a 1/2 hour presentation at the Fourth National School on Plasma Physics, Novosibirsk, July 1974)

It is well known that advances in high energy, pulsed power technology have made available extremely powerful electron beams, capable of delivering .1-1 megajoules of directed beam energy within .1 μ sec. My remarks today will be confined to the prospects for utilizing such beams for the heating of target plasmas of moderately high density, 10^{14} -10^{16} cm⁻³, in volumes of 10^3 -10^5 cm³, to multikilovolt temperatures. [I will not discuss pellet heating, and these remarks will be less relevant for the heating of lower (< 10^{14} cm⁻³) density plasmas.]

I will further presume that it is either necessary or desirable that the heating be accomplished rapidly and with a resonable efficiency of energy deposition from the beam into the target plasma. For example, this would be the case in any single pass heating, in which the lifetime of interaction for a beam electron would be limited to its transit time of a few nanoseconds. In this case it is important to study the alternative mechanisms of beam-plasma interaction, so that parameters might be selected to <u>optimize</u> one or another mechanism.

(There is another class of problems, which will not be further discussed here, in which the primary concern is how to inject and confine a powerful beam in a toroidal device for many thousands or perhaps millions of plasma periods. For this problem, the extended time of interaction would permit almost any of the interaction mechanisms to couple much of the beam energy into the target, and the question of optimizing one or another interaction would be much less important.)

There exists an increasing body of experimental data, indicating the successful one pass heating of target plasmas with energy deposition efficiencies in the range of 10%-50%, for the case where the target plasmas were no more than a few hundred times denser than the electron beams. The experiments, in agreement with theory, have shown increasing energy deposition efficiencies as the beam to target density ratio is increased toward one. Therefore, in response to the demand for heating plasmas of higher and higher density, there has been a certain trend toward increasing the beam current (if necessary at the expense of particle energy) and reducing the beam size to further increase its density. This evolution becomes increasingly more difficult and technologically more demanding as one considers heating the higher density target plasmas which may be desired in future controlled fusion experiments. For example, to heat a 1016 cmdensity target plasma with relativistic beam of density above 2% of the target density, one must be able to propagate current densities above a megampere/cm² for a distance of many cm. Such a beam would be much more intense than those commonly generated at particle densities of 1011 -1013 cm=3, or current-densities of-some kA/cm2.

It is an appreciation of the <u>difficulty</u> of this chore of propagating beams of such high current density, as one scales up to denser

-2-

fusion experiments, which has motivated us to examine the density scaling of the energy deposition efficiencies for various mechanisms of beam-plasma interaction, so as to determine the minimum required beam current density and any alternatives to very high beam density which may still allow adequate heating.

Let us suppose that the target plasma has been preionized, or else that the neutral gas pressure is sufficiently high (above ~30 mT or 10^{15} cm⁻³) that field induced cascade ionization produces a fully ionized target early in the beam pulse time. The induction fields of the electron beam will quickly drive a return current carried by the plasma <u>electrons</u>, provided that $\frac{\omega_p \cdot 2a^2}{c^2} \simeq \frac{np}{3X10^{11}} >> 1$. (Here ω_p is the target electron plasma frequency, a is the beam radius, and the condition has been shown by Sudan and others to be roughly appropriate with or without external magnetic fields.)

One mechanism for depositing beam energy into the target plasma is via the <u>dissipation of this return current</u> due to microturbulent interactions between the return current electrons and the target plasma ions. These interactions extract drift energy from the plasma electrons, which is replenished by the induction fields which transfer energy from the beam electrons to the plasma electrons. The scaling of these microturbulent interactions is illustrated on the first slide.

-3-

The first point to notice is that the return current drift velocit scales with the beam to target plasma density ratio, and that heating rate per target electron scales as the inverse square of the plasma density. This is because the return current drift energy is what directly feeds the turbulence. Consequently, the rate of return current dissipation falls rather dramatically as one attempts to heat target plasmas much denser than the beam.

The second point to notice is that there is evidence that the "effective collision frequency," whose average value influences the L/R current decay time, is <u>not</u> constant but in fact decreases as the plasma heats up. For example, we and others (Morse, Biscamp) have performed one-dimensional, particle computer calculations of electronion interactions, in which the initial inductive coupling to the beam electrons is mocked up by a constant current boundary condition

RETURN CURRENT HEATING $N_{a} = \frac{n_{b}}{n_{p}} \beta c$ Wpe a d Te ~ mNJ Vest ; Toecay C2 (Veff) CONSTANT CURRENT, I-D COMPUTER RUN mN 1000 2000 wet $\frac{1}{mN_{1}^{2}} \sim ln \left[1 + \frac{\omega_{p}t}{100}\right]$ Vefs ~ V. e-Te/msz2

 $(E + 4\pi J = 4\pi J_0)$. The resultant electron heating is as shown on the slide:

- (i) an initially rapid rise of T_e to $\epsilon_{drift} = \frac{1}{2} m v_d^2$ due to the two stream interaction, if $T_e < \epsilon_{drift}$ to start with, followed by
- (ii) a progressively slower increase in T_e above ε_{drift} due to ion-acoustic-like turbulence.

In this latter phase, the temperature only increases logarithmically in time during the simulation, corresponding to an exponential <u>decrease</u> in v_{eff} with temperature. This is a faster decrease than the linear ion acoustic growth rate displays, and the implication is that only a few units of return current drift energy may be dissipated within ~10⁵ ω_{pe}^{-1} . Consequently, when n_B/n_p is very small, very little of the beam energy can be dissipated by these return current interactions, within any reasonable time.

The difficulty with heating very dense targets via return current dissipation may also be seen easily from an elementary examination. of the macroscopic current decay, as illustrated on the next slide:

It is clear that if the return current decay time, which increases with the target plasma density, should become larger than the beam pulse time, then the return current will be inductively quenched prematurely when the tail of the beam passes by. This prevents completion of the resistive decay which heats the plasma. The effective collision frequency of the dissipative microturbulence tends to fall from .2 ω_{pi} to .01 ω_{pi} as the heating proceeds, so that for dense targets and centimeter beams, the decay time can well be microseconds in many cases and may exceed the pulse time. The energy deposition efficiency for return current interactions is indicated on the bottom of the slide for a relativistic beam, and the penalty for large decay times is evident. Since the transit time is only nanoseconds, the ratio of "times" will be small, and large v/γ beam parameters are essential to increase the efficiency. (Here

 $v_{\rm B} \equiv \frac{\omega_{\rm B}^2 a^2}{4c^2} = \frac{I(kA)}{17\beta}$, and G is a dimensionless geometrical factor relating to flux linkage.)

In summary, dense target plasmas can only be heated effectively by return current interactions if the beam current and current density are increased to the point that v_B/γ_B is large, $\tau_{decay}/\tau_{pulse}$ is not too large, and n_p/n_B is not too large. In short, one must confront the difficult problem of propagating ultra high beam current densities to heat dense target plasmas in this way.



An alternative mechanism for depositing the beam energy in the target plasma is the primary beam plasma interaction. This class of primary interactions is richly endowed with a large parameter space, which encompases a hydrodynamical and a kinetic regime, longitudinal and transverse waves, electrostatic and electromagnetic regimes, gyroeffects, relativistic effects, effects of finite geometry and inhomogeneity, and the various nonlinear effects which appear as the interaction evolves. Without attempting to survey all of this parameter space, I would only point out some of the interesting scalings of a well studied and important subclass of primary interactions, as indicated on the next slide.

This is the hydrodynamical interaction of a sufficiently monoenergetic relativistic beam, generating longitudinal electrostatic turbulence. We examine this interaction in one dimension for the

-7-

PRIMARY BEAM - PLASMA INTERACTION

COLD BEAM - HYDRODYNAMICAL

LONGITUDINAL (I-D) INTERACTION.

WEAK : <u>80 no</u> < 0.1

 $(\chi_{B}-I)n_{B}mc^{2}$

-O LINEAR, NON-REL. PLASMA RESPONSE INITIALLY SINGLE WAVE NONLINEAR BEAM RESPONSE

 \mathcal{E}_{BERM} $\epsilon = \frac{\Delta \mathcal{E}_{BEAM}}{\mathcal{E}_{BEAM}}$

Efiero

an an an an an an

The A Der Part

case where the beam is weak: $\gamma_{BnB}/n_p < 0.1$ and where gyroeffects, geometrical and inhomogeneity effects are negligible. The "weak beam" regime is appropriate for the problem we have posed of attempting to heat plasmas several orders of magnitude denser than the electron beams, and it implies that the plasma response will at first be linear and nonrelativistic, while the beam responds nonlinearly to the narrow spectrum "single wave" which the interaction produces. We are interested here in the deposition efficiency from the beam, achieved by the time of the first nonlinear saturation of the interaction--as defined on the slide--and in particular in how this efficiency depends on γ_B , n_B , and n_p .

These results are obtained from a variety of computer calculations performed at the University of Texas, including (1)"single wave calculations" in which the linear background response is treated analytically and a single wave is legislated and the nonlinear beam response is computed, (2) one dimensional, particle-in-cell, relativistic calculations with two and occasionally three (including ions) species, and (3) a very few, recent, two-dimensional, relativistic, electromagnetic, particle calculations.

The physics of this interaction is by now very well known, having been studied computationally in many laboratories, and experimentally by Ken Gentle at Texas--among others--for the nonrelativistic version of this interaction. A very pure electric wave is observed to grow up, propagating barely slower than the beam, and trapping the beam electrons when it attains sufficient amplitude. As the beam electrons

-8-





rotate in the troughs of the wave, they are slowed slightly and energy is transferred to the field oscillations and to initially coherent kinetic sloshing oscillations in the background plasma . electrons. It was early pointed out by Fainberg and coworkers that for a relativistic beam, even a slight slowing in velocity would allow an appreciable fraction of the beam energy to be deposited.

(Possible slides 3.1, 3.2, --- on computer phase space, etc.)

The computer calculations reveal the following scaling of the energy deposition efficiency with γ_B and n_B/n_p :

(72) 40-<u>np</u>=125 Na <u>ne</u>=3000 20 Y. 20 10 PEAK (%) X₈=3 20 PEAK 10 8⁸=30 IST BOUNCE .30 10 20 0 <u>"a</u> OPTIMUM : 8 (n8/np) 2 0.5

(1) One conclusion is that for a fixed value of n_p/n_B below a few hundred, the efficiency declines with γ_B , while for larger values of n_p/n_B there is a weak peak in $\epsilon(\gamma_B)$.

(2) Second, for fixed choices of γ_B , the efficiency may be optimized with respect to n_B/n_p . The efficiency curves are more peaked for high γ_B than for low γ_B , and they are steeper for n_B/n_p below optimum than they are above the optimum points (see "arrows" on slide 4).

(3) The peakedness of the efficiency curves is substantially reduced for n_B/n_p above optimum, if efficiency is defined from the <u>mean</u> energy deposited during the first cycle of trapping, rather than from the <u>peak</u> energy deposited (see dotted curve on the slide).

(4) Consequently, the optimum deposition efficiency can be approached provided only that $\gamma_B(n_B/n_p)^{1/3} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, and this optimum will be in the range of 10%-40%. This means that higher- γ beams are appropriate for heating plasmas much denser than the beam. There is no requirement that ν_B/γ_B be large for efficient energy deposition, as there is for return current dissipation.

Finally, if we assume that γ_B and n_B/n_p have been matched for optimum efficiency, this energy deposition efficiency may be plotted against n_p/n_B as in the next slide:

-10-
For the smaller values of n_p/n_B where the efficiency is highest, the primary interaction is supplemented by reverse current dissipation both the background and the beam response is highly nonlinear, and the turbulent spectrum is rather broad from the start. The chief conclusion we wish to draw is that for the larger values of n_p/n_B within the "single wave regime," the deposition efficiency--although lower--is still <u>appreciable</u>. The efficiency curves are "flatteningout" verses n_p . This means that extremely dense plasmas can be heated with much less dense, relativistic beams, if this interaction can be achieved.

-11-



and a second second

The primary difficulty is to assure that the beam is sufficiently monoenergetic that the interaction is at least marginally hydrodynamical rather than kinetic in nature. This means that the angular scatter of momenta must not be too high--roughly that $\theta_{\rm rms} \lesssim \frac{1}{\gamma_{\rm B}} \simeq (n_{\rm B}/n_{\rm p})^{3/4}$. Achieving this beam quality is also relatively more difficult for dense target plasmas, but it might prove easier than propagating megamperes/cm². The point is that there is an <u>alternative</u> way to go in trying to heat dense fusion plasmas with relativisitc electron beams. One can either improve the quality or else the current density of the beam. Although there has not been a large experimental effort to improve beam quality, steps such as introducing guide magnetic fields into the diode appear very promising.

Although this is the chief point of this talk, I should touch briefly on a few other points that have been neglected:

(1) Regarding gyroeffects--it will generally be technologically unfeasible to magnetize (i.e.; $\Omega_{e} > \omega_{pe}$) the target plasma at the densities we have been considering (10¹⁴ to 10¹⁸ cm⁻³). However, it is entirely possible to magnetize the beam, such that $B^{2}/8\pi > n_{B}(\gamma_{B}-1)m$

(2) In the absence of a magnetic field, the beam plasma interaction with the fastest growth rate is the electrostatic <u>transverse</u> beam instability, with $k_1 > k_{\parallel} \simeq \omega_p / \beta c$. However, when $\gamma_B (n_B/n_p)^{1/3} < 1$, the transverse interaction saturates without creating so much momentum scatter that the longitudinal interaction is cast into the kinetic regim It is also possible to strengthen the guide magnetic field to the point $\left[(\Omega_e/\omega_p) \simeq (\gamma_B^2 n_B/n_p)^{1/3} \right]$ that the transverse interaction is

-12-

suppressed while the longitudinal interaction is unaffected. In any case, our preliminary two dimensional computer calculations, which allow both transverse and longitudinal interactions with B=0, show adequate energy deposition not much below the one dimensional predictions. (Similar results have been reported from NRL.)

(3) The effect of collisions between the target plasma electrons and ions is rather weak on the <u>hydrodynamical</u> primary beam-plasma interaction, but it can lead to suppression of the <u>kinetic</u> beam plasma interaction (where the beam momentum scatter is too great.) This is why the beam quality must be assured for efficient heating. The target collisions will also lead to randomization of the coherent oscillations excited in the plasma electrons-generally on µsec time scales--and will lead to energy equilibration with the ions--generally on msec time scales.

(4) Finally we have not discussed the later time nonlinear effect such as parametric instabilities or trapped particle instabilities which can serve to further enhance the energy deposition efficiency, to randomize the turbulence (spread spectrum), and to heat the ions more quickly, provided that there is time for these interactions to occur. Since even the earliest interaction provides resonable deposition efficiencies when the necessary beam quality is achieved, the later interactions will be "icing on the cake."

(Possible conclusion by showing some of the slides from a two dimensional, B=0, γ_B =3, n_p/n_B =8 beam plasma interaction with $\epsilon \sim 25\%$)

-13-









FIELD AMPLITUDES vs. x,y at $t = 80 \omega_p^{-1}$

1.



APPENDIX F

1

LETTER SUMMARY OF BEAM-PLASMA HEATING RESEARCH AND COMPARISON OF RESULTS WITH THOSE OF

THODE, ET AL.

Letter from Brendan B. Godfrey to James R. Thompson
 Letter from James R. Thompson to Richard L. Gullickson
 Letter from James R. Thompson to Brendan B. Godfrey

(Appendix F contains 14 pages)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LOS ALAMOS SCIENTIFIC LABORATORY (CONTRACT W-7405-ENG-36) P.O. BOX 1663 LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO 87545

IN REPLY REFER TO: MAIL STOP:

T-15(5-77)1 531

May 5, 1977

Dr. J. R. Thompson Austin Research Associates, Inc. 1901 Rutland Drive Austin, Texas 78757

Dear Bob:

I have been reading over some of the work you and others at ARA have done on relativistic electron beam-plasma interactions. The research seems very interesting, but is not described in sufficient detail in the reports I have, namely

"Turbulent Heating of Plasmas by High Energy Particle Beams"

I-ARA-76-U-80/ARA-236	(Aug. 76)	
I-ARA-75-U-139/ARA-195	(Aug. 75)	
I-ARA-74-U-139/ARA-160	(Aug. 74)	
I-ARA-73-U-88/ARA-106	(June 73)	(Ch III only)

I would certainly appreciate any additional material you can send me.

Enclosed are several reprints by Les Thode which you may find of interest.

Best regards.

Brendan B. Godfrey

BBG: ncw Encl: a/s cc: B. B. Godfrey (2) ISD-5 (2) T-15 File

An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer

Fustin Research Associates, Inc.

1901 Rutland Drive Austin, Texas 78758 (512) 837-6623

August 22, 1977

Captain Richard L. Gullickson Program Manager Directorate of Physics Air Force Office of Scientific Research Bolling Air Force Base, D.C. 20332

Dear Dick:

A couple of months ago, while I was writing up some of the material for the renewal proposal which we sent you on June 17, 1977, I received from Brendan Godfrey a request for elaboration on some of the old beamplasma interaction research which we had performed and described in our prior AFOSR reports. Apparently, a question had arisen during an AFWL meeting on a proposed beam plasma heating experiment about how our research compared with that of Les Thode, et al.

I was too busy to respond to this request for some time, but I finally telephoned Brendan on August 1 and we discussed the research. I understand that he had already submitted a preliminary comparison of our research with Les Thode's research, and that any urgency associated with the question had largely dissipated, inasmuch as AFWL made a commitment to go ahead with their experiment. Nevertheless, I have taken the time to make a few detailed comments on this research in a letter to Brendan, and since the work was largely AFOSR-sponsored, I have enclosed a copy of the letter herewith, for your information.

Despite some possible minor differences, which may be largely semantic in nature, the main conclusion which struck me as I looked over some 1975-76 publications by Thode, et al. (which Brendan had sent me) was the near total agreement with my own conclusions in 1973-74, when I was last active in this area. This is not to belittle the very valuable research which has been accomplished in the meanwhile, including a number of two-dimensional particle simulations to probe transverse dynamical effects and magnetic field effects. Nevertheless, my early conclusions that very high density plasmas might be heated with reasonable efficiency by high quality (low angular scatter), high-Y (ultrarelativistic) electron beams, via the primary beam-plasma longitudinal streaming interaction, seem to be in agreement with Les Thode's conclusions. believe that our prescriptions for the optimum beam parameters are also in quantitative agreement, although I have not seen any papers by Les on the AFWL experiment in question. Assuming this to be the case, I am wholeheartedly in favor of the experiment being performed.

Capt. R. L. Gullickson

8-22-77

I will be interested to hear how the Air Force Summer Study came out, and what conclusions were reached. Perhaps I'll give you a call in a week or so to discuss it.

Also, I presume that our AFOSR proposal is still on schedule in the reviewing process. Let me know if I can be of any more help there.

Finally, the typing is now about complete for submission of our publication on limiting currents. I should be sending you a copy in a week or so.

Best regards,

Bob Fhompson

James Robert Thompson

JRT:sjb

Enclosure: I-ARA-74-U-114 I-ARA-77-U-76 (ARA-281)

I-ARA-77-U-76 (ARA-281)

Austin Research Associates, Inc.

1901 Rutland Drive Austin, Texas 78758 (512) 887-6623

August 22, 1977

Dr. Brendan Godfrey Group T-15, MS-531 University of California Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory P. O. Box 1663 Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

Dear Brendan:

Following our telephone conversation of August 1 regarding beam-plasma heating, I have secured a copy of some lecture notes which were compiled for a July, 1974 presentation by Dr. Drummond at Novosibirsk, which summarize our understanding of the most important features of the problem as of that time. These notes are enclosed herewith (they are somewhat rough, as the presentation was only verbal.)

Inasmuch as I spent the better part of five years of my professional life (i.e., 1968 - 1973) working on this problem--mostly supported by AFOSR-plus another year (i.e., 1973 - 1974) trying (unsuccessfully) to scare up support for an experiment to test some of our conclusions, I thought I would take the time to clarify our chief results somewhat.

The historical sequence of "our" own research is that we first applied a concentrated theoretical-computational-experimental attack on the nonrelativistic, one-dimensional (strong magnetic guide field), weak beam-plasma interaction, and we found a gratifying amount of agreement on the results.¹⁻⁵ We subsequently engaged in a period of protracted theoretical research designed to extend understanding to more and more effects: relativistic beams, electromagnetic effects, transverse waves, kinetic (or angular scattering) effects, gyroeffects, finite geometry effects, ion effects, trapped particle effects, parametric effects, etc. Simultaneously, our computer simulation capability (via Adam Drobot) was slowly improved to handle 1-D, relativistic, single wave calculations (a la Matsiborko, et al.⁶), then 1-D, relativistic particle simulations. At the culmination of this research effort in 1973, the outstanding facts which struck me were:

Page -2-

August 22, 1977

- (1) Technological developments in high voltage pulsed power seemed very promising, with relativistic electron beams already capable of delivering tens to hundreds of kJ. The future growth potential for engineering desirable beam properties, increasing the beam energy, etc. seemed very bright.
- (2) Despite the large amount of attention then being given to return current interactions, partly because of their relevance to a number of existing experiments with $n_p/n_B < 100$, these interactions held little theoretical promise for heating plasmas at much larger density ratios.
- (3) However, based only on the energy coupling obtainable from the primary, longitudinal, beam plasma interaction in the hydrodynamical regime, it already seemed possible to heat extremely dense target plasmas to fusion temperatures if the beam density, energy, and quality (i.e., angular scatter) could be properly controlled.
- (4) Although the transverse waves and the beam cyclotron modes were not yet as well understood as the longitudinal plasma wave interaction, it seemed that they could only enhance the energy coupling and should not quench the longitudinal interaction. Even without this complete understanding of the transverse interactions, the preliminary evidence (discussed later) was already adequate to justify designing an experiment to heat with a high quality, highly relativistic beam, via the primary longitudinal interaction.
- (5) Nevertheless, the thrust of the existing experimental effort seemed to be in the wrong direction, from the point of view of the application of single pass heating of very dense (i.e., > 10^{15} electrons/ cm³) target plasmas, which I viewed as one of the most promising fusion goals to which the e-beam technology could be applied, as well as an area where it should have a distinct competitive advantage. That is, the existing effort seemed aimed at producing higher ν/γ beams--giving up γ for ν if necessary, and producing high current density beams. There was almost no effort to produce higher - γ beams, or to improve (or even measure) the beam quality. (In fairness, I should concede that a justifiable motivation for some of the emphasis on high current density--small cross section--beams was the pellet fusion problem.)
- (6) This lack of interest in high γ , high quality (low θ) beams existed despite the likelihood that the poor coupling efficiencies observed

To: Dr. Godfrey

Page -3-

August 22, 1977

occasionally for very dense target plasmas were probably due to interactions occurring in the kinetic regime where they were subject to collisional quenching. In short, there was not much appreciation for the dividends which would accrue from improved beam quality.

(7) Finally, again from the point of view of relevance to a high density heating experiment, it seemed to me that there was a bit too much theoretical attention devoted to the slower, late-time, nonlinear homogeneous theory--and perhaps not enough attention devoted to effects of inhomogeneities, finite pulse time, and finite target size.

It is the above points which I tried to make in my AFOSR reports covering the 1972 - 1974 research period, and particularly in my talk at the Working Group on the Interaction Between Plasmas and Intense Laser and Electron Beams, at the International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy in August 1973, and in my paper⁷ at the 1973 Philadelphia APS meeting. This paper in turn was the basis of the enclosed notes which were written up for Dr. Drummond's 1974 Novosibirsk lecture. If this material has left the impression that we were only concerned with one-dimensional effects, or that we had not done any work on transverse interactions or gyroeffects, that was unintentional. It is just that there were larger points which I was trying to make without getting bogged down with subtleties, and the computer evidence on transverse interactions was still too preliminary for any definitive statements to be made.

During 1973 - 1974, I tried to promote interest in a beam heating experiment of a dense target plasma with the high - γ beam at the Aurora facility, Harry Diamond Laboratories, with the payoff to be a plasma radiation source. I first had a long battle to convince them that collisional stabilization of the beamplasma interaction could be avoided if the beam quality could be controlled. Then we performed a study for them which included a rough experimental design. We proposed to arrange $\gamma_{\rm B} (n_{\rm B}/n_{\rm p})^{1/3} \simeq 0.5$, with a strong magnetic guide field extended into the diode to give us a better chance of holding the angular scatter to $\theta_{\rm rms} \leq \gamma_{\rm B}^{-1} \simeq 2(n_{\rm B}/n_{\rm p})^{1/3}$. This experimental proposal ultimately floundered, not because of skepticism regarding beam heating, but because the expected pulse duration of the emitted radiation was somewhat longer than desired.

Next, let me touch briefly on my 1973 understanding of some of the transverse effects. First of all, for an infinite magnetic guide field, the hydrodynamical, electromagnetic dispersion relation is

$$0 = 1 - \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{\omega^{2}} - \frac{\omega_{B}^{2}}{\gamma_{B}^{3} (\omega - k_{z}\beta_{B}c)^{2}} + \frac{k_{\perp}^{2}c^{2}}{k_{z}^{2}c^{2} - \omega^{2}}$$

To: Dr. Godfrey

Page -4-

August 22, 1977

and the most unstable wave occurs for $k_{\perp} = 0$ (when allowed by infinite transverse boundaries) and is electrostatic. However, in a waveguide, the minimum allowable $k_{\perp} \sim (2.4/a)$, and stability can result if the wall radius is small enough that

this exceeds $\frac{\omega_p}{\gamma_B \beta_B c}$.

At the other extreme, when there is no magnetic field the hydrodynamical, electromagnetic dispersion relation is

$$0 = \left[1 - \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{\omega^{2}} - \frac{\omega_{B}^{2}}{\gamma_{B}^{3}(\omega - k_{z}\beta_{B}c)^{2}}\right] \left[\omega_{p}^{2} + \frac{\omega_{B}^{2}}{\gamma_{B}} + k^{2}c^{2} - \omega^{2}\right] - \frac{k_{L}^{2}\beta_{B}^{2}c^{2}\omega_{B}^{2}\omega_{p}^{2}}{\gamma_{B}^{\omega^{2}}(\omega - k_{z}\beta_{B}c)^{2}}$$

This is always unstable, and includes a longitudinal and a transverse regime, defined according to whether k_{\perp} is small or large. The longitudinal regime is electrostatic, while the transverse regime is electrostatic for large k_z and electromagnetic for small k_z . The case of $B_0 = 0$, $k_{\perp} \neq \infty$, $k_z \neq 0$ is sometimes referred to as the Weibel instability. Simulations showed that rather than transferring much beam energy, it tended to cause the beam to filiment in the transverse plane. The fastest growth for $B_0 = 0$ occurs for $k_z \simeq \omega_p/\beta_Bc$, where the mode is electrostatic, and the growth rate of this streaming interaction is

$$\Gamma \simeq \frac{3^{1/2}}{2^{4/3}} \frac{\omega_p}{\gamma_B} \left(\frac{n_B}{n_p} \right)^{1/3} \left[\frac{\gamma_B^2 k_{\perp}^2 + k_z^2}{k_{\perp}^2 + k_z^2} \right]^{1/3}$$

I usually define the longitudinal/transverse wave regimes via this expression. A transition region extends from $k_{\perp} = k_z/\gamma_B$ to $k_{\perp} = k_z$, with $k_{\perp} < k_z/\gamma_B$ being longitudinal and $k_{\perp} > k_z$ being transverse, and the middle region being a mixture.

Therefore, for an optimized interaction with $\gamma_B (n_B/n_p)^{1/3} \simeq 0.5$, I would expect the longitudinal wave regime to be characterized by $k_z \simeq \omega_p/c$ and $0 < k_{\perp} \leq k_z/\gamma_B \simeq 2(n_B/n_p)^{1/3} k_z$. Therefore, the "typical" case that you mentioned of $\leq 20^\circ$ angles in k-space could be within what I term the longitudinal regime unless $\gamma_B >> \cot 20^\circ \simeq 2.75$, while the strongly transverse regime corresponds to angles > 45°. Clearly, the large grey area invites semantic debate. In fact, I now suspect that some of our apparent differences during our phone conversation were merely semantic, since I find the above mentioned range of k_{\perp} cited in the very nice series of 1975-76 papers 8-13 which you sent me. Of course, in a





Page -5-

August 22, 1977

To: Dr. Godfrey

-

waveguide it is theoretically possibly for the lowest allowable value of $k_{\perp} \sim (2.4/a)$ to fall outside of $\frac{k_z}{\gamma_B} \simeq \frac{\omega_p}{\gamma_B \beta_B c}$, thus eliminating the longitudinal regime, but for

the problem of heating very dense plasmas this will not occur. In any case, it has always been clear that the eigenmode structure for a longitudinal interaction will necessarily have a non-zero k_{\perp} component, so that two dimensional computer simulations are necessary for a good mock-up of the physics. Nevertheless, one expects that the basic processes observed in the 1-D simulations (i.e., longitudinal trapping, etc.) would continue to dominate the longitudinal regime of 2-D simulations, and we and others confirmed this to be the case.

A more crucial question is what happens to the strongly transverse waves with $k_{\perp} > k_{\parallel}$, whose growth rate exceeds that of the longitudinal waves by $\gamma_B^{2/3}$. One might expect these modes to saturate at relatively low amplitudes due to transverse velocity scatter since k_{\perp} is large, and indeed, the Soviets (particularly Rudakov) made calculations of this. Then the question is whether the associated axial velocity spread due to this scattering would throw the coexisting longitudinal interaction into the kinetic regime. The answer was that for $\gamma_B (n_B/n_D)^{1/3} < 1$, it would not -- the longitudinal interaction would remain hydrodynamical. My own calculations tended to confirm these results, although admittedly, when $\gamma_p (n_B/n_p)^{1/3} \simeq 0.5$ for an optimum interaction, one might expect the hydrodynamic criterion to remain only marginally obeyed. My experience suggested to me that this would probably be good enough, although the proof of the pudding is in the 2-D simulations. Our own 2-D, $B_0 = 0$ simulations had just become available in 1973, and the preliminary results supported the above picture of the interaction, with continued longitudinal trapping, and with field amplitudes comparable to the 1-D prediction at the time of initial saturation of growth of the field amplitudes. Lampe, et al. reported similar preliminary results at the same 1973 APS meeting. This was essentially the state of affairs when I ceased active research on this problem. During our telephone conversation, I got the impression that perhaps subsequent 2-D simulations had led you to disavow the above described picture. However, in looking over the references⁸⁻¹³ that you sent, I find general agreement and even affirmation of these arguments in several places. Perhaps you could point out whether and where any disagreement remains.

Next, consider the questions of gyroeffects. For this problem of heating a very dense plasma with $n_p \ge 10^4 n_B$, technological limitations will insure that $\Omega_e << \omega_p$ for the target plasma, so the magnetic corrections may be neglected for the streaming interactions with the target plasma modes. However, the magnetic field will allow transverse beam cyclotron modes as well as the longitudinal beam plasma modes. We found that the $k_\perp + \infty$, $k_z + 0$ Weibel instability may be stabilized if $\Omega_e > \beta_B \gamma_B^{1/2} (n_B/n_p)^{1/2} \omega_p$. The more interesting case is the streaming interaction, where peak growth occurs in the electrostatic regime, for $k_z \simeq \omega_p/\beta_B c$. • The electrostatic dispersion relation, for $|\omega| >> \Omega_{o}$, is

$$0 = 1 - \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{\omega^{2}} - \frac{\omega_{B}^{2}k_{z}^{2}/k^{2}}{\gamma_{B}^{3}(\omega - k_{z}\beta_{B}c)^{2}} - \frac{\gamma_{B}^{\omega_{B}^{2}k_{\perp}^{2}}/k^{2}}{\gamma_{B}^{2}(\omega - k_{z}\beta_{B}c)^{2} - \Omega_{e}^{2}}$$

which yields the previously quoted growth rate when $B_0 \neq 0$. It may be seen that now beam-cyclotron modes coexist with the beam plasma modes, and each may interact with the background plasma mode. The beam-cyclotron interaction occupies the large-k₁, transverse region of phase space, where the beam gyroeffects modify the interaction from the above discussed case for $B_0 = 0$). When $(\Omega_e/\omega_p) << 0.5 \gamma_B^{2/3} (n_B/n_p)^{1/3}$, the gyroeffects only cause a slight slowing of the usual transverse interaction, but when 0.5 $\gamma_B^{2/3} (n_B/n_p)^{1/3} << \Omega_e/\omega_p << 1$, the transverse growth rate is slowed significantly to

$$\Gamma \simeq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{n_{\rm B}}{n_{\rm p}}\right)^{1/2} \frac{\omega_{\rm p}^{3/2}}{\Omega_{\rm p}^{1/2}}$$

for $k_{\perp} >> k_{z} \simeq \omega_{p}/\beta_{B}c$. (Here I should apologize for my use of the word "suppressed" on page 13 of the Novosibirsk notes. This is misleading, since the transverse interaction is not stabilized, but is only slowed by the gyroeffects, and it will still be faster than the usual longitudinal interaction unless the magnetic field is raised by an additional factor of $\gamma_R^{4/3}$.) The more relevant question is again the nonlinear saturation level of the transverse beam-cyclotron interaction, and whether or not it throws the coexisting longitudinal interaction into the kinetic regime. Our estimation was that the transverse wave saturation would be at or below the level occuring for $B_0 = 0$, since additional saturation mechanisms (e.g., finite kp - effects) are now available. Therefore we expected the longitudinal interaction to remain hydrodynamical under the previous condition that $\gamma_B (n_B/n_p)^{1/3}$ It was not clear to us in 1973 whether the modification in the interactions due to $B_0 \neq 0$ would have a net effect of increasing or decreasing the energy coupling effeciency from the beam, although we expected the change in either direction to be modest-to-small. (Any loss in transverse interaction coupling might be made up in a more efficient longitudinal interaction.) In any case, we again deferred to the computer simulation evidence, which consisted for us of only two or three 2-D, $B_0 \neq 0$ runs at that time. These indeed showed approximately the expected

To: Dr. Godfrey

Page -7-

August 22, 1977

amount of energy transfer by the initial nonlinear interaction, and continued to show the trapping dynamics associated with the longitudinal interaction. My own feeling was that the importance of the magnetic field was not likely to be associated so much with the way the cyclotron modes directly influenced the energy transfer, as with the way the field might improve the beam quality if it were carefully jesigned in the diode and injection regions.

During our telephone conversation, I got the impression that your conclusions regarding the magnetic field effects might differ from ours described above in two respects. First, I thought that you were claiming that in a parameter range recommended for a heating experiment, the transverse beam-cyclotron interaction itself was observed to stablize via beam trapping. However, after looking over your papers, I suspect that this was a misunderstanding and that you might agree with us that it is the coexisting longitudinal beam-plasma interaction with the background plasma mode which saturates by beam trapping. We have found that there are almost always other avenues for nonlinear saturation of the beam-cyclotron interaction which will enter prior to beam trapping.

The second possible difference is that I thought I understood you to say that the magnetic field had a very strong influence on the energy coupled out of the beam, and that there was an optimum magnetic field strength choice which would allow significant gains in the energy coupling efficiency over a non-optimum choice. However, in looking over one of your 1976 references¹², you seem to agree with our own preliminary conclusion that the beam energy loss is only weakly dependent on the magnitude of the magnetic field, if $\Omega_e < \omega_p$. Perhaps you could clarify whether subsequent simulations led you to change the view expressed in this paper, or whether there might again be semantic confusion over the adjective (strong, weak) attached to your observations.

Before leaving the topic of streaming interactions which involve magnetic field modes, let me mention two other areas not discussed above. First, when $\Omega_e << \omega_p$, there will be Whistler and electron cyclotron modes in the background plasma, in addition to the background plasma mode mentioned above, which are candidates for interaction with the beam-plasma and beam-cyclotron modes. The interaction between these and the beam-plasma mode will generally be stable for a high velocity beam, since the beam mode will then pass above the knee of the Whistler mode. However, the lower beam-cyclotron mode may be expected to intersect the Whistler at low frequency and long wavelength, where ion effects and electromagnetic effects are important. However, we tended to dismiss this interaction on the grounds of its being slower and probably less potent than the longitudinal beam-plasma/target-plasma mode interaction. We never detected it in our simulations; I wonder if you have?

Page -8-

August 22, 1977

To: Dr. Godfrey

The second area is the regime $\Omega_e >> \omega_p$, which I have not discussed in detail on the grounds of technological infeasibility, for target plasma densities above 10^{15} cm⁻³, or so. However, in looking over your reference on linear theory⁸, I noticed that there appeared to be an error in the analytical expression presented for the frequency and growth rate of the interaction between beam-plasma modes and background cyclotron modes in this parameter regime. This is the portion of your table I which contains δ_{+}^{T3} , in your Region 3, and the growth rate expression appears to be illustrated by curves drawn on your Figures 13 and 14. The problem is that your expression for the growth rate is independent of the magnetic field strength, whereas the growth should clearly vanish as $\Omega_e \to \infty$. The relevant terms in the electrostatic dispersion relation are

$$0 = 1 - \frac{\omega_{\rm p}^{2} \sin^{2}\theta}{\omega^{2} - \Omega^{2}} - \frac{\omega_{\rm B}^{2} \cos^{2}\theta}{\gamma_{\rm B}^{3} (\omega - k_{\rm z}\beta_{\rm B}c)^{2}}$$

where $\tan \theta = k_{\perp}/k_{z}$. In the regime $1 << \frac{\Omega_{e}}{\omega_{p}} << \frac{\gamma_{B}^{3/2}}{(n_{B}/n_{p})^{1/2}} \frac{\sin^{2}\theta}{\alpha r^{\theta}}$, the peak growth rate is approximately given by

$$\Gamma \simeq \frac{3^{1/2}}{2^{4/3}} \quad \frac{(n_{\rm B}/n_{\rm p})^{1/3}}{\gamma_{\rm B}} \quad \frac{\omega_{\rm p}^{4/3} \sin^{2/3} \theta \cos^{2/3} \theta}{(\Omega_{\rm p}^2 + \omega_{\rm p}^2 \sin^2 \theta)^{1/6}}$$

where $k_z \beta_B c \simeq (\Omega_e^2 + \omega_p^2 \sin^2 \theta)^{1/2}$. This growth rate is smaller than your expression, and is no longer symmetric about $\theta = 45^{\circ}$ in qualitative agreement with your plotted computer results. Other small corrections and angular dependence may be harvested if the small neglected terms in the electrostatic dispersion relation are reintroduced, or if electromagnetic corrections are recovered. However, this formula shows the major effect.

If the magnetic field is strengthened further, to the point

$$\frac{\Omega_{e}}{\omega_{p}} > \frac{\gamma_{B}^{3/2}}{(n_{p}/n_{p})^{1/2}} \frac{\sin^{2}\theta}{\cos\theta} >> 1$$

Page -9-

August 22, 1977

To: Dr. Godfrey

I

Toronto I

then (because of the increased relative significance of the splitting of the beam plasma modes) the interaction transits from the cubic regime to a slower quadratic regime, where

$$\Gamma \simeq \frac{1}{2} \frac{(n_{\rm B}/n_{\rm p})^{1/4}}{\gamma_{\rm B}^{3/4}} \frac{\omega_{\rm p}^{3/2} \sin \theta \, a s^{1/2} \theta}{\Omega_{\rm p}^{1/2}}$$

and peak growth occurs for $k_{z}\beta_{B}c \simeq (\Omega_{e}^{2} + \omega_{p}^{2}\sin^{2}\theta)^{1/2} + \frac{\omega_{B}\cos^{2}\theta}{\gamma_{B}^{3/2}}$.

This growth rate falls off with increasing B₀ somewhat more rapidly than in the cubic regime. (Of course, there will still exist the interaction between the beam plasma mode and the background plasma mode, with peak growth for $\theta = 0$ but finite growth for large θ , which will compete with this cyclotron mode interaction.) Unfortunately, you did not run Ω_e/ω_p high enough in your calculations for the paper that this flaw in your formula would have caught your attention.

I only point this correction out for academic reasons, since I believe this strong - B_0 regime to be irrelevant for the beam-heating problem of interest. (While I am at it, I presume you have noticed the 1/2 + 1/3 typo in the next-to-last paragraph of page 346.)

I had thought of elaborating on kinetic effects somewhat, but I think I will pass over that since this letter is already so long and we seem to be pretty much in agreement there anyway. Let me just wholeheartedly endorse any experimental efforts to improve the beam quality.

One final area where we might have some small quantitative differences is in the energy coupling efficiency to be expected. Back in 1973-74, there was fairly general agreement that efficiencies in the range of 20% - 30% were reasonable expectations for a wile range of beam energy and density ratios above \sim 10, and allowing some late-time nonlinear interactions--but not carrying this to extremes. Some of our own predictions are depicted graphically in the Novosibirsk notes, but the graphs should be interpreted with some care. I am intrigued by your statement over the telephone that $\sim 60\%$ coupling efficiency may be expected in the optimum case for target plasma heating at very high density ratios, like $n_n/n_B \sim 10^4$. I did not notice any coupling efficiencies that high in your references, and I would have guessed that it could only be achieved by going to low density ratios of \sim 10 or so, or by allowing the beam to coexist with the target for an extraordinary length of time (or space). I would be curious to hear if perhaps there is some recent evidence which gives you this confidence, and if the evidence is simulations, whether any have shown this result at the very high density ratios of interest.

To: Dr. Godfrey

Page -10-

August 22, 1977

Before closing, let me say that in giving all this discussion of my understanding of some aspects of this problem, I certainly did not mean to imply that I was telling you anything new, since I am well aware that you and many others have been down this same path. Rather, I sought to fill some of the gap of elaboration that you perceived in some of our earlier AFOSR reports. In fact, I claim no originality for any but the earliest non-relativistic work that I did, since the modus operandi for beam plasma work a few years ago was for ~ ten groups around the country to co-discover things more or less independently.

Let me also say that in dwelling on some areas of possible small differences in our work, I have probably misrepresented the dominant conclusion that struck me in comparing our work--which is the extraordinary extent to which we are in agreement. I certainly think that your careful exploration of two-dimensional effects and the many two-dimensional simulations were well worthwhile and represented a major advance in the field. I was particularly impressed with Les' paper surveying the experimental results. It seems to me that the evidence supporting the type of high - γ , high quality, beam heating experiment of very dense plasma targets which I fought for in vain is now well nigh overwhelming, and if I can endorse one of your proposals for such an experiment, I will be only too happy to do so.

If you do become actively involved in pursuing such an experiment, I would be interested to receive any reports which might be issued on it. I presently have no precise idea of the parameters which you have in mind, the experimental motivation (e.g., radiation source, fusion), and so forth.

Best regards,

Bob Thompson

James R. Thompson

JRT:tb

Enclosure: Report I-ARA-74-U-114

cc: Capt. Richard Gullickson Dr. Adam Drobot

LETTER REFERENCES

	1.	W.	Ε.	Drummond, et al., Phys. Fluids 13, 2422 (1970).
•				,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
	2.	J.	R.	Thompson, Phys. Fluids 14, 1532 (1971).
	3.	к.	w.	Gentle and C. W. Roberson, Phys. Fluids 14, 2780 (1971).
	4.	к.	w.	Gentle and J. Lohr, Phys. Rev. Lett. 30, 75 (1973).
	5.	ĸ.	w.	Gentle and J. Lohr, Phys. Fluids 16, 1464 (1973).
	6.	N.	G.	Matsiborko, et al., Plasma Phys. <u>14</u> , 591 (1972).
	7.	J.	R.	Thompson and A. T. Drobot, B.A.P.S. <u>18</u> , 1350 (1973).
	8.	в.	в.	Godfrey, et al., Phys. Fluids <u>18</u> , 346 (1975).
	9.	L.	E.	Thode and R. N. Sudan, Phys. Fluids <u>18</u> , 1552 (1975).
1	.0.	L.	E.	Thode and R. N. Sudan, Phys. Fluids <u>18</u> , 1564 (1975).
1	1.	L.	E.	Thode, Phys. Fluids 19, 305 (1976).
1	.2.	L.	E.	Thode and B. B. Godfrey, Phys. Fluids 19, 316 (1976).
1	.3.	L.	E.	Thode, Phys. Fluids <u>19</u> , 831 (1976).

l

[]

0

1

[]

[

Î

I

I

Ù

13

1

0

1

1

APPENDIX G

I

0

1

1

0

1

ł

1

R

1

1

1

G

SELF CONSISTENT EQUILIBRIA OF UNNEUTRALIZED RELATIVISTIC ELECTRON BEAMS

(Appendix G Contains 26 Pages)

In order to be able to exploit the powerful electron beams which technology has made available for a number of interesting applications, such as collective ion acceleration, it is first necessary to understand the equilibrium properties of the electron beam itself. The most fundamental question is to determine the conditions under which an equilibrium of forces can be arranged such that the electron beam may propagate in vacuum away from the diode into a drift tube in a grossly stable configuration. If such a force equilibrium is not achieved, the unneutralized electron beam will rapidly blow itself apart by the powerful self electromagnetic fields generated by its own space charge. A second objective of such an equilibrium analysis is to determine the self consistent radial profiles of all equilibrium quantities, including the electromagnetic fields and the number density and flow velocity of the electron beam. These equilibrium properties will in turn be needed to determine the linearized eigenmodes (or waves) which may be supported upon the electron beam.

Although one important application for this analysis is collective ion acceleration, the contribution of the

subject ions (to be accelerated) to this equilibrium is neglected in this calculation. The first reason for this is that for many accelerator configurations, the electron beam must propagate stably for some distance in vacuum prior to the introduction of ions, so that an analysis of pure electron beam equilibria is required. Second, the accelerator can operate in principal in the "test ion" regime, where the ion contributions to the equilibria and waves are truly negligible. Finally, it is anticipated that the highest density of ions which may be accelerated will still be much less dense than the electrons, so that the ion effects may be treated as a perturbation on the fields supported by the electron beam.

The electron equilibrium may be examined by considering the single particle equations of motion together with the Maxwell equations for the self-consistent electromagnetic fields.

$$\frac{d}{dt} \gamma \underline{\beta} = - \frac{e}{mc} (\underline{E} + \underline{\beta} \times \underline{B}) ; \qquad \frac{d}{dt} \underline{x} = \underline{\beta} c \qquad (1)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \underline{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{0} = \nabla \times \underline{\mathbf{E}} + \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \underline{\mathbf{B}}$$
(2)

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = -4\pi \mathbf{en} \tag{3}$$

$$\nabla \times \underline{B} = \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \underline{E} - 4\pi \mathrm{en} \underline{\beta}$$
 (4)

Here e = -|e|, m are the electron charge and mass, and $\underline{\beta}c$, $(\gamma - 1)mc^2$ are its velocity and kinetic energy. Since the single particle equations of motion (1) are the characteristics of the collisionless Vlasov equation, the equilibrium distribution function $f_o(\underline{x}, \underline{\beta})$ may be constructed from any constants of the single particle motion. We shall adopt a cold fluid model of the electron beam, in which the beam pressure is neglected, and n, $\underline{\beta}$ are the electron number density and flow velocity, which may in general be functions of x, t.

The existence of steady state beam equilibrium solutions is by no means guaranteed. The crucial condition is the balance of radial forces, which may be expressed as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \gamma \beta_{r} = \frac{e}{mc} \left\{ -E_{r} + \beta_{z}B_{\phi} - \beta_{\phi}B_{z} + \frac{mc^{2}}{e} \frac{\gamma \beta_{\phi}^{2}}{r} \right\} = 0$$
(5)

in the cylindrical coordinates r, ϕ , z. The basic assumptions are that the equilibrium is steady state $(\partial/\partial t = 0)$ and cylindrically symmetric $(\partial/\partial \phi = 0)$ throughout the vacuum waveguide. It is further assumed that there is a downstream region away from the beam diode, for which the equilibrium is approximately independent of axial position $(\partial/\partial z = 0)$. Practically speaking, this will be true even throughout an ion acceleration section of the waveguide, wherein the waves and ions are accelerated, if the z-variation in equilibrium quantities is small compared to the r-variation, and if the z-variation in equilibrium quantities is small (or adiabatic) compared to the z-variation in wave quantities, characterized by the axial wavelength.

The fields E_r and B_ϕ are the self-fields of the electron beam, determined in the downstream equilibrium region from the equations

$$\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}r E_{r} = -4\pi e n \qquad (6)$$

$$\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}r B_{\phi} = -4\pi e n \beta_z . \qquad (7)$$

It may be seen that both E_r and B_{ϕ} are negative, and that E_r is larger than B_{ϕ} in magnitude. Consequently there can be no equilibrium (in vacuum) for which $\beta_{\phi} = 0$, since the sum of the first two terms of equation (5) are always positive, evidencing a net outward force on the electrons. This net outward force must be overcome by the $-\beta_{\phi} B_z$ pinch force, without the final centrifugal force destroying the balance. Here B_z is presumed to be an externally generated magnetic guide field, which is slightly reduced by the beam's diamagnetic precession in ϕ according to

$$\frac{\partial B_z}{\partial r} = 4\pi e n \beta_{\phi}$$

(8)

If the fields E_r , B_{ϕ} , B_z are presumed to be known, equation (5) may be examined for the conditions which these fields must obey in order that equilibria exist for which $\beta_r = 0 = \frac{d}{dt} \beta_r$. This analysis is most easily accomplished in an inertial frame of reference for which β_z locally vanishes (notice that in general β_z will vary with r). In such a "beam" frame, the equilibrium condition (5) may be written as

$$\beta_{\phi}^{2} (1 - \beta_{\phi}^{2})^{-1/2} = \frac{e}{mc^{2}} rE_{r} + \frac{e}{mc^{2}} rB_{z} \beta_{\phi} . \qquad (9)$$

As a function of β_{ϕ} , the left-hand side of equation (9) increases monotonically from zero and diverges as β_{ϕ} approaches one, while the right-hand side is a linear function of β_{ϕ} (if the diamagnetic β_{ϕ} -dependence of B_z is ignored) with a positive slope and negative intercept at $\beta_{\phi} = 0$. There will obviously be two solutions if the functions intersect (i.e., two distinct equilibria) and no solutions if they do not.

A detailed algebraic analysis of equation (9) reveals the following necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of equilibria:

$$\frac{2 \overline{\omega_{PB}^2(r)}}{\Omega_B^2(r)} Q\left[\frac{-E_{rB}(r)}{B_z(r)}\right] \le 1$$
(10)

where

$$\frac{\overline{\omega_{PB}^{2}(r)}}{m_{PB}} \equiv -\frac{2 e E_{rB}(r)}{mr} = \frac{4\pi e^{2}}{m} \frac{1}{r^{2}} \int_{0}^{r^{2}} dr^{2} n_{B}(r^{2})$$

$$\Omega_{\rm B}({\bf r}) \equiv \frac{{\bf e}}{{\rm mc}} {\rm B}_{\rm Z}({\bf r})$$

$$Q(x) = \frac{\frac{1}{2} \left[1 - (1 + 8x^2)^{1/2}\right] + 2x^2}{4x \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(1 + 8x^2\right)^{1/2} - \frac{1}{2} - x^2\right]^{3/2}} \ge 1$$

and the function Q(x) is sketched in Figure (1) below.



Figure 1. Function Q(x)

Here E_{rB} and n_{B} are the radial electric field and the electron density as seen from the local beam frame, and $B_{z}(r)$ is the total axial magnetic field--including diamagnetic corrections.

Equation (10) immediately implies two necessary conditions for equilibrium. First is that the argument of $Q_r = \frac{E_{rB}}{B_z}$ must be less than one, which is obvious from equations (9) or (5) since otherwise the net forces are manifestly positive. Second, since $Q \ge 1$, the coefficient of Q in equation (10) must be less than one. This second condition ensures that the centrifugal forces do not destroy the equilibrium.

In order to express these two necessary criteria in terms of quantities observed in the laboratory frame of reference, it is necessary to make a Lorentz transformation, with the transformation velocity $c \beta_{z}(r)$. The results are

$$1 > \frac{-E_{r}(r)}{\gamma_{T}(r) B_{z}(r)} = \frac{\frac{1}{2} \frac{4\pi e^{2}}{mc} \frac{1}{r} \int_{0}^{r^{2}} dr^{2} n(r^{2})}{\gamma_{T}(r) \Omega_{B}(r)}$$
(11)

$$1 > \frac{2 \frac{4\pi e^2}{m} \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{-\gamma_{\rm T}(r) \Omega_{\rm B}^2(r)}^{r^2} dr^{-2} n(r^{-2})}{\gamma_{\rm T}(r) \Omega_{\rm B}^2(r)}$$
(12)

where $\gamma_{T}(r) = [1 - \beta_{Z}^{2}(r)]^{-1/2}$. Both conditions (11) and (12) must be obeyed for all r. Since the numerator of condition (11) increases roughly as r, while the denominator of (11) increases only weakly with r, condition (11) will be most stringent near the beam edge r = a. The numerator of condition (12) is roughly constant, while the

denominator increases weakly with r, so that condition (12) will be most stringent near the beam axis r = 0.

For virturally all cases of interest, both conditions (11) and (12) will be well satisfied and the equilibria may be readily analyzed in terms of the corresponding small parameters. In this case, the two equilibrium solutions for β_{ϕ} will be well separated; the "slow" equilibrium (for which β_{ϕ} is lowest) is the one desired for the accelerator applications.

In order to self-consistently compute the various equilibrium quantities, assumptions about the nature of the beam equilibrium are required, since many different equilibria are possible in general. It is most accurate to make these assumptions about the conditions of creation of the beam at the cathode, with conservation equations then utilized to complete determination of the equilibrium quantities in the downstream, z-independent region of the waveguide. In this way, the accessibility of the equilibrium is included in the calculation, which would not be the case if ad hoc assumptions were instead made about the downstream equilibrium.
Therefore, we shall assume that the electron beam is born at the cathode with $\beta_{\phi C} = 0$, $\gamma_C = 1$, and uniform current density $j_C = -ecn_O \beta_{OZ}$ throughout the initial beam radius a_O . The cathode is assumed to be at a uniform, negative electric potential $\Phi_C < 0$. The beam is assumed to flow from the cathode through a diode acceleration region where it is raised to ground potential $\Phi = 0$ and then injected into a cylindrical waveguide whose conducting walls are also at ground potential.

The initial beam properties which are assumed above may be related to the corresponding beam properties in the downstream, z-independent equilibrium through the use of three conservation equations. In this way, the chore of computing the actual beam trajectories all the way from the cathode to the downstream equilibrium region may be avoided.

The first equation is the conservation of canonical angular momentum, which follows from the assumption of azimuthal symmetry. It may be written as

$$\int_{0}^{r} dr^{2} B_{z0} = \int_{0}^{r^{2}} dr^{2} B_{z} - \frac{2 mc^{2}}{e} r \gamma \beta_{\phi}$$
(13)

0

where r_0 is the initial radius of an electron at radius r in the downstream equilibrium, and B_{ZO} is the external guide magnetic field in the cathode region, which is assumed to be known.

From the assumption that the equilibrium is steadystate in time, the continuity equation implies conservation of particles within annular rings:

$$n_0 \beta_{0Z} = n\beta_Z \frac{dr^2}{dr^2}$$
(14)

while the force equations imply an energy constant:

I

$$\gamma - \frac{e}{mc^2} \phi = 1 - \frac{e}{mc^2} \phi_C \equiv \gamma_0$$
(15)

where $(\gamma_0 - 1)mc^2$ is the final energy given to the electrons during acceleration within the diode region. For the case in which a foil anode is used, it may be considered to be held at ground potential $\Phi = 0$, so that γ_0 may be interpreted as the γ -factor of electrons at the instant that they penetrate the anode foil. However, the application of equation (15) is not restricted solely to the case of foil anode configurations.

Now the solution for the equilibrium may be obtained by iteration. Let us assume that

$$\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n} + \delta \mathbf{n} \tag{16}$$

$$\beta_{2} = \beta_{1} + \delta\beta_{2} \tag{17}$$

where n_c , β_c are the values of n, β_z at the center of the beam, and the ansatz is made that $|\delta n| << n_c$, $|\delta \beta_z| << \beta_c$. Next one may define

$$\Omega_{c} \equiv \frac{e B_{zc}}{\gamma_{c} mc}$$
(18)

$$\omega_{pc}^{2} \equiv \frac{4\pi e^{2} n_{c}}{m \gamma_{c}}$$
(19)

$$\varepsilon_{1} \equiv \left(\frac{\omega_{pc}^{2} a}{2 \gamma_{c} \Omega_{c} c}\right)^{2}$$
(20)

1

I

I

1

-

I

$$\varepsilon_2 \equiv \frac{2 \omega_{pc}^2}{\gamma_c^2 \Omega_c^2}$$
(21)

where $\gamma_c = (1 - \beta_c^2)^{-1/2}$ and it is assumed that $\varepsilon_1 << 1$, $\varepsilon_2 << 1$.

From equations (6) - (8) the electromagnetic field profiles are determined

$$B_{\phi} \simeq \beta_{c} E_{r} \simeq -2\pi e_{n} \beta_{c} r \qquad (22)$$

$$B_{z} \simeq B_{zc} \left(1 + \varepsilon_{1} \frac{r^{2}}{a^{2}}\right) \qquad (23)$$

and from equation (5) the equilibrium precessional velocity is determined

$$\beta_{\phi} \simeq \frac{\varepsilon_{1}^{1/2}}{\gamma_{c}} \frac{r}{a} \left[\frac{1 + \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_{2}}{1 + \varepsilon_{1} \frac{r^{2}}{a^{2}}} \right]$$
(24)

建物学

It is heuristically worthwhile to evaluate the necessary equilibrium conditions (11) and (12) at this point. To lowest order, condition (11) becomes

$$1 > \frac{-E_{rB}(a)}{B_{z}} \simeq \frac{\omega_{pc}^{2} a}{2 \gamma_{c} \Omega_{c} c} = \varepsilon_{1}^{1/2} \simeq \frac{I_{e}(kA)}{5 B_{z}(kG)a(cm)\gamma \beta_{z}}$$
(25)

and condition (12) becomes

$$1 > \frac{2 \omega_{pB}^2}{\Omega_B^2} \simeq \frac{2 \omega_{pC}^2}{\gamma_c^2 \Omega_c^2} = \varepsilon_2 \simeq \frac{I_e(kA)}{0.7 B_z^2(kG)a^2(cm)\gamma\beta_z}$$
(26)

- ----

-

1

where γ and β_z have not been subscripted in the final expressions since we have not yet taken account of their radial variations. It may later be seen that $\gamma \beta_z$ @ r = a is appropriate for condition (25) while $\gamma \beta_z$ @ r = 0 is appropriate for condition (26).

It is now apparent that $\varepsilon_1^{1/2}$, which reflects the first necessary condition for equilibrium, also

characterizes the strength of the axial diamagnetism (which varies as ε_1) and of the beam-frame precessional velocity $[\beta_{\phi B}(r=a) \approx \varepsilon_1^{1/2}]$. Likewise ε_2 , which reflects the second necessary condition for equilibrium, also characterizes the strength of centrifugal effects. Therefore, for the majority of cases where ε_1 and ε_2 are quite small, these complicating effects of diamagnetism, relativistic precession, and centrifugal effects may be treated as small corrections.

Concession of the local distance of the loca

If the diamagnetic corrections are neglected in equation (24), then $\beta_{\phi} \propto r$ and the electron beam precesses as a rigid body. Given the precessional velocity from equation (24), then r^2/r_0^2 may be determined from equation (13). One finds

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}r^2}{\mathrm{d}r_0^2} \approx \frac{\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ZO}}}{\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ZC}}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1 \frac{\mathrm{r}^2}{\mathrm{a}^2} \right)$$
(27)

 $\frac{a^2}{a_0^2} = \frac{B_{ZO}}{B_{ZC}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_2 - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_1 \right)$ (28)

where B_{20} is assumed to be uniform across the cathode surface. To lowest order, equation (13) implies that the electron beam propagates on magnetic flux surfaces; the small corrections due to the mechanical angular momentum acquired by the electrons are the $\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_2$ terms in equations (27) and (28).

From equation (14), the downstream equilibrium particle density may now be expressed as

$$n \approx \frac{n_{o} \beta_{oz} a^{2}}{a^{2}} \frac{\left[1 - \varepsilon_{1}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{r^{2}}{a^{2}}\right)\right]}{\beta_{z}} \qquad (29)$$

Finally, the radial dependence of γ may be determined from solving Poisson's equation in the downstream equilibrium region where the z-variation is negligible compared to the r-variation. The beam extends from r = 0 to r = a, with a vacuum gap from r = ato the conducting waveguide walls at r = b. The third conservation equation (15) may be used to define γ in terms of the electric potential Φ for all r in the range $0 \le r \le b$. Hence the boundary condition $\Phi(r = b) = 0$ is equivalent to $\gamma(r = b) = \gamma_0$. One thereby arrives at the following differential equation and boundary condition for $\gamma(r)$:

$$\frac{1}{r}\frac{d}{dr}r\frac{d\gamma}{dr} = \frac{4\pi e^2}{mc^2}n$$
(30)

$$\left(\gamma + \ln \frac{b}{a} r \frac{d\gamma}{dr}\right)_{r=a} = \gamma_0$$
(31)

where the Poisson equation has already been integrated through the vacuum gap to yield the modified boundary condition (31) at the beam edge. Equations (30) and (31) now determine the amount of γ -reduction (i.e., slowing) which the electron beam undergoes because of the space charge in the drift tube.

Equations (29) - (31) may be recognized as specifying the limiting current phenomena which we previously investigated in the limit of an infinite magnetic guide field (i.e., see Appendix C). In that limit however, $\varepsilon_1 \neq 0$, $\varepsilon_2 + 0$, $B_{zo} + B_{zc}$, $a + a_o$ and equation (29) is simplified considerably. In this previous limiting current calculation, the parameter space of γ_o and b/a was explored exhaustively for expressions which would accurately predict the limiting current threshold. However, for the present calculation we will assume that the application is such that operation of the electron beam diode near the limiting current threshold is not required. Then extreme precision as to the determination of the limiting current should not be necessary, and the first order iteration which we have begun should be of sufficient accuracy.

Inserting equation (29) into equation (30), with $\beta_z \simeq \beta_c$, one then obtains the results

$$\gamma(\mathbf{r}) \simeq \gamma_{c} + \Delta \gamma \frac{r^{2}}{a^{2}} \left[1 - \frac{1}{4} \epsilon_{1} \left(1 - \frac{r^{2}}{a^{2}} \right) \right]$$

$$\gamma_{c} + \Delta \gamma \frac{r^{2}}{a^{2}}$$
(32)

where

$$\gamma_{c} = \gamma_{0} - \frac{\nu}{\beta_{c}} \left(2 \ln \frac{b}{a} + 1 - \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_{1} \right)$$
(33)

 $\Delta \gamma = \frac{v}{\beta_{c}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{4} \epsilon_{1} \right)$

$$v \equiv \frac{\pi n_{o} e^{2} a_{o}^{2} \beta_{oz}}{mc^{2}} = \frac{I_{e}}{mc^{3}/e} = \frac{I_{e}}{17 \text{ kA}}$$
(34)

and we shall assume that

-

The second

T

1

$$1 \gg \frac{\Delta \gamma}{\gamma_{c}} = \frac{\nu \left(1 - \frac{1}{4} \epsilon_{1}\right)}{\gamma_{c} \beta_{c}} = \frac{\omega_{pc}^{2} a^{2}}{4c^{2}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{4} \epsilon_{1}\right)$$

$$=\frac{2 \varepsilon_1 \left(1 + \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_1\right)}{\varepsilon_2} \qquad (35)$$

Here condition (35) is imposed purely for theoretical simplicity, since a wide range of interesting practical applications are still possible which obey this restriction to moderate electron currents. Other cases could also be examined, but we shall not do so herein. If one is within the pencil beam regime, for which $\gamma_0^{2/3} \ll 1 + 2 \ln b/a$, then condition (35) is valid up to the limiting current threshold--as discussed below. Otherwise, condition (35) may still be valid if the beam current is sufficiently below the limiting current.

If equation (33) is solved for $\nu(\gamma_c)$, ν is found to have a maximum value when

$$\gamma_{c} \simeq \gamma_{0}^{1/3} - \frac{\varepsilon_{1L}}{6\left(2 \ln \frac{b}{a} + 1\right)} \equiv \gamma_{cL}$$
(36)

where ε_{1L} is ε_{1} evaluated for $\gamma_{c} = \gamma_{cL} \simeq \gamma_{0}^{1/3}$. The ε_{1L} correction in equation (36) reflects the γ_{c} dependence of ε_{1} in equation (33). We shall assume that

$$1 >> \frac{\varepsilon_{1L}}{2} \frac{\gamma_{o}^{2/3}}{2 \ln \frac{b}{a} + 1}$$
(37)

so that this correction is small. When $\gamma_c = \gamma_{cL}$, then $v = v_L = v_{max}$, and the corresponding maximum value of I_e is called I_L , the limiting current. It is the largest electron current which may be propagated within the drift tube, and is given by

$$I_{\rm L} \simeq \frac{(\gamma_{\rm O}^{2/3} - 1)^{3/2} \text{ mc}^{3/e}}{2 \ln \frac{b}{a} + 1 - \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_{\rm 1L}} \qquad (38)$$

Equations (36) and (38) are expressions of first order accuracy within the pencil beam regime for the limiting current parameters γ_{cL} and I_L , which reflect the finite magnetic field influence through the parameter ε_{1L} . In the infinite magnetic field limit, $\varepsilon_{1L} \neq 0$ and these expressions reduce to the usual pencil beam interpolation results. It may be noted that as the magnetic guide field is reduced, ε_{1L} increases, γ_{cL} decreases, and I_L increases--in qualitative agreement with some reported numerical simulations of this problem.

Using the expressions for β_{ϕ} and γ in equations (24) and (32), one may solve for β_z from $\beta_z = (1 - \gamma^{-2} - \beta_{\phi}^2)^{1/2}$. The result is

$$\beta_{z} \simeq \beta_{c} \left[1 + \left(\frac{\Delta \gamma}{\gamma_{c}^{3} \beta_{c}^{2}} - \frac{\varepsilon_{1}}{2 \gamma_{c}^{2} \beta_{c}^{2}} \right) \frac{r^{2}}{a^{2}} \right] , \qquad (39)$$

which exhibits the corrections to β_c . From condition (35) one may observe that the $\varepsilon_1/2 \gamma_c^2 \beta_c^2$ correction is smaller than the $\Delta \gamma/\gamma_c^3 \beta_c^2$ correction by a factor of $\frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_2$. Hence the dominant radial dependence of β_z derives from the space charge slowing, which affects the center electrons relatively more than those on the edge of the beam. The ansatz $1 >> |\delta\beta_z|/\beta_c \simeq \Delta \gamma/\gamma_c^3 \beta_c^2$ follows from the assumption $I_e << I_L$, but the ansatz may also be obeyed fairly well even when $I_e \leq I_L$.

If equation (39) is inserted in equation (29), an improved expression for the radial dependence of the beam density is obtained:

$$n \approx n_{c} \left[1 - \left(\frac{\Delta \gamma}{\gamma_{c}^{3} \beta_{c}^{2}} - \varepsilon_{1} - \frac{\varepsilon_{1}}{2 \gamma_{c}^{2} \beta_{c}^{2}} \right) \frac{r^{2}}{a^{2}} \right]$$
(40)

Again, our previous assumptions imply that the $\varepsilon_1/2 \gamma_C^2 \beta_C^2$ correction is smaller than the $\Delta \gamma / \gamma_C^3 \beta_C^2$ correction, and that the ansatz $1 >> |\delta n| / n_C$ is obeyed. However the relative size of the ε_1 diamagnetic correction and the $\Delta \gamma / \gamma_C^3 \beta_C^2$ space charge correction is not determined from the preceeding assumptions.

If the results from equations (39) and (40) are inserted into equations (6) and (7), improved expressions for the self-fields E_r and B_ϕ are obtained:

$$E_{r} \simeq -2\pi e n_{c} r \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\Delta \gamma}{\gamma_{c}^{3} \beta_{c}^{2}} - \varepsilon_{1} - \frac{\varepsilon_{1}}{2 \gamma_{c}^{2} \beta_{c}^{2}} \right) \frac{r^{2}}{a^{2}} \right]$$
(41)

(41)

$$B_{\phi} \simeq -2\pi e n_{c} \beta_{c} r \left[1 + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{1} \frac{r^{2}}{a^{2}}\right] \qquad (42)$$

Equation (23) for B_z is still correct to lowest order in the small parameters.

At this point, one could continue with a second major iterative cycle through the equations to obtain still higher order corrections. However, since we expect our various assumptions of smallness to be fairly well obeyed for most applications of interest, we will stop after listing one further updated expression for the equilibrium precessional velocity:

$$B_{\phi} \approx \frac{\varepsilon_{1}^{1/2}}{\gamma_{c}} \frac{r}{a} \left[\frac{1 + \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_{2}}{1 + \left(\frac{\Delta \gamma}{2 \gamma_{c}} \frac{\beta_{c}^{2}}{\beta_{c}} + \frac{\Delta \gamma}{\gamma_{c}}\right) \frac{r^{2}}{a^{2}}} \right] \qquad (43)$$

If the radial dependences herein derived are inserted into the necessary condition (11) for the existence of equilibria, there results

$$1 > \varepsilon_{1}^{1/2} \frac{r}{a} \left[1 - \frac{r^{2}}{a^{2}} \left(\frac{\Delta \gamma}{\gamma_{c}} + \frac{\Delta \gamma}{2 \gamma_{c}^{3} \beta_{c}^{2}} - \frac{\varepsilon_{1}}{4 \gamma_{c}^{2} \beta_{c}^{2}} \right) \right] \quad (44)$$

Since our previous assumptions insure that $[(\Delta \gamma / \gamma_{c}) + (\Delta \gamma / 2 \gamma_{c}^{3} \beta_{c}^{2}) - (\epsilon_{1} / 4 \gamma_{c}^{2} \beta_{c}^{2})] < \frac{1}{3}$, the right-hand side of equation (44) is largest at r = a as we previously hypothesized. The small correction terms to the zero order result $1 > \epsilon_{1}^{1/2}$ are only present because we chose to define ϵ_{1} in terms of on-axis quantities in equation (20).

Likewise, condition (12) is found to be most restrictive at the center of the beam, and it reduces simply to $1 > \epsilon_2$ since ϵ_2 was originally defined in terms of on-axis quantities.

APPENDIX H

I

1

I

I

[]

1

1

**

LINEAR THEORY OF COLLECTIVE WAVES SUPPORTED BY AN UNNEUTRALIZED RELATIVISTIC ELECTRON BEAM

(Appendix H Contains 34 Pages)

Among the important applications which have been suggested in recent years for high energy relativistic electron beams are the use of such beams as a medium for the collective acceleration of ions. An important subclass of these collective acceleration schemes are based upon the utilization of self-consistent collective eigenmodes, or waves, supported by the electron beam--within which waves, the subject ions are to be confined during the process of ion-wave acceleration. For example, the Auto-Resonant acceleration concept seeks to utilize the negative energy electron cyclotron wave, while the Converging Guide acceleration concept seeks to utilize the negative energy longitudinal plasma wave. We will examine herein the derivation of the dispersion relation for these waves, paying attention to certain effects of centrifugal forces, Coriolis forces, and longitudinal compression which are negligible when the electrons are ultrarelativistic (i.e., $\gamma_0^{-2} \ll 1$), but which must be retained for the case of lower energy electrons. Likewise, the effects due to an axial magnetic guide field of finite strength are retained in general, although these effects become negligible in the infinite magnetic field

limit which is often adopted when plasma waves are examined. The more general analysis which is presented here will permit an appraisal of the validity of the "ultrarelativistic" and the "infinite magnetic field" limits which are frequently taken, and will display the coupling effects between the plasma waves and the electron cyclotron waves.

The mathematical complications which arise within linear theory may be traced to the complications inherent in the equilibrium of such unneutralized relativistic electron beams. The self-fields E_r and B_{ϕ} of the electron beam combine to produce a net outward force $-e(E_r - \beta_z B_{\phi}) \approx$ $e \gamma_0^{-2} E_r$ acting upon the electrons, which can only be counterbalanced if the electrons have a precessional velocity $\beta_{\phi}c$ in an axial magnetic guide field, so that the magnetic pinch force $-e \beta_{\phi} B_z$, reduced somewhat by the outward centrifugal force $\gamma_0 mc^2 \beta_{\phi}^2/r$, restores the radial force equilibrium. This precession of the electrons in turn produces a diamagnetic reduction in the axial magnetic field within the beam, and slightly alters the radial distribution of the electrons relative to that at the cathode

before the precession is established. Finally, the injection of the electron beam into an evacuated waveguide is accompanied by some r-dependent slowing of the beam due to space charge forces. This produces a slight outward radial gradient to the axial beam velocity, and corresponding r-dependence for the beam density and relativistic γ -factor. All of the above mentioned effects produce complicated radial dependence in the beam density and velocity parameters, which in turn cause the self-fields E_r and B_{ϕ} and the diamagnetic correction to the axial magnetic field B_z to have complicated r-dependence.

.

(1)

These complicating features in the self-consistent equilibrium quantities produce a corresponding complication in the radial eigenvalue problem which must be solved to yield the linear wave dispersion relation. The extent of the complication is apparent from examining the linearized version of the relativistic force equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \gamma \underline{\beta} = - \frac{e}{mc} (\underline{E} + \underline{\beta} \times \underline{B})$$

where e = -|e|, m are the electron charge and mass, $\gamma_0 = (1 - \frac{\beta^2}{0})^{-1/2}$, $\frac{\beta}{0} = \beta_2 \hat{z} + \beta_{\phi} \hat{\phi}$ is the normalized, zero-order velocity vector of the electrons, and $\underline{E}_0 = \underline{E}_r \hat{r}$, $\underline{B}_0 = \underline{B}_z \hat{z} + \underline{B}_{\phi} \hat{\phi}$ are the zero-order electromagnetic fields. In zero-order (i.e., equilibrium), the radial component of the force equation (1) is

$$-\gamma_{o} \frac{c \beta_{\phi}^{2}}{r} = -\frac{e}{mc} \left(E_{r} - \beta_{z} B_{\phi} + \beta_{\phi} B_{z}\right)$$
(2)

while in first-order, the force equation may be written as

$$\underbrace{\tilde{\beta}}_{O} \left(\underbrace{\frac{d}{dt}}_{O} \gamma \right)_{O} + \underbrace{\beta}_{O} \left(\underbrace{\frac{d}{dt}}_{O} \gamma \right) + \widetilde{\gamma} \left(\underbrace{\frac{d}{dt}}_{B} \underbrace{\beta}_{O} + \gamma_{O} \left(\underbrace{\frac{d}{dt}}_{B} \underbrace{\beta}_{O} \right) =$$

$$-\frac{\mathbf{e}}{\mathbf{mc}}\left(\underline{\tilde{\mathbf{E}}}+\underline{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}\times\underline{\mathbf{B}}\right)+\beta_{0}\times\underline{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}\right)$$
(3)

where a tilde denotes first-order (i.e., wave) quantities. The \hat{r} , $\hat{\phi}$, and \hat{z} components of equation (3) are as follows:

$$\tilde{\gamma} \left(\frac{-e}{mc\gamma_{o}}\right) \begin{bmatrix} E_{r} - \beta_{z} B_{\phi} + \beta_{\phi} B_{z} \end{bmatrix} + \gamma_{o} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{c\beta_{\phi}}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + c\beta_{z} \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\right] \tilde{\beta}_{r}$$

$$-2\gamma_{O}c \frac{\beta_{\phi}\beta_{\phi}}{r} = \frac{-e}{mc} \left[\tilde{E}_{r} - \beta_{z}\tilde{B}_{\phi} + \tilde{\beta}_{\phi}B_{z} + \beta_{\phi}\tilde{B}_{z} - \tilde{\beta}_{z}B_{\phi}\right]$$

(4)

1

1

I

I

I

11

1

1

$$\beta_{\phi}\left(\frac{-e}{mc}\right)\left[\tilde{\beta}_{r}E_{r}+\beta_{\phi}\tilde{E}_{\phi}+\beta_{z}\tilde{E}_{z}\right]+\gamma_{o}\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t}+\frac{c\beta_{\phi}}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}+c\beta_{z}\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\right]\tilde{\beta}_{\phi}$$

+
$$\gamma_{o} \frac{c\beta_{\phi}}{r} \tilde{\beta}_{r} + \gamma_{o} c \tilde{\beta}_{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \beta_{\phi} = \frac{-e}{mc} [\tilde{E}_{\phi} - \tilde{\beta}_{r} B_{z} + \beta_{z} \tilde{B}_{r}]$$

(5)

$$\beta_{z}\left(\frac{-e}{mc}\right)\left[\tilde{\beta}_{r}E_{r}+\beta_{\phi}\tilde{E}_{\phi}+\beta_{z}\tilde{E}_{z}\right]+\gamma_{o}\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t}+\frac{c\beta_{\phi}}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}+c\beta_{z}\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\right]\tilde{\beta}_{z}$$

+
$$\gamma_{o}c \tilde{\beta}_{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \beta_{z} = \frac{-e}{mc} [\tilde{E}_{z} + \tilde{\beta}_{r} B_{\phi} - \beta_{\phi} \tilde{B}_{r}]$$
 (6)

Here, the downward pointing arrows indicate terms which are present because of the equilibrium precession of the beam, while the upward pointing arrows indicate terms which are present because of the self-fields of the beam equilibrium. There are seventeen such terms in these equations, all of which have complicated r-dependence and all of which are missing for the case of a charge- and current-neutralized beam, for an ultrarelativistic beam, or for a beam in an infinite magnetic guide field.

It is clear that the arrowed terms vanish individually for a neutralized beam. The ultrarelativistic limit may be taken formally by tending γ_0 , B_z , n (hence E_r , B_{ϕ}) to infinity in such a way that the ratio of any two such quantities remains finite. In this way, the relativistic plasma and cyclotron frequencies remain finite, but longitudinal mass terms and precessional terms, which vary as γ_0^{-3} , tend to zero. Thus the β_{ϕ} terms of equations (4) - (6) tend to zero and the remaining self-field terms cancel to with $0(\gamma_0^{-2})$ and may be omitted. One also finds that $\tilde{\beta}_z \propto \gamma_0^{-3} + 0$, so that there is no longitudinal beam compression in the ultrarelativistic limit.

For the infinite magnetic field limit, β_{ϕ} , $\tilde{\beta}_{r}$, and $\tilde{\beta}_{\phi}$ tend to zero as B_{z}^{-1} , and only the \hat{z} -equation (6) is required to relate $\tilde{\beta}_{z}$ to the perturbed wave fields. Hence the perturbed electron motion is strictly axial in this case, and longitudinal plasma waves are allowed. By comparison, in the ultrarelativistic limit, the perturbed electron motion is purely transverse, and electron cyclotron waves are allowed.

Although neither of these limits is appropriate in general, one can still define parameters ε_1 , ε_2 , and $\beta_{\phi}(a) \simeq \varepsilon_1^{1/2}/\gamma_0$ as in Appendix G, which are small for most cases of interest and thus simplify the theory. (Notice that each of these parameters would vanish within the ultrarelativistic limit, or within the infinite magnetic field limit.) Of the above three small parameters, the largest for many cases of interest is ε_2 , reflecting the centrifugal and Coriolis force effects. The parameters ε_1 and $\beta_{\phi}(a)$ represent effects of axial diamagnetism, $\beta_{\phi} \times \underline{B}$ forces, $\beta_{\phi} \tilde{n}$ current density sources, and relativistic beam-frame precession which have a relative magnitude of only a few

these latter effects, but retain the large ε_2 centrifugal effects within the linear theory. In addition, it is necessary to retain effects such as longitudinal compression which have a relative magnitude of γ_0^{-2} , and are not at all small for electron beams which are not ultrarelativistic.

Finally, there are the small parameters $\Delta\gamma/\gamma_c$ and $\Delta\gamma/\gamma_c^3\beta_c^2$, also discussed in Appendix G. These parameters reflect the radial variation in beam energy due to effects of space-charge slowing. They are small only if the electron beam current is well below the Alfvén-Lawson limits, which--fortunately--is often the case. Nevertheless, these corrections can sometimes be as large as ten percent or more, in which case they should be included in the analysis. In addition, these parameters do not formally vanish in either the ultrarelativistic or the infinite magnetic field limits, and they consequently have relevance for many accelerator applications. (In fact, for the converging guide accelerator these parameters may have to be appreciable in order for the plasma wave phase velocity to be somewhat low at the front of the accelerator.) However, because these effects produce

radial dependence which greatly complicates the mathematical eigenvalue problem within linear theory, we shall neglect them for the present calculation. This will allow the linear theory to be solved in terms of relatively simple eigenfunctions (i.e., Bessel functions), and will allow us to examine the modifications which arise due to the retention of the ε_2 and γ_0^{-2} terms which are omitted for ultrarelativistic beams. Also, the coupling between the plasma and cyclotron waves may be examined within such a calculation.

Elsewhere, the effects of the radial variation in γ on the electron cyclotron wave are considered within the ultrarelativistic limit in Appendix D, and the effects on the longitudinal plasma wave are considered within the infinite magnetic field limit in Appendix I.

The approximations discussed above for this linear theory calculation imply that the electron density n, the axial velocity $\beta_z c$, and the kinetic energy $(\gamma - 1)mc^2$ may be treated as constants with respect to r, as may be seen from the expressions derived in Appendix G. Hence we shall denote them as $n = n_0$, $\beta_z = \beta_0$, $\gamma = \gamma_0$. In addition we may let $\gamma_0 = (1 - \beta_0^2)^{-1/2}$ since the β_{ϕ} corrections

to γ_0 will be negligible under these approximations. Furthermore, the axial magnetic field B_z may be treated as uniform in r, and we may define the usual characteristic frequencies

$$\Omega \equiv \frac{e B_z}{\gamma_0 mc}$$
(7)

$$\omega_p^2 \equiv \frac{4\pi n e^2}{\gamma_0 m} , \qquad (8)$$

and the small parameters

1

I

1

$$\varepsilon_{1} \equiv \left(\frac{\omega_{p}^{2} a}{2 \gamma_{0} \Omega c}\right)^{2} << 1$$
(9)

$$\varepsilon_{2} \equiv \left(\frac{2 \omega_{p}^{2}}{\gamma_{o}^{2} \Omega^{2}}\right) << 1 \qquad .$$
 (10)

The equilibrium self-fields of the beam are then given by

$$B_{\phi} \simeq \beta_{o} E_{r} \simeq -2\pi e n_{o} \beta_{o} r \qquad (11)$$

and the equilibrium velocity of precession/c is

$$B_{\phi} \simeq \frac{\omega_p^2 \mathbf{r}}{2 \gamma_p^2 \Omega c} = \frac{\varepsilon_1^{1/2}}{\gamma_p} \frac{\mathbf{r}}{\mathbf{a}} \qquad (12)$$

Among the approximations invoked for this calculation are the orderings

$$\varepsilon_1 << \varepsilon_2 << 1$$
 (13)

1

1

and

$$\epsilon_1 << \beta_0(a) << \gamma_0^{-2}, 1$$
 (14a)

No assumption is invoked about the size of γ_0^{-2} , so that the calculation may be relevant even for a nonrelativistic beam. Assumption (14a) may also be written as

$$1 >> \gamma_{o} \varepsilon_{1}^{1/2} \simeq \gamma_{o}^{2} \beta_{\phi}(a) \simeq \left| \frac{E_{r}(a)}{B_{z}} \right|$$
 (14b)

There will exist some cases of interest for which condition (13) is fairly well obeyed, but condition (14) is not. However, for these cases, $\gamma_0^{-2} << 1$ and the violation of condition (14) merely means that the γ_0^{-2} effects are no larger than the neglected β_{ϕ} and ε_1 effects, and so the γ_0^{-2} effects should be neglected as well.

Returning again to the linear theory of waves supported by such an equilibrium, the force equations, continuity equation, and Maxwell's field equations are linearized and transformed with respect to the basis functions exp $i(l\phi + k_z - \omega t)$. It is convenient to define the following wave field variables

$$\mathbf{A}^{\dagger} \equiv \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\mathbf{r}} + \mathbf{i} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\phi} + \mathbf{i} \beta_{o} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\mathbf{r}} - \beta_{o} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\phi}$$
(15)

$$\mathbf{A}^{T} \equiv \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\mathbf{r}} - \mathbf{i} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\phi} - \mathbf{i} \beta_{\phi} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\mathbf{r}} - \beta_{\phi} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\phi} . \tag{16}$$

For this case in which β_0 is constant, Maxwell's equations imply the following pair of equations for A^{\pm}

$$\left(\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r} r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} - \frac{(\ell \pm 1)^2}{r^2} - k_z^2 + \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}\right) A^{\pm} =$$

$$-\frac{4\pi i\Delta\omega}{c^2} (\tilde{J}_r \pm i \tilde{J}_{\phi})$$

+
$$4\pi \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \mp \frac{\ell}{r}\right) \left(\tilde{\rho} - \frac{\beta_0}{c} \tilde{J}_z\right)$$
 (17)

where $\Delta \omega \equiv \omega - k_z \beta_0 c$ and $\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\underline{J}}$ are the beam charge and current density. In general, there will be boundary conditions at the conducting wall at r = b to ensure that \tilde{E}_z , \tilde{E}_{ϕ} , \tilde{B}_r vanish there, and in addition there must be jump conditions at the beam edge r = a to properly patch the beam interior field solutions to the vacuum gap field solutions. However, a great deal of this complexity may be avoided when the vacuum gap is narrow (i.e., $b - a \ll a$), since then only the beam interior solutions are required and the boundary conditions may be applied at the beam edge. We shall make this assumption, in which case the boundary conditions reduce to

$$(A^{+} - A^{-})_{r=a} = 0$$
(18)

$$\left[\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}r\left(A^{+}+A^{-}\right)\right]_{r=a} = 8\pi \left(\tilde{\rho}-\frac{\beta_{0}}{c}\tilde{J}_{z}\right)_{r=a}.$$
 (19)

From the variables A^{\pm} , the perturbed electric and magnetic fields are found as follows

I

I

I

1

1

again all the state of the state

#27.7

$$\tilde{E}_{z} = \frac{i}{2\left(k_{z} - \beta_{o} \frac{\omega}{c}\right)} \left[\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} r \left(A^{+} + A^{-}\right) + \frac{\ell}{r} \left(A^{+} - A^{-}\right) - 8\pi \left(\tilde{\rho} - \frac{\beta_{o}}{c} \tilde{J}_{z}\right)\right]$$
(20)

$$\tilde{E}_{r} = \frac{-1}{2\left(k_{z}\beta_{o} - \frac{\omega}{c}\right)} \left[2 \beta_{o} i \frac{\partial \tilde{E}_{z}}{\partial r} + \frac{\omega}{c} (A^{+} + A^{-})\right]$$
(21)

$$\tilde{E}_{\phi} = \frac{i}{2\left(k_{z}\beta_{o} - \frac{\omega}{c}\right)} \left[\frac{\omega}{c} \left(A^{+} - A^{-}\right) - \frac{2i\ell \beta_{o}}{r} \tilde{E}_{z}\right]$$
(22)

14

Perst h

$$\widetilde{B}_{z} = \frac{1}{2\left(k_{z}\beta_{0} - \frac{\omega}{c}\right)} \left[\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} r \left(A^{+} - A^{-}\right) + \frac{\ell}{r} \left(A^{+} + A^{-}\right)\right]$$
(23)

I

1

I

0

-

1

1

and the state of the

$$\tilde{B}_{r} = \frac{-1}{2\left(k_{z}\beta_{c} - \frac{\omega}{c}\right)} \left[i k_{z} (A^{+} - A^{-}) + \frac{2\ell}{r} \tilde{E}_{z}\right]$$
(24)

$$\tilde{B}_{\phi} = \frac{-1}{2\left(k_{z}\beta_{o} - \frac{\omega}{c}\right)} \left[2i\frac{\partial \tilde{E}_{z}}{\partial r} + k_{z}(A^{+} - A^{-})\right]$$
(25)

The perturbed beam charge and current densities are related to the perturbed velocities and number density as follows

$$\tilde{\rho} = -e \tilde{n}$$
(26)

$$\tilde{J}_{z} = -ec \left(\beta_{o}\tilde{n} + n_{o}\tilde{\beta}_{z}\right)$$
(27)

$$\tilde{J}_{r} = -ec n_{o} \tilde{\beta}_{r}$$
(28)

$$\tilde{J}_{\phi} = - ec \left(n_{O}\tilde{\beta}_{\phi} + \tilde{n}_{\phi}\beta_{\phi}\right) \simeq - ec n_{O}\tilde{\beta}_{\phi}$$
(29)

where the β_{ϕ} term in equation (29) is neglected according to the previously discussed approximation (14).

I

I

1

1

and the second

The force equations (4) - (6) simplify under our approximations to the form

$$i \frac{\delta \omega}{\Omega} \tilde{\beta}_{r} - \left(1 - \frac{2 c \beta_{\phi}}{r \Omega}\right) \tilde{\beta}_{\phi} = \frac{1}{B_{z}} \left(\tilde{E}_{r} - \beta_{o} \tilde{B}_{\phi}\right) = \frac{A^{+} + A^{-}}{2 B_{z}}$$
(30)

$$\left(1 - \frac{2 c \beta_{\phi}}{r \Omega}\right) \tilde{\beta}_{r} + \frac{i \delta \omega}{\Omega} \tilde{\beta}_{\phi} = \frac{1}{B_{z}} (\tilde{E}_{\phi} + \beta_{O} \tilde{B}_{r}) = \frac{A^{+} - A^{-}}{2i B_{z}}$$

$$i\delta\omega \tilde{\beta}_{z} = \frac{e}{\gamma_{o} mc} \left[\gamma_{o}^{-2} \tilde{E}_{z} - \beta_{\phi} (\tilde{B}_{r} + \beta_{o} \tilde{E}_{\phi})\right] \simeq \frac{e}{\gamma_{o}^{3} mc} \tilde{E}_{z}$$

(32)

Antonio alla della della

where approximation (14) is invoked to simplify equation (32), and $\delta \omega \equiv \omega - k_{z}\beta_{o}c - \frac{\ell\beta_{\phi}c}{r} = \Delta \omega - \ell \omega_{\phi}$. Here $\omega_{\phi} = \beta_{\phi}c/r = \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_{2} \Omega$ is the precessional frequency of the beam equilibrium.

Finally, the continuity equation is employed to relate \tilde{n} to $\underline{\tilde{\beta}}$ as follows

$$\widetilde{n} = n_{O} \left(\frac{k_{C}}{\delta \omega} \widetilde{\beta}_{z} + \frac{c}{i \delta \omega} \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} r \widetilde{\beta}_{r} + \frac{\ell c}{\delta \omega r} \widetilde{\beta}_{\phi} \right) . \quad (33)$$

It may be observed that the ε_2 effects are represented through the ϕ -portion of the convective derivative terms (i.e., $\ell \omega_{\phi} = \frac{1}{4} \ell \varepsilon_2 \Omega$) and through the centrigugal and Coriolis force terms in equations (30) and (31), which are the terms with coefficients $\frac{2}{r\Omega} \frac{c\beta_{\phi}}{r\Omega} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_2$. These latter effects may be conveniently retained by introducing the modified variables

$$\overline{B}_{z} \equiv B_{z} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{2}\right); \ \overline{\Omega} \equiv \Omega \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{2}\right)$$
(34)

1

$$i \frac{\delta \omega}{\overline{\Omega}} \tilde{\beta}_{r} - \tilde{\beta}_{\phi} = \frac{A^{+} + A^{-}}{2 B_{r}}$$
(35)

$$\tilde{\beta}_{r} + \frac{i\delta\omega}{\bar{\Omega}} \tilde{\beta}_{\phi} = \frac{A^{+} - A^{-}}{2i \bar{B}_{-}}$$
(36)

The source terms $\tilde{J}_r + i \tilde{J}_{\phi}$ in equation (17) require only $\tilde{\beta}_r$, $\tilde{\beta}_{\phi}$ which may be readily related to A^{\pm} via the \hat{r} , $\hat{\phi}$ force equations (35) and (36). However, the source terms $\tilde{\rho} - \frac{\beta_0}{c} \tilde{J}_z$ require $\gamma_0^{-2} \tilde{n} - n_0 \beta_0 \tilde{\beta}_z$, which couples the continuity equation and the \hat{z} force equation to Maxwell's equations.

From equations (28), (29), (35), and (36), one finds

$$-\frac{4\pi i \Delta \omega}{c^2} (\tilde{J}_r \pm i \tilde{J}_{\phi}) = \frac{\omega_p^2}{c^2} \frac{\Delta \omega}{\delta \omega \pm \bar{\Omega}} A^{\pm} . \qquad (37)$$

while from equations (20), (26), (27), (32), (33), (35), and (36), one finds that

$$8\pi\left(\tilde{\rho} - \frac{\beta_{o}}{c}\tilde{J}_{z}\right) = -2 T_{\varrho}\left\{\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}r\left[\frac{A^{+}}{1+\delta_{\varrho}} + \frac{A^{-}}{1-\delta_{\varrho}}\right]\right\}$$

$$+ \frac{\varrho}{r} \left[\frac{A^{+}}{1 + \delta_{\varrho}} - \frac{A^{-}}{1 - \delta_{\varrho}} \right]$$

$$+ \frac{\beta_{o}^{\ell}\omega_{\phi}}{k_{z}c - \beta_{o}\omega} \left[\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} r \left(A^{\dagger} + A^{-} \right) + \frac{\ell}{r} \left(A^{\dagger} - A^{-} \right) \right] \right\}$$

(38)

where

$$T_{g} \equiv \frac{\frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{2 \gamma_{o}^{2} \delta \omega^{2}}}{1 - \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{\gamma_{o}^{2} \delta \omega^{2}} \left(1 + \frac{\beta_{o}^{2} \omega_{\phi}}{k_{z}^{c} - \beta_{o} \omega}\right)}$$
(39)
$$\delta_{\ell} \equiv \frac{\delta \omega}{\overline{\Omega}}$$

One may now insert equations (37) and (38) for the selfconsistent beam source terms into the pair of equations (17) to obtain a pair of coupled, second-order differential equations for the wave field variables A^{\pm} . First however, it may be noted that the complicating effects associated with the $\ell \omega_{\phi}$ terms, which are present also in $\delta \omega$, δ_{ℓ} , and T_{ℓ} , will be removed for the important cases of $\ell = 0$ (i.e., ϕ -symmetric sausage modes or compressional modes) or $\omega_{\phi} = \frac{1}{4} \epsilon_2 \Omega \neq 0$ (e.g., the infinite magnetic field limit). When $\epsilon_2 << 1$, these ω_{ϕ} effects will tend to influence the plasma and cyclotron waves significantly only at large values of ℓ --where some fluting perturbations might be anticipated for the electron beam.

(40)

Let us briefly consider the infinite magnetic field limit, for which $\omega_{\phi} \neq 0$, $\delta \omega \neq \Delta \omega$, $\delta_{\ell} \neq 0$, $\tilde{J}_{r} \neq 0$, $\tilde{J}_{\phi} \neq 0$. In this limit, the pair of equations (17) may be expressed as

$$\left[\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}r\frac{\partial}{\partial r}-\frac{(\ell \pm 1)^2}{r^2}-k_z^2+\frac{\omega^2}{c^2}\right]A^{\pm}=$$
$$-T\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\mp\frac{\ell}{r}\right)\left[\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}r\left(A^{\pm}+A^{-}\right)+\frac{\ell}{r}\left(A^{\pm}-A^{-}\right)\right]$$

where

Г

$$\mathbf{T} \equiv \mathbf{T}_{\ell} (\omega_{\phi} \neq 0) = \mathbf{T}_{\ell=0} = \frac{\frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{2 \gamma_{o}^{2} \Delta \omega^{2}}}{1 - \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{\gamma_{o}^{2} \Delta \omega^{2}}} .$$
(42)

The boundary conditions (18) and (19) then become

$$(A^{+} - A^{-})_{r=a} = 0 = \left[\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} r (A^{+} + A^{-})\right]_{r=a} .$$
(43)

The pair of equations (41) may be put in the form

$$\left[(1+2T) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \quad \frac{1}{r} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \quad r - \frac{k^2}{r^2} - k_z^2 + \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}\right] (A^+ + A^-) = \frac{2k}{r} \left[-T \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1+T}{r} \right] (A^+ - A^-)$$

(44a)

(41)

1

1

1

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}r - (1+2T)\frac{\ell^2}{r^2} - k_z^2 + \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}\right](A^+ - A^-) = \frac{2\ell}{r}\left[T\frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1+T}{r}\right](A^+ + A^-)$$
(44b)

1

1

from which it is apparent that the modes decouple for l = 0, since then there is one equation and one outer boundary condition (in addition to regularity at r = 0) for each of the variables $A^+ + A^-$ and $A^+ - A^-$. Equation (44a) is seen to yield the longitudinal plasma wave dispersion in this case, while equation (44b) describes electromagnetic waves. To discover the decoupling which might occur for $l \neq 0$, one is led to define the variable

$$R \equiv \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} r (A^{+} + A^{-}) + \frac{\ell}{r} (A^{+} - A^{-})$$
(45)

since this combination appears on the right hand side of equation (41) and one also finds that $\tilde{E}_z \propto R$. Sure enough, the equations (44a) and (44b) imply that

$$\left[\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}r\frac{\partial}{\partial r}-\frac{\ell^2}{r^2}-\frac{k_z^2-\frac{\omega^2}{c^2}}{1+2T}\right]R=0$$
(46)

while the boundary conditions (43) imply that R(r = a) = 0. It follows that $R(r) = J_{\ell}(k_{\perp}r)$, where the dispersion relation is given by

$$\kappa_{\perp}^{2} = \left(\frac{\lambda_{\ell n}}{a}\right)^{2} = -\left(\kappa_{z}^{2} - \frac{\omega^{2}}{c^{2}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{\gamma_{o}^{2}\Delta\omega^{2}}\right)$$
(47)

and the λ_{ln} are the zeroes of $J_l(\lambda) = 0$ (e.g., $\lambda_{01} = 2.4$). Equation (47) is the desired dispersion relation for longitudinal plasma waves in the infinite magnetic field limit. One may also define a variable conjugate to R which may be shown from equations (44) to obey an equation which describes electromagnetic waves. However, we shall not explore these waves here.

The second case which we wish to examine in some detail is that of l = 0, ϕ -symmetric sausage modes or compressional modes of oscillation. This case is important for the applications of collective ion-wave acceleration since it is the l = 0 waves within which the ions are to be trapped and accelerated. For l = 0, it is again true that $\delta \omega + \Delta \omega$, and we shall employ the variables T and

$$\delta \equiv \delta_{\ell=0} = \frac{\Delta\omega}{\overline{\Omega}}$$

1

I

T

1

0

H

$$p_{\pm}^{2} = k_{z}^{2} - \frac{\omega^{2}}{c^{2}} + \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{c^{2}} \frac{\Delta\omega}{\Delta\omega \pm \overline{\Omega}}$$
(49)

If the sources of equations (37) and (38) are then inserted into equations (17) - (19), there results

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}r - p_{\pm}^{2}\right)A^{\pm} = -T\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}r\left(\frac{A^{+}}{1+\delta} + \frac{A^{-}}{1-\delta}\right)$$
(50)

$$(A^{+} - A^{-})_{r=a} = 0$$
 (51)

$$\left[\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}r\left(A^{+}+A^{-}\right)\right]_{r=a} = -2T\left[\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}r\left(\frac{A^{+}}{1+\delta}+\frac{A^{-}}{1-\delta}\right)\right]_{r=a}$$

(48)

The pair of equations (50) would be uncoupled in the ultrarelativistic limit where T vanishes, but otherwise they are coupled due to the γ_0^{-2} compressional effects. This coupled set of second order equations is equivalent to the following uncoupled pair of fourth order equations

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}r - \frac{P_{+}(1+\delta)(1-\delta+T)}{1-\delta^{2}+2T}\right]\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}r\right]$$

$$-\frac{p_{-}^{2}(1-\delta)(1+\delta+T)}{1-\delta^{2}+2T}\bigg]A^{\pm} = \frac{T^{2}p_{+}^{2}p_{-}^{2}(1-\delta^{2})}{(1-\delta^{2}+2T)^{2}}A^{\pm}$$

(53)

which may be solved in terms of Bessel functions since the coefficients are independent of r. If one makes the ansatz

$$A^{+} = \alpha_{1}^{+} J_{1}(k_{11}r) + \alpha_{2}^{+} J_{1}(k_{12}r)$$
(54)

$$A = \alpha_{1} J_{1}(k_{11}r) + \alpha_{2} J_{1}(k_{12}r)$$
(55)

then equation (53) reduces to a quadratic equation for k_{\perp}^2 which must be obeyed by both k_{\perp}^2 and k_{\perp}^2 , which are therefore the two roots of the quadratic:

I

I

1

$$\left[k_{\perp}^{2} + \frac{p_{+}^{2}(1+\delta)(1-\delta+T)}{1-\delta^{2}+2T}\right]\left[k_{\perp}^{2} + \frac{p_{-}^{2}(1-\delta)(1+\delta+T)}{1-\delta^{2}+2T}\right]$$

$$-\frac{T^2 p_+^2 p_-^2 (1 - \delta^2)}{(1 - \delta^2 + 2T)^2} = 0 \qquad . \tag{56}$$

If equations (54) and (55) are inserted into equations (50) and the boundary conditions (51) and (52), one finally arrives at the dispersion relation, which may be cast in the form

$$G_{1} \frac{k_{11}a J_{0}(k_{11}a)}{J_{1}(k_{11}a)} + G_{2} \frac{k_{12}a J_{0}(k_{12}a)}{J_{1}(k_{12}a)} = 0$$
(57)

where

$$G_{1} = \frac{\left(1 + \frac{2T}{1 + \delta}\right) + \left(1 + \frac{2T}{1 - \delta}\right) \left\{ \frac{\frac{T \quad p_{+}^{2}(1 - \delta)}{1 - \delta^{2} + 2T}}{\left[k_{\perp 1}^{2} + \frac{p_{-}^{2}(1 - \delta)(1 + \delta + T)}{1 - \delta^{2} + 2T}\right]\right\}}$$

$$G_{1} = \frac{1 - \left\{\frac{\frac{T \quad p_{+}^{2}(1 - \delta)}{1 - \delta^{2} + 2T}}{\left[k_{\perp 1}^{2} + \frac{p_{-}^{2}(1 - \delta)(1 + \delta + T)}{1 - \delta^{2} + 2T}\right]\right\}}$$

(58)

1

1

and

$$G_2 = -G_1 (k_{\perp 1}^2 + k_{\perp 2}^2) \qquad . \tag{59}$$

The familiar infinite magnetic field and ultrarelativistic limits correspond in this notation to $\delta \neq 0$ and $T \neq 0$, respectively. For an improved analysis which retains the effects of coupling between the cyclotron and plasma waves and yet exploits the smallness of the ε_2 parameter which characterizes the frequency separation of these two modes, one merely treats either δ or T as a small (but nonzero)

parameter--depending upon which mode is being examined. We conclude this calculation by considering the case of the negative energy cyclotron mode, for which we may anticipate that $\Delta \omega \simeq - \Omega$, hence $\delta \simeq -1$ and $T \simeq \frac{1}{4} \epsilon_2 << 1$. Now let k_{11}^2 be that solution of equation (56) which is near the zero of the first square bracket

I

I

I

1

1

$$k_{\perp 1}^{2} \simeq - \frac{p_{+}^{2}(1+\delta)(1-\delta+T)}{1-\delta^{2}+2T} + \dots \qquad (60)$$

and likewise $k_{\perp 2}^2$ will be the remaining solution which is near the zero of the second square bracket

$$k_{\perp 2}^{2} \simeq - \frac{p_{\perp}^{2}(1-\delta)(1+\delta+T)}{1-\delta^{2}+2T} + \dots \qquad (61)$$

Referring to equation (49), one notes that $p_+^2 < 0$ is associated with the negative energy cyclotron mode, and therefore $k_{11}^2 > 0$ and k_{11} will be the corresponding perpendicular wave number for that mode. Likewise, when

 $\Delta \omega \simeq - \Omega$, $p_{-}^2 > 0$ and thus $k_{12}^2 < 0$. Consequently, the Bessel functions in equation (57) of argument k_{12}^2 actually behave like the corresponding modified Bessel functions I_0 and I_1 of real arguments. Furthermore, for $|k_{12}a|^2 \simeq p_{-}^2a^2 \leq 1$, these Bessel functions may be expanded as

$$\frac{k_{12}a J_0(k_{12}a)}{J_1(k_{12}a)} \approx 2 - \frac{1}{4} k_{12}^2 a^2 \approx 2 + \frac{1}{4} p_2^2 a^2 . \quad (62)$$

The functions G_1 and G_2 may also be expanded for $\delta \simeq -1$, $|p_2^2/p_+^2| \ll 1$, T $\ll 1$ to yield

 $G_1 \approx 1$ (63)

 $G_2 \simeq 1 + T \left[1 + \frac{p_-^2}{p_+^2} \left(1 + \frac{T}{1 + \delta} \right) \right]$

so that the dispersion relation (57) becomes

$$\frac{k_{\perp 1}^{a} J_{0}(k_{\perp 1}^{a})}{J_{1}(k_{\perp 1}^{a})} \simeq -2\left\{1 + \frac{p_{\perp}^{2}a^{2}}{8} + T\left[1 + \frac{p_{\perp}^{2}}{p_{+}^{2}}\left(1 + \frac{T}{1+\delta}\right)\right]\right\} \simeq -2$$
(64)

Since the right hand side is approximately constant, equation (64) approximately determines the numerical value of k_{11}^{a} , and then equation (56) becomes the dispersion relation relating ω and k_{z} . The smallest solution of equation (64) is given by

I

1

Ш

$$k_{11}a \simeq 2.95 + \frac{1}{5.66} \left\{ \frac{p_{-}^2a^2}{4} + 2T \left[1 + \frac{p_{-}^2}{p_{+}^2} \left(1 + \frac{T}{1+\delta} \right) \right] \right\} \simeq 2.95$$

(65)

Finally, if equations (34), (42), (48), and (49) are inserted into equation (56), the dispersion relation for linear waves becomes

$$O = \left(\Omega^2 - \frac{2\omega_p^2}{\gamma_o^2}\right) (k^2 c^2 - \omega^2) \left[\Delta \omega^2 (k^2 c^2 - \omega^2)\right]$$

 $-\frac{\omega^2}{\gamma_0^2} (k_z^2 c^2 - \omega^2) \bigg]$

$$-\Delta\omega^{2} \left(\Delta\omega^{2} - \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{\gamma_{Q}^{2}}\right) (k^{2}c^{2} + \omega_{p}^{2} - \omega^{2})^{2}$$
(66)

1

where $k^2 = k_{11}^2 + k_z^2$ and $\Delta \omega = \omega - k_z \beta_c$. This dispersion relation contains eight waves: four light waves, two longitudinal plasma waves, and two cyclotron waves. If equation (66) is examined for the case of $\omega^2 << k_z^2 c^2 < k^2 c^2$ for which the four light waves are decoupled, it is quadradic in $\Delta \omega^2$, and the solution which represents the two cyclotron waves may be written as

$$\Delta \omega^{2} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{k^{4}c^{4} \left(\Omega^{2} - \frac{2\omega_{p}^{2}}{\gamma_{O}^{2}} \right)}{\left(k^{2}c^{2} + \omega_{p}^{2}\right)^{2}} + \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{\gamma_{O}^{2}} \right]$$

1

0

1

0

[

-

I

I

I

Π

1

1

[

-

$$+\frac{1}{2} \left\{ \left[\frac{k^{4}c^{4} \left(\Omega^{2} - \frac{2\omega^{2}}{\gamma^{2}}\right)}{\left(k^{2}c^{2} + \omega^{2}\right)^{2}} + \frac{\omega^{2}}{\gamma^{2}}\right] \right\}$$

$$-\frac{4\omega_{p}^{2}\left(\Omega^{2}-\frac{2\omega_{p}^{2}}{\gamma_{O}^{2}}\right)k^{2}k_{z}^{2}c^{4}}{\gamma_{O}^{2}\left(k^{2}c^{2}+\omega_{p}^{2}\right)^{2}}\right)^{1/2}}$$
(67)

2

$$2 \frac{\omega_{p}}{\gamma_{o}} \frac{\left(\Omega^{2} - \frac{2\omega_{p}^{2}}{\gamma_{o}^{2}}\right)^{1/2} kk_{z}c^{2}}{(k^{2}c^{2} + \omega_{p}^{2})} << \frac{k^{4}c^{4}\left(\Omega^{2} - \frac{2\omega_{p}^{2}}{\gamma_{o}^{2}}\right)}{(k^{2}c^{2} + \omega_{p}^{2})^{2}} + \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{\gamma_{o}^{2}}$$

(68)

an derer

CARA 2

. 7

one obtains

$$\Delta \omega^{2} \simeq \frac{k^{4}c^{4} \left(\Omega^{2} - \frac{2\omega^{2}}{\gamma_{0}^{2}}\right)}{\left(k^{2}c^{2} + \omega_{p}^{2}\right)^{2}} + \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{\gamma_{0}^{2}} \frac{k^{2}}{k^{2}} \qquad (69)$$

Finally, for $\omega_p^2 \ll k^2 c^2$, $\gamma_0^2 \Omega^2$ one obtains

$$\Delta \omega = \omega - k_{z} \beta_{o} c \simeq - \Omega \left[1 - \frac{\omega^{2}}{k^{2} c^{2}} - \frac{\omega^{2}}{\gamma_{o}^{2} \Omega^{2}} \left(1 - \frac{k^{2}}{2k^{2}} \right) \right]$$

(70)

1

1

as the dispersion relation for the negative energy cyclotron mode. Here the correction term $-\omega_p^2/\gamma_0^2\Omega^2$ is due to the centrifugal and Coriolis forces on the electrons, while the correction $+\omega_p^2k_{\perp}^2/2k^2\gamma_0^2\Omega^2$ is due to the longitudinal compression of the electrons which couples longitudinal plasma modes to the cyclotron modes through the T terms. The dispersion relation (70) is the starting point for all subsequent linear analysis which must be performed to examine the nature of the negative energy cyclotron waves.

Having developed a framework within which the linear mode analysis of cyclotron and plasma waves may proceed inclusive of coupling effects, we will conclude by reiterating that it is the smallness of the ε_1 and ε_2 parameters of equations (9) and (10) which validates the frequently adopted limits of "infinite magnetic fields" [wherein $\delta = 0(\varepsilon_2^{1/2}) << 1$ for plasma waves] or of "ultrarelativistic beams" [wherein T = 0 (ε_2) << 1 for cyclotron waves]. In addition, it is the orderings of conditions (13) and (14) and the neglect of $\Delta \gamma / \gamma_c$ effects which allow solution for the beam eigenfunctions in terms of Bessel functions.

APPENDIX I

[

1

1

I

I

1

1

1

0

1

LINEAR THEORY OF PLASMA WAVES SUPPORTED BY A RADIALLY VARYING ELECTRON BEAM IN A MAGNETIZED WAVEGUIDE

(Appendix I Contains 27 Pages)

. 43

The possibility of utilizing the negative energy, longitudinal plasma wave supported by an electron beam for collective ion acceleration (i.e., the converging guide accelerator) has been previously studied in some detail, but mainly in the limit of an infinite magnetic guide field and in the limit of pencil beam geometry, for which $\gamma_{0}^{2/3} << 1 + 2 \ln b/a$ [where $(\gamma_{0} - 1)mc^{2}$ is the injection energy of the beam electrons and b/a is the ratio of the radius of the conducting waveguide to that of the beam]. One of the difficulties encountered in these prior calculations [e.g., R. J. Briggs, Phys. Fluids 19, 1257 (1976)] is that the phase velocity of the plasma waves can only be made small (for loading the ions into the wave) by increasing the electron current extremely close to the limiting current which can be propagated without virtual cathode formation. It is of interest to explore whether these unfortunate results still hold for more realistic nonpencil beam geometries where the radial variation in the equilibrium quantities γ , β , n is significant.

For this analysis, we shall adopt the infinite magnetic field limit. Then the beam equilibrium calculation

will be just as described in the limiting current publication of Appendix C, to which the equilibrium analysis of Appendix G reduces in the limit $\varepsilon_1 \neq 0$, $\varepsilon_2 \neq 0$. To this equilibrium analysis we shall couple a linear theory calculation of the plasma waves, which differs from that in Appendix H in that we shall here focus on the $\Delta\gamma/\gamma_c$ effects and ignore the finite magnetic field effects.

We begin by reviewing the equations for the equilibrium quantities. For a steady state electron beam diode, two constants of the motion for electrons are

$$\gamma - \frac{e}{mc^2} \phi = \gamma_A = 1 - \frac{e}{mc^2} \phi_C$$
(1)

$$\beta_{T} = n_{A}(r) \beta_{A}$$
(2)

where - e, m are the charge and mass of the electrons, $(\gamma_A - 1)mc^2$ is the electron energy at the anode, $\beta_A c$ is the axial electron velocity at the anode, n_A is the electron number density at the anode, and $\Phi_c < 0$ is the electrostatic potential at the cathode. It is assumed that the anode is grounded electrically to the waveguide walls (i.e., $\Phi_A = 0$) and that the electrons are born at the cathode with zero energy (i.e., $\gamma_c = 1$). since Φ_c is an equipotential, γ_A must be independent of r, and to conform to prior notation we will let $\gamma_A = \gamma_0$, $\beta_A = \beta_0 =$ $(1 - \gamma_0^{-2})^{1/2}$. In principle, n_A may vary with r if a way is devised for the cathode to emit nonuniformly. Therefore we shall let $n_A = n_0 g(r)$, where n_0 is the mean density of the beam, such that

$$p \equiv \frac{\pi n_{o} e^{2} a^{2} \beta_{o}}{mc^{2}} = \frac{I_{e}}{mc^{3}/e} .$$
 (3)

Here a is the beam radius (constant for a uniform, infinite magnetic field), I is the electron current, and $mc^3/e = 17$ kA. Consequently, g(r) must have the normalization

$$1 = \frac{2}{a^2} \int_{0}^{a} dr r g(r)$$
 (4)

Finally, the radial profile for the equilibrium quantity $\gamma(r)$ is determined from the radial Poisson equation

subject to $\gamma(r \neq 0)$ being regular, and

1

$$\gamma(\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{b}) = \gamma_{\mathbf{c}} , \qquad (6)$$

and where $\beta_z = (1 - \gamma^{-2})^{1/2}$. Equations (5b) and (6) may be combined to yield the alternative boundary condition

$$\left(\gamma + \ln \frac{b}{a} r \frac{d\gamma}{dr}\right)_{r=a} = \gamma_{o} \qquad (7)$$

Techniques for the solution of these equations are discussed in Appendix C. In principle, equation (5a) determines $\gamma(\gamma_c, \nu, r/a)$, where $\gamma_c \equiv \gamma(r = 0)$. Then the boundary condition (7) determines $\gamma_0(\gamma_c, \nu, b/a)$, or equivalently $\nu(\gamma_c, \gamma_0, b/a)$. As a function of γ_c , ν has a peak value

 $v_L(\gamma_0, b/a)$ when $\gamma_c = \gamma_{cL}(\gamma_0, b/a)$. Several numerical solutions for $v(\gamma_c, \gamma_0, b/a)$ are illustrated in Figure 1, which may be compared with Figure 1 of Appendix C.

1

1

-

1

(10)

The condition of limiting current is $\partial v/\partial \gamma_c = 0$, which may be seen to correspond to the condition $\partial \gamma_0 / \partial \gamma_c = 0$, since $0 = \partial \gamma_0 / \partial \gamma_c + (\partial \gamma_0 / \partial v) (\partial v / \partial \gamma_c)$. From equation (7), this limiting current condition becomes

$$\frac{\partial \gamma_{o}}{\partial \gamma_{c}} = \left(\mathbf{T} + \ln \frac{\mathbf{b}}{\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{r} \frac{\partial \mathbf{T}}{\partial \mathbf{r}} \right)_{\mathbf{r}=\mathbf{a}} = 0$$
(8)

where the function $T = \frac{\partial \gamma(\gamma_c, \nu, r/a)}{\partial \gamma_c} = T(\gamma_c, \nu, r/a)$ is determined by differentiating equation (5a) to obtain

$$\frac{1}{r}\frac{d}{dr}r\frac{dT}{dr} = -\frac{4\nu g(r)}{\gamma^3 \beta_z^3}T$$
(9)

subject to the interior boundary conditon

$$T(r = 0) = 1$$
.



Appendix C describes how a scaled version of equations (5a), (7), (8), (9), and (10), using the dimensionless variable $y = vr^2/a^2$, may be used to achieve an efficient numerical solution for v_L , γ_O from any initial choice of γ_{cL} , b/a.

Consider now the equations for linearized waves, transformed with respect to the basis functions exp $i(\ell\theta + k_z z - \omega t)$. In the limit of an infinite magnetic guide field, it follows that $\beta_{\theta} = 0$ for the beam equilibrium and $\tilde{\beta}_r = 0 = \tilde{\beta}_{\theta}$ for the linearized waves. [Here a tilde denotes first order (i.e., wave) quantities]. Therefore, the vector potential components $\tilde{A}_r = \tilde{A}_{\theta} = 0$, and the Lorentz guage condition implies that $\tilde{A}_z = \frac{\omega}{k_z c} \tilde{\phi}$. As a result, the various wave field components may be obtained from the perturbed potential $\tilde{\phi}$ as follows:

$$\tilde{E}_{r} = -\frac{d\tilde{\Phi}}{dr}$$
(11)

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\theta} = -\frac{\mathbf{i}\ell}{\mathbf{r}} \,\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}} \tag{12}$$

$$\tilde{E}_{z} = i \left(\frac{\omega^{2} - k_{z}^{2} c^{2}}{k_{z} c^{2}} \right) \tilde{\Phi}$$
(13)

$$\tilde{B}_{r} = -\frac{\omega}{k_{z}c} \tilde{E}_{\theta} = \frac{\omega}{k_{z}c} \frac{i\ell}{r} \tilde{\Phi}$$
(14)

$$\tilde{B}_{\theta} = \frac{\omega}{k_z c} \tilde{E}_r = -\frac{\omega}{k_z c} \frac{d\tilde{\Phi}}{dr}$$
(15)

$$\tilde{B}_{z} = 0 \tag{16}$$

The perturbed axial equation of motion is

Į

IJ

1

ĺ

0

1

IJ

()

D

$$i \Delta \omega \tilde{\beta}_{z} = \frac{e}{mc} \frac{\tilde{E}}{\gamma^{3}}$$
 (17)

where $\Delta \omega \equiv \omega - k_{z} c_{z}^{\beta}(r)$. The perturbed continuity equation is

 $\Delta \omega \tilde{n} - k_z c n \tilde{\beta}_z = 0 \qquad (18)$

Using equations (13), (17), and (18) to relate the perturbed charge density $\tilde{\rho} = -e \tilde{n}$ to $\tilde{\Phi}$, the perturbed Poisson

equation may be cast in the form

$$\left\{\frac{1}{r}\frac{d}{dr}r\frac{d}{dr}-\frac{\ell^2}{r^2}+\left(k_z^2-\frac{\omega^2}{c^2}\right)\left[-1+\frac{4\nu g(r)c^2}{\gamma^3\beta_z\Delta\omega^2a^2}\right]\right\}\tilde{\Phi}=0.$$
(19)

It is understood that g(r) = 0 by definition in the vacuum gap region a < r \leq b. Equation (19) for $\tilde{\Phi}$ is subject to the boundary conditions that $\tilde{\Phi}(r \neq 0)$ be regular, and that

$$\tilde{\phi}(r = b) = 0$$
 (20)

so that \tilde{E}_{θ} , \tilde{E}_{z} , and \tilde{B}_{r} vanish at the conducting wall. In the same fashion that the alternative boundary condition (7) was derived for the equilibrium differential equation, we may combine an analytical solution to equation (19) for $\tilde{\Phi}$ in the vacuum gap with equation (20) to obtain the alternative boundary condition

$$\tilde{\phi} + \frac{1}{a\sqrt{k_z^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}}} \begin{bmatrix} K_{\ell}\left(a\sqrt{k_z^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}}\right) - \frac{K_{\ell}\left(b\sqrt{k_z^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}}\right)}{I_{\ell}\left(b\sqrt{k_z^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}}\right)} I_{\ell}\left(a\sqrt{k_z^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}}\right) \\ \frac{K_{\ell}\left(a\sqrt{k_z^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}}\right) - \frac{K_{\ell}\left(b\sqrt{k_z^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}}\right)}{I_{\ell}\left(b\sqrt{k_z^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}}\right)} I_{\ell}\left(a\sqrt{k_z^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}}\right)}{I_{\ell}\left(b\sqrt{k_z^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}}\right)} \end{bmatrix}$$

 $\times r \left. \frac{d\tilde{\phi}}{dr} \right\} = 0 \tag{21}$

where I_{ℓ} , K_{ℓ} are the usual modified Bessel functions of the first and second kind, and I_{ℓ} , K_{ℓ} are the derivatives of these functions with respect to their arguments.

It may also be shown that the solution to equation (19) for $\tilde{\Phi}$ which is regular near r = 0 must vary as $\tilde{\Phi} \propto r^{\ell}$. We will henceforth restrict attention to the case of $\ell = 0$, θ -symmetric plasma waves, since these eigenmodes are the ones that would be utilized for the collective

acceleration applications. For l = 0, without loss of generality we may assert the interior boundary condition

$$\Phi(r = 0) = 1$$
(22)

since only the shape of $\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{r})$ is determined from equations (19) and (21).

The r-dependence of the coefficients of equation (19) is generally quite complex, since the γ and β_z r-dependence generated by equations (5) - (7) appears not only through $1/\gamma^3\beta_z$, but also through $\Delta\omega$. In addition, g may have r-dependence. However, we shall first consider the special case in which all of this r-dependence is weak, since analytical expressions may then be developed for the eigenfunction $\tilde{\Phi}$ and for the plasma wave dispersion relation. Let us also consider the case for which b = a and $\gamma_o >> 1$, within the "fat beam limit," which is opposite to the "pencil beam limit" within which the previous analytical expressions were derived (e.g., by R. J. Briggs, <u>ibid</u>.). Let g(r) = 1 and $\nu << \nu_L$ so that the r-dependence of the

equilibrium is weak. From equations (5a) and (7), one finds

$$\gamma(\mathbf{r}) \simeq \gamma_{0} - \frac{v}{\beta_{k}} \left(1 - \frac{r^{2}}{a^{2}}\right)$$
 (23a)

where

$$\beta_{z}(r) \simeq \beta_{k}$$
 (23b)

to lowest order, and the value β_k about which we expand may be selected later for convenience. (For greatest accuracy, β_k should be the value of β_z at some intermediate value of r between 0 and a.)

Equation (19) may be put in the dimensionless form

$$\left[\frac{1}{R}\frac{d}{dR}R\frac{d}{dR} + k_{\perp}^{2}(R)a^{2}\right]\widetilde{\Phi}(R) = 0$$
(24)

where

$$k_{\perp}^{2}(R)a^{2} \equiv (1 - \beta_{\phi}^{2}) \left[-k_{z}^{2}a^{2} + \frac{4\nu}{\gamma^{3}\beta_{z}(\beta_{z} - \beta_{\phi})^{2}} \right]$$
(25)

 $R \equiv r/a$

 $\beta_{\phi} \equiv \omega/k_z c$

and the boundary conditions (21) and (22) become

 $\widetilde{\Phi}(R=0)=1$

(26a)

1

1

1

I

1

1

1

1

J

1

1

1

0

 $\widetilde{\Phi}(R=1)=0$

(26b)

Let $k_{\perp}^{2}(R) = k_{\perp 0}^{2} + \delta k_{\perp}^{2}(R)$ and $\tilde{\Phi}(R) = \tilde{\phi}^{(0)}(R) + \tilde{\phi}^{(1)}(R)$. Then the zero-order eigenfunction obeys

;

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{R} \frac{d}{dR} & \frac{d}{dR} + k_{\perp 0}^2 a^2 \end{bmatrix} \tilde{\phi}^{(0)}(R) = 0$$

 $\tilde{\Phi}^{(0)}(R=0)=1$

(27b)

(27a)

 $\tilde{\phi}^{(0)}(R=1)=0$

(27c)

whose solution is

11

$$\tilde{\Phi}^{(0)}(R) = J_0(k_{10}a R) = J_0(k_{10}r)$$
 (28)

where

-

J

11

$$k_{10}^{a} = \lambda_{on} = 2.4, \dots$$
 (29)

The first order eigenfunction must then obey

$$\left[\frac{1}{R}\frac{d}{dR}R\frac{d}{dR} + k_{\perp 0}^{2}a^{2}\right]\tilde{\Phi}^{(1)}(R) = -\delta k_{\perp}^{2}(R)a^{2}\tilde{\Phi}^{(0)}(R)$$

(30a)

$$\tilde{\Phi}^{(1)}(R=0) = 0$$
 (30b)

$$\tilde{\Phi}^{(1)}(R=1) = 0$$
 (30c)

The Rayleigh-Ritz procedure may be used to generate the dispersion relation for plasma waves, correct to first order, from equations (30):

$$0 = \int_{0}^{1} dR R \tilde{\Phi}^{(0)^{2}}(R) \delta k_{\perp}^{2}(R)$$

$$= \int_{0}^{1} dR R J_{0}^{2} (k_{10}a R) \left\{ (1 - \beta_{\phi}^{2}) \left[\frac{4\nu}{\gamma^{3}\beta_{2} (\beta_{2} - \beta_{\phi})^{2}} - k_{2}^{2}a^{2} \right] \right\}$$

$$-k_{\perp 0}^{2}a^{2}$$
(31)

Consequently, with $\beta_z \simeq \beta_k = \text{constant}$, the plasma wave dispersion relation may be written as

$$k_{\perp 0}^{2}a^{2} = \lambda_{on}^{2} = (1 - \beta_{\phi}^{2}) \left[\frac{4\nu}{\beta_{k}(\beta_{k} - \beta_{\phi})^{2}} \langle \gamma^{-3} \rangle - k_{z}^{2}a^{2} \right]$$

(32)

.

]

where

$$\langle \gamma^{-3} \rangle \equiv \frac{\int_{0}^{1} dR R J_{0}^{2} (k_{10}^{a} R) \gamma^{-3} (R)}{\int_{0}^{1} dR R J_{0}^{2} (k_{10}^{a} R)}$$
 (33)

Therefore, the weak r-dependence in the coefficient of equation (24) should be averaged over the zero-order eigenfunctions of the equation, to determine the dispersion relation. Let β_k now be chosen such that

$$\langle \gamma^{-3} \rangle = \gamma_k^{-3} = (1 - \beta_k^2)^{3/2}$$
 (34)

The dispersion relation (32) may be seen to agree with the result obtained in Appendix H, equation (47) if one identifies γ_k , β_k with the constant values γ_0 , β_0 of Appendix H. It is a quartic equation for β_{ϕ} as a function of k_z . If one expands for $\beta_{\phi} = \beta_k + \delta \beta_{\phi}$, $|\delta \beta_{\phi}| << \beta_k$, $(2\beta_k \gamma_k^2)^{-1}$, one obtains

$$\beta_{\phi} = \frac{\omega}{k_{c}z} \simeq \beta_{k} - \frac{2 v^{1/2}}{\gamma_{k}^{5/2} \beta_{k}^{1/2} a \sqrt{k_{\perp 0}^{2} + \gamma_{k}^{-2} k_{z}^{2}}} + \dots$$

(35)

where $\gamma_k = \gamma_0 - O(v)$, $\beta_k = \beta_0 - O(v)$, as determined from

equations (23), (33), and (34). The following features may be observed about the scaling of the plasma wave phase velocity in equation (35):

- (i) the phase velocity increases weakly as a function of k_z , although this increase will not be noticeable until k_z is larger than $\gamma_k k_{\pm 0}$;
- (ii) the phase velocity is lowest for the lowestk modes;
- (iii) as $\nu \neq 0$, $\beta_{\phi} \neq \beta_{k} \neq \beta_{o}$ so that the plasma wave phase velocity approaches the electron beam velocity;
 - (iv) as the electron current is increased from zero, the phase velocity decreases below the beam velocity, although throughout the regime $\nu/\nu_{\rm L} << 1$ of this approximation, the decrease is only a small correction to $\beta_{\rm k}$. Thus $\beta_{\phi}(\nu)$ will appear fairly flat near $\beta_{\phi} \simeq \beta_{\rm k}$ for $\nu << \nu_{\rm L}$.

Since the lowest phase velocities are realized in the long wavelength limit, let's consider the case of l = 0 and $k_z \neq 0$. We shall make the ansatz that β_{ϕ} remains bounded in this case, or that $\omega \neq 0$ as well. Then for g(r) and b/a arbitrary, equation (19) reduces to

$$\left[\frac{1}{r}\frac{d}{dr}r\frac{d}{dr}+\frac{4\nu g(r)(1-\beta_{\phi}^{2})}{\gamma^{3}\beta_{z}(\beta_{z}-\beta_{\phi})^{2}}\right]\tilde{\Phi}=0$$
(36)

while the boundary condition (21) reduces to

$$\left(\tilde{\Phi} + \ln \frac{b}{a} r \frac{d\tilde{\Phi}}{dr}\right)_{r=a} = 0$$
 (37)

and

-

I

I

$$\tilde{\Phi}(r=0) = 1$$
 . (38)

It is now apparent that as $\beta_{\phi} \neq 0$, equations (36) - (38) for $\tilde{\phi}$ approach the limiting current conditions (8) - (10)

for the variable T. Consequently, as $v \neq v_L$, the phase velocity must vanish for arbitrary choices of the density profile and b/a.

Finally, numerical solutions have been determined to equations (19) - (22), and typical results are illustrated in Figures 1 - 7 for cases with g(r) = 1 and $\ell = 0$. The equilibrium quantities $\gamma(r)$, $\beta_{z}(r)$ which appear in the coefficient of equation (19) are determined from a numerical solution to the equilibrium equations (5) - (7).

In Figure 2, the dispersion relation $\omega(k_z)$ is plotted for the lowest k_1 mode, for the case $\gamma_0 = 7$ and b/a = 1, but for three different choices of γ_c : (a) $\gamma_c >$ γ_{cL} , (b) $\gamma_c = \gamma_{cL}$, (c) $\gamma_c < \gamma_{cL}$. These three curves in Figure 2 may be correlated with the three points marked (a), (b), (c) on the corresponding $\nu(\gamma_c)$ curve in Figure 1. The predicted scaling of β_{ϕ} vs. k_z , ν may be observed. Equation (35) was also found to be quantitatively correct when $\nu << \nu_L$. The possibility of negative phase velocities for $\gamma_c < \gamma_{cL}$ is possibly associated with the transition to virtual cathode formation which is experimentally observed

Colored and



-

I

I

T



20

Non-want States South 18-13
to occur after ν has been raised to ν_L and γ_c reduced to γ_{cL} .

In Figures 3, 4, 5, and 6, the linear eigenfunctions $\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{r})$ are illustrated for the two smallest values of k_{\perp} and for two values of ν . For these figures, $\gamma_{0} = 7$, b/a = 1, and $k_{z} = 0$. It may be observed that the lowest- k_{\perp} modes have no interior nodes, while successively higher- k_{\perp} modes will have successively more nodes. The eigenfunctions for small values of current (i.e., $\nu < \nu_{L}$) are relatively broad, and exhibit the $J_{0}(k_{\perp}\mathbf{r})$ dependence, while the higher current eigenfunctions are more peaked near the beam axis.

Finally, in Figure 7, β_{ϕ} is plotted vs. $\nu/\nu_{\rm L}$ for two choices of $\gamma_{\rm O}$. For these data, $k_{\rm Z} = 0$ and the lowest $k_{\rm I}$ -mode is examined. The two end-points of such a plot are known to be independent of b/a, and the rest of the plot was also found to be remarkably insensitive to b/a for the modest values of b/a which were computed (i.e., $1 \le b/a \le 2$). Therefore, we are able to conclude from this study that the difficulty in lowering the plasma wave velocity seems to persist even in the fat beam regime where the radial variation in the equilibrium quantities γ , β_{γ} , n is significant. It















remains necessary to increase the electron current very near to the limiting current to achieve $\beta_{\phi} << \beta_{o}$.

and the second

I

Contradiction of the

APPENDIX J

I

-

I

I

0

ľ.

-

and the second s

THE EFFECTS OF FINITE THERMAL SPREAD ON THE ELECTRON CYCLOTRON BEAM MODES

(Appendix J Contains 16 Pages)

For a cold relativistic electron beam propagating with velocity $u \neq c$ along a magnetic guide field in the z-direction, the frequency ω of the electron cyclotron beam mode with wave number k_z is I

I

Calcing Street

.

$$\omega \approx k_z u - \Omega + \frac{p}{k^2 c^2}$$

where

$$k^{2} = k_{z}^{2} + k_{\perp}^{2} >> \frac{\omega^{2}}{c^{2}}$$

$$\frac{\frac{\omega^2}{p}}{k^2c^2} << 1$$

 Ω and ω_{p} are the relativistic electron cyclotron and plasma frequencies respectively. The perturbed electron perpendicular velocity v_{\perp} associated with the cyclotron beam mode is

$$v_{\perp} \propto \frac{1}{\omega - k_z v_z + \Omega}$$

Thus a thermal spread in v_z of magnitude Δv_z :

 $v_z \neq u + \Delta v_z$

such that

$$k_z \Delta v_z \sim \frac{\frac{\omega^2 \Omega}{p}}{k^2 c^2}$$

will modify the perturbed perpendicular velocities and hence the linear dispersion relation of the electron cyclotron beam mode for a cold beam.

A relativistic electron beam will acquire a thermal spread in v_z after passage through an anode foil. If the foil is thin enough, the scattering of the electron beam by the foil results in a negligibly small spread in energy but rotates the electron velocity vector in velocity space. A finite spread in propagation velocities occurs.

In this appendix, we investigate the effects of a finite thermal spread in v_z on the dispersion relation for the electron cyclotron beam mode.

Equilibrium

We consider a slab equilibrium of the electron beam, infinite in extent in the z- and y-directions and bounded by conducting walls at $x = \pm a$. The beam propagates along a magnetic guide field B in the z-direction.

The electron beam equilibrium is described by the equilibrium distribution function

$$f_{o}(\ell, P_{z}) = \begin{cases} D_{o}^{\delta}(\ell - \ell_{o}) g_{o}[P_{\perp}^{2}(\ell, P_{z})], P_{z} > 0\\ 0 & f_{z} < 0 \end{cases}$$

(1)

where \mathcal{E} and P_z are the energy and z-component of the canonical momentum respectively:

$$e = m\gamma c^2 - e\phi_0(x)$$

$$P_{z} = P_{z} - \frac{e}{c} A_{oz}(x)$$

$$\gamma = \left[1 + \frac{p^2}{m^2 c^2}\right]^{1/2}$$

and

-

I

I

Γ

1

10

$$g_{o}(p_{\perp}^{2}) = \exp\left(-\frac{p_{\perp}^{2}}{\hat{p}^{2}}\right)$$

$$P_{\perp}^{2}(e, P_{z}) = \frac{e^{2}}{c^{2}} - m^{2}c^{2} - P_{z}^{2}$$

 $\hat{p}^2 << m^2 \gamma^2 c^2$ is a measure of the thermal spread.

The equilibrium beam density is

 $N_{o} = \int d^{3}p f_{o}$

$$= 2\pi \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dP_z \int_{e_b}^{\infty} de \frac{(e + e\phi)}{c^2} f_c$$

where

$$e_{b}(P_{z}) = \left[\left(P_{z} + \frac{e}{c}A_{oz}\right)^{2}c^{2} + m^{2}c^{4}\right]^{1/2} - e\Phi_{o}$$

4

新加加加加加加

We restrict the discussion to the case of a low density ultrarelativistic electron beam where $\mathcal{E}_{0} >> e \Phi_{0}$, $e A_{0z}$. In this limit

$$N_{o} = \frac{2\pi D_{o} \gamma_{o}}{c} \int_{o}^{p_{o}} dP_{z} \exp\left[-\frac{(p_{o}^{2} - P_{z}^{2})}{p^{2}}\right]$$

$$\approx \frac{\pi D_{o} m\gamma_{o}}{P_{o}} \hat{p}^{2}$$
(2)

1

-

I

-

100500

where

$$p_0^2 = \frac{e^2}{c^2} - m^2 c^2 \implies \hat{p}^2$$

Equation (2) relates the normalization constant D_0 to the beam density N_0.

Similarly, the equilibrium current is

$$J_{oz} = -e \int d^3p \frac{p_z}{m\gamma} f_o z - e \frac{N_o p_o}{m\gamma_o}$$

From Maxwell's equations, the equilibrium electric potential Φ_0 and magnetic potential A_0 can be determined.

The equilibrium electron trajectories may be approximated by

$$p_{z}' \approx P_{z}$$

$$p_{x}' \approx p_{\perp} \cos \{\Omega(t' - t) + \psi\}$$

$$p_{y}' \approx p_{\perp} \sin \{\Omega(t' - t) + \psi\}$$

$$z' \approx z + \frac{p_{z}}{m\gamma} (t' - t)$$

$$x' - x \approx \frac{r_1}{m\gamma\Omega} [\sin \{\Omega(t' - t) + \psi\} - \sin \psi]$$

where

and the second

-

A.Sought

$$\Omega = \frac{e B_{oz}}{m \gamma c}$$

Dispersion Relation

Let the perturbed electromagnetic fields have the form

1

$$\underline{E}(\underline{r},t) + \underline{E}(x) \exp [-i\omega t + i k_z], etc.$$

The linearized perturbed distribution function is given by

$$f_{1}(\underline{p}, \mathbf{x}) = e \int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' \left[\underline{E}(\mathbf{x}') + \frac{\underline{p}_{\mathbf{x}}' \underline{B}(\mathbf{x}')}{m\gamma c} \right] \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial p'} \quad (3)$$

where the time integral is taken over the equilibrium trajectories.

Neglecting finite Larmor radius terms of order $(k_{\perp}^2 p_{\perp}^2)/(m^2\gamma^2\Omega^2) << 1,$

$$f_{1}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{x}) \approx \frac{e}{m\gamma} \frac{\partial f}{\partial e} \int d\mathbf{t}' \exp\left\{-i\omega(\mathbf{t}'-\mathbf{t}) + i\frac{\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{z}}\mathbf{P}}{m\gamma}(\mathbf{t}'-\mathbf{t})\right\}$$

$$\times \left[\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{P}_{\perp} \cos\left(\Omega(\mathbf{t}'-\mathbf{t}) + \psi\right)$$

$$+ \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{P}_{\perp} \sin\left(\Omega(\mathbf{t}'-\mathbf{t}) + \psi\right) + \dots$$

$$+ \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{z}}\left\{\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{x}) + (\mathbf{x}'-\mathbf{x})\frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \dots\right\}\right]$$

$$+ e\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{z}}} \int d\mathbf{t}' \exp\left\{-i\omega(\mathbf{t}'-\mathbf{t}) + i\frac{\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{z}}\mathbf{P}}{m\gamma}(\mathbf{t}'-\mathbf{t})\right\}$$

$$\times \left[\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{x}) + (\mathbf{x}'-\mathbf{x})\frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \dots$$

$$+ \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{i}}}{m\gamma} \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}) \cos\left(\Omega(\mathbf{t}'-\mathbf{t}) + \psi\right)$$

$$- \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{i}}}{m\gamma c} \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \sin\left(\Omega(\mathbf{t}'-\mathbf{t}) + \psi\right) + \dots$$

$$\left[\left(\frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} \right] \left(\frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{x}} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{$$

I

I

0

*

8

Art Walt

Salo A.

Souther St. S.

The perpendicular perturbed currents are

$$J^{\pm}(x) = -e \int d^{3}p f_{1} \frac{(p_{x} \pm i p_{y})}{m\gamma}$$

$$= -e \int_{0}^{2\pi} d\psi \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dP_{z} \int_{b}^{\infty} d\ell p_{1} e^{\pm i\psi} f_{1}$$
(5)

1

1

I

I

-

1

I

The electron cyclotron beam modes have frequency $\omega \sim (k_{z}P_{z})/(m\gamma) - \Omega$ so that

$$\frac{1}{\omega - \frac{k}{2}\frac{p}{m\gamma} + \Omega} >> \frac{1}{\omega - \frac{k}{2}\frac{p}{m\gamma}}$$

Substituting equation (4) for f_1 in equation (5),

$$J^{+} \simeq 2\pi i e^{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dP_{z} \int_{\varepsilon_{b}}^{\infty} d\varepsilon \frac{f_{o}(\varepsilon, P_{z})}{\left(\omega - \frac{k_{z}P_{z}}{m\gamma} + \Omega\right)}$$

1

-

-

T

$$\cdot \left[\mathbf{E}^{+} \left\{ 1 - \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\perp}^{2}(\boldsymbol{e},\mathbf{P}_{\perp})}{2 \mathbf{m}^{2} \mathbf{\gamma}^{2} \mathbf{c}^{2}} - \frac{\mathbf{k}_{\perp}^{2} \mathbf{c}^{2}}{\alpha \left(\omega - \frac{\mathbf{k}_{\perp}^{2} \mathbf{p}_{\perp}}{\mathbf{m} \mathbf{\gamma}} + \alpha \right)} \right] \right\}$$

+ i B⁺
$$\left\{ \frac{P_{z}}{m\gamma c} - \frac{P_{\perp}^{2}(\mathcal{E}, P_{z})}{2 m^{2}\gamma^{2}c^{2}} \frac{\left(k_{z}^{c} \Omega + \omega k_{z}^{c} - \frac{\omega^{2} P_{z}}{m\gamma c}\right)}{\Omega\left(\omega - \frac{k_{z}^{P}}{m\gamma} + \Omega\right)} \right\} \right]$$

$$\approx \frac{i \omega_{p}^{2}}{2\pi} \frac{p_{o}^{2}}{\hat{p}^{2}k_{z}c} \left[E^{+} \left\{ \left(1 + \frac{\omega}{k_{z}c} - \frac{\Delta}{\Omega}\right) \left[1 - e^{Q} Q E_{1}(Q)\right] - \left(\frac{\omega}{k_{z}c} - \frac{\Delta}{\Omega}\right) e^{Q} E_{1}(Q) \right\} - \left(\frac{\omega}{k_{z}c} - \frac{\Delta}{\Omega}\right) e^{Q} E_{1}(Q) \right\}$$

$$+ i B^{+} \left\{ \left(1 + \frac{\omega}{k_{z}c} \frac{(k_{z}c - \omega)}{\Omega} \right) \left[1 - e^{Q} Q E_{1}(Q) \right] - \frac{\omega}{k_{z}c} \frac{(k_{z}c - \omega)}{\Omega} e^{Q} E_{1}(Q) \right\} \right\}$$

$$= 10$$

Marine Straham

Test for

ALL STREET STREET

这些我们有些你就

$$\approx i \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{2\pi} \frac{p_{0}^{2}}{\hat{p}^{2}k_{z}^{c}} (E^{+} + i B^{+}) [1 - e^{Q} Q E_{1}(Q)]$$
(6)

1

1

Ì

I

1

1 march

1

1

1

No.

$$J \approx i \frac{\omega_p^2 (E - i B)}{4\pi (\omega - k_z c - \Omega)}$$
(7)

where

$$E^{\pm} = E_{x} \pm i E_{y}$$
$$B^{\pm} = B_{x} \pm i B_{y}$$
$$\frac{\partial E_{z}}{\partial x} = i k_{z}E^{+} - \frac{\omega}{c} B$$
$$\Delta = \omega + \Omega - k_{z}c$$

$$Q = \frac{2 p_0^2}{\hat{p}^2} \frac{\Delta}{k_z c}$$

and we have assumed that $\left|\frac{\omega}{k_z c}\right|$, $\left|\frac{\Delta}{\Omega}\right| << 1$. $E_1(\Omega)$ is the

exponential integral

I

I

I

1

And other a

In such

-

and the second

$$E_{1}(Q) = \int_{Q}^{\infty} \frac{d\phi \ e^{-\phi}}{\phi}$$
(8)

From Maxwell's equations

$$\frac{\partial^2 A^+}{\partial x^2} - \left(k_z^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}\right) A^+ \approx i \left(k_z c - \omega\right) \frac{4\pi}{c^2} J^+$$

$$\approx -\frac{2 p_0^2}{\hat{p}^2} \frac{\omega_p^2}{c^2} \frac{(k_z c - \omega)}{k_z c} \{1 - e^Q Q E_1(Q)\} A^+$$
(9)

$$\frac{\partial^2 A}{\partial x^2} - \left(k_z^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}\right) A^- \approx i(k_z c - \omega) \frac{4\pi}{c^2} J^-$$

$$\approx + \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} \frac{(k_c - \omega)}{(k_c - \omega + \Omega)} \mathbf{A}^-$$
(10)

53.75

where

$$A^{\pm} = E^{\pm} \pm i B^{\pm}$$

The solutions of these equations are

$$A^{+} = \alpha_{1} \sin \kappa^{+} x + \alpha_{2} \cos \kappa^{+} x$$

$$A = \beta_1 \sin \kappa x + \beta_2 \cos \kappa x$$

where

$$k^{+2} = -k_{z}^{2} + \frac{\omega^{2}}{c^{2}} + 2 \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{c^{2}} \frac{p_{o}^{2}}{\hat{p}^{2}} \frac{(k_{z}^{c} - \omega)}{k_{z}^{c}} \{1 - e^{Q} Q E_{1}(Q)\}$$
(11)

-

I

I

1

12

-

A DAMES

$$\kappa^{-2} = -k_{z}^{2} + \frac{\omega^{2}}{c^{2}} - \frac{\omega_{p}^{2}}{c^{2}} \frac{(k_{z} - \omega)}{(k_{z} - \omega + \Omega)}$$
(12)

The boundary conditions on A^{\pm} at $x = \pm a$ where the beam is bounded by conducting walls are

$$A^+ = A^-$$

Contraction of the

1

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{A}^{+}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}^{-}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = 0$$
(13)

For solutions antisymmetric in A^{\pm} , the dispersion relation is

$$\kappa^{\dagger} \cot \kappa^{\dagger} a + \kappa^{\dagger} \cot \kappa^{\dagger} a = 0$$
 (14)

If $\kappa^{-}a \ll 1$, $\kappa^{+}a \cot \kappa^{+}a \approx -1$, and $\kappa^{+}a \approx 2.03$, 4.91, The frequency ω is then given by equation (11). In terms of Q, the frequency ω is

$$\omega = k_{z}c - \Omega + \frac{Q \hat{p}^{2}}{2 p_{z}^{2}} k_{z}c$$

 $\equiv k_{z}^{c} - \Omega + \frac{Q \hat{v}^{2}}{2 c^{2}} k_{z}^{c}$ (15)

In the limit of Q >> 1,

$$E_1(Q) + \frac{e^{-Q}}{Q} \left[1 - \frac{1}{Q} + \frac{2}{Q^2} + ... \right]$$

and from equation (11),

$$Q \approx \frac{2 p_0^2}{\hat{p}^2} \frac{\omega_p^2}{(k^2 c^2 + \omega_p^2)} \frac{\Omega}{k_z c} - 2$$

1

The frequency ω is

$$\omega \approx k_{z}^{c} - \Omega + \frac{\omega^{2}}{k^{2}c^{2}} \Omega - \frac{\hat{v}^{2}}{c^{2}} k_{z}^{c}$$

where $k^2 = k_z^2 + \kappa^{+2} >> \frac{\omega^2}{c^2}$ and we have assumed that $\frac{\omega_z^2}{k^2 c^2} << 1$. We also require that $\frac{2 \omega_z^2}{k^2 \vartheta^2} \frac{\Omega}{k_z c} >> 1$ for validity of the asymptotic representation of $E_1(\Omega)$.

A finite thermal spread introduces a correction $\Delta \omega \simeq -\frac{\hat{v}^2}{c^2} k_z c$ to the frequency of the electron cyclotron beam mode.

As $\frac{\hat{v}^2}{c^2}$ increases, the magnitude of Q which solves equation (11) decreases. Q remains real and consequently ω is real. In the limit of $\frac{k^2\hat{v}^2}{\omega_p^2} \neq 2 \frac{\Omega}{k_z c}$, Q $\neq 0$ and the frequency $\omega \neq k_z c - \Omega$. The neglect of finite Larmor

radius effects in this discussion imposes the condition $\omega_p^2 << \Omega^2$.

-

In conclusion, if the thermal spread is low enough so that $\frac{k^2 \hat{v}^2}{\omega_p^2} < \frac{2\Omega}{k_z c}$ and finite Larmor radius effects can be neglected $(k_\perp^2 \hat{v}^2)/(\Omega^2) << 1$, the solutions of equation (11) for ω are real, and the electron cyclotron beam modes propagate undamped by thermal effects.