

Comment on “Rotation Velocities and Radial Electric Field in the Plasma Edge”

Robert W. Johnson*

Atlanta, GA 30238, USA

(Dated: April 25, 2019)

Abstract

The calculation presented in “Rotation Velocities and Radial Electric Field in the Plasma Edge” by W. M. Stacey [*Contrib. Plasma Phys.* **46** (2006)] contains an inconsistent treatment of the electrostatic potential. Comparing the expressions for the potential associated with the radial electrostatic field with that associated with the poloidal electrostatic field reveals the inconsistency. A field-theoretic perspective implies that the electrostatic field must vanish in a model based upon the physics of a neutral, conducting fluid.

PACS numbers: 28.52.-s, 52.30.Ex, 52.55.Fa

arXiv:0806.0792v1 [physics.plasm-ph] 4 Jun 2008

*rob.johnson@gatech.edu

The calculation presented in “Rotation Velocities and Radial Electric Field in the Plasma Edge” by W. M. Stacey [1] contains an inconsistent treatment of the electrostatic potential. Comparing the expressions for the potential associated with the radial electrostatic field with that associated with the poloidal electrostatic field reveals the inconsistency. A field-theoretic perspective implies that the electrostatic field must vanish in a model based upon the physics of a neutral, conducting fluid.

The Georgia Tech Fusion Research Center (GT-FRC) model of Reference [1] takes the radial electrostatic field from the equation of motion for arbitrary species s as

$$E_r = \frac{1}{n_s e_s} \frac{\partial p_s}{\partial r} + V_{\phi s} B_\theta - V_{\theta s} B_\phi, \quad (1)$$

where we drop the convective term as is standard practice in the field [2, 3, 4]. The usual evaluation of that equation from experimental measurements neglects any poloidal dependence; however, when the intrinsic variation of quantities induced by the geometry is considered [5], given in the large aspect ratio $\varepsilon \equiv r/R_0 \ll 1$, concentric circular $R_r \equiv R_0$ flux surface approximation $\mathbf{B} = (0, B_\theta, B_\phi)$ by

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}^0 / (1 + \varepsilon \cos \theta), \quad V_{\theta s} = V_{\theta s}^0 / (1 + \varepsilon \cos \theta), \quad V_{\phi s} = V_{\phi s}^0 (1 + \varepsilon \cos \theta), \quad n_s = n_s^0, \quad (2)$$

where $A^0 \equiv \langle A \rangle \equiv \oint d\theta (1 + \varepsilon \cos \theta) A / 2\pi$ is the flux-surface average of A . Using these values (r dependence implied), we find

$$E_r(\theta) = p'_s / n_s^0 e_s + V_{\phi s}^0 B_\theta^0 - V_{\theta s}^0 B_\phi^0 / (1 + \varepsilon \cos \theta)^2, \quad (3)$$

for species pressure $p'_s \equiv \partial n_s \mathcal{F}_s / \partial r$ and $kT_e \equiv \mathcal{F}_e$, thus $E_r(\theta) \neq E_r^0$. Expanding the denominator reveals a power series in $\varepsilon \cos \theta$, and as integration with respect to r does not affect the θ dependency, the potential associated with the radial electrostatic field may be written as a cosine series

$$\Phi_{E_r} = \Phi_{E_r}^0 + \Phi_{E_r}^1 \cos \theta + \Phi_{E_r}^2 \cos 2\theta + \dots, \quad (4)$$

where we note the explicit absence of any $\sin \theta$ dependence.

Turning now to the electrostatic potential appearing in the poloidal equation of motion, which since 1992 [6] has been expressed for $E_\theta \equiv \partial \Phi / r \partial \theta$ as

$$\Phi_{E_\theta} = \Phi_{E_\theta}^0(r) [1 + \Phi_{E_\theta}^c(r) \cos \theta + \Phi_{E_\theta}^s(r) \sin \theta], \quad (5)$$

where $\Phi_{E_\theta}^0(r) \equiv -\int_a^r dr E_r^0 \neq 0$ for a last closed flux surface at $r = a$, we note that the solution of the Fourier flux surface moments, defined by the expressions

$\langle A \rangle_{U,C,S} \equiv \oint d\theta \{1, \cos \theta, \sin \theta\} (1 + \varepsilon \cos \theta) A / 2\pi$, of the electron poloidal equation of motion, $F_e \partial n_e / r \partial \theta = -en_e E_\theta$ when other terms are assumed negligible at equilibrium, used to obtain the GT-FRC expressions relating the coefficients appearing in E_θ to the extrinsic variations of the electron density $\Phi_{E_\theta}^{c,s} = n_e^{c,s} T_e / e \Phi_{E_\theta}^0$, itself becomes inconsistent beyond zeroth order in ε [7] yet will be retained herein to maintain consistency with the article commented upon. The neglect of the $O(\varepsilon)$ terms in the system of equations indicates a solution valid only on the magnetic axis where $\varepsilon = 0$ for $R_0 \neq \infty$, yet the GT-FRC model commonly addresses the physics near the edge of the confinement region [1, 4]. With vanishing extrinsic poloidal dependence to the electron density, as in the paragraph above, the potential retains no explicit poloidal dependence. A $\sin \theta$ dependence to the electron density introduces a similar dependence in Φ_{E_θ} but not one in Φ_{E_r} , when the effect of radial dependence to the poloidal coefficients is neglected, as in the GT-FRC model. Thus, we conclude that the electrostatic potentials associated with the radial and poloidal components of the electrostatic field evaluated from the equation of motion by the GT-FRC model are inconsistent, $\Phi_{E_r} \neq \Phi_{E_\theta}$.

The root of the problem lies in the treatment of the radial and poloidal components of the electrostatic field as separate entities, when there is only one electrostatic potential from which both components may be calculated [8], stemming from the neoclassical prescription to relegate the defining relation for the electrostatic field, Gauss' law, to a position of subsidiary moment [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19], a procedure fraught with difficulties [7, 20]. For a model of confined plasma based on the physics of a neutral, conducting fluid, where neutrality is understood to hold down past the scale of the differential volume element defining the continuum quantities, the electrostatic field must vanish [21]. To support an electrostatic field within the medium, a neutral plasma must behave as a polarized dielectric along the component directions considered; however, the presence of currents in the poloidal plane driven by an applied toroidal electric field [7] counters such hypothesis. In summary, a consistent treatment of the electric field within a tokamak relies on the proper application of *all* of Maxwell's laws.

-
- [1] W. M. Stacey, *Contributions to Plasma Physics* **46**, 597 (2006), URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ctpp.200610050>.
- [2] W. M. Solomon, K. H. Burrell, R. Andre, L. R. Baylor, R. Budny, P. Gohil, R. J. Groebner, C. T. Holcomb, W. A. Houlberg, and M. R. Wade, *Phys. Plasmas* **13** (2006).
- [3] W. M. Stacey, R. W. Johnson, and J. Mandrekas, *Phys. Plasmas* **13** (2006), URL <http://link.aip.org/link/?PHPAEN/13/062508/1>.
- [4] W. M. Stacey and R. J. Groebner, *Physics of Plasmas* **15**, 012503 (pages 11) (2008), URL <http://link.aip.org/link/?PHP/15/012503/1>.
- [5] M. S. Chu, *private communication* (2007).
- [6] W. M. Stacey, *Physics of Fluids B: Plasma Physics* **4**, 3302 (1992), URL <http://link.aip.org/link/?PFB/4/3302/1>.
- [7] R. W. Johnson, *Phys. Rev. E* (2008), under consideration, URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/0803.0780>.
- [8] J. C. Maxwell, *Royal Society Transactions* **155** (1864).
- [9] D. L. Book, Tech. Rep. 3332, Naval Research Laboratory (1977), see National Technical Information Service Document No. ADA041545., URL <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1977nrl1..reptQ...B>.
- [10] S. I. Braginskii, in *Review of Plasma Physics*, edited by M. Leontovich (Consultants Bureau, New York, U.S.A., 1965), vol. 1 of *Review of Plasma Physics*, pp. 201–311.
- [11] F. F. Chen, *Introduction to Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion* (Springer, 1984), ISBN 0306413329.
- [12] R. Dendy, *Plasma Physics: an Introductory Course* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1993).
- [13] J. Wesson, *Tokamaks* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2004), 3rd ed.
- [14] A. Dinklage, T. Klinger, G. Marx, and L. Schweikhard, eds., *Plasma Physics: Confinement, Transport and Collective Effects* (Springer, 2005).
- [15] W. M. Stacey, *Fusion Plasma Physics* (Wiley-VCH, 2005).
- [16] M. G. Kivelson and C. T. Russell, *Introduction to Space Physics* (Cambridge University Press, 1995).

- [17] J. Büchner, C. T. Dum, and M. Scholer, eds., *Space Plasma Simulation* (Springer, 2003).
- [18] M.-B. Kallenrode, ed., *Space Physics: An Introduction to Plasmas and Particles in the Heliosphere and Magnetospheres* (Springer, 2004).
- [19] R. J. Goldston and P. H. Rutherford, *Introduction to Plasma Physics* (CRC Press, 1995).
- [20] R. W. Johnson, Phys. Rev. E (2008), under consideration, URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/0803.3283>.
- [21] D. Griffiths, *Introduction to Electrodynamics* (Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA, 1989), 2nd ed., ISBN 0-13-481367-7.