

# An ‘endpoint’ formulation for the calculation of electromagnetic radiation from charged particle motion

Clancy W. James,<sup>1</sup> Heino Falcke,<sup>1,2</sup> Tim Huege,<sup>3</sup> and Marianne Ludwig<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Astrophysics, IMAPP, Radboud University Nijmegen,  
P.O.Box 9010, 6500GL Nijmegen, The Netherlands*

<sup>2</sup>*ASTRON, Postbus 2, NL-7990AA Dwingeloo, the Netherlands*

<sup>3</sup>*Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, Institut für Kernphysik - Campus Nord, 76021 Karlsruhe, Germany*

<sup>4</sup>*Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik - Campus Süd, 76128 Karlsruhe, Germany*

We present a new methodology for calculating the electromagnetic radiation from accelerated charged particles. Our formulation — the ‘endpoint formulation’ — combines numerous results developed in the literature in relation to particular radiation processes using a complete, and completely general, treatment. We do this by describing particle motion via a series of discrete, instantaneous acceleration events, or ‘endpoints’, with each such event being treated as a source of emission. This method implicitly allows for particle creation/destruction, and is suited to direct numerical implementation in either the time- or frequency-domains. In this paper, we demonstrate the complete generality of our method for calculating the radiated field from charged particle motion, and show how it reduces to the classical named radiation processes such as synchrotron, Vavilov-Cherenkov, and transition radiation under appropriate limits. Using this formulation, we are immediately able to answer outstanding questions regarding the phenomenology of radio emission from ultra-high-energy particle interactions in both the Earth’s atmosphere and the Moon. In particular, our formulation makes it apparent that the dominant emission component of the Askaryan Effect (coherent radio-wave radiation from high-energy particle cascades in dense media) comes from coherent ‘bremsstrahlung’ from particle acceleration, rather than coherent Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation.

PACS numbers: 02.70.-c, 41.60.-m, 41.60.Ap, 41.60.Bq, 41.60.Dk

## I. INTRODUCTION

Electromagnetic radiation arising from charged particle motion at scales outside the quantum-mechanical limit can be described completely from Maxwell’s equations and the distribution of charges and their accelerations<sup>1</sup>. Most university courses begin with these fundamental relations, proceed to intermediate results such as the Liénard-Wiechert potentials and/or the Larmor formula for the power radiated from an accelerated charge, and use these to derive the properties of classical named radiation processes such as synchrotron, transition, and Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation where an (at least semi-) analytic solution can be found. This approach leads to a greater understanding of both radiation phenomenology, such as relativistic beaming, and of those physical situations where the rather special assumptions on the particle motion required to find an analytic solution apply.

The focus on classical named radiation processes however can leave the impression that these are the fundamental mechanisms of electromagnetically radiating systems, whereas they are really short-hand for a type of charged particle acceleration which results in a particular radiation field. Because of this focus, there is a tendency among physicists to ascribe the radiation

from complex systems to a combination of these classical processes. This tendency can lead to confusion however even when a physical situation deviates only slightly from the classical idealised cases. For instance, consider the titles of the following papers: “Synchrotron radiation of charged particles passing through the boundary between two media” [2], “On the Čerenkov threshold associated with synchrotron radiation in a dielectric medium” [3], and “Čerenkov radiation from an Electron Traveling in a Circle through a Dielectric Medium” [4]. The titles could equally have referred to ‘transition radiation’, ‘Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation’, and ‘synchrotron radiation’ respectively. Indeed, numerous papers exist which note that the same fundamental physics can explain multiple mechanisms, for instance Schwinger, Tsai and Erber’s “Classical and Quantum Theory of Synergetic Synchrotron-Čerenkov Radiation” [5]. However, the problem of which mechanism to attribute to what process can be avoided entirely by going ‘back to basics’ and formulating a general description of radiation processes according to the well-known mantra “electromagnetic radiation comes from accelerated charges”.

The goal of this paper is therefore to develop a new methodology — the ‘endpoint formulation’ — by which the calculation of the radiated fields from charged particle motion can be performed completely generally via a method which is intuitively understandable at an undergraduate level. For generality, our formulation must be equally suited to that of a simple system allowing an analytic solution as to a complex one requiring a numerical solution, and allow not just the calculation of the

<sup>1</sup> For a review of radiating, non-accelerated systems, see Ginzburg [1]. Our treatment will also allow for ‘apparent acceleration’, e.g. in the case of transition radiation.

total radiated power, but also the time- and frequency-dependent electric field strengths.

We thus proceed as follows. In Section II, we begin with expressions for the electric field from the well-known Liénard-Wiechert potentials, and use these to develop our formulation, which is based on the radiation from the instantaneous acceleration of a particle from/to rest (an ‘endpoint’). Given the radiation from a single endpoint, we describe how to use this to calculate the radiation from an arbitrary complex physical situation. In Section III, we use the endpoint formulation in specific applications to numerically reproduce the well-known results from idealised classical phenomena such as synchrotron and transition radiation, and Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation from finite particle tracks<sup>2</sup>. Section IV discusses the use and range of applicability of our endpoint formulation. In Section V, we return to the original motivation for this work from the point of view of the authors, and demonstrate how this formulation trivially resolves outstanding questions relating to the calculation of radiation from high-energy particles cascades in the Moon and the Earth’s atmosphere. The explanations also serve to illustrate how the application of classical radiation emission mechanisms to complex physical situations has led to incorrect and misunderstood conclusions.

## II. AN ENDPOINT FORMULATION

We wish to describe electromagnetic radiation in terms of particle acceleration. Rather than write down a general function for the charged particle distribution and its time derivatives, and then derive results for specific cases of that charge distribution, here we adopt a ‘bottom-up’ approach. Thus we begin by describing the radiation from a simple single radiating unit, that being the instantaneous acceleration of a charged particle either to or from rest, and later we will show how to combine such basic units into more complex physical situations.

Radiation from an instantaneous particle acceleration is known best through Larmor’s formula and its relativistic generalisation, which gives the total power radiated per unit frequency and solid angle. In the interest of clarity, and because we wish to preserve phase information, we proceed below to re-derive the emitted radiation in terms of the electric-field in the time- and frequency-domains. By beginning with the Liénard-Wiechert potentials only, we hope to emphasise the generality of our result.

### A. The Liénard-Wiechert approach

The electric fields resulting from charged particle motion can be intuitively understood from the Liénard-Wiechert potentials, which are derived directly from Maxwell’s equations in the relativistic case (see e.g. Jackson [6]), and reproduced below:

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(\vec{x}, t) &= \left[ \frac{e}{(1 - n\vec{\beta} \cdot \vec{r})R} \right] \\ \vec{A}(\vec{x}, t) &= \left[ \frac{e\vec{\beta}}{(1 - n\vec{\beta} \cdot \vec{r})} \right]\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

where  $R$  is the distance from the point to an observer,  $\hat{r}$  a unit vector in the direction of the observer, and  $\vec{\beta} = \vec{v}/c$  ( $\vec{v}$  is the velocity vector). Using Eq. 1, it is possible to calculate the total static and vector potentials from a distribution of source charges, by summing the contributions from individual charges in the distribution. These can then be used to calculate the corresponding electric and magnetic fields. This alternative approach is used for instance by Alvarez-Muñiz et al. in the ‘ZHAireS’ code [42]. In our methodology however, we calculate the electric fields directly, since from the Liénard-Wiechert potentials, the electric field in a dielectric, non-magnetic medium due to a particle of charge  $q$  (in c.g.s. units) can be expressed (see e.g. Jackson [6]) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}E(\vec{x}, t) &= q \left[ \frac{\hat{r} - n\vec{\beta}}{\gamma^2(1 - n\vec{\beta} \cdot \hat{r})^3 R^2} \right]_{\text{ret}} \\ &+ \frac{q}{c} \left[ \frac{\hat{r} \times [(\hat{r} - n\vec{\beta}) \times \dot{\vec{\beta}}]}{(1 - n\vec{\beta} \cdot \hat{r})^3 R} \right]_{\text{ret}}\end{aligned}\quad (2)$$

and  $\dot{\vec{\beta}}$  the time-derivative of  $\vec{\beta}$ , and  $\gamma$  the usual relativistic factor of  $(1 - \beta^2)^{-0.5}$ . The subscript ‘ret’ denotes evaluation at the retarded time  $t' = t - nR/c$ , ( $n$  is the refractive index). The first term is the near-field term, since the strength of the resulting fields falls as  $R^{-2}$  — in the case of  $\beta = 0$ , it reduces to Coulomb’s Law. The second term is the radiation term, with the familiar  $1/R$  dependence. The well-known maxim ‘radiation comes from accelerated charges’ is seen easily by the dependence of this term on  $\dot{\vec{\beta}}$ .

In most practical applications, the near-field term presents only a minor correction to the observed fields, we from here on we formulate our methodology purely from the radiated field term only. Thus the following expressions for the electric fields will be those arising solely from the particle acceleration. The applicability of this approximation is discussed in Sec. IV.

### B. Radiation from an endpoint

The most simple acceleration event is the instantaneous acceleration of a particle at rest at time  $t' = t'_0$  to a ve-

<sup>2</sup> As will be discussed later, this radiation is not ‘true’ Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation arising from the particle motion, but ‘bremsstrahlung’ from the implied acceleration events — or endpoints — at the ends of each track.

locity  $\beta = \beta^*$ , i.e.  $\dot{\beta} = \beta^* \delta(t' - t'_0)$ , or equivalently the deceleration of such a particle from velocity  $\beta = \beta^*$  to rest ( $\dot{\beta} = -\beta^* \delta(t' - t'_0)$ ). We define the electric field resulting from such an acceleration as  $E_{\pm}$ , where the acceleration vector  $\dot{\beta}$  can be either parallel (+) or anti-parallel (−) to the velocity vector  $\vec{\beta}$ , corresponding respectively to acceleration or deceleration. We proceed to derive  $E_{\pm}$  from the RHS of Eq. 4 in terms of the ‘lab-time’  $t$  in both the time- and frequency-domains.

### 1. Frequency-domain derivation

The expression for the radiated component of the electric field (from Eq. 3) for the instantaneous particle acceleration described above is:

$$E_{\pm}(\vec{x}, t) = \pm \frac{q}{c} \left[ \frac{\hat{r} \times [\hat{r} \times \vec{\beta}^* \delta(t' - t'_0)]}{(1 - n\vec{\beta} \cdot \hat{r})^3 R} \right]_{\text{ret}} \quad (4)$$

where we have removed the  $\vec{\beta} \times \dot{\beta}$  term from Eq. 3 since  $\vec{\beta} \parallel \dot{\beta}$ . We begin the frequency-domain derivation by taking the Fourier-transform of Eq. 4 converted to the retarded time  $t'$  using  $t = t' + Rn/c$  and  $dt = dt'(1 - n\vec{\beta} \cdot \hat{r})$ :

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\pm}(\vec{x}, \nu) &= \int dt E_{\pm}(\vec{x}, t) e^{2\pi i \nu t} \\ &\equiv \int dt' E_{\pm}(\vec{x}, t(t')) (1 - n\vec{\beta} \cdot \hat{r}) e^{2\pi i \nu (t' + Rn/c)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

A conceptual and mathematical difficulty to overcome is that at the time of acceleration,  $\beta$ , and hence  $E_{\pm}(\vec{x}, \nu)$ , is undefined. This can be dealt with letting the acceleration last a finite (but small) time interval  $\Delta t'$ , then taking the limit as  $\Delta t' \rightarrow 0$ . Writing  $t'' = t' - t'_0$ , the acceleration takes place over the interval  $0 < t'' < \Delta t'$ , during which we have  $\beta(t'') = \beta^* t'' / \Delta t'$ ,  $\dot{\beta} = \beta^* / \Delta t'$ , and  $R(t'') = R - 0.5c(\beta^* / \Delta t') t''^2 \cos \theta$ . Thus the frequency-domain integral becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\pm}(\vec{x}, \nu) &= \pm \lim_{\Delta t' \rightarrow 0} \frac{q}{c} e^{2\pi i \nu t'_0} \times \\ &\int_0^{\Delta t'} \frac{\frac{1}{\Delta t'} e^{2\pi i \nu (t'' + nR(t'')/c)}}{(1 - \frac{nt''}{\Delta t'} \vec{\beta}^* \cdot \hat{r})^2 R(t'')} \left( \hat{r} \times [\hat{r} \times \vec{\beta}^*] \right) dt'' \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

This somewhat difficult integral can be greatly simplified by applying the limit  $\Delta t' \rightarrow 0$ , in which case the integral and limit eventually evaluate to the rather simple form:

$$E_{\pm}(\vec{x}, \nu) = \pm \frac{q}{c} \frac{e^{ikR}}{R} \frac{e^{2\pi i \nu t'_0}}{1 - n\vec{\beta}^* \cdot \hat{r}} \hat{r} \times [\hat{r} \times \vec{\beta}^*] \quad (7)$$

Recall that the ‘ $\pm$ ’ is positive when the acceleration is parallel to the motion (acceleration from rest), and negative when the acceleration is anti-parallel to the motion (acceleration to rest).

### 2. Time-domain derivation

For the time-domain derivation, we again consider the radiated component of Eq. 3. We can calculate the time-integral of the electric field for one starting-point or stopping-point, taking into account the conversion to the retarded time  $t'$  as  $t = t' + Rn/c$  and  $dt = dt'(1 - n\vec{\beta} \cdot \hat{r})$  via:

$$\begin{aligned} \int E(\vec{x}, t) dt &= \frac{q}{c} \int_{\Delta t} \left[ \frac{\hat{r} \times [(\hat{r} - n\vec{\beta}) \times \dot{\vec{\beta}}]}{(1 - n\vec{\beta} \cdot \hat{r})^3 R} \right]_{\text{ret}} dt \\ &= \frac{q}{c} \int_{\Delta t'} \frac{\hat{r} \times [(\hat{r} - n\vec{\beta}) \times \dot{\vec{\beta}}]}{(1 - n\vec{\beta} \cdot \hat{r})^2 R} dt' \\ &= \frac{q}{c} \int_{t'_0}^{t'_1} \frac{d}{dt'} \left( \frac{\hat{r} \times [\hat{r} \times \vec{\beta}]}{(1 - n\vec{\beta} \cdot \hat{r}) R} \right) dt' \\ &= \pm \frac{q}{c} \left( \frac{\hat{r} \times [\hat{r} \times \vec{\beta}^*]}{(1 - n\vec{\beta}^* \cdot \hat{r}) R} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $\Delta t$  denotes a time window fully encompassing the acceleration process. For a starting point (+ sign) the particle is at rest at the time  $t'_0$  and has velocity  $\vec{\beta}^*$  at  $t'_1$ . The opposite is the case for a stopping point (− sign).

While the electric field as a function of time  $E(\vec{x}, t)$  becomes infinite in case of instantaneous acceleration, the time-integrated electric field is finite and independent of the specific choice of  $\Delta t$ . Consequently, one can calculate the time-averaged electric field over the time-scale  $\Delta t$  as

$$E_{\pm}(\vec{x}, t) = \pm \frac{1}{\Delta t} \frac{q}{c} \left( \frac{\hat{r} \times [\hat{r} \times \vec{\beta}^*]}{(1 - n\vec{\beta}^* \cdot \hat{r}) R} \right). \quad (8)$$

An adequate choice of  $\Delta t$  is dictated by the time resolution of interest. If  $\Delta t$  is chosen significantly longer than the time-scale over which the acceleration process occurs — which is in particular the case for the instantaneous acceleration considered here — the details of the acceleration process are of no importance.

At first glance, the results given in Eqs. 7 and 8 for a radiating endpoint may appear as yet another special case of particle motion with very limited application. However, observe that in arriving at Eqs. 7 and 8, we have made no assumptions about the macroscopic motion of the particle — only that at a given instant, the particle becomes accelerated. As we will see, validating this assumption is really a question of describing the particle motion with sufficient accuracy for the frequency-range/time-resolution of interest, rather than being a limitation of the endpoint approach. In following sections, we will show how arbitrary particle motion can be described in terms of such endpoints. However, before proceeding to more complex situations, it is worthwhile examining the radiation from the most simple acceleration event, a single endpoint.

### 3. Radiation pattern of a single endpoint

The radiation pattern from a single endpoint is exactly that corresponding to a once-off acceleration event. A relevant physical situation would be the  $\beta$ -decay of a heavy element in vacuum, where the motion of the heavy nucleus can be neglected, and the emitted  $e^\pm$  travels with constant velocity to infinity. There are quite a few interesting features of even this simple situation which it is worthwhile to explore in greater depth.

For most applications, it is preferable to use the vectorial notation given in Eqs. 7 and 8 to describe the radiation from a single endpoint. However, for a single event, the radiation is cylindrically symmetric about the acceleration/velocity axis, so it is common to express these equations using an observer's position described by a distance  $R$  and angle to the acceleration vector  $\theta$  ( $\theta = 0 \equiv \hat{r} \parallel \beta$ ). This angular dependence is seen easily from the LHS of Fig. 3. For this case, the magnitude of the electric field vector in Eqs. 7 and 8 respectively becomes:

$$E_\pm(\vec{x}, \nu) = \pm \frac{q}{c} \frac{e^{ikR}}{R} \frac{\sin \theta e^{2\pi i \nu t'_0}}{1 - n\beta^* \cos \theta} \hat{E}_\pm \quad (9)$$

$$E_\pm(\vec{x}, t) = \pm \frac{1}{\Delta t} \frac{q}{c} \frac{\sin \theta}{(1 - n\beta^* \cos \theta)R} \hat{E}_\pm \quad (10)$$

and it is taken as given that the electric field vector  $\hat{E}_\pm$  points away from the acceleration axis from  $\theta < \pi/2$  and towards it for  $\theta > \pi/2$ . At all times the angle  $\theta$  is defined to be positive in the direction of positive velocity, irrespective of the acceleration. Thus under the transformation  $\theta \rightarrow \pi - \theta$ ,  $\beta \rightarrow -\beta$ , Eqs. 7 and 8 are invariant, since  $\hat{E}_\pm \rightarrow -\hat{E}_\pm$ .

To illustrate, Eqs. 9/10 have been plotted in a vacuum and dielectric for varying  $\beta$  in Fig. 1.

Firstly, note that for a single endpoint, the magnitude of the radiation in Eqs. 9, 10 have *no* frequency-dependence. This may seem counter-intuitive, since almost all radiation processes become characterised by their particular frequency-dependence. Such frequency-dependence can only be produced however by the particle acceleration appearing differently on different wave-length scales, while a point-like acceleration looks identical on all scales, so that the resulting radiation could not possibly have any dependence on the wavelength/frequency. Only in the quantum-mechanical (extremely-high-frequency regime — see Sec. IV) will there be a frequency-dependence in the radiation from a single endpoint, since the particle will no longer appear point-like.

Secondly, observe that there is a singularity in the emitted electric field about  $n\beta \cos \theta = 1$ , which for super-relativistic velocities corresponds to the Vavilov-Cherenkov angle  $\theta_C = \arccos(1/n)$ . That is, the electric field strength becomes undefined. This is, of course, unphysical, since we do not observe infinite electric fields in nature. Nonetheless, both Eqs. 9, 10 and reality can happily coexist since we always observe over some finite observation angle  $\delta\theta$ . Writing  $\theta = \theta_C + \delta\theta$ , the

$(1 - n\beta \cos \theta)^{-1}$  term in Eqs. 9, 10 in the vicinity of  $\theta_C$  becomes:

$$(1 - n\beta \cos(\theta_C + \delta\theta))^{-1} \approx (n\beta \delta\theta \sin \theta_C)^{-1} \quad (11)$$

which is odd about  $\delta\theta = 0$ . Therefore, for any real measurement, an integral of the field about  $\theta_C$  will have the infinite contributions very near to  $\theta_C$  cancel to first order, leaving a finite result. In addition, any real medium will have a frequency-dependent refractive index, so that infinite field strengths will only be observed over an infinitely small bandwidth.

Finally, note that away from the singularity, there is a broad angle dependence which depends primarily on  $\sin \theta$  and  $\beta$ . There is no emission in the exact forward direction for any values of  $\beta$  and  $n$ , though for highly-relativistic particles in vacuum, the radiation pattern rises extremely rapidly away from  $\theta = 0$ , producing the characteristic forward ‘beaming’ expected. Also note that for mildly- and sub-relativistic particles, the emitted radiation reflects the particle energy at all angles, whilst in the ultra-relativistic regime, only extremely near to  $\theta_C$  does the radiation pattern differ.

### C. Building physical situations

Eq. 7 and Eq. 8 are formulated as the result of a particle accelerating from/to rest. In fact, it is more general than this, since an arbitrary acceleration of a particle can be viewed as a superposition of deceleration and acceleration events, which will not cancel if either  $\vec{\beta}$  or  $\theta$  differ<sup>3</sup>. For curved particle motion at constant speed, the angles to the observer will differ, while for gradually accelerating/decelerating particles, the values of  $\beta$  will be different for simultaneous endpoints. In either case, contributions from starting and stopping points will not cancel, and radiation will occur. Conversely, if a simple linear motion with constant velocity is described piece-wise as a series of starting and stopping endpoints, the terms will cancel completely — the particle will not radiate. Superposition of endpoints in this way is sometimes viewed as destroying the ‘old’ particle and creating a ‘new’ one — since this formulation is applicable only to the radiated component, static fields (which fall as  $1/R^2$ ) can be ignored, so that bringing a particle to rest (‘stopping’ it) is equivalent to destroying it, and accelerating a particle from rest (‘starting’ it) is equivalent to creating it, and *vice versa*. An arbitrary change in particle velocity can be dealt with by combining two simultaneous, coincident endpoints, the first to ‘stop’ the particle by bringing it from its old velocity to rest, the second to ‘start’ the

<sup>3</sup> The superposition of two endpoints in this manner produces the “well-known formula for radiation of charges which change their velocity sharply” as discussed by Ginzburg (1982) [1] and Boltovskii, Davydov, and Rok (1982) [7].






FIG. 1: Radiation from a single endpoint in vacuum as given by Eqs. 9 (units on y-axis of V/m/Hz) and 10 (units V/m), as a function of the angle  $\theta$  from the shower axis, for a range of  $\gamma$ -factors (and hence  $\beta$ s), left: in vacuum, and right: in an  $n = 2$  medium. In both figures, the highly relativistic cases produce near-identical radiation patterns.

particle by accelerating it to its new velocity. Multiple particles/events can be treated by adding the contributions with appropriate  $\theta$ ,  $\beta_{1/2}$ ,  $R$ ,  $n$ , and  $t_0$ . Since each source is point-like, the radiation in each case propagates simply as a spherical wave, allowing an easy treatment of propagation effects.

To illustrate, we have plotted the emitted radiation in four elementary situations in a vacuum and dielectric in Fig. 2: a single endpoint representing an electron accelerating from rest (‘acceleration’); the deflection of an energetic electron through  $20^\circ$  (‘deflection’); the deceleration of a fast electron (‘slow-down’); and a reversal of direction in a mildly relativistic electron with no change in speed (‘reversal’). Note in the three highly relativistic cases the characteristic beaming in the forward direction in the vacuum case and about the Cherenkov angle  $\theta_C = \cos^{-1}(1/(\beta n))$  in the  $n = 2$  dielectric. For velocity reversal, significant peaks are observed at the Cherenkov angle since  $\beta n > 1$ , while in the vacuum case, no appreciable beaming is evident and the emission is broad, which is characteristic of (non-relativistic) dipole radiation.

The simple examples presented in Fig. 2 — and Eqs. 9, 10 themselves — deal only with point-like acceleration events, while in most situations particle motion will be smooth; however, this is not a limitation in practice. Every numerical simulation necessarily describes particle motion as a series of uniform motions joined by instantaneous acceleration events, for which either of Eqs. 7 or 8 will calculate the emitted radiation *exactly*. The key point is that the degree to which the radiation calculated from the addition of endpoint contributions resembles the true radiation is limited only by the degree to which the simulated motion resembles the true motion. Usually this means that a particle simulator must be accurate to within a small fraction of the wavelengths of interest —

for a discussion of this effect in practice, see for example the discussion in Fig. 3 and Appendix A of Ref. [8] or section 2 of Ref. [9]. It is not a concern of this paper. It is instructive however to recreate classical radiating systems and reproduce the classical results using our endpoint formulation. We do this below for the cases of synchrotron, Vavilov-Cherenkov, and transition radiation.

### III. COMPARISON TO ESTABLISHED THEORY

#### A. Synchrotron radiation

Synchrotron radiation arises from a relativistic particle undergoing infinite helical motion (a superposition of circular motion in a 2D plane and linear motion perpendicular to the plane) in a vacuum ( $n = 1$ ), as is typically induced by the presence of a uniform magnetic field. Here, we treat the case of a particle of velocity  $\beta$  executing a single circular loop of radius  $L$  in the  $x-y$  plane only in a vacuum. This motion is viewed by an observer at a very large distance  $\sim R$  in direction  $\hat{r}$ . Such motion can be represented by a series of  $N$  starting and stopping points as follows:

$$\sum_{m=0}^{N-1} E_+(t_m, R_m, \beta \hat{v}_{m+1}) + E_-(t_m, R_m, \beta \hat{v}_m), \quad (12)$$

where the calculation of each velocity unit vector  $\hat{v}_m$ , time  $t_m$ , and distance  $R_m$  to the observer is a matter of simple geometry. While the  $1/R_m$  term can be assumed constant,  $R_m$  also changes the relative phase-factors between emission at different endpoints. This is shown schematically in Fig. 3. Note that every starting term is balanced at any time  $t_m$  by a simultaneous stopping term




FIG. 2: Electric field magnitude resulting from the acceleration of a relativistic electron in four simple cases (see text) in (left) a vacuum and (right) a dielectric with refractive index  $n = 2$ , as given by Eq. 7.




FIG. 3: (top) Sketch of  $\theta$ , the angle from the velocity vector; (right) Schematic diagram of the contributions from two terms in the sum of Eq. 12.

at the same position. The reason the terms do not cancel is due to the direction of the velocity vectors  $\beta\hat{v}$  differing between simultaneous starting and stopping terms. Note also that there is only one term with  $\hat{\beta}_0$  (a stopping event) and  $\hat{\beta}_N$  (only a starting event). The sum therefore describes the physical situation of a particle moving in some direction from  $-\infty$ , executing the loop described, then continuing on to  $+\infty$  in the original direction. This is necessary so that there is no change of particle number throughout, otherwise the initial starting and final stopping terms would dominate the ‘synchrotron terms’ from the circular motion.

We present numerical evaluations of Eq. 12 in Fig. 4 for a loop of radius 100 m and  $\beta = 0.999$  ( $\gamma \approx 22.4$ ), equivalent to a 11.4 MeV electron moving perpendicular to a 3.809 Gauss field. The observer is assumed to lie in the very-far-field in the plane of the loop. For the plot in the time (frequency) domain, we present both a di-

rect calculation, and the results from taking a Fourier transform from the calculation in the frequency (time) domain. All the characteristic features are reproduced perfectly: a steep spectral fall below the cyclotron frequency ( $\nu = 2\pi L(\beta c)^{-1}$ ), and a slow rise in power until an exponential cut-off above the critical frequency  $\nu_{\text{crit}} = 1.5\gamma^3\beta c/L \approx 50$  GHz. In the time-domain, a sharp pulse of characteristic width  $1/\nu_{\text{crit}}$  is seen. That the results calculated by Fourier transform do not exactly match the direct calculations is due to the difficulty in generating sufficient data to make an accurate transform. However, the correspondence is obvious. From here on therefore, we deal only with calculations in the frequency-domain, and take it for granted that one can transmute time-trace data to spectral data and *vice versa* accurately and as needed.

## B. Particle tracks and Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation

In this paper, we describe physical situations in terms of endpoints, whereas in numerical codes, the physical situation is usually described in terms of particle tracks. Such a track-based description defines the total charge distribution in position and time in terms of charges moving from position  $(\vec{x}_1, t_1)$  to position  $(\vec{x}_2, t_2)$ . This implicitly defines a velocity and, given the type of particle, an energy/momentum/ $\gamma$ -factor.

It is obvious that the radiation from such a particle track can be constructed from two endpoint contributions — one accelerating/creating a particle at  $\vec{x}_1, t_1$  from rest to velocity  $\beta_1 = \beta$ , the other decelerating/destroying the particle at  $\vec{x}_2, t_2$ . In the very-far-field of both events, the corresponding parameters  $R, \theta$  can be written  $\theta_1 = \theta$ ,  $R_1 = R$ ,  $\theta_2 = \theta$ ,  $R_2 = R - \cos\theta\delta l$ ; we also write  $t_2 = t_1 + \delta t$ . The track-length  $\delta l$  is often expressed in terms of the time interval  $\delta t$  via  $\delta l = c\beta\delta t$ . The entire particle track is considered as being sufficiently far from the observer




FIG. 4: Time-trace of a synchrotron pulse produced by a single gyration of an electron with  $\beta = 0.999$  and gyration radius  $r = 100$  m (left), and power spectrum of the same pulse (right). In each case, the direct calculations (time- and frequency-domain respectively) are shown in comparison with the results generated by fast-Fourier-transforming data from the other domain (frequency- and time-domain respectively). The direct calculation produces the higher-quality result and is much less computing-intensive. (For such practical reasons, the indirect, frequency-domain calculation of the time-trace was performed by modelling only the relevant part of the gyration cycle indicated by the plotted time range.)

so that the approximation  $1/R_1 \approx 1/R_2 = 1/R$  holds<sup>4</sup>. Again, it is more common to begin with the expression in Eq. 9. Recalling  $k = 2\pi\nu n/c$ , we find the radiation from a particle track to be:

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_{\text{track}}(\vec{x}, \nu) &= \frac{q}{c^2} \frac{\beta \sin \theta}{1 - n\beta \cos \theta} \\
 &\times \left( \frac{e^{i(kR_1 + 2\pi\nu t_1)}}{R_1} - \frac{e^{i(kR_2 + 2\pi\nu t_2)}}{R_2} \right) \hat{E} \\
 &\approx \frac{q\beta \sin \theta}{c} \frac{e^{i(kR + 2\pi\nu t_1)}}{R} \\
 &\times \left( \frac{1 - e^{2\pi i\nu(1 - n\beta \cos \theta)\delta t}}{1 - n\beta \cos \theta} \right) \hat{E} \quad (13)
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that Eq. 13 is (to within a factor of 2, due to a different definition of the Fourier transform) the ‘Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation formula’ of Eq. 12 in Zas, Halzen, and Stanev [12], with  $\mu_r = 1$  and  $q = -e$ . That is, although the ZHS code is commonly understood to calculate ‘the Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation’ from a cascade in

a dense medium, what it actually calculates is simply ‘the radiation’ due to particle acceleration. When the particles in the cascade are all travelling in the same direction in a medium with refractive index significantly different from 1, the radiation just so happens to very closely resemble the classical notion of Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation. The Vavilov-Cherenkov condition is plainly evident by letting the phase term  $(1 - n\beta \cos \theta) \rightarrow 0$  — that is, the observation angle  $\theta$  tends towards the Vavilov-Cherenkov angle  $\theta_C$ , where  $\cos \theta_C = (n\beta)^{-1}$  — in which case Eq. 13 reduces to:

$$E_{\text{track}}(\vec{x}, \nu) = 2\pi i \nu \delta t \, c\beta \sin \theta \frac{e}{c^2} \frac{e^{i(kR + 2\pi\nu t)}}{R} \hat{E} \quad (14)$$

The product  $c\beta\delta t = \delta l \sin \theta$ , so that the radiated intensity is proportional to the apparent tracklength. Thus to a far-field observer near the Cherenkov angle, the radiation seen is consistent with emission per unit tracklength, although our description makes it clear that this is not the case<sup>5</sup>.

We conclude our discussion on Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation by noting that ‘true’ Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation, which is emitted in the absence of particle acceleration in a dielectric medium, can not be dealt with by this methodology. This comes by virtue of the fact we deal only with the ‘radiation’ component of the Liénard-Wiechert potentials, whereas contributions from unac-

<sup>4</sup> As discussed in detail by Afanasiev, Kartavenko, and Stepanovsky (1999) [10], this approximation breaks down as the Cherenkov angle  $\theta_C = \cos^{-1}(1/\beta n)$  is approached, since second-order terms in  $R$  and  $\cos \theta$  become important. It is exactly this approximation that removed the Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation component from Tamm’s formula [11] for the radiation from a finite particle track viewed at large distances, leaving only the ‘bremsstrahlung’ contributions from the endpoints. However, this approximation — and hence equation 13 — is still valid for angles  $\theta$  satisfying  $|\theta - \theta_C| \gg \sin \theta_C \delta l R^{-1}$ , where there is essentially no Vavilov-Cherenkov component.

<sup>5</sup> It was first noted by Zrelov and Ružička (1989) that Tamm’s (1939) approximate formula for radiation from a finite particle track results from contributions from acceleration at the endpoints.




FIG. 5: Sketch of the endpoint-formulation of transition radiation.

celerated motion must come from the ‘nearfield’ term. Thus in the classical treatment of Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation by Frank and Tamm [25] in which an infinite particle track is assumed, the near-field must also be infinite. Thus it should come as no surprise that a radiation-based far-field treatment can not explain this phenomenon.

### C. Transition radiation

Transition radiation arises from a relativistic particle moving between two media with different refractive indices. The radiated power was first calculated by Ginzburg and Frank [13] in the case of a sharp boundary and a particle moving infinitely with uniform velocity parallel to the boundary surface normal. J. Bray (private communication) has noted that the resulting radiation can be explained as a particle being destroyed on the incoming side of the boundary, then being created on the outgoing side; this picture is consistent with the ‘mirror-charge’ explanation of transition-radiation, where the radiation in vacuum from a particle entering an  $n = \infty$  medium is explained by the sum of two mirror-charge contributions which appear to disappear upon reaching the boundary (see Ginzburg [1]). While the starting and stopping events are simultaneous and co-located (or rather, infinitesimally separated), they do not cancel because 1: the events occur in different media, and 2: an observer must be on one or the other side of the boundary, and thus the radiation from one of the two events will have to be transmitted through the boundary layer. The resulting radiation must be summed over three contributions: a direct contribution from the event in the observer’s medium, a reflected contribution from the event in the observer’s medium, and a transmitted contribution from the event in the non-observer medium. This

situation is shown in Fig. 5 for an observer in medium 1 (seeing  $E = E_1$ ) — since the separation of the two endpoints is infinitely small, any such observer will be in the far field. In our formulation, the total electric field in medium 1 is given by Eq. 15:

$$E(\vec{x}, t) = E_-(\vec{\beta}, n_1, \hat{x}, t_0, R) + c_r E_-(\beta, n_1, \hat{x}_r, t_0, R) + c_t E_+(\beta, n_2, \hat{x}_t, t_0, R) \quad (15)$$

where  $c_t$  and  $c_r$  are the appropriate transmission and reflection coefficients (a combination of parallel and perpendicular components, with  $c_t$  accounting for the divergence of a spherical wave). The first two terms arise from a stopping event, and  $\hat{x}$ ,  $\hat{x}_r$ , and  $\hat{x}_t$  are, respectively, the apparent observer directions seen directly, in reflection, and accounting for refraction. We leave it as a trivial exercise to calculate the appropriate geometrical constructions for these. Note that the distance  $R$  to the observer is constant for all contributions, since the two endpoints are infinitely close together, and the event times are simultaneous. The result for an observer in medium 2 is analogous. The result of Ginzburg (Eq. 15 in Ref. [1]) for the limiting case of  $n_1 = 1$  and normal incidence is reproduced by Eq. 15.

## IV. DISCUSSION

The endpoint formalism described above provides a simple, accurate, and intuitive method for calculating the radiation resulting from particle acceleration. Using it, the radiated electromagnetic fields due to particle acceleration can be calculated in either the time- or frequency-domain for arbitrary particle motion. The domain in which to perform an endpoint-calculation should be the same as that of the desired result. While the process of fast-Fourier transforming between time- and frequency-domains is usually relatively quick, such transforms usually require many points in the first domain to produce an accurate result in the second. Usually, if both the time- and frequency-domains are of interest, it will be computationally quicker to perform two direct calculations than to generate excess data points in one domain and use a fast-Fourier transform to convert to the other. Such was the case for the example of synchrotron radiation presented in Sec. III A. The only exception to this rule is when dispersive effects (changing refractive index with frequency) become important, in which case frequency-domain calculations would be more practical. Like any method using a distribution of sources, the accuracy of the endpoint method will reflect the accuracy with which the distribution of endpoints reflects the true particle motion on scales of the smallest wavelength / highest time resolution of interest. With reasonable awareness of these issues however, our endpoint methodology can be used to calculate the radiation in some very complex physical situations, such as those described in Sec. V. In emphasising the utility of the endpoint formulation, we should also mention its limitations, the most obvious



of which is its classical foundation in Maxwell’s equations: it breaks down in any quantum-mechanical limit. Specifically, it can not treat radiation processes involving only a single photon, nor the radiation of extremely energetic photons where the wavelength is of the order of the de Broglie wavelength of the radiating particle(s). Such limitations however are common to all classical methods of treating radiation and are not increased by our approach. The second limitation is that we have ignored the ‘nearfield’ term from Eq. 3. This does *not* mean that our formulation cannot calculate radiation in the near-field of a source distribution. Since each endpoint is point-like, any observer is always in the far-field of any particular endpoint. Thus a near-field calculation requires only taking the trouble to re-calculate the direction to the observer from each endpoint individually. Only in certain special circumstances, such as the case of Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation from non-accelerated systems as discussed in Sec. III B, will the near-field term provide a significant contribution to the observed electric fields. In general, this nearfield term will only become important when a large part of the charge distribution passes very close to the detectors, and for most experiments it will represent at most a minor correction only. Our last note is to emphasise that this paper is by no means the first to use (explicitly or implicitly) an endpoint-like treatment to solve for various radiation processes. The best-known endpoint-based treatment is the Larmor formula for the power radiated by an accelerated charge, which is commonly used in derivations of other radiation processes (again, see Jackson [6]). Also, as discussed in the introduction, there are numerous examples in the literature where multiple classical radiation processes have been described using the same fundamental underlying physics. What we have done here is to explicitly state that *all* radiation from particle acceleration can be described in terms of a superposition of instantaneous accelerations (endpoints), and give a general methodology for applying this method to an arbitrary problem.

## V. PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

### A. Coherent radio emission from near-surface cascades in the lunar regolith

Strong pulses of coherent Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation are expected from extremely high energy ( $E_s \gtrsim 10^{17}$  eV) particle cascades in dense media. The mechanism for producing the radiation is the Askaryan effect, whereby a total negative charge excess arises from the entrainment of medium electrons through e.g. Compton scattering, and the loss of cascade positrons via annihilation in flight [14]. The excess electrons travelling super-luminally through the medium will then produce Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation which will be coherent at wavelengths larger than the physical size of the cascade. The emission is the basis of the lunar Cherenkov technique [15], a detection method

by which the radiation is observed from ground-based radio-telescopes. Several current experiments utilise the technique [16–18], which had been proposed to detect both cosmic ray and neutrino interactions. For neutrinos interacting deep below the lunar surface (that is, far from the dielectric-vacuum interface), the radiation production and transmission are separable problems, and viewing the radiation as Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation is not problematic. However, for cascades developing near the dielectric-vacuum boundary (e.g. from a cosmic-ray interaction), this simple picture begins to break down.

Consider such a near-surface cascade, induced by a cosmic-ray interaction near the regolith (dielectric)-vacuum boundary. It has been both predicted [19, 20] and observed (qualitatively by Danos *et al.* [21], and as a coherent pulse from single electron bunches by Takahashi *et al.* [22]) that charged particles moving in a vacuum near a dielectric boundary generate Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation in the dielectric. Analogously, as the distance between the cascade and the surface tends to zero, the radiation emitted into the vacuum will approach that from a cascade in the vacuum itself (the ‘formation-zone’ effect, first considered in this context by Gorham *et al.* [23]). So far, this reasoning is correct; however: in the phenomenological picture, the emission mechanism is Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation, which is generated by the passage of a particle through a dielectric; since vacuum is not a dielectric, the emitted power into the vacuum from cascades nearing the boundary must tend towards zero. Thus emission from cosmic rays will be highly suppressed.

The above conclusion is erroneous; it has been pointed out by Zrelov and Ružička [24] that Tamm’s 1939 [11] result for the ‘Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation’ from a finite particle track in a dielectric medium when viewed at a large distance (the ‘Tamm problem’) originates from the acceleration/deceleration at the beginning and end of the track, and thus neither Tamm’s approximate result, nor the majority of the radiation emitted, is truly Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation<sup>6</sup>. Indeed, this tells us that the majority of detectable radiation produced by the ‘classical’ Askaryan Effect (in a dense  $\rho \sim 1$  g/cm<sup>3</sup> medium) itself is not coherent Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation at all, but rather coherent radiation from particle acceleration. While Askaryan also mentions the possibility of coherent transition radiation and ‘bremsstrahlung’ (radiation from particle acceleration) in his first (1961) paper, the major-

---

<sup>6</sup> While as early as 1939 Tamm’s calculations [11] indicated that radiation from finite particle tracks would be different to that from infinite tracks (the 1937 Frank and Tamm result [25]), it is this latter result, which gives zero emission in a vacuum, which is better known in the authors’ fields, and commonly accepted to be ‘the’ Vavilov-Cherenkov result. When Tamm’s 1939 calculations are recalled, they are also treated as giving ‘Vavilov-Cherenkov’ radiation, even though it can be shown [10] that the final result ignores the Vavilov-Cherenkov component.

ity of the paper refers to Cherenkov radiation and coherent radiation from a moving charge excess, rather than an accelerated charge excess. Both imply no radiation in a vacuum would be expected, which is not that case, as can be readily seen by simply putting  $n = 1$  into Eq. 14. Thus the primary reason why the zero-emission argument is incorrect is that the radiation due to the Askaryan Effect does not resemble the ‘true’ Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation as described in the Frank-Tamm picture [25], which indeed will tend towards zero as a particle cascade develops closer to a vacuum-interface. Our endpoint formulation easily resolves the issue — charged particles are accelerated and decelerated, ergo, the system radiates, and the effect of the nearby surface from the point of view of a far-field observer is no worse or more profound than for any transmission problem. The actual contribution of the true Vavilov-Cherenkov component from particle motion is expected to be negligible compared to this.

### B. Radiation from extensive air showers

A second example is the case of radio emission from extensive air showers. When an energetic primary particle interacts in the upper atmosphere, it produces a cascade of secondary particles which can reach ground level. Radiation at frequencies of a few tens to a few hundreds of MHz from the electron/positron component of these cascades has been both predicted [14, 26–28] and observed [29–32], with up until recently only fair agreement between predictions and measurements. The emitted radiation is often understood in terms of one or more classical radiation mechanisms, and it can be unclear as to what extent the mechanisms are different ways of explaining the same phenomena, or are completely separate effects. The transverse current model [26] describes the effect of the magnetic field as causing a macroscopic flow of charge (a transverse current) due to the different drift directions of electrons and positrons. The time-variation of this current in the course of the air shower evolution produces radiation polarized in the direction denoted by the Lorentz force. A modern implementation of the transverse current model, the MGMR model [33], complements the transverse current emission with additional radiation components, in particular the emission from a relativistically moving dipole and from a time-varying charge excess, the latter of which has already been described in [14]. Difficulties can, however, arise in the separation of these phenomenological “mechanisms”. For example, a Vavilov-Cherenkov-like component can appear even in case of charge-neutral particle distributions because the magnetic field induces a sufficient spatial separation of the positive and negative charges for the electron and positron contributions not to cancel at the frequencies of interest [34].

In contrast to such macroscopic descriptions, microscopic Monte Carlo models calculate the radio emission as a superposition of radiation from individual charges being

deflected in the geomagnetic field. This approach of interpreting the radio emission, coined the geosynchrotron mechanism [35, 36], has been realized in many different time-domain Monte Carlo implementations [37–40]. It recently turned out, however, that all of these implementations (and others) were neglecting radio emission produced by the variation of the number of charged particles during the course of the air shower evolution. With the endpoint formalism described here, a new implementation of a microscopic modelling approach has been realized in the REAS3 code [9]. The universality of the endpoint formalism ensures that the radio emission from the motion of the charged particles is predicted in all of its complexity. In case of the REAS3 code, this becomes evident since both the “transverse current” radiation polarized in the direction of the Lorentz force and the radially polarized “charge excess” emission is reproduced automatically and in good agreement with macroscopic calculations. [41]. Inclusion of the refractive index of the atmosphere, which is slightly different from unity and varies with atmospheric depth, is also very simple in the endpoint formalism, and no differentiation between Vavilov-Cherenkov components due to charge excess or charge distributions having been separated by the earth’s magnetic field is necessary.

## VI. CONCLUSION

We have presented an ‘endpoint’ methodology for modelling the electromagnetic radiation produced by arbitrary motion of charged particles. The approach is universally applicable and is especially well-suited for numerical implementation. Its universality has been illustrated by reproducing prototypical radiation processes such as synchrotron radiation, Vavilov-Cherenkov radiation and transition radiation in the frequency- and/or time-domains. The method’s true strength, however, lies in modelling more complex (in other words “realistic”) situations in which such individual prototypical radiation mechanisms can no longer be easily disentangled. As demonstrated in Sec. V, the ‘endpoint’ methodology can for example be used to solve outstanding problems in the field of high-energy particle astrophysics. In conclusion, we would like to point out that we believe the ‘endpoint’ approach to be an important way of viewing radiation processes which is useful at both an undergraduate student level, and also for career researchers. Except perhaps for those researchers working constantly with fundamental electromagnetic theory, we hope this methodology will increase the reader’s understanding of radiative processes by providing a simple and unified approach.

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge J. Alvarez-Muñiz and J. Bray for discussions regarding the ‘ZHS’ code and

the nature of transition radiation. This research has been supported by grant number VH-NG-413 of the Helmholtz Association. C.W. James is the recipient of a Rubicon Fellowship from the NWO.

- 
- [1] V.L. Ginzburg, *Physica Scripta* **T2**, 182 (1982).
  - [2] A.A. Sokolov, A.Kh. Mussa, and Yu.G. Pavlenko, *Sov.Phys.J.* **20**, 599 (1977).
  - [3] R.J. Pogorzelski, C. Yeh, and K.F. Casey, *J.App.Phys.* **45**, 5251 (1974).
  - [4] A. Erteza and J.J. Newman, *J.App.Phys.* **33**, 1864 (1962).
  - [5] J. Schwinger, W. Tsai, and T. Erber, *Annals of Physics* **96**, 303 (1976).
  - [6] J.D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics* (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1998), 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.
  - [7] B.M. Bolotovskii, V.A. Davydov, and V.E. Rok, *Sov.Phys.Uspekh* **25** [3], 167 (1982).
  - [8] J. Alvarez-Muñiz, R.A. Vázquez, and E. Zas, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 063001 (2000).
  - [9] M. Ludwig and T. Huege, submitted to *Astropart. Phys.*
  - [10] G.N. Afanasiev, V.G. Kartavenko, and Y.P. Stepanovsky, *J.Phys.D* **32**, 2029 (1999).
  - [11] I.E. Tamm, *J.Phys.Moscow* **1**, 439 (1939).
  - [12] E. Zas, F. Halzen, and T. Stanev, *Phys. Rev. D* **45**, 362 (1992).
  - [13] V.L. Ginzburg and I.M. Frank, *ZhETF* **16**, 15 (1946); I.M. Frank and V.L. Ginzburg, *J.Phys. USSR* **9**, 353 (1945).
  - [14] G.A. Askaryan, *Sov. Phys. JETP*, **14**, 441 (1962); **48**, 988 (1965).
  - [15] R.D. Dagkesamanskii and I. M. Zheleznykh, *Sov.Phys. JETP Lett.* **50**, 233 (1989).
  - [16] C.W. James, R.D. Ekers, J. Álvarez-Muñiz, J.D. Bray, R.A. McFadden, C.J. Phillips, R.J. Protheroe, and P. Roberts, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 042003 (2010).
  - [17] O. Scholten *et al.*, *Phs.Rev.Lett.* **103**, 191301 (2009).
  - [18] T. Jaeger, R.L. Mutel, and K.G. Gayley, AAS Meeting #215, #437.03; *Bulletin of the American Astronomical Society* **41**, 390 (2010).
  - [19] V.L. Ginzburg and I.M. Frank, *Dokl.Akad.Nauk* **56**, 699 (1947).
  - [20] R. Ulrich, *Zeitschrift fur Physik* **194**, 180 (1966)
  - [21] M. Danos, S. Geschwind, H. Lashinsky, and A. van Trier, *Phys. Rev.* **92**, 828 (1953).
  - [22] T. Takahashi, Y. Shibata, K. Ishi, M. Ikezawa, M. Oyama, and Y. Kondo, *Phys. Rev. E* **62**, 8606 (2000).
  - [23] P.W. Gorham, K.M. Kiewer, C.J. Naudet, D.P. Saltzberg, and D.R. Williams, arXiv:astro-ph/0102435 (2001).
  - [24] V.P. Zrellov and J. Ružička, *Czech. J. Phys B* **39**, 368 (1989).
  - [25] I.M. Frank and I.E. Tamm, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **14**, 109 (1937).
  - [26] F.D. Kahn and I. Lerche, *Roal. Soc. London. Proc. Series A* **289**, 206 (1966).
  - [27] S.A. Colgate, *J.Geophys.Res.* **72**, 4869 (1967).
  - [28] H.R. Allan, *Prog. Elem. part. Cosm. Ray. Phys.* **10**, 171 (1971).
  - [29] J.V. Jelley *et al.*, *Nature* **205**, 327 (1965).
  - [30] H. Falcke *et al.*, *Nature* **435**, 313 (2005).
  - [31] D. Ardouin *et al.*, *Astropart. Phys.* **26**, 341 (2006).
  - [32] T. Huege *et al.*, *Nucl. Instr. Meth. A* **617**, 484 (2009).
  - [33] O. Scholten, K. Werner, and F. Rusydi, *Astropart. Phys.* **29**, 94 (2008).
  - [34] R. Engel, N.N. Kalmykov, and A.A. Konstantinov, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **21S1**, 65 (2006).
  - [35] H. Falcke and P. Gorham, *Astropart. Phys.* **19**, 477 (2003).
  - [36] T. Huege and H. Falcke, *Astron. & Astroph.* **412**, 19 (2003).
  - [37] D.A. Suprun, P.W. Gorham, and J.L. Rosner, *Astropart. Phys.* **20**, 157 (2003).
  - [38] T. Huege and H. Falcke, *Astron. & Astroph.* **430**, 779 (2005).
  - [39] M.A. Duvernois, B. Cai, and D. Kleckner, *Proc. 29th ICRC, Pune, India* **8**, 311 (2005).
  - [40] T. Huege, R. Ulrich, and R. Engel, *Astropart. Phys.* **27**, 392 (2007).
  - [41] T. Huege, *A detailed comparison of REAS3 and MGRM radio emission simulations*, Presented at ‘Acousitc and Radio EeV Neutrino detection Activities’ (ARENA), Nantes, France (2010) (to be published in proceedings).
  - [42] J. Alvarez-Muñiz, W.R. Carvalho, Jr, M. Tueros, and E. Zas, arXiv:1005.0552 (2010).