

Theory of spatially non-symmetric kinetic equilibria for collisionless plasmas

Claudio Cremaschini

*Department of Mathematics and Geosciences, University of Trieste, Via Valerio 12, 34127 Trieste, Italy and
Institute of Physics, Faculty of Philosophy and Science,
Silesian University in Opava, Bezručovo nám.13, CZ-74601 Opava, Czech Republic*

Massimo Tessarotto

*Department of Mathematics and Geosciences, University of Trieste, Via Valerio 12, 34127 Trieste, Italy
(Dated: July 4, 2023)*

The problem posed by the possible existence/non-existence of spatially non-symmetric kinetic equilibria has remained unsolved in plasma theory. For collisionless magnetized plasmas this involves the construction of stationary solutions of the Vlasov-Maxwell equations. In this paper the issue is addressed for non-relativistic plasmas both in astrophysical and laboratory contexts. The treatment is based on a Lagrangian variational description of single-particle dynamics. Starting point is a non-perturbative formulation of gyrokinetic theory, which allows one to construct “a posteriori” with prescribed order of accuracy an asymptotic representation for the magnetic moment. In terms of the relevant particle adiabatic invariants generalized bi-Maxwellian equilibria are proved to exist. These are shown to recover, under suitable assumptions, a Chapman-Enskog form which permits an analytical treatment of the corresponding fluid moments. In particular, the constraints posed by the Poisson and the Ampere equations are analyzed, both for quasi-neutral and non-neutral plasmas. The conditions of existence of the corresponding non-symmetric kinetic equilibria are investigated. As a notable feature, both astrophysical and laboratory plasmas are shown to exhibit, under suitable conditions, a kinetic dynamo, whereby the equilibrium magnetic field can be self-generated by the equilibrium plasma currents.

PACS numbers: 52.25.Xz, 52.25.Dg, 52.30.Cv, 52.30.Gz, 52.55.Hc, 95.30.Qd

I. INTRODUCTION

A fundamental issue of plasma kinetic theory is related to the search of possible spatially non-symmetric (in particular, non-axisymmetric) Vlasov-Maxwell kinetic equilibria or more generally quasi-stationary solutions characterizing magnetized plasmas. As it is well known, the problem has remained unsolved since its foundation laid down originally by Harold Grad in a series of famous papers [1–3]. In fact, according to what was pointed out by H. Grad himself, it is very unlikely that there exists a general class of toroidal non-symmetric equilibria with nested magnetic surfaces and smooth pressure profiles. His conclusion was based on the existence of periodicity constraints on the equilibrium magnetic field which he found to be generally not satisfied. The constraints considered by Grad had actually been pointed out independently by Kruskal, Kulsrud and Newcomb [4–6]. These were shown by Tessarotto *et al.* [7, 8] to be necessary conditions for the existence of quasi-symmetric MHD equilibria, i.e., localized stationary solutions of the scalar-pressure ideal-MHD equations in which the magnetic field satisfies locally the periodicity constraints on a suitable set of rational magnetic surfaces. In these works only the case of fluid equilibria was considered. However, the general problem of the construction of consistent kinetic (i.e., Vlasov-Maxwell) equilibria was actually not addressed. Surprisingly, despite its fundamental conceptual relevance for theoretical plasma physics, the problem has remained unsolved to date.

A further motivation is provided by recent develop-

ments regarding the construction of kinetic equilibria for collisionless axisymmetric magnetized plasmas [9–12] and their stability properties [13]. In these works it was shown that consistent solutions of the Vlasov-Maxwell equations can be determined for the kinetic distribution function (KDF), based on the identification of the relevant single-particle invariants. The perturbative kinetic theory developed therein permits to represent the species KDF in terms of generalized Maxwellian distributions, characterized by temperature anisotropy, non-uniform fluid fields and local plasma flows. Basic feature of these equilibria is that they can also support a kinetic dynamo mechanism, which can be responsible for the self-generation of the electromagnetic (EM) field in which the plasma is immersed [9, 10, 14]. These conclusions apply to axisymmetric magnetized plasmas both in the laboratory and astrophysical contexts. Important examples for the two cases are provided by Tokamak devices and accretion discs respectively.

The question arises, however, whether similar physical mechanisms can be found for collisionless magnetized plasmas also in the absence of spatial symmetries. A consistent theoretical description of these systems which may explain the observed phenomenology should be sought within the framework of a kinetic theory. This refers in particular, to the possible kinetic origin of equilibrium flows and electric current densities, together with the simultaneous occurrence of temperature and pressure anisotropies. The goal of the present investigation lies in the extension of the kinetic treatment presented in Refs.[9–12] to generally spatially non-symmetric plasma

configurations in both laboratory and astrophysical contexts. More precisely, here we refer specifically to the case of local configurations in bounded domains which are characterized by quasi-stationary plasma flows (flow-through plasma equilibria). In all cases plasmas are considered in spatially non-symmetric smooth electromagnetic fields, with astrophysical plasmas being possibly subject also to the action of a gravitational field. For this purpose, a necessary prerequisite consists in the determination of the single-particle invariants occurring in magnetized plasmas. This goal is reached in the framework of the gyrokinetic (GK) treatment of single-particle dynamics formulated in the framework of a variational Lagrangian approach. As a result, the GK magnetic moment is determined correct to first-order in the Larmor-radius expansion (LRE, see definition below). The expression of the magnetic moment thus obtained is then used for the construction of generalized Maxwellian solutions of the Vlasov equation. A remarkable feature of these equilibria lies in the fact that they can sustain non-uniform number density and anisotropic temperatures, while at the same time allowing for parallel and perpendicular flows and current densities. The latter could be in principle responsible for the self-generation of stationary non-symmetric magnetic and electric fields, thus giving rise to corresponding non-symmetric MHD equilibria (kinetic-MHD equilibria).

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 the solution method adopted here for the construction of kinetic equilibria is first discussed. In Section 3 fundamentals of GK theory are recalled in the framework of the Hamilton variational principle. In Section 4 a variational non-perturbative GK theory is developed for energy-conserving systems. After constructing a GK Lagrangian differential form, conditions of existence for the GK transformation are obtained together with a non-perturbative expression for the particle magnetic moment. On this basis, in Section 5 an asymptotic formulation of GK theory is derived, based on the Larmor-radius expansion. This allows one to obtain a representation of the magnetic moment in terms of an adiabatic invariant of first-order in the expansion parameter. Section 6 deals with the construction of exact equilibrium solution of the Vlasov equation, which are proved to admit a representation in terms of generalized bi-Maxwellian distributions. A suitable perturbative theory is developed in Section 7, which permits the analytical treatment of these solutions and their asymptotic representation in terms of a Chapman-Enskog series performed around an equilibrium bi-Maxwellian distribution. The equilibrium fluid moments corresponding to this solution are then calculated analytically in Section 8, which are identified with the species number density, flow velocity, pressure tensor and current density. Analysis of the constraints posed on the equilibrium KDF by the Poisson and the Ampere equations are investigated respectively in Sections 9 and 10 for both astrophysical and laboratory plasmas. Concluding remarks are presented in Section 11, while

the Appendix reports details of the Hamilton variational principles and the corresponding Euler-Lagrange equations in GK variables.

II. SOLUTION METHOD

The method adopted for the construction of Vlasov-Maxwell equilibria follows the guidelines pointed out in a series of recent papers [9–11]. The basic requirement is the search of equilibrium KDFs f_s for collisionless plasmas such that, in a suitable subset of phase-space, each of them can be realized in terms of appropriate generalized Gaussian distributions able to sustain kinetic-MHD equilibria. In the case of stationary or quasi-stationary configurations, besides the Chapman-Enskog method (see for example Refs.[15–19] for symmetric systems), a convenient solution technique for the Vlasov equation consists in the determination of particular solutions of the form $f_s = f_{*s}$, where f_{*s} is considered as a function of a suitable set of independent particle invariant phase-functions $\{K_j, j = 1, n\}$. More precisely, let $\mathbf{x} \equiv (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v})$ be the particle Newtonian state spanning the phase-space Υ and $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ a suitable transformed state in Υ' defined by the phase-space diffeomorphism $\Upsilon \rightarrow \Upsilon' : \mathbf{x} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{x}, t)$. Then, the local phase-functions $K_j = K_j(\mathbf{z}, t)$ are to be identified with exact or adiabatic invariants, here referred to as pointwise invariants, which satisfy one of the following conditions:

a) *Local (global) first integral*: K_j does not depend explicitly on time and moreover the equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}K_j(\mathbf{z}) = 0 \quad (1)$$

holds for all \mathbf{z} belonging to the proper subset of $\Upsilon'_1 \subset \Upsilon'$ (respectively, $\Upsilon'_1 = \Upsilon'$).

b) *Local (global) adiabatic invariant of order $k \geq 1$* : K_j can depend at most slowly on time, in the sense $K_j = K_j(\mathbf{z}, \varepsilon^k t)$, and satisfies the asymptotic equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}K_j(\mathbf{z}, \varepsilon^k t) = 0 + O(\varepsilon^k), \quad (2)$$

for all \mathbf{z} belonging to the proper subset of $\Upsilon'_1 \subset \Upsilon'$ (respectively, $\Upsilon'_1 = \Upsilon'$). Here $\varepsilon \ll 1$ is a suitable dimensionless parameter to be considered as infinitesimal and later identified with the Larmor-radius parameter (see Section 5).

If f_{*s} is a function of first integrals only, then it is itself a first integral. This identifies a stationary KDF. On the other hand, if f_{*s} depends also on adiabatic invariants of prescribed order, it is necessarily quasi-stationary, in the sense that it is itself an adiabatic invariant too. As a short way, in the following, in both cases f_{*s} will be referred to as an equilibrium KDF (or kinetic equilibrium).

Notice that the notion of adiabatic invariant given by Eq.(2) and required for the solution method adopted

here, generally differs from that considered previously in some literature. In particular, both Eqs.(1) and (2) state that each K_j must remain constant pointwise along a phase-space trajectory, and not just merely in some averaged sense. In the latter case the notion of invariant, based on Eq.(2), is replaced by the requirement that, for a prescribed $k \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha < k$, the averaged equation $\langle \frac{d}{dt} K_j \rangle = 0 + O(\varepsilon^\alpha)$ holds, with the brackets “ $\langle \rangle$ ” denoting a suitable phase-space average operator (cf gyrophase average; see discussion below in Section 3). The type of requirement indicated by Eqs.(1) and (2) necessarily demands the adoption of gyrokinetic theory. Approaches of this type are well-known in the literature (see for example the Hamiltonian Lie-transform method by Dubin et al. [20], also adopted by Brizard [21] in the case of laboratory plasmas). In this paper however we formulate the problem from a more general viewpoint applicable also to astrophysical plasmas immersed in equilibrium configurations. This is based on a Lagrangian formulation valid in principle also for finite guiding-center transformations. Such a formulation allows one to determine “a posteriori” explicit perturbative corrections of the magnetic moment with prescribed accuracy.

To conclude this section, it is important to remark that a basic requirement for the application of the method is that it should also afford determining “a posteriori” a perturbative representation of the KDF equivalent to the Chapman-Enskog expansion, according to the perturbative technique developed in Refs.[9–12] for axisymmetric plasmas. Here we point out that in fact this goal can be reached also for non-symmetric configurations, in the framework of validity of GK theory and in a suitable subset of phase-space characteristic for each plasma species.

III. FUNDAMENTALS OF GK THEORY

The theory of charged particle dynamics in intense EM fields has a long history, whose origin dates back to Alfvén [22] who first showed that the magnetic moment is an adiabatic invariant associated to the fast rotation of charged particles around magnetic flux lines. The problem belongs to the more general framework related to the search of local/global first integrals of motion and/or adiabatic invariants for classical dynamical systems represented by Newtonian N -body systems of charged particles.

In the context of classical dynamics, both for non-relativistic and relativistic charged particles, the appropriate theoretical framework is provided by the Hamilton variational principle [23–26]. In fact, the result follows in a natural way thanks to the validity of Noether theorem as a consequence of the existence of exact or approximate symmetry transformations. When EM radiation-reaction effects are neglected, the treatment in the two cases exhibits analogous qualitative properties. In particular, it can be shown that, under suitable conditions,

the magnetic moment in both cases remains an adiabatic invariant to arbitrary order in terms of the asymptotic expansion parameter ε , to be associated with the particle Larmor radius (see Refs.[27, 28] and the discussion below).

In this paper we focus on the dynamics of isolated point-like charges in suitably-smooth spatially non-symmetric and stationary EM fields, ignoring relativistic effects. Thus, in the present context, the phase-space transformation of interest $\Upsilon \rightarrow \Upsilon'$ is identified with the so-called gyrokinetic (GK) transformation

$$\mathbf{x} \equiv (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}) \rightarrow \mathbf{z}' \equiv (\mathbf{y}', \phi'), \quad (3)$$

in which the transformed state \mathbf{z} is realized by the GK state $\mathbf{z}' \equiv (\mathbf{y}', \phi')$ which can be conveniently identified with hybrid (i.e., non-canonical) variables. Here ϕ' is a suitable gyrophase-angle (see Section 3) and \mathbf{y}' is an appropriate five-component vector. They are defined in such a way to satisfy either identically or in asymptotic sense (at least in a suitable subset of phase-space) the GK equations of motion

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{z}' = \mathbf{Z}, \quad (4)$$

in which the vector field \mathbf{Z} is respectively either of the form $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{y}', t)$ or $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{y}', t) [1 + O(\varepsilon^k)]$, where the correction contribution of $O(\varepsilon^k)$ is generally a function of the gyrophase-angle ϕ' too. A fundamental consequence is that the momentum $p_{\phi'}$ conjugate to ϕ' determines necessarily one of the phase-functions K_j . The construction of a phase-space diffeomorphism of the type (3) is referred to as GK theory.

The explicit determination of the phase-function $p_{\phi'}$ follows from the Hamilton variational functional expressed in hybrid variables. Starting point is the fundamental differential form in superabundant Newtonian variables $(\mathbf{r}, \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v})$ (with \mathbf{v} to be considered independent of $\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{r}$). For a particle characterized by mass M_s and charge $Z_s e$ this is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda \left(\mathbf{r}, \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v} \right) &\equiv dt \mathcal{L} \left(\mathbf{r}, \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v} \right) = \\ &= d\mathbf{r} \cdot \left[M_s \mathbf{v} + \frac{Z_s e}{c} \mathbf{A} \right] - dt \mathcal{H}_s, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where \mathbf{A} is the vector potential, \mathcal{H}_s is the total particle energy

$$\mathcal{H}_s = \frac{M_s v^2}{2} + Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff} \equiv Z_s e \Phi_{*s} \quad (6)$$

and $\Phi_s^{eff} \equiv \Phi + \frac{M_s}{Z_s e} \Phi_G$, with Φ and Φ_G being the electrostatic (ES) and gravitational potential respectively. For definiteness, in the following \mathbf{A} is prescribed in the Coulomb gauge $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = 0$, with both \mathbf{A} and Φ_s^{eff} to be assumed stationary and \mathbf{A} satisfies the boundary condition at infinity $\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$. By representing Λ in terms of

the variables \mathbf{z}' , this yields the fundamental Lagrangian differential form $\Lambda_1(\mathbf{z}', \frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{z}')$ of the type

$$\Lambda_1\left(\mathbf{z}', \frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{z}'\right) = \left[\Gamma_{y'_i} + \frac{\partial R}{\partial y'_i}\right] dy'_i + \left[\Gamma_{\phi'} + \frac{\partial R}{\partial \phi'}\right] d\phi' + \left[\Gamma_t + \frac{\partial R}{\partial t}\right] dt, \quad (7)$$

with R being a generic gauge phase-function. Provided the gauge function R and the GK transformation (3) are suitably defined, ϕ' is a GK variable only if it is ignorable for the phase-functions $\left[\Gamma_{y'_i} + \frac{\partial R}{\partial y'_i}\right]$, $\left[\Gamma_{\phi'} + \frac{\partial R}{\partial \phi'}\right]$ and $\left[\Gamma_t + \frac{\partial R}{\partial t}\right]$. This means that $p_{\phi's} = \left\langle \Gamma_{\phi'} + \frac{\partial R}{\partial \phi'} \right\rangle$, where the brackets “ $\langle \rangle$ ” denote the gyrophase-average performed with respect to the gyrophase-angle ϕ' and keeping constant the remaining GK variables, namely \mathbf{y}' . For a generic smooth function of the GK state this is defined as the linear operator $\langle \rangle \equiv \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\phi'$. For completeness, we introduce here also the tilda-operator $\tilde{[]} \equiv I - \langle \rangle$, with I denoting the identity operator. This permits to define the magnetic moment m'_s as the invariant

$$m'_s = -\frac{Z_s e}{M_s c} p_{\phi's}. \quad (8)$$

Notice that in principle the construction of m'_s can be formally realized by means of a finite, rather than infinitesimal [20, 21], transformation of the type (3). This task is carried out in the next section.

IV. VARIATIONAL NON-PERTURBATIVE GK THEORY

In this Section we proceed with the construction of a non-perturbative approach to non-relativistic GK theory for point-like magnetized charged particles, namely immersed in stationary and spatially non-symmetric smooth EM and gravitational fields such that $E^2 \ll B^2$. Starting point is the definition of the non-canonical variables which prescribe the GK transformation. In view of the applications to the investigation of kinetic equilibria we consider here the case in which the total particle energy is conserved, so that $\mathcal{H}_s = E_s$, where E_s is the initial value of \mathcal{H}_s . In the following it is also assumed that the effective potential Φ_s^{eff} is bounded from below, so that, thanks to energy-conservation, $|\mathbf{v}| = \sqrt{\frac{2}{M_s} (E_s - Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff})}$ remains always bounded too. In this case, a convenient choice for the GK state \mathbf{z}' is to identify it with $\mathbf{z}' \equiv (\mathbf{r}', \mathcal{H}_s, p_{\phi's}, \phi')$, where \mathbf{r}' denotes the guiding-center position vector. As a consequence of this choice it follows that the vector field \mathbf{Z} introduced in Eq.(4) takes the form $\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}'}, Z_{\mathcal{H}_s} = 0, Z_{p_{\phi's}} = 0, Z_{\phi'}]$,

with $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}'}$ and $Z_{\phi'}$ to be determined in terms of the Euler-Lagrange equations prescribed by the Lagrangian differential form Λ_1 .

In order to define the variables \mathbf{r}' and ϕ' we introduce preliminarily for the Newtonian particle state \mathbf{x} the transformation to the corresponding guiding-center state $\mathbf{x}' = (\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{v}')$. This is determined by the guiding-center diffeomorphism:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r} &= \mathbf{r}' + \rho'_1, \\ \mathbf{v} &= \mathbf{v}' + \mathbf{V}', \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where \mathbf{r}' and $\mathbf{v}' \equiv u'\mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{w}' + \nu'_1$ are respectively referred to as guiding-center position and velocity vectors, the latter being defined relative to a suitably-prescribed reference velocity $\mathbf{V}' \equiv \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{y}', t)$. In the following all primed quantities are intended as evaluated at the position \mathbf{r}' . Furthermore $\rho'_1 = \rho'_1(\mathbf{z}', t)$, denoted as Larmor-radius vector, and the velocity contribution $\nu'_1 = \nu'_1(\mathbf{z}', t)$ are assumed to be purely oscillatory, namely of the form $\langle \rho'_1 \rangle = \langle \nu'_1 \rangle = 0$. Instead, \mathbf{r}' and u' are assumed to be gyrophase-independent, namely such that $\mathbf{r}' = \langle \mathbf{r}' \rangle$ and $u' = \langle u' \rangle$. In detail, the meaning of the variables is as follows. First, $\mathbf{b}' \equiv \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{r}', t)$ denotes the unit vector associated to the magnetic field evaluated at the guiding-center position \mathbf{r}' . It follows that $u' + \nu'_1 \cdot \mathbf{b}' \equiv u' + \nu'_{1\parallel}$ is the relative parallel velocity, while $\mathbf{w}' + \nu'_1 \cdot (\underline{\mathbf{I}} - \mathbf{b}'\mathbf{b}')$ is the corresponding perpendicular relative velocity. In particular, \mathbf{w}' is represented as $\mathbf{w}' = w' \cos \phi' \mathbf{e}'_1 + w' \sin \phi' \mathbf{e}'_2$, where by construction $w' \equiv |\mathbf{w}'| = \langle w' \rangle$, while

$$\phi' \equiv \arctan \left[\frac{(\mathbf{v} - u'\mathbf{b}' - \nu'_1 - \mathbf{V}') \cdot \mathbf{e}'_2}{(\mathbf{v} - u'\mathbf{b}' - \nu'_1 - \mathbf{V}') \cdot \mathbf{e}'_1} \right] \quad (11)$$

identifies the guiding-center gyrophase angle and $(\mathbf{e}'_1, \mathbf{e}'_2, \mathbf{e}'_3 = \mathbf{b}')$ is a right-handed system of orthogonal unit vectors (magnetic orthonormal basis). Hence, ϕ' is a velocity-space variable which determines the direction of \mathbf{w}' in the plane orthogonal to \mathbf{b}' at position \mathbf{r}' . Finally, \mathbf{V}' is identified with the gyrophase-independent species drift velocity

$$\mathbf{V}' = \mathbf{V}'_{Eff} + \mathbf{V}'_1 \equiv V'_{\parallel} \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{V}'_{\perp}, \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbf{V}'_{Eff} = \frac{c}{B'} \mathbf{E}'^{eff} \times \mathbf{b}'$ and $\mathbf{E}'^{eff} \equiv -\nabla' \Phi_s^{eff}$ is the species-dependent effective electric field generated by Φ_s^{eff} . In this representation the species-dependent component V'_{\parallel} and the remaining contribution \mathbf{V}'_1 are both to be considered as suitably-prescribed functions of the GK variables \mathbf{y}' . Due to the choice of GK variables considered here, we need to establish the relationship between u' and $\nu'_{1\parallel}$ in terms of the constant total particle energy E_s . Denoting by $D_s(\mathbf{z}') \equiv \sqrt{\frac{2}{M_s} [E_s - Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff} - \frac{M_s}{2} (\mathbf{w}' + \nu'_{1\perp} + \mathbf{V}'_{\perp})^2]}$, one obtains the following unique representations:

$$|u' + V'_{\parallel}| = \langle D_s(\mathbf{z}') \rangle, \quad (13)$$

$$|\nu'_{1\parallel}| = [D_s(\mathbf{z}')]^{\sim}. \quad (14)$$

Notice that the previous quantities demand the evaluation of ϕ' -averages in terms of the GK variables \mathbf{y}' indicated above. This requires the corresponding representations for w' of the form $w' = w'(m'_s, E_s, \mathbf{r}')$ as well as the explicit determination of ρ'_1 , ν'_1 and m'_s .

A. GK Lagrangian differential form

Let us now proceed constructing explicitly the GK Lagrangian differential form Λ_1 from Eq.(5). Invoking the guiding-center transformations (9) and (10), let us introduce the dynamical gauge $Y = \rho'_1 \cdot (M_s \mathbf{V}' + \frac{Z_s e}{c} \mathbf{A}') + R(\mathbf{z}')$, with $R(\mathbf{z}')$ assumed to be purely oscillatory and to be determined below. Then the Lagrangian differential form can be equivalently written in terms of $\Lambda_1(\mathbf{z}', \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{z}') \equiv \Lambda(\mathbf{r}, \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}) - dY$. A sufficient condition for Λ_1 to be gyrophase-independent is that the following constraint equations are satisfied identically in the whole subset of phase-space in which the guiding-center transformation is defined so that:

$$[\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbf{r}'} - \nabla' R] \sim = 0, \quad (15)$$

$$\left[\Gamma_{\phi'} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi'} R \right] \sim = 0, \quad (16)$$

where $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbf{r}'} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbf{r}'}(\mathbf{z}')$ and $\Gamma_{\phi'} = \Gamma_{\phi'}(\mathbf{z}')$ denote the phase-functions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbf{r}'} \equiv & M_s (u' \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{w}' + \mathbf{V}' + \nu'_1) \\ & + \nabla' \rho'_1 \cdot \left[M_s (u' \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{w}' + \nu'_1) + \frac{Z_s e}{c} \mathbf{A}' \right] \\ & + \frac{Z_s e}{c} \mathbf{A}' - \frac{Z_s e}{c} \nabla' \rho'_1 \cdot \mathbf{A}' \\ & - \left[M_s \nabla' \mathbf{V}' \cdot \rho'_1 + \frac{Z_s e}{c} \nabla' \mathbf{A}' \cdot \rho'_1 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

$$\Gamma_{\phi'} \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi'} \rho'_1 \cdot \left[M_s (u' \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{w}' + \nu'_1) + \frac{Z_s e}{c} (\mathbf{A}' - \mathbf{A}') \right]. \quad (18)$$

It follows that, provided a smooth solution to the constraint equations (15) and (16) exists, $\Lambda_1(\mathbf{z}', \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{z}')$ becomes

$$\Lambda_1 \left(\mathbf{y}', \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{z}' \right) = d\mathbf{r}' \cdot \langle \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbf{r}'} - \nabla' R \rangle + p_{\phi'_s} d\phi' - dt \mathcal{H}_s, \quad (19)$$

to be referred to as GK Lagrangian differential form. Here the notation is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbf{r}'} - \nabla' R \rangle \equiv & M_s (u' \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{V}') + \frac{Z_s e}{c} \langle \mathbf{A}' \rangle - \nabla' \langle R \rangle \\ & + \left\langle \nabla' \rho'_1 \cdot \left[M_s (\mathbf{w}' + \nu'_1) + \frac{Z_s e}{c} \mathbf{A}' \right] \right\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

while

$$p_{\phi'_s} \equiv \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi'} \rho'_1 \cdot \left[M_s (\mathbf{w}' + \nu'_1) + \frac{Z_s e}{c} \mathbf{A}' \right] \right\rangle. \quad (21)$$

The corresponding Euler-Lagrange equations are reported for completeness in the Appendix. The following remarks are in order:

1) For the extremal variables \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{v} the relationship $\mathbf{v} = \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{r}$ is implied by the Hamilton variational principle. This means that ρ'_1 and ν'_1 must necessarily satisfy the additional constraint equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} \rho'_1 = \mathbf{w}' + \nu'_1, \quad (22)$$

where, due to the chain rule, the lhs becomes

$$\frac{d}{dt} \rho'_1 = \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}'} \cdot \nabla' \rho'_1 + Z_{\phi'} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi'} \rho'_1. \quad (23)$$

Therefore, this implies that the two phase-functions $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}'}$ and $Z_{\phi'}$ enter the very definition of ρ'_1 and ν'_1 .

2) The evaluation of Λ_1 as well as $p_{\phi'_s}$ necessarily involves the preliminary determination of both the vectors ρ'_1 and ν'_1 and the gauge function R . This task requires the explicit solution of the set of constraint equations (15), (16) and (22). The two vector equations (15) and (22) determine ρ'_1 and ν'_1 , while the scalar equation (16) yields the gauge function R . This implies that R is a non-local function of ρ'_1 and ν'_1 , while (15) and (22) are non-local equations for the same variables.

3) The non-perturbative expression of $p_{\phi'_s}$ in Eq.(21) recovers the familiar form of a particle canonical momentum. Due to the constraint equation (22) the latter provides for the magnetic moment the representation

$$\begin{aligned} m'_s \equiv & -\frac{1}{M_s} \left(\frac{Z_s e}{c} \right)^2 \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi'} \rho'_1 \cdot \mathbf{A}' \right\rangle \\ & - \frac{Z_s e}{c} \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi'} \rho'_1 \cdot \left[\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}'} \cdot \nabla' \rho'_1 + Z_{\phi'} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi'} \rho'_1 \right] \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Notice that this means in particular that $p_{\phi'_s}$ is generally non-observable. In fact, let us consider the EM gauge transformation which preserves the conservation of \mathcal{H}_s , $(\Phi, \mathbf{A}) \rightarrow (\Phi, \mathbf{A} + \nabla S(\mathbf{r}))$, with S denoting a suitable real smooth scalar function. Then it follows that in such a gauge $p_{\phi'_s}$ becomes generally different from Eq.(21).

4) For the same reason, also ρ'_1 and ν'_1 are non-unique and therefore represent physical non-observable quantities. In fact both the phase-functions $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbf{r}'}(\mathbf{z}')$ and $\Gamma_{\phi'}(\mathbf{z}')$ depend explicitly on the choice of the EM gauge function $S(\mathbf{r})$. This means that also the guiding-center position vector \mathbf{r}' as well as the guiding-center velocity components u' and \mathbf{w}' are generally non-unique (and non-observables). Nevertheless it is obvious that Eqs.(9) and (10) warrant that the rhs of these equations are unique and therefore define observables.

5) To restore the uniqueness of both $p_{\phi'_s}$ and the set (ρ'_1, ν'_1) with respect to the EM gauge transformation indicated above, it is sufficient to impose that the gauge function $S(\mathbf{r})$ vanishes on the boundary of a suitable bounded sub-set Ω of the configuration space \mathbb{R}^3 to which the charged particle belongs. In fact, in this case the

Coulomb gauge $\nabla^2 S = 0$ requires $S = 0$ identically in Ω . This includes also the case in which ∇S is a constant vector. Therefore, under this condition the vector potential \mathbf{A} is uniquely determined.

6) A fundamental issue is whether under the assumption indicated in point 5) $p_{\phi's}$ and the set (ρ'_1, ν'_1) are actually observables. The answer to this question is straightforward. In fact, let us consider the action of a dynamical gauge $R_1 = R_1(\mathbf{y}')$. This manifestly leaves invariant the constraint equations (15) and (16) as well as Eq.(21). This proves the statement.

7) We stress that, at this stage, the transformations relating \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{x}' and \mathbf{z}' are in principle finite and non-perturbative, which means that they are not based on any perturbative expansion for the guiding-center transformation and/or the construction of the GK Lagrangian differential form. The fundamental physical implication is that, in the subset of phase-space in which the GK transformation (3) is defined, provided ρ'_1 and ν'_1 are uniquely determined, the magnetic moment m'_s is a local first-integral of motion.

V. SECOND-ORDER LRE FOR GK THEORY

In order to obtain an explicit solution for the constraint equations (15), (16) and (22) and to determine explicitly the guiding-center and GK transformations (respectively, Eqs.(9)-(10) and (3)) in this section we develop a second-order perturbative Larmor-radius expansion (LRE) for all these quantities [10, 20, 29–37]. This is achieved by introducing suitable asymptotic orderings in terms of the Larmor-radius dimensionless parameter ε defined as

$$\varepsilon \equiv \frac{|\rho'_1|}{L} \ll 1, \quad (25)$$

with L denoting the smallest local characteristic scale-length associated to the stationary EM and gravitational fields. In particular we first impose the following asymptotic GK orderings:

$$|\nabla' \rho'_1| \sim \frac{|\nu'_1|}{|\mathbf{v} - \nu'_1|} \sim O(\varepsilon), \quad (26)$$

$$\frac{|\mathbf{V}'|}{|\mathbf{v}|} \lesssim O(\varepsilon^0), \quad (27)$$

$$\frac{\frac{M_s v^2}{2}}{Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff}} \sim \frac{M_s |\mathbf{v}|}{\frac{Z_s e}{c} |\mathbf{A}|} \sim O(\varepsilon), \quad (28)$$

and furthermore for the two fields $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}'}$ and $Z_{\phi'}$ we require

$$\frac{|\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}'}|}{L \Omega'_{cs}} \sim O(\varepsilon), \quad (29)$$

$$\left| \frac{Z_{\phi'}}{\Omega'_{cs}} \right| = 1 + O(\varepsilon), \quad (30)$$

where $\Omega'_{cs} \equiv \frac{Z_s e B'}{M_s c}$ is the cyclotron frequency at the guiding-center position \mathbf{r}' . Then, introducing for ρ'_1 and ν'_1 perturbative expansions of the form

$$\rho'_1 = \varepsilon \mathbf{r}'_1 + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{r}'_2 + \dots, \quad (31)$$

$$\nu'_1 = \varepsilon \mathbf{v}'_1 + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{v}'_2 + \dots, \quad (32)$$

the second-order guiding-center transformation is thus obtained by letting

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}' + \varepsilon \mathbf{r}'_1 + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{r}'_2, \quad (33)$$

$$\mathbf{v} = u' \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{w}' + \mathbf{V}' + \varepsilon \mathbf{v}'_1, \quad (34)$$

while the gauge function R must be similarly expanded as $R = \varepsilon R_1 + \varepsilon^2 R_2 + \dots$. Let us now assume that the EM and gravitational fields are smooth- C^∞ functions which vary slowly on the Larmor-radius scale, in the sense that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}(\varepsilon^k \mathbf{r})$ and $\Phi^{eff} = \Phi^{eff}(\varepsilon^k \mathbf{r})$, with $k \geq 0$. In the case $k = 0$, this implies for them the validity of Taylor-expansions of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) &= \mathbf{A}' + \varepsilon \mathbf{r}'_1 \cdot \nabla' \mathbf{A}' + \varepsilon^2 \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{r}'_1 : \nabla' \nabla' \mathbf{A}' \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{r}'_2 \cdot \nabla' \mathbf{A}' [1 + O(\varepsilon)], \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^{eff}(\mathbf{r}) &= \Phi^{eff'} + \varepsilon \mathbf{r}'_1 \cdot \nabla' \Phi^{eff'} + \varepsilon^2 \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{r}'_1 : \nabla' \nabla' \Phi^{eff'} \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{r}'_2 \cdot \nabla' \Phi^{eff'} [1 + O(\varepsilon)]. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Introducing the previous representations in the constraint equations (15), (16) and (22) one readily finds that, correct to first order in ε , \mathbf{r}'_1 is given by the customary expression

$$\mathbf{r}'_1 = -\frac{\mathbf{w}' \times \mathbf{b}'}{\Omega'_{cs}}. \quad (37)$$

Instead, \mathbf{r}'_2 is found to obey the constraint equation

$$\begin{aligned} M_s \mathbf{v}'_1 + \frac{Z_s e}{c} \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{r}'_1 : \nabla' \nabla' \mathbf{A}' \right]^\sim \\ + \left[\nabla' \mathbf{r}'_1 \cdot \left[M_s (u' \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{w}') + \frac{Z_s e}{c} \mathbf{r}'_1 \cdot \nabla' \mathbf{A}' \right] \right]^\sim \\ - \frac{Z_s e B'}{c} \mathbf{r}'_2 \times \mathbf{b}' - M_s \nabla' \mathbf{V}' \cdot \mathbf{r}'_1 = [\nabla' R_1]^\sim, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

with the gauge function R_1 being given by

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &= \frac{Z_s e}{c \Omega'_c} \int d\phi' [(\mathbf{r}'_1 \cdot \nabla' \mathbf{A}') \cdot \mathbf{w}']^\sim \\ &\quad - \left\langle \frac{Z_s e}{c \Omega'_c} \int d\phi' [(\mathbf{r}'_1 \cdot \nabla' \mathbf{A}') \cdot \mathbf{w}']^\sim \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

As a consequence, the magnetic moment representation given by Eq.(24) yields correct to first order in ε the expression

$$m'_s = \mu'_0 + \varepsilon \mu'_1, \quad (40)$$

where $\mu'_0 \equiv \frac{1}{2} \frac{M_s}{B'} w'^2$ is the customary representation for the leading-order magnetic moment, while the first-order correction is given by

$$\varepsilon \mu'_1 \equiv \varepsilon \frac{M_s}{B'} \langle \mathbf{w}' \cdot \mathbf{v}'_1 \rangle. \quad (41)$$

In particular, the scalar product $\langle \mathbf{w}' \cdot \mathbf{v}'_1 \rangle$ can be evaluated explicitly based on Eq.(38) yielding

$$\langle \mathbf{w}' \cdot \mathbf{v}'_1 \rangle = -\langle \mathbf{w}' \cdot \nabla' (u' \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{V}') \cdot \mathbf{r}'_1 \rangle + \Omega'^2_{cs} \langle \mathbf{r}'_2 \cdot \mathbf{r}'_1 \rangle, \quad (42)$$

where in particular

$$\langle \mathbf{w}' \cdot \nabla' (u' \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{V}') \cdot \mathbf{r}'_1 \rangle = \frac{c}{B' Z_s e} \mu' \left[u \frac{4\pi}{c} J'_{\parallel} + \mathbf{B}' \cdot \nabla' \times \mathbf{V}' \right], \quad (43)$$

with $J'_{\parallel} \equiv \mathbf{J}'_{\parallel} \cdot \mathbf{b}'$ being the parallel electric current density which locally generates the non-vacuum magnetic field. From Eq.(42) it follows that, in order to determine the correction $\varepsilon \mu'_1$, the explicit representation of \mathbf{r}'_2 is required. In order to proceed with this, we introduce the following perturbative expansions for the two quantities $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}'}$ and $Z_{\phi'}$ which enter the constraint equation (23):

$$\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}'} = [\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}'}]_0 + \varepsilon [\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}'}]_1, \quad (44)$$

$$Z_{\phi'} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} [Z_{\phi'}]_{-1} + [Z_{\phi'}]_0. \quad (45)$$

In particular, from the Euler-Lagrange equations given in the Appendix, after setting $V'_{\parallel} = 0$, one can obtain for the terms in Eq.(44) the following result

$$[\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}'}]_0 = u' \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{V}', \quad (46)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon [\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}'}]_1 &= \frac{\varepsilon u'}{\Omega'_{cs}} \left(u' \frac{4\pi}{c B'} \mathbf{J}' + \nabla' \times \mathbf{V}' \right) \cdot (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{b}\mathbf{b}) \\ &\quad - \frac{\varepsilon}{\Omega'_{cs}} \left[u'^2 \nabla' \ln B' \times \mathbf{b}' + \frac{\mu'}{M_s} \nabla' B' \right] \times \mathbf{b}' \\ &\quad - \frac{\varepsilon}{\Omega'_{cs}} [\nabla \mathbf{V}' \cdot \mathbf{V}'] \times \mathbf{b}', \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where in these expressions and in the following calculations $\mathbf{V}' = \mathbf{V}'_{E^{eff}}$. Similarly, the series terms in Eq.(45) are found to be

$$[Z_{\phi'}]_{-1} = -\Omega'_{cs}, \quad (48)$$

$$\begin{aligned} [Z_{\phi'}]_0 &= \frac{\Omega'_{cs}}{w'^2} \langle \mathbf{w}' \cdot \nabla' (u' \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{V}') \cdot \mathbf{r}'_1 \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{\Omega'_{cs}}{w'^2} \langle \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}'_0} \cdot \nabla' \mathbf{r}'_1 \cdot \mathbf{w}' \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Then, combining Eqs.(22) and (38), the following equation is obtained for \mathbf{r}'_2 :

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi'} \mathbf{r}'_2 + \mathbf{r}'_2 \times \mathbf{b}' = \mathbf{S}_2^{\sim}, \quad (50)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_2^{\sim} &= \frac{1}{\Omega'_{cs}} \left[[\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{r}'}]_0 \cdot \nabla' \mathbf{r}'_1 + [Z_{\phi'}]_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi'} \mathbf{r}'_1 \right] - \frac{[\nabla' R_1]_{\sim}}{M_s \Omega'_{cs}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\Omega'_{cs}} \left[\nabla' \mathbf{r}'_1 \cdot \left[(u' \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{w}') + \frac{Z_s e}{c M_s} \mathbf{r}'_1 \cdot \nabla' \mathbf{A}' \right] \right]_{\sim} \\ &\quad + B' \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{r}'_1 : \nabla' \nabla' \mathbf{A}' \right]_{\sim} - \frac{1}{\Omega'_{cs}} \nabla' \mathbf{V}' \cdot \mathbf{r}'_1. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

In order to determine an explicit solution for \mathbf{r}'_2 , we project Eq.(50) along the magnetic orthonormal basis ($\mathbf{e}'_1, \mathbf{e}'_2, \mathbf{e}'_3 = \mathbf{b}'$). The parallel component determines $r'_{2\parallel} \equiv \mathbf{r}'_2 \cdot \mathbf{b}'$, yielding

$$r'_{2\parallel} = \int d\phi' [\mathbf{S}_2^{\sim} \cdot \mathbf{b}'] - \left\langle \int d\phi' [\mathbf{S}_2^{\sim} \cdot \mathbf{b}'] \right\rangle. \quad (52)$$

The projections along \mathbf{e}'_1 and \mathbf{e}'_2 can be combined to give the set of equations

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi'^2} r'_{21} + r'_{21} = D_1(\phi'), \quad (53)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi'^2} r'_{22} + r'_{22} = D_2(\phi'), \quad (54)$$

where $r'_{21} \equiv \mathbf{r}'_2 \cdot \mathbf{e}'_1$ and $r'_{22} \equiv \mathbf{r}'_2 \cdot \mathbf{e}'_2$, and furthermore

$$D_1(\phi') \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi'} \mathbf{S}_2^{\sim} \cdot \mathbf{e}'_1 - \mathbf{S}_2^{\sim} \cdot \mathbf{e}'_2, \quad (55)$$

$$D_2(\phi') \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi'} \mathbf{S}_2^{\sim} \cdot \mathbf{e}'_2 + \mathbf{S}_2^{\sim} \cdot \mathbf{e}'_1. \quad (56)$$

In both cases, the general solution can be written as

$$r'_{21} = \alpha r'_{11} + \int_0^{2\pi} d\bar{\phi} F(\phi', \bar{\phi}) D_1(\bar{\phi}), \quad (57)$$

$$r'_{22} = \beta r'_{12} + \int_0^{2\pi} d\bar{\phi} F(\phi', \bar{\phi}) D_2(\bar{\phi}), \quad (58)$$

where $r'_{11} \equiv \mathbf{r}'_1 \cdot \mathbf{e}'_1$ and $r'_{12} \equiv \mathbf{r}'_1 \cdot \mathbf{e}'_2$, $F(\phi', \bar{\phi}) = \sin(\phi' - \bar{\phi})$ is the Green function for Eqs.(53) and (54) and α, β are gyrophase-independent. In the context of the present perturbative theory, the terms $\alpha r'_{11}$ and $\beta r'_{12}$ represent corrections proportional to \mathbf{r}'_1 . Therefore, the coefficients α and β can always be set equal to zero. The explicit determination of the two components r'_{21} and r'_{22} can be readily obtained based on Eq.(51). Combining Eqs.(42) and (43) and the result for \mathbf{r}'_2 yields the following expression for the first-order perturbation $\varepsilon \mu'_1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \mu'_1 &= -\varepsilon \mu'_0 \frac{1}{B'} \frac{1}{\Omega'_{cs}} \left[u' \frac{4\pi}{c} J'_{\parallel} + \mathbf{B}' \cdot \nabla' \times \mathbf{V}' \right] \\ &\quad - \varepsilon \mu'_0 \frac{2}{\Omega'_{cs}} \left[\nabla' \cdot \mathbf{V}' + \frac{4\pi}{B'^2} \mathbf{J}' \cdot \mathbf{E}'^{eff} \right] \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \mu'_0 \frac{1}{\Omega'_{cs}} \frac{8\pi}{B'^2} J'_{\parallel} E'_{\parallel}{}^{eff}, \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

where $E_{\parallel}^{eff} \equiv \mathbf{E}^{eff} \cdot \mathbf{b}'$.

Let us briefly analyze the physical interpretation of Eq.(59). The first two terms on the rhs formally agree with the perturbative calculations obtained in Ref.[29] for the magnetic moment evaluated at the actual particle position \mathbf{r} . The remaining contributions on the rhs are new and represent corrections arising due to the presence of both a finite current density \mathbf{J}' and a strong effective electric field, in the sense of Eqs.(27) and (28). In more detail, we notice that the first contribution on the rhs which is proportional to u' coincides with the term identified originally by Kruskal [38] and ascribed to the existence of a non-vanishing parallel current density J'_{\parallel} . Remarkably, at this order, the latter is the only contribution to the magnetic moment which is odd in the parallel velocity u' .

We conclude this section pointing out that the existence of additional adiabatic invariants should be excluded in the present context. In particular, the parallel adiabatic invariant must be generally ruled out because of the ordering assumption (28) invoked for the effective potential together with the absence of symmetry for the EM and gravitational fields. Therefore, under these conditions and in validity of the GK transformation and the LRE, it follows that the only independent adiabatic invariants which characterize the system of interest are the total particle effective potential Φ_{*s} defined in Eq.(6) and the magnetic moment m'_s given by Eqs.(40) and (59). For definiteness, in the following we consider the subset of phase-space for which the adiabatic invariants $G_s = (\Phi_{*s}, m'_s)$ exist and are assumed such that $\frac{1}{\Omega_s} \frac{d}{dt} \ln G_s = 0 + O(\varepsilon_s^k)$, with $k \geq 3$, while possible lower-order adiabatic invariants will be ignored.

VI. KINETIC EQUILIBRIA: GENERAL SOLUTION

In this section we address the issue of the construction of Vlasov-Maxwell spatially non-symmetric kinetic equilibria, which describe collisionless plasmas immersed in spatially non-symmetric and smooth EM and gravitational fields. As stated in the Introduction, here we focus on the treatment of flow-through plasma equilibria occurring in suitable sub-sets of the configuration space and in the presence of appropriate plasma sources. In particular, we look for solutions of the Vlasov equation in the sub-set of velocity space $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ in which the magnetic moment m'_s is an adiabatic invariant. We restrict our analysis to the case of slowly-varying EM and gravitational fields, ignoring the possible occurrence of both global and local (in velocity space) resonance phenomena for the magnetic moment [39–42]. Following the corresponding treatment developed in Refs.[9–12] for axisymmetric kinetic equilibria, the solutions are taken of the form

$$f_{*s} = f_{*s}(\Phi_{*s}, m'_s, \Lambda_{*s}, \lambda^k t), \quad (60)$$

with $k \geq 1$ and λ being a suitable small dimensionless parameter to be later identified, so that f_{*s} is at most slowly explicitly dependent on t . Here f_{*s} is assumed to be a strictly-positive real function which depends on the set $G_s = (\Phi_{*s}, m'_s)$ both explicitly and implicitly. In addition, f_{*s} is summable, in the sense that the velocity moments of the form $\Xi_s(\mathbf{r}) = \int_W d^3v X_s(\mathbf{x}) f_{*s}$ must exist for a suitable ensemble of weight functions $\{X_s(\mathbf{x})\}$, to be prescribed in terms of polynomials of arbitrary degree defined with respect to components of the velocity vector field \mathbf{v} . The implicit dependences in f_{*s} occur through analytic functions Λ_{*s} , which identify the so-called structure functions. Hence, Λ_{*s} must be a function of the same invariants G_s . The latter restriction is referred to as a kinetic constraint and is expressed by imposing that

$$\Lambda_{*s} = \Lambda_{*s}(\Phi_{*s}, m'_s). \quad (61)$$

As discussed in the next section, under suitable assumptions the choice of the functions Λ_{*s} is shown to be related to the construction of an appropriate set of observable associated with the same KDF. A particular realization for the kinetic constraint (61) is

$$\Lambda_{*s} = \Lambda_{*s}(\Phi_{*s}, \lambda^j m'_s), \quad (62)$$

with $j \geq 1$. In this case the structure functions Λ_{*s} admit the series expansion

$$\Lambda_{*s} = \Lambda_{*s}^{(0)}(\Phi_{*s}) + \lambda^j \Lambda_{*s}^{(1)}(\Phi_{*s}, m'_s). \quad (63)$$

In view of the theory developed in Refs.[9–12] and the previous considerations, a convenient choice for f_{*s} is represented by the *generalized bi-Maxwellian distribution* expressed as

$$f_{*s} = \frac{\beta_{*s}}{(2\pi/M_s)^{3/2} (T_{\parallel *s})^{1/2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{Z_s e \Phi_{*s}}{T_{\parallel *s}} - m'_s \alpha_{*s} \right\}. \quad (64)$$

Here $\alpha_{*s} \equiv \frac{B}{\Delta T_{s*}}$, the quantities $\frac{1}{\Delta T_{s*}} \equiv \frac{1}{T_{\perp s}} - \frac{1}{T_{\parallel *s}}$, $T_{\perp s}$, $T_{\parallel *s}$ are denoted respectively as generalized species temperature anisotropy, perpendicular and parallel temperatures, while $\beta_{*s} \equiv \frac{\eta_s}{T_{\perp s}}$, with η_s to be referred to as the generalized species pseudo-density. In Eq.(64) the structure functions are identified with the set $\{\Lambda_{*s}\} \equiv \{\beta_{*s}, \alpha_{*s}, T_{\parallel *s}\}$. Notice that, at this stage, the functional form of the structure functions remains still arbitrary, so that they cannot be directly identified with particular fluid fields, i.e. velocity moments of the KDF. This means that the KDF f_{*s} in Eq.(64) is always an exact solution of the Vlasov equation, but in a strict sense it remains non-Gaussian in velocity space, although its asymptotic behavior in velocity space must be such to warrant the existence of the velocity moments $\{\Xi_s(\mathbf{r})\}$.

VII. PERTURBATIVE THEORY: MAXWELLIAN-LIKE KDFS

In this section we prove that the general solution for the species equilibrium KDF given by Eq.(64) admits an asymptotic approximation which corresponds to a Maxwellian-like equilibrium and we investigate the physical conditions under which this happens. In particular, here we search for the asymptotic orderings which warrant that f_{*s} in Eq.(64) becomes asymptotically “close” (in a sense to be specified below) to a local bi-Maxwellian KDF, at least in a suitable sub-set of phase-space. Following Refs.[9–12], this goal is reached by developing a perturbative theory which permits to treat explicitly the implicit functional dependences on the particle invariants carried by the structure functions in Eq.(64).

In detail, we restrict here the analysis to the thermal sub-set of the velocity sub-space W such that the following ordering assumption holds:

$$\frac{|\mathbf{v}|}{v_{ths}} \sim O(1), \quad (65)$$

where $v_{ths} \equiv \sqrt{2T_s/M_s}$ is the species thermal velocity defined with respect to the plasma species temperature T_s . In such a set the Larmor radius r_{Ls} is of order $r_{Ls} \sim v_{ths}/\Omega_{cs}$, so that the Larmor-radius parameter can be identified with $\varepsilon_s \equiv \frac{v_{ths}}{\Omega_{cs}L} \ll 1$. Similarly, for thermal particles satisfying the ordering (65) we introduce the independent parameter $\sigma_s \equiv \left| \frac{T_s}{Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff}} \right|$ which determines the ratio between thermal kinetic energy and the particle effective potential energy. Adopting the classification of kinetic regimes for collisionless plasmas developed in Ref.[12], we shall assume that the species thermal particles belong to the *strong effective potential energy regime (SEPE regime)*, namely the sub-set of the one-particle (s -species) phase-space for which the asymptotic ordering $\sigma_s \ll 1$ holds. In this case the particle kinetic energy $\frac{M_s v^2}{2}$ is ordered as $O(\sigma_s)$ with respect to the effective potential Φ_s^{eff} , so that all smooth functions of Φ_{*s} can be Taylor-expanded around Φ_s^{eff} .

Invoking now the σ_s -ordering appropriate for thermal particles in the SEPE regime and the series representation (40) for m'_s , after identifying the parameter λ with ε_s in Eq.(63), correct to first order in σ_s and ignoring terms of $O(\sigma_s)O(\varepsilon_s^j)$ with $j \geq 1$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{*s} &= \Lambda_s^{(0)}(\Phi_s^{eff}) + \varepsilon_s^j \Lambda_s^{(1)}(\Phi_s^{eff}, \mu'_{0s}) \\ &+ \sigma_s (\Phi_{*s} - \Phi_s^{eff}) \frac{\partial \Lambda_s^{(0)}}{\partial \Phi_s^{eff}}. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

In terms of Eq.(66) a Chapman-Enskog representation can be recovered for f_{*s} , yielding

$$f_{*s} = f'_{bi-M,s} \left[1 + \sigma_s h_s^{(1)} + \varepsilon_s^j h_s^{(2)} \right], \quad (67)$$

where $f'_{bi-M,s} \equiv f'_{bi-M,s}(\Phi_{*s}, m'_s, \Lambda_s^{(0)}, \lambda kt)$, while $h_s^{(1)}$

and $h_s^{(2)}$ represent respectively the perturbative corrections carried by the σ_s - and ε_s -expansions of the structure functions Λ_{*s} . Plasma species satisfying Eq.(67) will be referred to below as local-Maxwellian species. In this case the leading-order KDF $f'_{bi-M,s}$ is found to be

$$f'_{bi-M,s} = \frac{\beta_s \exp \left\{ -\frac{Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff}}{T_{\parallel s}} \right\}}{(2\pi/M_s)^{3/2} T_{\parallel s}^{1/2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{M_s v^2}{2T_{\perp s}} - m'_s \alpha_s \right\}, \quad (68)$$

where now the leading-order structure functions are only position-dependent and are identified with the set $\{\Lambda_s^{(0)}\} = \{\beta_s, \alpha_s, T_{\parallel s}\}$ which depends functionally only on Φ_s^{eff} . More precisely, here $\alpha_s \equiv \frac{B}{\Delta T_s}$, with $\frac{1}{\Delta T_s} \equiv \frac{1}{T_{\perp s}} - \frac{1}{T_{\parallel s}}$ being the species temperature anisotropy, where $T_{\perp s}$ and $T_{\parallel s}$ are respectively the leading-order species perpendicular and parallel temperatures. In addition, $\beta_s \equiv \frac{\eta_s}{T_{\perp s}}$, where the pseudo-density η_s is related to the leading-order species number density n_s to be determined in the next section.

It will be shown below that a basic consequence of this solution is that the functions $\Lambda_s^{(0)}(\Phi_s^{eff})$ are related to the leading-order equilibrium fluid fields associated with $f'_{bi-M,s}$. Notice that in Eq.(68) no expansion has been carried out in terms of the explicit dependences with respect to Φ_{*s} and m'_s . Recalling the expression of m'_s given by its second-order approximation in Eq.(40), this means that $f'_{bi-M,s}$ carries an explicit contribution which is odd in the parallel velocity u' .

For completeness, we report also the expressions of the two functions $h_s^{(1)}$ and $h_s^{(2)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_s h_s^{(1)} &\equiv \sigma_s \frac{M_s}{2Z_s e} v^2 \left(\frac{Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff}}{T_{\parallel s}} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{\partial \ln T_{\parallel s}}{\partial \Phi_s^{eff}} \\ &+ \sigma_s \frac{M_s}{2Z_s e} v^2 \left[\frac{\partial \ln \beta_s}{\partial \Phi_s^{eff}} - \mu'_{0s} \frac{\partial \ln \alpha_s}{\partial \Phi_s^{eff}} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_s^j h_s^{(2)} &\equiv \varepsilon_s^j \left[\frac{\beta_s^{(1)}}{\beta_s} - \frac{T_{\parallel s}^{(1)}}{2T_{\parallel s}} - \mu'_{0s} \alpha_s^{(1)} \right] \\ &+ \varepsilon_s^j \frac{Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff}}{T_{\parallel s}^2} T_{\parallel s}^{(1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

where the expansion (40) for m'_s and the leading-order approximation for Φ_{*s} have been used in this case. We notice that, by construction, $\sigma_s h_s^{(1)}$ and $\varepsilon_s^j h_s^{(2)}$ are both even in u' and \mathbf{w}' . Consistency of Eq.(69) requires that $\sigma_s \frac{M_s}{2Z_s e} v^2 \left(\frac{Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff}}{T_{\parallel s}} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{\partial \ln T_{\parallel s}}{\partial \Phi_s^{eff}} \lesssim O(\sigma_s)$, which implies that $T_{\parallel s}$ must be of the form $T_{\parallel s} = T_{\parallel s}(\sigma_s^l \Phi_s^{eff})$, with $l \geq 1$, i.e., slowly-dependent on Φ_s^{eff} . Similarly, Eq.(70) demands that $\varepsilon_s^j \frac{Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff}}{T_{\parallel s}^2} T_{\parallel s}^{(1)} \lesssim O(\varepsilon_s^j)$, namely $\frac{T_{\parallel s}^{(1)}}{T_{\parallel s}} \lesssim O(\sigma_s)$.

To conclude this section we remark that the SEPE regime requires that $\frac{Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff}}{T_{\parallel s}} \sim \frac{1}{O(\sigma_s)}$. If, on the con-

trary, one imposes the asymptotic ordering $\frac{Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff}}{T_{\parallel s}} \sim O(\sigma_s^0)$, it follows that for thermal particles it must be $\frac{M_s v^2}{Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff}} \sim O(\sigma_s^0)$ too. Therefore, in such a case the σ_s -expansion of the structure functions is no longer permitted. Therefore, when this happens, the corresponding equilibrium KDF f_{*s} remains generally always non-Gaussian in the whole phase-space. The exception occurs when the species structure functions are of the form (63) with $\Lambda_{*s}^{(0)}$ identically constant in phase-space. In fact, when these conditions are met, f_{*s} still admits a Chapman-Enskog representation of the form (67) with $h_s^{(1)} = 0$ and the leading-order KDF coincides with the bi-Maxwellian KDF given by Eq.(68) with uniformly-constant structure functions $\{\Lambda_{*s}^{(0)}\} = \{\beta_s, \alpha_s, T_{\parallel s}\}$.

VIII. FLUID MOMENTS

In this section we evaluate the relevant approximations for the species number density, flow velocity and pressure tensor carried by the equilibrium KDF f_{*s} . These fluid fields can be explicitly analytically evaluated in the case in which f_{*s} admits the Chapman-Enskog representation given by Eq.(67). This calculation requires representing the same KDF in terms of the Newtonian state (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}) , i.e. making use of the inverse guiding-center transformation to be determined from Eqs.(9) and (10). This is achieved by letting

$$\mathbf{r}' = \mathbf{r} - \varepsilon \mathbf{r}_1 - \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{r}_2, \quad (71)$$

$$\mathbf{v} = u \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{V}_s = u' \mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{w}' + \mathbf{V}'_s + \varepsilon \mathbf{v}'_1, \quad (72)$$

where $\varepsilon \mathbf{r}_1 = -\mathbf{w} \times \mathbf{b} / \Omega_{cs}$ and $\mathbf{V}_s = \frac{c}{B} \mathbf{E}^{eff} \times \mathbf{b}$ is the s -species drift velocity. Correct to first-order this implies

$$u' = u - \varepsilon \mathbf{r}_1 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{w} - \varepsilon \mathbf{r}_1 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{V} - \varepsilon \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{b}, \quad (73)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}' &= \mathbf{w} + \varepsilon (\mathbf{r}_1 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{r}_1 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{V}) \mathbf{b} \\ &+ \varepsilon u \mathbf{r}_1 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b} + \varepsilon \mathbf{r}_1 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{V} - \varepsilon \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{b}\mathbf{b}). \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

As a consequence, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \mu'_{0s} &= \mu_{0s} \left[1 - \varepsilon \mathbf{w} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{b} \times \nabla \ln B}{\Omega_c} \right] \\ &+ \varepsilon \frac{2\mu_{0s}}{w^2} [\mathbf{r}_1 \cdot \nabla (u \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{V}) \cdot \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{w}], \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

where $\mu_{0s} = \frac{M_s w^2}{2B}$, so that its gyrophase-average evaluated at the position \mathbf{r} yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mu'_{0s} \rangle_\phi &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \mu'_{0s} = \\ &= \mu_{0s} \left[1 - \varepsilon \frac{2}{\Omega_c B} \left[u \frac{4\pi}{c} J_{\parallel} + \mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \times \mathbf{V} \right] \right] \\ &+ \varepsilon \mu_{0s} \frac{2}{w^2} \Omega_c^2 \langle \mathbf{r}_2 \cdot \mathbf{r}_1 \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{r}_2 \cdot \mathbf{r}_1 \rangle &= \frac{w^2}{\Omega_{cs}^3} [\mathbf{V} \cdot \nabla \ln B - (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{b}\mathbf{b}) : \nabla \mathbf{V}] \\ &= \frac{w^2}{\Omega_{cs}^3} \left[\frac{4\pi}{B^2} J_{\parallel} E^{eff} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{V} - \frac{4\pi}{B'^2} \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}^{eff} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

Finally the magnetic moment perturbation $\varepsilon \mu'_{1s}$ becomes simply to the same accuracy

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \mu'_{1s} &\cong -\varepsilon \mu_{0s} \frac{1}{B} \frac{1}{\Omega_{cs}} \left[u \frac{4\pi}{c} J_{\parallel} + \mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \times \mathbf{V} \right] \\ &- \varepsilon \mu_{0s} \frac{2}{\Omega_{cs}} \left[\nabla \cdot \mathbf{V} + \frac{4\pi}{B^2} \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}^{eff} \right] \\ &+ \varepsilon \mu_0 \frac{1}{\Omega_{cs}} \frac{8\pi}{B^2} J_{\parallel} E^{eff}. \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

The leading-order expressions of the fluid fields carried by the equilibrium Maxwellian-species KDF can in principle be evaluated with arbitrary accuracy. To leading-order (with respect to all the relevant expansion parameter) the species number density is determined by the velocity moment

$$n_s = \int_W d^3 v f_{bi-M,s}^{(0)}, \quad (79)$$

where

$$f_{bi-M,s}^{(0)} = \frac{\eta_s \exp \left\{ -\frac{Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff}}{T_{\parallel s}} \right\}}{(2\pi/M_s)^{3/2} T_{\perp s} T_{\parallel s}^{1/2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{M_s v^2}{2T_{\parallel s}} - \mu_{0s} \alpha_s \right\} \quad (80)$$

is a local bi-Maxwellian KDF defined in terms of μ_{0s} . It follows that

$$n_s = \eta_s \exp \left\{ -\frac{Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff}}{T_{\parallel s}} - \frac{M_s V_s^2 T_{\perp s}}{2\Delta T_s T_{\parallel s}} \right\}. \quad (81)$$

The additional moment to be computed explicitly in terms of the KDF which is needed for the evaluation of the Ampere equation is the total electric current density, which in turn depends on the flow velocity. Let us compute separately the perpendicular and parallel flow velocities and the corresponding current densities. Concerning the perpendicular component of the species flow velocity $\mathbf{U}_{\perp s}$, for local Maxwellian-species its leading-order contribution is determined by the following velocity moment

$$\mathbf{U}_{\perp s} = \frac{1}{n_s} \int_W d^3 v (\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{V}_s) f_{bi-M,s}^{(0)}, \quad (82)$$

which yields

$$\mathbf{U}_{\perp s} = \left(1 - \frac{T_{\perp s}}{T_{\parallel s}} \right) \mathbf{V}_s. \quad (83)$$

As a consequence, one finds that the perpendicular flow velocity is linearly proportional to the effective electric-field drift velocity and vanishes in case of isotropic species

temperatures. The perpendicular current $\mathbf{J}_\perp^{(M)}$ generated by the Maxwellian-species is therefore

$$\mathbf{J}_\perp^{(M)} = \sum_{s \in \text{Maxwellian}} Z_s e n_s \frac{T_{\perp s}}{\Delta T_s} \mathbf{V}_s. \quad (84)$$

Concerning the parallel flow velocity, this is in principle determined for Maxwellian-species by the whole Chapman-Enskog representation as

$$U_{\parallel s} = \frac{1}{n_s} \int_W d^3 v u f'_{bi-M,s} \left[1 + \sigma_s h_s^{(1)} + \varepsilon_s^j h_s^{(2)} \right]. \quad (85)$$

Since \mathbf{V}_s is purely perpendicular, while both $h_s^{(1)}$ and $h_s^{(2)}$ are even in u , it follows that the leading-order contribution is necessarily provided by

$$U_{\parallel s} = -\varepsilon_s \frac{1}{n_s} \int_W d^3 v u f_{bi-M,s}^{(0)} (\alpha_s \Delta \mu_s^1), \quad (86)$$

with $\Delta \mu_s^1 = -u \mu_{0s} \frac{3}{\Omega_c B} \frac{4\pi}{c} J_{\parallel}$. Explicit calculation for the local Maxwellian-species gives

$$U_{\parallel s} = \varepsilon_s \frac{1}{\Omega_c B} \frac{6\pi}{c} J_{\parallel} \left[2 \frac{T_{\parallel s}}{M_s} + V^2 \frac{T_{\perp s}}{T_{\parallel s}} \right] \frac{T_{\perp s}}{\Delta T_s}, \quad (87)$$

which vanishes identically only if $J_{\parallel} \frac{1}{\Delta T_s} = 0$, namely if either the total parallel current density is null or the species temperature is isotropic. The total parallel current density $J_{\parallel}^{(M)}$ carried by all the Maxwellian species is therefore $J_{\parallel}^{(M)} = \gamma J_{\parallel}$, with

$$\gamma \equiv \frac{6\pi}{B^2} \sum_{s \in \text{Maxwellian}} \varepsilon_s n_s \left[2T_{\parallel s} + M_s V^2 \frac{T_{\perp s}}{T_{\parallel s}} \right] \frac{T_{\perp s}}{\Delta T_s}. \quad (88)$$

Hence $J_{\parallel}^{(M)}$ can be generally non-zero even for quasi-neutral plasmas only provided there is an additional source for J_{\parallel} . At equilibrium, there is only one possible physical mechanism consistent with the solution indicated above for f_{*s} . This occurs when there exists locally non-Maxwellian populations of particles described by KDFs of the form (64), which must co-exist in the same domain of the plasma. Denoting by $J_{\parallel}^{(non-M)}$ the corresponding current density it follows that the total current J_{\parallel} is necessarily given by

$$J_{\parallel} = \frac{J_{\parallel}^{(non-M)}}{1 - \gamma}, \quad (89)$$

so that J_{\parallel} can be strongly amplified when $\gamma \sim 1$, i.e., for high-beta plasmas characterized by strong temperature anisotropies of the Maxwellian species.

Finally, the leading-order pressure tensor for local Maxwellian-species is found to be given by the velocity moment

$$\underline{\underline{\Pi}}_s = M_s \int_W d^3 v (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{U}_{\perp s}) (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{U}_{\perp s}) f_{bi-M,s}^{(0)}, \quad (90)$$

which yields

$$\underline{\underline{\Pi}}_s = p_{\perp s} \mathbf{I} + (p_{\parallel s} - p_{\perp s}) \mathbf{b}\mathbf{b}, \quad (91)$$

where $p_{\perp s} \equiv n_s T_{\perp s}$ and $p_{\parallel s} \equiv n_s T_{\parallel s}$ represent the leading-order species perpendicular and parallel pressures for Maxwellian-species.

IX. THE POISSON EQUATION FOR ES POTENTIAL

In this section we analyze the Poisson equation which determines the ES potential Φ in terms of the number density n_s determined in Eq.(81) for Maxwellian-species. This analysis provides also the constraint conditions for the realizability of Maxwellian-like kinetic equilibria and the existence of the related Chapman-Enskog expansion of the type given by Eq.(67).

We first consider the case in which quasi-neutrality condition applies. Then, for local-Maxwellian species the Poisson equation requires to leading-order

$$\sum_{s \in \text{Maxwellian}} Z_s e n_s = 0. \quad (92)$$

For a two-species ion-electron plasma ($s = i, e$), substituting for n_s from Eq.(81) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta_i |Z_i e| \exp \left\{ -\frac{Z_i e \Phi_i^{eff}}{T_{\parallel i}} - \frac{M_i V_i^2}{2\Delta T_i} \frac{T_{\perp i}}{T_{\parallel i}} \right\} \\ &= \eta_e |e| \exp \left\{ -\frac{e \Phi_e^{eff}}{T_{\parallel e}} - \frac{M_e V_e^2}{2\Delta T_e} \frac{T_{\perp e}}{T_{\parallel e}} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

Recalling that $\Phi_s^{eff} \equiv \Phi + \frac{M_s}{Z_s e} \Phi_G$ one obtains to leading-order

$$\Phi = \frac{X_{ie} - \left[\frac{M_i}{T_{\parallel i}} - \frac{M_e}{T_{\parallel e}} \right] \Phi_G}{\left[\frac{|Z_i e|}{T_{\parallel i}} + \frac{|e|}{T_{\parallel e}} \right]}, \quad (94)$$

where

$$X_{ie} \equiv \ln \left[\frac{\eta_i |Z_i e|}{\eta_e |e|} \right] - \frac{M_i V_i^2}{2\Delta T_i} \frac{T_{\perp i}}{T_{\parallel i}} + \frac{M_e V_e^2}{2\Delta T_e} \frac{T_{\perp e}}{T_{\parallel e}}. \quad (95)$$

Eq.(94) represents an implicit solution for the ES potential Φ . In fact both the species temperatures and pseudo-densities on the rhs of the same equation can still depend functionally on Φ_s^{eff} , according to the kinetic constraint prescribed on the equilibrium solution. In addition, the quantity X_{ie} depends also on the drift velocity V_s^2 , which is again still a function of the same effective potential.

We first notice that for astrophysical gravitationally-bound plasmas in which the ordering condition $\left| \frac{M_i \Phi_G}{T_{\parallel i}} \right| \sim \frac{1}{O(\sigma_i)}$ holds, it then follows that also $\left| \frac{Z_s e \Phi}{T_{\parallel s}} \right| \sim \frac{1}{O(\sigma_s)}$ applies. This conclusion is consistent with the requirement

of SEPE regime, so that in this case the σ_s -ordering expansion is valid and the equilibrium KDF admits the Chapman-Enskog representation (67) with non-vanishing $h_s^{(1)}$. On the other hand, for astrophysical plasmas in which $\left|\frac{M_s \Phi_G}{T_{\parallel s}}\right| \sim O(\sigma_i^0)$ and for laboratory plasmas for which Φ_G is negligible, since $O(X_{ie}) \lesssim O(\sigma_i^0)$, then Eq.(94) implies that Φ satisfies necessarily the ordering $\left|\frac{Z_s e \Phi}{T_{\parallel s}}\right| \lesssim O(\sigma_s^0)$. This condition violates the requirement for the existence of the SEPE regime, so that in this case the σ_s -expansion does not apply. As discussed in Section 7, this conclusion implies in turn that the equilibrium KDF f_{*s} remains generally non-Gaussian in the whole phase-space, unless the corresponding structure functions are taken to be identically constant in the whole phase-space. In this case f_{*s} can still be expressed to leading-order in terms of the bi-Maxwellian KDF given by Eq.(68), but with uniformly-constant structure functions, while the energy-correction contributions $h_s^{(1)}$ in the Chapman-Enskog representation (67) vanish identically. Of course this does not generally imply a condition of constant fluid fields, provided the magnetic and electric fields are spatially non-uniform.

Let us now address the case of non-neutral plasmas for local-Maxwellian species. For simplicity, let us consider the case in which there exists a single-species plasma. The determination of the ES potential now necessarily requires integration of the Poisson equation. Invoking again Eq.(81) for the species number density, one obtains the non-linear differential equation

$$\nabla^2 \Phi = -4\pi Z_s e \eta_s \exp \left\{ -\frac{Z_s e \Phi_s^{eff}}{T_{\parallel s}} - \frac{M_s V_s^2 T_{\perp s}}{2\Delta T_s T_{\parallel s}} \right\}. \quad (96)$$

In the presence of an external gravitational field, let us assume that Φ_G satisfies the ordering $\left|\frac{M_s \Phi_G}{T_{\parallel s}}\right| \sim \frac{1}{O(\sigma_s)}$. In this case one can infer that Φ must remain always exponentially small, both for $Z_s e > 0$ or $Z_s e < 0$. When this happens, a local Maxwellian equilibrium solution of the type obtained above exists, consistent with the ordering assumptions introduced for the SEPE regime. Instead, if Φ_G is negligible (as in the case of laboratory plasmas) and we impose at the same time the orderings $\left|\frac{Z_s e \Phi}{T_{\parallel s}}\right| \sim \frac{1}{O(\sigma_s)}$ and $\left|\frac{Z_s e \eta_s}{\nabla^2 \Phi}\right| \sim O(\sigma_s^k)$, with $k \geq 1$, it follows that a local Maxwellian equilibrium with non-uniform structure functions cannot generally exist. In fact in this case Eq.(96) would demand for a generic species s that $O(\sigma_s^k) \sim e^{-\frac{1}{O(\sigma_s)}}$, and therefore that $k \rightarrow 0$. As a consequence also in the case of non-neutral plasmas the only admissible non-symmetric Maxwellian-like kinetic equilibrium for laboratory plasmas requires constant structure functions (no σ_s -expansion).

X. AMPERE'S EQUATION AND THE KINETIC DYNAMO

In this section we investigate the solubility conditions posed by the Ampere equation. Let us assume that the magnetic field admits locally a representation in terms of Clebsch potentials (ψ, Q) of the form $\mathbf{B} = \nabla\psi \times \nabla Q$.

For definiteness, let us consider first the case of flow-through equilibria in which the magnetic surfaces $\psi(\mathbf{r}) = \text{const.}$ and $Q(\mathbf{r}) = \text{const.}$ are open (i.e., unbounded) in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^3 occupied by the plasma. Then the only constraint condition to be taken into account is given by the requirement of solenoidal current density

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J} = 0. \quad (97)$$

For a stationary plasma, the constraint (97) is necessarily already satisfied by the exact equilibrium KDF f_{*s} [10, 11]. More precisely, the latter is fulfilled either identically or asymptotically depending whether f_{*s} is a first integral or an adiabatic invariant.

As a basic consequence, when the Chapman-Enskog expansion (67) is adopted for f_{*s} and consequently $\mathbf{J} \equiv \sum_s \mathbf{J}_s$ is expanded in power series of ε_s and σ_s , the previous equation generally implies a relationship between the various series perturbative contributions. For example, let us assume that for each species \mathbf{J}_s is determined asymptotically up to first-order, so that $\mathbf{J}_s \cong \mathbf{J}_s^{(0)} + \varepsilon_s \mathbf{J}_{\varepsilon s}^{(1)} + \sigma_s \mathbf{J}_{\sigma s}^{(1)}$. Then one obtains that

$$\nabla \cdot \sum_s \mathbf{J}_s^{(0)} \cong -\nabla \cdot \sum_s \left(\varepsilon_s \mathbf{J}_{\varepsilon s}^{(1)} + \sigma_s \mathbf{J}_{\sigma s}^{(1)} \right). \quad (98)$$

Notice that, as a consequence, no physical constraints can possibly arise on the functional form of $\mathbf{J}_s^{(0)}$ or the perturbations $\mathbf{J}_{\varepsilon s}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{J}_{\sigma s}^{(1)}$. This shows that, in order to satisfy the constraint condition (98) in asymptotic sense, the corresponding Ampere's equation must also include first-order currents. Therefore in such a case one obtains the asymptotic equation

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \frac{4\pi}{c} \sum_s \left[\mathbf{J}_s^{(0)} + \varepsilon_s \mathbf{J}_{\varepsilon s}^{(1)} + \sigma_s \mathbf{J}_{\sigma s}^{(1)} \right]. \quad (99)$$

Basic implications are:

1) The possible existence of a kinetic dynamo effect also in the case of spatially non-symmetric EM fields, which may be responsible for the self-generation of equilibrium magnetic field by the plasma itself. This conclusion is in agreement with the predictions obtained in the case of symmetric systems (see Refs.[9–11]).

2) The possible occurrence of a “twist” effect which characterizes the equilibrium magnetic field. This is produced by the combined effect of perpendicular and parallel plasma currents in spatially non-symmetric equilibria.

3) For gravitationally-bound astrophysical plasma for which the ordering $\left|\frac{M_s \Phi_G}{T_{\parallel s}}\right| \sim \frac{1}{O(\sigma_s)}$ applies, the leading-order current-density carried by local-Maxwellian species

is given by Eq.(84), while the parallel current density is necessarily of first-order and is given in terms of Eq.(89).

4) The treatment of laboratory plasmas is different, because the drift velocity \mathbf{V}_s and the corresponding current density are always of $O(\varepsilon_s)$ with respect to $v_{th,s}$, while at the same time the structure functions must be constant.

5) In both cases 3) and 4), the parallel current density can only arise in the presence of locally non-Maxwellian species.

Let us now consider the solubility conditions which arise in the case in which the magnetic surfaces $\psi(\mathbf{r}) = \text{const.}$ are locally closed and nested. We stress that, in principle, also this case can be regarded as a flow-through equilibrium provided suitable plasma sources are set up in order to compensate for the possible occurrence of corresponding loss-cones. For definiteness, to this aim we introduce again the magnetic coordinates $(\psi, \varphi, \vartheta)$ and identify $Q = \varphi - q(\psi)\vartheta$, with $q(\psi)$ being the rotational transform. For definiteness, we limit our analysis to the periodicity conditions following from the constraint equation (97) indicated above. Then, on a rational ψ -magnetic surface in which $q(\psi) = \frac{m}{n}$, with $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, Eq.(97) implies

$$\int_0^{2\pi m} d\vartheta J_p \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}_\perp = 0, \quad (100)$$

where J_p is the Jacobian $J_p = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \vartheta|}$. Introducing for \mathbf{J}_\perp the perturbative expansion indicated above, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{2\pi m} d\vartheta J_p \nabla \cdot \sum_s \mathbf{J}_{\perp s}^{(0)} = \\ & = - \int_0^{2\pi m} d\vartheta J_p \nabla \cdot \sum_s \left(\varepsilon_s \mathbf{J}_{\perp \varepsilon s}^{(1)} + \sigma_s \mathbf{J}_{\perp \sigma s}^{(1)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

This equation is qualitative different from the customary solubility condition usually considered in the literature (see for example Refs.[3–6]) for the following reasons:

1) If we restrict ourselves to the case in which the perpendicular current density is only generated by local-Maxwellian species, so that $\mathbf{J}_\perp = \mathbf{J}_\perp^{(M)}$, then both the leading-order current density $\sum_s \mathbf{J}_{\perp s}^{(0)}$ as well as the first-order perturbations $\sum_s \left(\varepsilon_s \mathbf{J}_{\perp \varepsilon s}^{(1)} + \sigma_s \mathbf{J}_{\perp \sigma s}^{(1)} \right)$ arise only in the presence of temperature anisotropy (i.e., they all vanish identically in the case of isotropic species temperature).

2) The equation is asymptotic and therefore the lhs vanishes only when first-order corrections in ε_s and σ_s are neglected.

For astrophysical plasmas the solubility condition (101) can always be satisfied by suitable prescription of the spatially non-uniform structure functions, for example the ion perpendicular temperature $T_{\perp i}$. In fact, the latter for an arbitrary species is generally of the form $T_{\perp s} = T_{\perp s}(B, \Phi_s^{eff})$. If B and Φ_s^{eff} are considered independent it follows that $T_{\perp i} = \widehat{T}_{\perp i}(\mathbf{r})$ remains arbitrary,

so that it can always be determined by Eq.(101). In the case of laboratory plasmas instead $T_{\perp s} = T_{\perp s}(B)$, which means that it cannot longer be used as a free parameter. On the other hand in this case the perpendicular current contains only first-order terms, which can include also contributions of locally non-Maxwellian species or perturbations of local Maxwellian species associated to the terms $\varepsilon_s^j \Lambda_s^{(1)}(\Phi_s^{eff}, \mu'_{0s})$ in Eq.(66). In both cases, in view of the general form of the functional dependences of the structure functions, the latter can always be prescribed in such a way to fulfill Eq.(101).

XI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper the construction of spatially non-symmetric kinetic equilibria has been addressed. The theory has been developed in the framework of the Vlasov-Maxwell treatment and applies to non-relativistic collisionless magnetized plasmas subject to both electromagnetic and gravitational fields.

The result is based on a non-perturbative formulation of guiding-center theory for single-particle dynamics, carried out in terms of a variational Lagrangian formulation obtained by introducing a finite phase-space gyrokinetic transformation of the particle Newtonian state. The theory holds for non-relativistic single charged particles moving in external non-homogeneous suitably-smooth electromagnetic and gravitational fields. The conditions of existence of the gyrokinetic transformation have been determined in terms of solubility conditions for the corresponding constraint equations which are determined by the Lagrangian formulation. As a consequence of the symmetry properties of the Hamilton variational principle, an exact formal representation of the magnetic moment has been obtained, which recovers the form of a particle canonical momentum and is proved to be, under suitable assumptions, a local phase-space first-integral of motion. As an application, a second-order Larmor-radius expansion for gyrokinetic theory has been presented. The corresponding approximation for the magnetic moment has been explicitly calculated “a posteriori” and proved to represent an adiabatic invariant of prescribed order.

Then, exact quasi-stationary solutions of the Vlasov equation for spatially non-symmetric configurations have been determined. These are expressed as functions of the relevant particle adiabatic invariants, namely the total particle energy and the magnetic moment. An explicit representation in terms of generalized bi-Maxwellian distributions has been given, proving that the solution is generally non-Gaussian. In terms of a suitable perturbative theory holding for local-Maxwellian species, the equilibria thus obtained have been shown to admit a Chapman-Enskog representation. Analytical calculations of the corresponding fluid moments has been obtained, which include the species number density, flow velocity and pressure tensor. As a notable outcome, it has

been pointed out that non-symmetric kinetic equilibria of this kind admit both perpendicular and parallel components of the flow velocity. For Maxwellian species, both exist provided the temperature is non-sotropic, while the parallel component requires in addition a non-vanishing equilibrium parallel current density. The constraints posed by the Maxwell equations have been analyzed and proved to be satisfied both in the case of astrophysical and laboratory plasmas. First, from the Poisson equation it has been shown that these solutions are consistent with quasi-neutrality condition as well as with configurations of non-neutral plasmas. Then, analysis of the Ampere equation has revealed the existence of kinetic dynamo effects, namely the possibility of self-generation of quasi-stationary magnetic fields by the same equilibrium plasma currents.

The theory presented here provides a useful background for possible theoretical investigations of a wide range of plasma kinetic equilibria and corresponding stability analyses. In particular it permits applications for the study of spatially non-symmetric plasmas in both laboratory contexts [43, 44] and astrophysical scenarios, including non-symmetric structures in accretion disc plasmas around compact objects [45, 46] and in the solar corona, like solar arcades [47], prominences [48] and loops [49].

Acknowledgments

This work has been partly developed in the framework of MIUR (Italian Ministry for Universities and Research) PRIN Research Program “Problemi Matematici delle Teorie Cinetiche e Applicazioni”, University of Trieste, Italy.

XII. APPENDIX: HAMILTON VARIATIONAL PRINCIPLE AND GK EULER-LAGRANGE EQUATIONS

The Hamilton variational principle in superabundant hybrid (i.e., non-canonical) variables has first been given in Ref.[34]. It amounts to introduce the Hamilton variational functional of the form

$$\begin{aligned} J(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}) &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \Lambda \left(\mathbf{r}, \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t \right) = \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \mathcal{L} \left(\mathbf{r}(t), \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{r}(t), \mathbf{v}(t), t \right), \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

with $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{r}, \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t) \equiv \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{r} \cdot [M_s \mathbf{v} + \frac{Z_s e}{c} \mathbf{A}] - \mathcal{H}_s$ denoting the Lagrangian expressed in terms of the hybrid variables \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{v} , which are considered as independent and \mathcal{H}_s the single-particle energy given by Eq.(6). The extremal curves $\mathbf{r}(t)$ and $\mathbf{v}(t)$, solutions of the Hamilton

variational principle

$$\delta J(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}) = 0, \quad (103)$$

which have null variations at the extrema t_1, t_2 , satisfy the Euler-Lagrange equations

$$\frac{\delta J(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v})}{\delta \mathbf{v}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{v}} = M_s \left[\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{v} \right] = \mathbf{0}, \quad (104)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta J(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v})}{\delta \mathbf{r}} &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{r}} - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{r}} = \\ &= Z_s e \left(\mathbf{E}^{eff} + \frac{\mathbf{v}}{c} \times \mathbf{B} \right) - M_s \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

The same variational principle holds also in arbitrary hybrid variables. Therefore, introducing in particular a phase-space diffeomorphism of the form (3), among the transformed variables one can always set $y'_4 = \mathcal{H}_s$ and $y'_3 = p_{\phi'_s}$, where $p_{\phi'_s}$ is the canonical momentum conjugate to the generalized coordinate ϕ' introduced in Eq.(3).

The corresponding Euler-Lagrange equations expressed in terms of the GK transformed state \mathbf{z}' defined in Section 3 (see Eq.(3)) are determined by the GK differential 1-form $\Lambda_1(\mathbf{z}', \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{z}')$ given by Eq.(19). The Hamilton variational principle (103) delivers the Euler-Lagrange equations

$$\frac{\delta J(\mathbf{z}')}{\delta \mathbf{z}'} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_1}{\partial \mathbf{z}'} - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_1}{\partial \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{z}'} = 0. \quad (106)$$

For $\mathbf{z}' \equiv (\mathbf{r}', \mathcal{H}_s, p_{\phi'_s}, \phi')$ one obtains respectively:

$$\frac{\delta J(\mathbf{z}')}{\delta \mathcal{H}_s} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_1}{\partial \mathcal{H}_s} = \frac{d\mathbf{r}'}{dt} \cdot \frac{\partial \langle \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbf{r}'} - \nabla' R \rangle}{\partial \mathcal{H}_s} - 1 = 0, \quad (107)$$

$$\frac{\delta J(\mathbf{z}')}{\delta p_{\phi'_s}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_1}{\partial p_{\phi'_s}} = \frac{d\mathbf{r}'}{dt} \cdot \frac{\partial \langle \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbf{r}'} - \nabla' R \rangle}{\partial p_{\phi'_s}} + \frac{d\phi'}{dt} = 0, \quad (108)$$

$$\frac{\delta J(\mathbf{z}')}{\delta \phi'} = -\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_1}{\partial \frac{d}{dt} \phi'} = -\frac{dp_{\phi'_s}}{dt} = 0, \quad (109)$$

$$\frac{\delta J(\mathbf{z}')}{\delta \mathbf{r}'} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_1}{\partial \mathbf{r}'} - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_1}{\partial \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{r}'} = \frac{d\mathbf{r}'}{dt} \times \mathbf{B}^* = \mathbf{0}, \quad (110)$$

where $\mathbf{B}^* \equiv \frac{c}{Z_s e} [\nabla' \times \langle \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbf{r}'} - \nabla' R \rangle]$ is the effective magnetic field and $\langle \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\mathbf{r}'} - \nabla' R \rangle$ its corresponding effective vector potential. It is immediate to show that, under the assumption of constant particle energy ($\mathcal{H}_s = const.$), the previous equations recover the correct asymptotic approximations when a LRE is performed (see Section 2).

-
- [1] H. Grad, Proc. of the Workshop on mathematical aspects of fluid and plasma dynamics, Trieste, Italy, May 30 - June 02, 1984, Ed. C. Cercignani, S. Rionero and M. Tessarotto (Quaderni del CNR, Gruppo Nazionale per la Fisica Matematica, 1984).
- [2] H. Grad, Phys. Fluids **10**, 137-154 (1967).
- [3] H. Grad and H. Rubin, Proc. Second United Nation Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, Geneva 1958, vol.31, pp.190-197 (1958).
- [4] K. Kruskal and R. Kulsrud, *ibid.*, vol.31, p.213 (1958).
- [5] K. Kruskal and R. Kulsrud, Phys. Fluids **1**, 265 (1958).
- [6] W. Newcomb, Phys. Fluids **2**, 362 (1959).
- [7] M. Tessarotto, J.L. Johnson and L.J. Zheng, Phys. Plasmas **2**, 4499 (1995).
- [8] M. Tessarotto, J.L. Johnson, R.B. White and L.J. Zheng, Phys. Lett. A **218**, 304 (1996).
- [9] C. Cremaschini, J.C. Miller and M. Tessarotto, Phys. Plasmas **17**, 072902 (2010).
- [10] C. Cremaschini, J.C. Miller and M. Tessarotto, Phys. Plasmas **18**, 062901 (2011).
- [11] C. Cremaschini and M. Tessarotto, Phys. Plasmas **18**, 112502 (2011).
- [12] C. Cremaschini and M. Tessarotto, Phys. Plasmas **19**, 082905 (2012).
- [13] C. Cremaschini, M. Tessarotto and J.C. Miller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 101101 (2012).
- [14] C. Cremaschini, M. Tessarotto and J.C. Miller, Magnetohydrodynamics **48**, N. 1, pp. 3-13 (2012).
- [15] S.M. Mahajan, Phys. Fluids B **1**, 143 (1989).
- [16] S.M. Mahajan, Phys. Fluids B **1**, 2345 (1989).
- [17] V. Krishan, T.D. Sreedharan and S.M. Mahajan, Mon. Not. R. Astr. Soc. **249**, 596 (1991).
- [18] P. Bhaskaran and V. Krishan, Astrophysics and Space Science **232**, 65-78 (1995).
- [19] M. S. Janaki and Brahmananda Dasgupta, Phys. Plasmas **19**, 032113 (2012).
- [20] D.H.E. Dubin, J.A. Krommes, C. Oberman and W.W. Lee, Phys. Fluids **26**, 3524 (1983).
- [21] A.J. Brizard, Phys. Plasmas **2**, 459 (1995).
- [22] H. Alfven, Ark. Mat. Astron. Fys. **27A**, 1 (1940).
- [23] C. Cremaschini and M. Tessarotto, Eur. Phys. J. Plus **126**, 42 (2011).
- [24] C. Cremaschini and M. Tessarotto, Eur. Phys. J. Plus **126**, 63 (2011).
- [25] C. Cremaschini and M. Tessarotto, Eur. Phys. J. Plus **127**, 4 (2012).
- [26] C. Cremaschini and M. Tessarotto, Eur. Phys. J. Plus **127**, 103 (2012).
- [27] M. Kruskal, J. Math. Phys. **3**, 806 (1962).
- [28] A. Beklemishev and M. Tessarotto, Phys. Plasmas **6**, 4487 (1999).
- [29] I.B. Bernstein and P.J. Catto, Phys. Fluids **28**, 1342 (1985).
- [30] A.J. Brizard and T.S. Hahm, Rev. Mod. Phys. **79**, 421 (2007).
- [31] P.J. Catto, Plasma Phys. **20**, 719 (1978).
- [32] R.G. Littlejohn, J. Math. Phys. **20**, 2445 (1979).
- [33] R.G. Littlejohn, Phys. Fluids **24**, 1730 (1981).
- [34] R.G. Littlejohn, J. Plasma Phys. **29**, 111 (1983).
- [35] T.S. Hahm, W.W. Lee and A. Brizard, Phys. Fluids **31**, 1940 (1988).
- [36] B. Weyssow and R. Balescu, J. Plasma Phys. **35**, 449 (1986).
- [37] J.D. Meiss and R.D. Hazeltine, Phys. Fluids B **2**, 2563 (1990).
- [38] M. Kruskal, *Plasma Physics* (International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna), 91 (1965).
- [39] B.V. Chirikov, J. Nucl. Energy, Part C Plasma Phys. **1**, 253 (1960).
- [40] I.Y. Dodin and N.J. Fisch, Phys. Lett. A **349**, 356 (2006).
- [41] I.Y. Dodin and N.J. Fisch, Phys. Lett. A **372**, 6111 (2008).
- [42] I.Y. Dodin and N.J. Fisch, Phys. Rev. E **79**, 026407 (2009).
- [43] C.D. Cothran, M.R. Brown, T. Gray, M.J. Schaffer and G. Marklin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 215002 (2009).
- [44] C.D. Cothran, M.R. Brown, T. Gray, M.J. Schaffer, G. Marklin and V.S. Lukin, Phys. Plasmas **17**, 055705 (2010).
- [45] B. Czerny, A. Rozanska, M. Dovčiak, V. Karas and A.-M. Dumont, Astron. Astrophys. **420**, 1-16 (2004).
- [46] T. Pecháček, V. Karas and B. Czerny, Astron. Astrophys. **487**, 815-830 (2008).
- [47] R. Bhattacharyya, M.S. Janaki, B. Dasgupta and G.P. Zank, Solar Phys **240**, 63 (2007).
- [48] A.A. van Ballegooijen and S.R. Cranmer, Astrophys. Journal **711**, 164 (2010).
- [49] D. Kumar and R. Bhattacharyya, Phys. Plasmas **18**, 084506 (2011).