

An analytic solution of the Boltzmann equation in the presence of self-generated magnetic fields in astrophysical plasmas

L.H. Li

Purple Mountain Observatory, Academia Sinica, Nanjing 210008, People's Republic of China

Through relating a self-generated magnetic field to the regular motion of free electrons that is responsible for the magnetic field generation in astrophysical plasmas, we solve the Boltzmann kinetic equation in the presence of the self-generated magnetic fields to obtain a steady-state, collisional invariant analytic solution of the equation.

PACS numbers: 52.25.Dg, 95.30.Qd

Most astrophysical plasmas are weakly inhomogeneous nonideal gases consisting of a large number of free charged particles that are closely coupled together by electrostatic and electromagnetic interactions. These interactions can propagate in the form of electrostatic waves such as high-frequency Langmuir waves, low-frequency ion-sound waves, and electromagnetic waves such as high- and low-frequency transverse plasma waves [1]. The so-called self-generated magnetic fields are the low-frequency (zero-frequency) transverse plasma waves. The zero frequency waves are defined to be mirror waves.

Spontaneous excitation of the mirror waves is a well-established experiment fact [2] in laser-produced plasmas and microwave-plasma systems. In these experiments the free energy sources are coherent radiations. The underlying mechanisms have been well understood [3]. In addition to coherent radiations, recently it has been shown that incoherent radiations such as thermal radiations [4] and neutrinos [5] can also excite magnetic fields in astrophysical plasmas. The keys are the nonlinear interactions between plasmas and photons or neutrinos. Bingham, Dawson, Shukla, Stenflo, Bethe etc [5] have shown that nonlinear coupling between plasmas and neutrinos by means of the weak interaction is likely to be responsible for the most violent astrophysical activities such as supernova explosions. In order to take into account the self-generated magnetic fields in the standard stellar evolution codes we first have to solve the Boltzmann kinetic equation for the free electrons in the presence of the self-generated magnetic fields, as we are about to do in this letter.

Suppose there be a self-generated magnetic field \mathbf{B}_s in a weakly inhomogeneous plasma. Our aim is to analyse how such a magnetic field affects electron distribution in six-dimensional phase space. For the sake of simplicity, we assume that the plasma consist of electrons and a single species of ions, the ion mass m_i be much larger than the electron mass m_e . Real plasmas are collisional, so we should start from the Boltzmann kinetic equation of electrons [1,6]

$$\frac{\partial f_e}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}_e \cdot \frac{\partial f_e}{\partial \mathbf{r}} + \mathbf{F}_e \cdot \frac{\partial f_e}{\partial \mathbf{v}_e} = \left(\frac{\partial f_e}{\partial t} \right)_{\text{col}}^{ee} + \left(\frac{\partial f_e}{\partial t} \right)_{\text{col}}^{ei}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{F}_e = (q_e/m_e)(\mathbf{E}_{\text{tot}} + \mathbf{v}_e \times \mathbf{B}_{\text{tot}})$ is the electromagnetic force, noticing that \mathbf{B}_{tot} contains \mathbf{B}_s . If we exchange subscripts e and i in Eq. (1), we will obtain the Boltzmann equation for ions.

$$\left(\frac{\partial f_e}{\partial t} \right)_{\text{col}}^{ei} = \int d\mathbf{p}_i d\mathbf{p}'_e d\mathbf{p}'_i W(\mathbf{p}_e, \mathbf{p}_i; \mathbf{p}'_e, \mathbf{p}'_i) \cdot \delta^{(4)}(p_e + p_i - p'_e - p'_i) \cdot [f_e(\mathbf{p}'_e) f_i(\mathbf{p}'_i) - f_e(\mathbf{p}_e) f_i(\mathbf{p}_i)], \quad (2)$$

is the collision integral between an electron and an ion, in which W is the collision probability, p is a (4-dimensional) energy-momentum vector, while the δ function stands for the energy-momentum conservation law. If the subscript e is replaced by i in Eq. (2), we will obtain the collision integral between two electrons.

In order to solve the kinetic equations we utilize the well-established two-timescale technique [3]. We first decompose $A_e = \{f_e, \mathbf{p}_e, \mathbf{E}_{\text{tot}}, \mathbf{B}_{\text{tot}}\}$ into the fast varying component A_f and the slowly varying component A_s , noticing that the variation time scale is similar to $\tau_e = 2\pi/\omega_{pe}$ for A_f , $\tau_i = 2\pi/\omega_{pe(i)}$ for A_s , where $\omega_{pe(i)} = (4\pi n_{e(i)} e^2 / m_{e(i)})^{1/2}$ is the electron (ion) plasma frequency. Since $\tau_i \gg \tau_e$, $\int_0^{\tau_i} A_f(t) dt = 0$. Using such a decomposition in the Boltzmann equation and taking the time average over τ_i , we will then obtain

$$\frac{\partial f_s}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}_e \cdot \frac{\partial f_s}{\partial \mathbf{r}} + \mathbf{F}_s \cdot \frac{\partial f_s}{\partial \mathbf{v}_e} = \left(\frac{\partial f_s}{\partial t} \right)_{\text{col}}^{ee} + \left(\frac{\partial f_s}{\partial t} \right)_{\text{col}}^{ei}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{F}_s = (q_e/m_e)\mathbf{v}_e \times \mathbf{B}_s$ in that $\mathbf{E}_s = 0$ is assumed because of quasineutrality in the slowly varying time scale. We have neglected those terms that contain f_f since the condition $f_f \ll f_s$ holds good. Ion distribution function has only slowly varying component since an ion is much heavier than an electron. So we have

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial \mathbf{r}} + \mathbf{F}_i \cdot \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial \mathbf{v}_i} = \left(\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial t} \right)_{\text{col}}^{ii} + \left(\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial t} \right)_{\text{col}}^{ie}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{F}_i = (q_i/m_i)\mathbf{v}_i \times \mathbf{B}_s$. f_s and f_i couple together through collision integrals.

Generally, particle microscopic velocity \mathbf{v} can be decomposed into a regular motion component \mathbf{u} and a random (thermal) motion component \mathbf{w} [7,3],

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u} + \tilde{w}. \quad (5)$$

In order to emphasize randomness of \tilde{w} and distinguish it from the regular vector \mathbf{u} , we write \tilde{w} explicitly in terms of a random phase angle ϕ and a usual vector \mathbf{w} as follows

$$\tilde{w} = \frac{1}{2}\{\mathbf{w} \exp(-i\phi) + c.c.\}, \quad (6)$$

where c.c. represents the complex conjugate of the first term. Obviously, $\tilde{w}^2 = \mathbf{w}^2$. If $\mathbf{B}_s = 0$, the regular motion velocity components \mathbf{u}_e and \mathbf{u}_i of electrons and ions associated with \mathbf{B}_s vanish.

When \mathbf{B}_s is absent, $\mathbf{F}_s = \mathbf{F}_i = 0$ and we thus can apply Boltzmann's H-theorem [7]. According to this theorem, we know that the steady-state solutions of Eqs. (3) and (4) satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} f_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_1) f_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_2) &= f_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}'_1) f_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}'_2), \\ f_i(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_1) f_i(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_2) &= f_i(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}'_1) f_i(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}'_2), \\ f_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_e) f_i(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_i) &= f_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}'_e) f_i(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}'_i), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

which are the so-called condition of detailed balance. The first two have simplest general solutions as such

$$\begin{aligned} \ln f_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_e) &= \alpha_e(\mathbf{r}) + \beta_e(\mathbf{r}) \frac{1}{2} m_e [\mathbf{w}^2 + \mathbf{u}_e^2(\mathbf{r})], \\ \ln f_i(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_i) &= \alpha_i(\mathbf{r}) + \beta_i(\mathbf{r}) \frac{1}{2} m_i [\mathbf{w}^2 + \mathbf{u}_i^2(\mathbf{r})], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

since they are simplest general scalar functions made of \tilde{w} and \mathbf{u} . The cross term $\mathbf{u} \cdot \tilde{w}$ is meaningless and should be absent because of the randomness of \tilde{w} . The combination coefficient functions α and β depend upon macroscopic thermodynamic variables of the system, particle number density $n(\mathbf{r})$ and temperature $T(\mathbf{r})$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} n_e(\mathbf{r}) &= \frac{N_e}{V} \int f_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_e) d\mathbf{p}_e, \\ T_e(\mathbf{r}) &= \frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{n_e k_B} \frac{N_e}{V} \int \frac{1}{2} m_e \mathbf{w}_e^2 f_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_e) d\mathbf{p}_e, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and the same definitions for ions, where k_B is the Boltzmann constant, N_e the total electron number, V the total volume of the system. Substituting Eq. (8) into these definitions, using the equality $d\mathbf{p} = m d\mathbf{w}$ and the integration formula $\int_0^\infty x^{2n} \exp(-x^2) dx = (n - \frac{1}{2})(n - \frac{3}{2}) \cdots \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\pi}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_e &= \frac{m_e \mathbf{u}_e^2}{2k_B T_e} + \ln\left(\frac{n_e V}{N_e}\right) - \frac{3}{2} \ln(2\pi m_e k_B T_e), \\ \beta_e &= -\frac{1}{k_B T_e}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and the same expressions for ions. Substituting Eq. (8) with (10) into the last equation of Eq. (7), we find that it requires

$$T_e = T_i = T, \quad (11)$$

but imposes no constraint on regular motion velocity components \mathbf{u}_e and \mathbf{u}_i .

If a single-component system is in global equilibrium, its particle number density $n = N/V$, regular motion velocity \mathbf{u} and temperature T do not depend upon \mathbf{r} . Consequently, we can make such a Lorentz boost that $\mathbf{u} = 0$ and $\alpha = -\frac{3}{2} \ln(2\pi m k_B T)$. In this special case, we reproduce the well-known Maxwell distribution

$$f(\mathbf{p}) = (2\pi m k_B T)^{-3/2} \exp\left(-\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m k_B T}\right), \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{p}/m$ is the random thermal motion velocity with respect to the comoving reference system with the system. In a two-component system, if $\mathbf{u}_e \neq \mathbf{u}_i$, even if the system is in global equilibrium, we cannot find out a unique comoving reference system so that it comoves with both components simultaneously. Of course, if the system is in only local equilibrium, there is no a unique comoving reference system, either. Therefore, in local equilibrium described by Eqs. (8), (10) and (11), if we retain $\alpha = -\frac{3}{2} \ln(2\pi m k_B T)$, the first of Eq. (10) reduces to

$$n_e(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{N_e}{V} \exp\left(-\frac{m_e \mathbf{u}_e^2}{2k_B T}\right), \quad (13)$$

and the same expression for ions, which are the natural extension from global equilibrium to local equilibrium.

When \mathbf{B}_s is present, we use

$$\begin{aligned} f_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}) &= (2\pi m_e k_B T)^{-3/2} \exp\left[-\frac{m_e(\mathbf{u}_e^2 + \mathbf{w}^2)}{2k_B T}\right], \\ f_i(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}) &= (2\pi m_i k_B T)^{-3/2} \exp\left[-\frac{m_i(\mathbf{u}_i^2 + \mathbf{w}^2)}{2k_B T}\right] \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

as the try solution of Eqs. (3) and (4). Substituting Eq. (14) into Eqs. (3) and (4), using the explicit expressions of collision integrals, Eq. (2), we find all collision integrals vanish due to the condition of detailed balance (7), the terms like $\mathbf{F} \cdot \partial f / \partial \mathbf{v}$ vanish since $(\tilde{w} \times \mathbf{B}_s) \cdot \tilde{w} = 0$ and $(\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B}_s) \cdot \tilde{w} = 0$ (randomness), and $\partial f / \partial t = 0$. Consequently, Eq. (3) reduces to

$$\nabla \ln(E_e^{\text{Reg}} / k_B T) = 0, \quad (15)$$

where $E_e^{\text{Reg}} = \frac{1}{2} m_e \mathbf{u}_e^2$ is the regular motion energy per electron. Solving it for E_e^{Reg} , we obtain

$$E_e^{\text{Reg}} = \theta k_B T, \quad (16)$$

where θ is a dimensionless integration constant. It does not explicitly depend upon spatial coordinates but depends upon the magnetic field \mathbf{B}_s , the plasma temperature T , and the number density of free electrons n_e .

In order to relate θ to those quantities, we need expressing E_e^{Reg} in terms of \mathbf{B}_s first. In fact, it has been

shown [3] that the self-generated magnetic field is due to a slowly-varying solenoidal current given by

$$\mathbf{j}_s = -i \frac{e\omega_{pe}^2}{16\pi m_e \omega_0^3} \nabla \times (\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{E}^*), \quad (17)$$

where \mathbf{E} is the slowly varying complex envelope of the total high-frequency electric field $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}$:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}} = \frac{1}{2} \{ \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}, t) e^{-i\omega_0 t} + \mathbf{E}^*(\mathbf{r}, t) e^{i\omega_0 t} \}. \quad (18)$$

Inasmuch as it is the resonance between the plasma and radiation fields that is responsible for the magnetic field excitation, $\omega_0 \sim \omega_{pe}$, the high-frequency waves can be considered to be quasi-monochromatic waves. So we set $\omega_0 = \omega_{pe}$ hereafter. The validity condition [3] for Eq. (17) is

$$k/k_{De} \ll 1 \text{ and } (|\mathbf{E}|^2/8\pi n_e T_e)(k/k_{De}) \ll 1, \quad (19)$$

where $k_{De} = (4\pi n_e e^2/T_e)^{1/2}$ is the electronic Debye wave number, k is the characteristic wave number.

The Maxwell equation for the slowly varying electromagnetic field reduces to $\nabla \times \mathbf{B}_s = 4\pi \mathbf{j}_s$ in the steady-state limit. From this equation and Eq.(17) we obtain

$$\mathbf{B}_s = -i(e/4m_e\omega_{pe})\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{E}^*, \quad (20)$$

which shows that the magnetic field self-generation in the plasma is a kind of nonlinear behaviours. If Eq. (19) is satisfied, we can neglect the convective term in the momentum balance equation for an electron-fluid element. Using this approximation and Eq. (18), we relate the total fast varying electric field $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}$ to the fast varying electron-fluid element velocity \mathbf{u}_e , $\mathbf{u}'_e(\mathbf{r}, t) = -i(e/m_e\omega_0)\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}, t)$, where \mathbf{u}'_e is the complex envelope of \mathbf{u}_e , as \mathbf{E} is the complex envelope of $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}$. Using this relation and defining $\mathbf{u}'_e = \mathbf{u}_r + i\mathbf{u}_i$, Eq. (20) can be rewritten as follows

$$\mathbf{B}_s = -(m_e\omega_{pe}/2e)\mathbf{u}_r \times \mathbf{u}_i. \quad (21)$$

If we measure \mathbf{B}_s over a much larger time scale τ than its correlation time scale τ_b , \mathbf{B}_s can be considered to be stochastic. The mean magnetic pressure P_B over $\tau \gg \tau_b$ can be expressed by

$$P_B \equiv \langle |\mathbf{B}_s|^2/8\pi \rangle_\tau = (m_e^2\omega_{pe}^2/64\pi e^2)|\mathbf{u}_r|^2|\mathbf{u}_i|^2. \quad (22)$$

Assuming $u_r = u_i$ without loss of generality, this equation leads to

$$E_e^{\text{Reg}} = \frac{1}{2}m_e \langle |\mathbf{u}_e|^2 \rangle_\tau = (4P_B m_e/n_e)^{1/2}, \quad (23)$$

which expresses E_e^{Reg} in terms of P_B or \mathbf{B}_s . Comparing Eq. (16) with Eq. (23), we obtain

$$\theta = \sqrt{2} \frac{\Omega_{ce} m_e c^2}{\omega_{pe} k_B T}, \quad (24)$$

which expresses the integration constant θ in terms of the self-generated magnetic field B_s , the plasma temperature T and the number density of free electrons n_e , where $\Omega_{ce} = e\bar{B}_s/m_e$ is the electronic cyclotron frequency with $\bar{B}_s \equiv (8\pi P_B)^{1/2}$. θ can be called as magnetic parameter since it is determined by the magnetic field B_s . From Equations (20) and (19) it can be seen that

$$0 < \theta \ll k_{De}/k, \quad (25)$$

where $L_b \equiv 2\pi/k$ stands for the characteristic correlation length of the self-generated magnetic field \mathbf{B}_s . If L_b is much larger than the electronic Debye length $r_{De} = 1/k_{De}$ as it should be, θ can be much larger than unity.

For example, using our simulation result [4] $\bar{B}_s = 6 \times 10^8$ Gauss at the solar center with $n_e = 6.26 \times 10^{25} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, $T_c = 1.36$ KeV, we can estimate θ_c by means of Eq. (24) to be $\theta_c = 12.5$. Such large a θ does not ruin the theory. In fact, numerical simulations [4] show $L_b \geq 10^{-4}$ cm. Using T_c and n_e we can estimate $r_{De} = 3 \times 10^{-9}$ cm. We thus know $k/k_{De} = 2\pi r_{De}/L_b \leq 2 \times 10^{-4}$. Using Eq. (20) and θ_c we can estimate $(|\mathbf{E}|^2/8\pi n_e T_e)(k/k_{De}) < 3 \times 10^{-3}$, which shows that the validity condition (19) of the theory holds good.

Using the magnetic parameter θ , the electron distribution in the presence of the self-generated magnetic field can be expressed as follows

$$f_e(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}) = f_{e0} \exp(-\theta), \quad (26)$$

where $f_{e0} = (2\pi m_e k_B T)^{3/2} \exp(-m_e \mathbf{w}^2/2k_B T)$ is the local maxwellian in that \mathbf{w} is the random thermal motion velocity. $\theta k_B T$ takes a role of chemical potentials, called as quasi-chemical potential [6]. Eq. (26) with θ defined by Eq. (24) is a steady-state, collisional invariant analytic solution of the Boltzmann equation for free electrons in the presence of self-generated magnetic fields in astrophysical plasmas that are in local thermodynamic equilibrium. This is the main result of the paper.

With Eq. (26), the statistically-averaged ${}^7\text{Be}$ electron capture rate [9] in stellar interior is equal to

$$\lambda_{e7} = \lambda_{e7}^0 \exp(-\theta), \quad (27)$$

see (3.18) of [10] for λ_{e7}^0 . Using $\theta_c = 12.5$ estimated above, we find the suppression factor of the ${}^7\text{Be}$ solar neutrino flux is 3.6×10^{-6} in the solar core since the magnetic field-related regular motion of electrons will hinder the electron capture reaction of ${}^7\text{Be}$. Such large a suppression factor is large enough to explain the ${}^7\text{Be}$ solar neutrino missing problem, the root of the solar neutrino problem [11]. This, however, tends to worsen the ${}^8\text{B}$ solar neutrino deficit, which shows that even if there be self-generated magnetic fields in the solar core we still need matter-enhanced neutrino oscillations to fit [11] solar neutrino experiments. Nevertheless, in this case, the

neutrino mixing parameters such as the neutrino mass and mixing angle may change. This may reduce the difference of the neutrino masses (mixing angles) inferred from atmospheric neutrino experiments and solar neutrino experiments. In order to investigate this important problem quantitatively, we have to use Eq. (26) to recalculate the equation of state and opacities of the stellar plasma with the self-generated magnetic fields taken into account. We'll present such research results separately.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research belonged to project 19675064 supported by NSFC and was also supported in part by CAS. The author wants to thank Profs. Stenflo and Shukla for their constructive suggestions on the paper.

-
- [1] A.F. Alexandrov, L.S. Bogdankevich and A.A. Rukhadze, *Principles of Plasma Electrodynamics* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984).
- [2] J.A. Stamper, K. Papadopoulos, R.N. Sudan, S.O. Dean and E.A. McLean, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 26 (1971) 1012; J.A. Stamper and B.H. Ripin, *ibid* 34 (1975) 138; J.J. Thomson, C.E. Max and K. Estabrook, *ibid* 35 (1975) 663; W.F. DiVergilio, A.Y. Wong, H.C. Kim and Y.C. Lee, *ibid* 38 (1977) 541; J.A. Stamper, E.A. McLean and B.H. Ripin, *ibid* 40 (1978) 1177; A. Raven, O. Willi and P.T. Rumsby, *ibid* 41 (1978) 554; S.C. Wilks, W.L. Kruer, M. Tabak and A.B. Langdon, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 69 (1992) 1383; R.N. Sudan, *ibid* 70 (1993) 3075.
- [3] B. Bezzerides, D.F. DuBois and D.W. Forslund, *Phys. Rev. A* 16 (1977) 1678; B. Bezzerides, D.F. DuBois, D.W. Forslund and E.L. Lindman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 38 (1977) 495; P. Mora and R. Pellat, *Phys. Lett.* 66A (1978) 28; *Phys. Fluids* 22 (1979) 2048; S.A. Bel'kov and V.N. Tsytovich, *Soviet Phys. JETP* 49 (1979) 656; V.N. Tsytovich, *Comm. Plasma Phys. Contr. Fusion* 4 (1978) 81; M. Kono, M.M. Škorić and D. ter Haar, *J. Plasmas Phys.* 26 (1981) 123; O.M. Gradov and L. Stenflo, *Phys. Lett.* 95A (1983) 233; L.H. Li, *Phys. Fluids B* 5, (1993a) 350; (1993b) 1760.
- [4] L.H. Li and H.Q. Zhang, *J. Phys. D: Appl.Phys.* 29 (1996) 2217.
- [5] R. Bingham, J.M. Dawson, J.J. Su and H.A. Bethe, *Phys.Lett.* A193 (1994) 279; J.T. Mendonça, R. Bingham, P.K. Shukla, J.M. Dawson and V.N. Tsytovich, *Phys. Lett.* A209 (1995) 78; R. Bingham, H.A. Bethe, J.M. Dawson, P.K. Shukla and J.J. Su, *Phys. Lett.* A220 (1996) 107; T. Chiueh, *Astrophys. J.* 413 (1993) L35; P.K. Shukla, R. Bingham, H.A. Bethe, J.M. Dawson and L. Stenflo, *Physica Scripta* 55 (1997) 96; P.K. Shukla, L. Stenflo, R. Bingham, H.A. Bethe, J.M. Dawson and J.T. Mendonça, *Phys. Lett.* A224 (1997) 239; P.K. Shukla, L. Stenflo, R. Bingham, H.A. Bethe, J.M. Dawson and J.T. Mendonça, *Phys. Lett.* A226 (1997) 375; P.K. Shukla, L. Stenflo, R. Bingham, H.A. Bethe, J.M. Dawson and J.T. Mendonça, *Phys. Lett.* A230 (1997) 353; P.K. Shukla, L. Stenflo, R. Bingham, H.A. Bethe, J.M. Dawson and J.T. Mendonça, *Phys. Lett.* A233 (1997) 181.
- [6] J. Bernstein, *Kinetic Theory in the Expanding Universe* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988).
- [7] H.J. Kreuzer, *Nonequilibrium Thermodynamics and its Statistical Foundations* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1981); D.C. Montgomery and D.A. Tidman, *Plasma Kinetic Theory* (McGraw Hill, New York, 1964).
- [8] L.H. Li, Q.L. Cheng, Q.H. Peng and H.Q. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* 56 (1997) 8082.
- [9] J.N. Bahcall, *Phys. Rev.* 128 (1962) 1297.
- [10] J.N. Bahcall, *Neutrino Astrophysics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1989)
- [11] N. Hata and P. Langacker, *Phys. Rev. D* 56, No.10 (1997); 52 (1995) 420; K. Heeger and R.G.H. Robertson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 77 (1996) 3720; S. Parke, *ibid* 74 (1995) 839; J. Bahcall, *Phys. Lett B* 338 (1994) 276.