

Short waves and cyclotron losses in the relativistic gyrokinetic theory

Alexei Beklemishev

Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, 630090 Novosibirsk, Russia

and Massimo Tessarotto

*Department of Mathematics and Informatics,
University of Trieste, 34127 Trieste, Italy*

Abstract

Radiation damping of the motion of charged particles in relativistic, optically thin plasmas is described within the framework of the covariant gyrokinetic theory [1]. It involves description of the collisionless single-particle dynamics as well as the Vlasov and Maxwell equations both written in the covariant formulation. The damping causes corrections to the phase-space trajectory of the particle, as well as to the form of the kinetic equation itself, due to the failure of conditions of the Liouville theorem. Both effects result independent of the gyrophase, which is retained as an ignorable variable. In addition, the applicability range of the covariant gyrokinetic theory is extended to describe short-wavelength perturbations with the background of zero parallel electric field. The presented theory is suitable for description of magnetized, relativistic, collisionless plasmas in the context of astrophysical or laboratory problems. Non-uniqueness of the gyrokinetic representation and consequences thereof are discussed.

PACS: 52.30.Gz, 52.27.Ny, 04.20.Cv

I. INTRODUCTION

Gyrokinetic description of hot magnetized plasmas[2] is an effective tool that allows to combine relative simplicity of the drift approximation with adequate account for the finite-Larmor-radius (FLR) effects, including description of short-wavelength perturbations. Currently, most applications are in the tokamak physics,[6, 9, 10, 18] where it is used for analysis of transport, stability and turbulence. Earlier relativistic modifications of the theory[2, 5] were designed for simulation of confinement of fusion products. Meanwhile, the covariant, four-dimensional formalism of the gyrokinetic (GK) theory, developed in our previous papers [1, 13, 14], aims at being capable of describing fast flows of matter, such as taking place in accretion disks and relativistic jets in the realm of astrophysics. In particular, it is consistent with the general relativity, permits the use of arbitrary four-dimensional coordinate systems and non-canonical phase-space variables. Since four-dimensional formulation utilizes internal symmetries of electrodynamics, so that the applicability range of the gyrokinetic theory extends even in its non-relativistic limit.

Four-dimensional representation of drift trajectories, and its relationship to symmetries of the Faraday tensor were first published by Fradkin.[16] On that basis, using the Lie-transform methods, Boghosian[17] constructed the first version of the covariant, four-dimensional gyrokinetic transformation. Still, that version was not covariant in the general-relativistic sense, inherited several restrictions of the non-relativistic theories, and was too complicated to be of practical use. Another formulation of covariant gyrokinetic theory was launched by Beklemishev and Tessarotto[13] using a perturbative Lagrangian approach introduced by Littlejohn.[7] The theory was just first-order in the Larmor radius, but it was simple, straightforward and fully covariant. An important point of that paper was concerned the non-uniqueness of the gyrokinetic transformation, on which we are going to elaborate further below. Additional work in this direction[1, 14] extended analysis to second order in the Larmor radius and in the amplitude of the wave-field, added explicit solutions for particle trajectories, determined the covariant gyrokinetic equation, and the effective source-term for the Maxwell equations.

The covariant GK theory, published in [1] has two important limitations, which we aim at amending in the present paper. The first is typical to all existing gyrokinetic theories, namely, their inability to account for cyclotron losses. The losses, while relatively small in

the non-relativistic limit, become significant for relativistic particles. In both cases they destroy the most important integral of motion exploited by GK theories, the “magnetic moment”. The effect, however, is difficult to account for within the context of any Lagrangian formulation, since it destroys the Hamiltonian nature of the system. Hence its inclusion in the context of GK theory requires a specific treatment.

Radiation damping of the motion of a charged particle is a natural process described in textbooks.[21] However, there is a question whether it can be directly applied for plasma particles as is. Indeed, the effect is resonant and definitely falls out of the scope of the theory for cold dense plasmas, where the cyclotron emission is trapped and becomes a collective process. This statement can be illustrated by the following example: a single particle moving in a circle emits waves, while a steady circular current (or lots of particles moving in the same circle) emits nothing. Well, the opposite limit is also realistic. In hot plasmas relativistic effects destroy the resonance, so that the radiation losses grow and lose coherence, i.e., occur as if each particle is independent. This is the case we are going to explore: a hot rarefied plasma, with a small optical depth in the cyclotron/synchrotron frequency range. The “small optical depth” clause is included so that the radiation can escape, and the inverse processes of scattering/absorption can be neglected.

In a hot rarefied plasma, the radiation damping causes corrections to the phase-space trajectories of particles, as well as to the form of the kinetic equation itself, since the phase-space volume is no longer conserved. We describe these effects as small corrections, evaluating them in the unperturbed gyrokinetic variables. Both effects result independent of the gyrophase, which thus can be retained as an ignorable variable.

The second limitation of the covariant GK theory developed in [1, 13, 14], which we intend to overcome in this paper, is its inability to treat the short-wavelength perturbations when the background parallel electric field is zero. This effectively limits description of typical plasmas in fusion devices, where the parallel electric field is small, to long-wavelength perturbations. In contrast, all alternative formulations of the gyrokinetic theory are applicable *only* if the electric field is small. By searching for the gyrokinetic transformation in a broader class than before, we are able to derive an alternative formulation, which is valid in all limits, i.e., both for small and for large (of the order of the magnetic field) parallel electric fields.

We also try to look at the problem of alternative formulations of the gyrokinetic theory

in broader context: is the gyrokinetic description unique? Are all alternative formulations equivalent in some sense in their common applicability range? We intend to show that non-equivalent descriptions are possible and still valid in certain orders of the perturbation theory. This feature is not related to the Lagrangian approach but is common to all perturbative methods.

Direct comparison of two non-equivalent gyrokinetic theories, in the common applicability range, shows that even such basic feature as drift trajectories of the guiding center are affected by the choice of free parameters. Exploration of these degrees of freedom provides new insight into the nature and applicability of gyrokinetic theories. For example, a closed drift trajectory in one representation will not necessarily be closed in the other one. The same applies for drift surfaces in magnetic traps as well. This feature is very important for theoretical interpretation of cross-field transport processes. Indeed, it follows that though existence of closed drift surfaces means that particles are contained, the reverse is not true - those closed surfaces might still exist in other representations of the drift variables.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II we start by introducing necessary notations and definitions, and in Section III present the derivation of the covariant gyrokinetic transformation, valid for all values of the electric field, and the relevant equations of motion. On this basis, in Section IV we discuss the uniqueness and convergence of the gyrokinetic approximation. Next, in Section V, we describe the effect of the radiation damping on the motion of a particle in the gyrokinetic variables. In Section VI the covariant kinetic and gyrokinetic equations are derived with due account for the radiation damping effects. The section also contains our proof of the Liouville theorem in Lagrangian variables, and explicit expressions for the rate of contraction of the phase-space volume. Results are summarized in Conclusion.

Throughout the paper the following notations are used: for four-dimensional vectors we use bold letters, for tensor fields and operators use roman and calligraphic fonts. Normal math letters are either scalars, or components of vector and tensor fields.

II. COORDINATES, THE TETRAD AND THE VARIATIONAL PRINCIPLE

In order to carry out the program indicated in the introduction we first introduce the phase-space coordinates, and the tetrad of unit four-vectors linked to symmetry planes of

the Faraday tensor. In the covariant formulation the tetrad plays a role similar to magnetic coordinates. In these terms we formulate the variational principle for description of the single particle dynamics. Finally, we introduce and discuss the template and the ordering, which will be used later for construction of the gyrokinetic transformation of the phase-space variables.

Covariance of the representation is defined as follows: suppose we have arbitrary, user-defined coordinate system, of which we know the metric tensor, $g_{\mu\nu}$, and the time-like invariant interval ds is defined as

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu, \quad (1)$$

where the Greek indices are assumed to go through $\mu, \nu = 0, \dots, 3$. The signature of $g_{\mu\nu}$ is assumed to be $\langle 1+, 3- \rangle$, so that the zero coordinate is also time-like, and s is the same as the “proper time”. The four-velocity \mathbf{u} is then defined in terms of its contravariant components according to

$$u^\mu = \frac{dx^\mu}{ds}. \quad (2)$$

As a result of (1), \mathbf{u} is defined as the unit 4-vector tangent to the trajectory. It is time-like,

$$u_\mu u^\mu = 1. \quad (3)$$

Thus, for an arbitrary coordinate system we have defined the seven-dimensional phase-space as (x^μ, u_ν) . If, then, we present an expression for a particle trajectory in this phase-space, it will be covariant, i.e., valid in any coordinates. Section VI contains more information about the phase space and distribution functions in it.

A. The basis tetrad

In the following we shall assume that in each point of space-time, \mathbf{x} , there is defined a “tetrad”, i.e., an orthogonal basis of unit 4-vectors $(\tau, \mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}', \mathbf{l}'')$, such that the last three 4-vectors are space-like, and

$$\epsilon_{\varsigma\lambda\mu\nu} \tau^\varsigma l^\lambda l'^\mu l''^\nu = 1, \quad (4)$$

where $\epsilon_{\varsigma\lambda\mu\nu}$ is the purely antisymmetric tensor. Orientation of the tetrad is arbitrary and is defined by 6 sufficiently smooth scalar functions (3 pure space rotations and 3 space-time rotations). The other 10 (out of 16 components of the tetrad vectors) fully describe

properties of the space-time itself. This feature is used in the so-called ‘‘tetrad formalism’’ of general relativity [21]. It is important not to confuse this tetrad with the basis vectors of the coordinate system.

A special choice of orientation links the tetrad $(\tau, \mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}', \mathbf{l}'')$ to the electromagnetic field tensor, $F_{\mu\nu}$. We shall refer to such basis choice as ‘‘field-related’’. Our subsequent use of the tetrad makes other choices possible in the first approximation,[13] but in higher orders just the field-related choice of orientation is compatible with the solution,[14] so we shall use it from the beginning.

With the field-related tetrad the $(\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{l}'')$ -plane coincides with the space-like invariant plane of the antisymmetric tensor $F_{\mu\nu}$, while (\mathbf{l}, τ) result belonging to its other invariant plane, so that the Faraday tensor can be fully expressed as [14]

$$F_{\mu\nu} = H (l'_\nu l''_\mu - l'_\mu l''_\nu) + E (l_\mu \tau_\nu - l_\nu \tau_\mu), \quad (5)$$

where H and E are scalar functions, having the physical meaning of the magnetic and electric fields in the reference frame where they are parallel. Thus, the field-related basis orientation is a generalization of the magnetic coordinates of the non-relativistic treatments. Fradkin[16] first used the invariant planes of the electromagnetic field tensor for decomposition of motion of a charged particle.

The bivector combinations in the expression for $F_{\mu\nu}$, namely

$$b_{\mu\nu} = l'_\nu l''_\mu - l'_\mu l''_\nu, \quad c_{\mu\nu} = l_\mu \tau_\nu - l_\nu \tau_\mu, \quad (6)$$

can be viewed as linear operators, which combine projection on an invariant plane with an orthogonal turn in it. Then the Faraday tensor is

$$F = Hb + Ec, \quad (7)$$

while its dual is

$$\mathcal{F} = -Eb + Hc.$$

The pure projection operators $\mathcal{O}^{(a)}, \mathcal{O}^{(b)}$ introduced by Fradkin can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{O}^{(a)} = -bb, \quad \mathcal{O}^{(b)} = cc.$$

Since $\mathcal{O}^{(a)} + \mathcal{O}^{(b)} = \mathcal{I}$, and $bc = 0$, it is easy to check that the inverse of the Faraday tensor, $D^{\nu\mu} = (F_{\mu\nu})^{-1}$ exists for $HE \neq 0$, and looks like

$$D = -\frac{1}{H}b + \frac{1}{E}c. \quad (8)$$

B. Variational principle and the ordering scheme

Particle dynamics in phase-space can be described on the basis of a variational principle.[19] Of course, it is not unique, since different functionals may have coinciding extrema. One of the simplest-looking forms of such functional was used by Beklemishev and Tessarotto[13] for description of particle dynamics in the seven-dimensional phase-space in the framework of the general relativity. It allows to describe the particle trajectory in the phase-space as a seven-dimensional extremal curve. In the non-relativistic limit the extra, seventh dimension is just time, and the whole representation can be easily reduced to conventional terms.

The phase-space trajectory of a particle with the rest-mass m_a and charge q_a in prescribed fields can be found from the variational principle $\delta S = 0$, as the extremal of the functional

$$S = \int Q_\mu dx^\mu = \int (qA_\mu(x^\nu) + u_\mu) dx^\mu, \quad (9)$$

where $q = q_a/m_a c^2$, and A_μ is the four-vector potential of the electromagnetic field. Ideally, a variational principle in the phase space should yield the standard relativistic equation of motion of the particle, plus the relationship between the velocity and displacement, (2). As shown in [13], this is indeed the case for the functional (9), but only for variations of u_μ occurring on the hypersurface $u_\mu u^\mu = 1$. In this sense the phase space is only seven-dimensional. The above variational principle is independent of the parameterization of world lines. Furthermore, the above variational principle, as any Lagrangian variational principle, is gauge invariant, i.e., any change of the generating differential 1-form of the type

$$Q_\mu dx^\mu \rightarrow Q_\mu dx^\mu + dF, \quad (10)$$

where F is an arbitrary smooth function of coordinates x^μ and u_ν , does not change the extremal curve.

In general terms one can define the gyrokinetic transformation as such transformation of the phase-space variables, that one of the new variables, called the gyrophase, becomes ignorable, i.e., the functional, when expressed in a suitable gauge, becomes independent of it. Then, the canonically conjugate variable to the gyrophase, called the ‘‘magnetic moment’’ or the ‘‘adiabatic invariant’’ depending on the context, is an integral of motion. As a result, the motion of particles in the new gyrokinetic variables is simplified, since the system

is effectively integrated in one degree of freedom, eliminating the highest characteristic frequency. Once the transformation and equations of motion are found, it is possible to simplify the kinetic description as well, i.e., find the gyrokinetic equation (see Sect.VI).

Construction of the gyrokinetic transformation is done by way of expansion in powers of formal small parameters ε and λ . They are introduced according to the “gyrokinetic” ordering scheme, which in our case, following the notation of [6], is

$$Q_\mu dx^\mu = \{u_\mu + q(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}A_\mu(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda a_\mu(\mathbf{x}/\varepsilon))\}dx^\mu, \quad (11)$$

so that ε accounts for the relative strength and inhomogeneity of the background field, while λ allows distinction between the large-scale background field A_μ , and the wave-fields given by a_μ . In the final expressions both parameters should be set to 1.

For an infinitesimal Larmor radius, $\varepsilon, \lambda \rightarrow 0$, the particle trajectory is a very tight spiral, which allows to represent the transformation as

$$x^\mu = x'^\mu + \sum_{s,p} \varepsilon^s \lambda^p r_{sp}^\mu(y^i), \quad (12)$$

and

$$u_\nu = \bar{u}_\nu + w(l'_\nu \cos \phi + l''_\nu \sin \phi), \quad (13)$$

where

$$(\bar{u}_\nu, w) = (\bar{u}'_\nu, w') + \sum_{s,p} \varepsilon^s \lambda^p (\tilde{u}_\nu, \tilde{w})_{sp}. \quad (14)$$

Here $y^i = (x'^\mu, \phi, \mu, u_\parallel)$ are the new gyrokinetic variables; x'^μ being the coordinate of the spiral center, the gyrocenter; the Larmor corrections $r_s^\mu(y^i)$ describe the difference between the particle position and its gyrocenter, and are thus defined to be purely oscillatory in the gyrophase, ϕ ; \mathbf{l}' and \mathbf{l}'' are the tetrad vectors defining the “plane of rotation”, they are assumed to vary on the scale of the background field and depend on \mathbf{x}' only; \bar{u}'_ν is the average part of velocity, w' is its “perpendicular” component, while oscillatory corrections to the velocity components describe the possibility that the velocity along the Larmor orbit may behave in a complex fashion in higher orders.

The transformation (13),(14) should preserve the velocity as a unit vector. This requirement, expressed by Eq.(3), is satisfied if \bar{u}_ν is orthogonal to $\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{l}''$, i.e.,

$$\bar{u}_\nu = u_o \tau_\nu + u_\parallel l_\nu, \quad (15)$$

while parameters w, u_{\parallel}, u_o satisfy

$$u_o^2 = 1 + w^2 + u_{\parallel}^2, \quad (16)$$

which follows from $u_{\mu}u^{\mu} = 1$ for all ϕ . Note that u_o is *not* the 0th component of \mathbf{u} .

There are just 6 independent corrections to be defined in each order of the expansion. It is possible to introduce the seventh free function by way of a correction to ϕ , but it is not necessary. Thus, the gyrophase ϕ is defined as *an angle in the velocity-subspace*, where we introduced a cylindrical coordinate system linked to the Faraday tensor. This definition is covariant with respect to transformations of the space-time coordinate system, which may change the vector components, but not the vectors themselves.

As compared to our previous work,[14] the gyrokinetic transformation is being searched for in broader class of transformations, (12)-(14), than before. Our previous formulation left components of the velocity unperturbed, i.e., $(\tilde{u}_{\nu}, \tilde{w})_{sp} \equiv 0$. This made the whole work simpler, but there was no solution in one particular limit in orders $\lambda^i, i > 1$. Without the wave-field (λ^0) solution existed for all parameters.

A more natural way of defining the velocity transformation would be to keep \bar{u}_{ν} independent of ϕ , i.e., discard Eq.(14), but allow the tetrad to flex with respect to the background field tensor. Unfortunately, this involves too many variables, and is not realized at the moment.

The ordering scheme should ensure that all components of the particle velocity are of the same order despite the ordering of displacement, (12). This is achieved by ordering the dx^{μ} vector components in the new variables y^i as

$$dx^{\mu} = \frac{\partial x^{\mu}}{\partial y^i} dy^i = (dx^{\mu})_{\phi} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \frac{\partial x^{\mu}}{\partial \phi} d\phi. \quad (17)$$

Here $(dx^{\mu})_{\phi}$ means the differential of x^{μ} with respect to all variables of the new set y^i except ϕ .

The ordering is designed to ensure that the expansion into the Taylor series in $(x^{\mu} - x'^{\mu})$, i.e., in the Larmor radius, is possible for components of the background field, A_{μ} , and the orientation vectors, l^{μ} and l'^{μ} . Note, that we are going to expand the vector components using partial derivatives, rather than vectors using covariant derivatives. Thus, we are going to expand the scalar products of vector fields by basis vectors. For this to be possible, the metric coefficients, and, hence, the coordinate system and the curvature of the space-time

should be sufficiently smooth, i.e., vary on scales larger than the Larmor radius. In contrast, the wave-field, $a_\mu(\mathbf{x}/\varepsilon)$, is allowed to vary rapidly, so that its Taylor expansion in $(x^\mu - x'^\mu)$ is impossible. Instead of the Taylor expansion the Fourier representation can be used for a_μ . Nevertheless, a_μ can be still Taylor-expanded in powers of the displacement from the “unperturbed” orbit. This displacement is proportional to the amplitude of the wave and is required to be suitably smaller than the wavelength.

III. THE GYROKINETIC THEORY

The goal of the gyrokinetic transformation is to make ϕ the ignorable variable, and determine the corresponding integral of motion. We shall first suppose that our general template of the transformation, (12)-(17), satisfies the requirement, apply it to the variational principle, and then determine the arbitrary functions of the template in such a way that the Lagrangian is indeed independent of ϕ . The procedure will proceed order by order. Most of the related algebra is already published,[1] so that we shall drop common expressions and highlight differences in the process of derivation.

First we substitute expressions (12),(17) into (11) and drop terms of order ε^2 or smaller, assuming that u_μ is of order zero, and expanding components of the vector potential into the Taylor series. Then, following[13] we construct the gauge-modified functional

$$\delta G' = Q_\mu dx^\mu - d \left(\frac{1}{2} q (A_\mu + A'_\mu) (r_1^\mu + \varepsilon r_2^\mu) \right), \quad (18)$$

where $A'_\mu = A_\mu(x'^\nu)$. This gauge makes the expression more symmetric and converts all references to partial derivatives of the vector potential into components of the Faraday tensor at \mathbf{x}' :

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial A'_\nu}{\partial x'^\mu} - \frac{\partial A'_\mu}{\partial x'^\nu}. \quad (19)$$

As a result, $\delta G'$ becomes a long expression with terms proportional to dx'^μ , $(dr_1^\mu)_\phi$, and $d\phi$:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta G' = & \left(\frac{q}{\varepsilon} A'_\mu + u_\mu + \lambda q a_\mu - q r_1^\nu F_{\mu\nu} - \varepsilon q \left(r_2^\nu F_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} r_1^\nu r_1^\zeta \frac{\partial F_{\mu\nu}}{\partial x'^\zeta} \right) \right) dx'^\mu + \\ & + \varepsilon \left(u_\mu + \lambda q a_\mu - \frac{1}{2} q r_1^\nu F_{\mu\nu} \right) (dr_1^\mu)_\phi + \varepsilon \left(q A'_\mu \frac{\partial r_3^\mu}{\partial \phi} + (u_\mu + \lambda q a_\mu) \frac{\partial r_2^\mu}{\partial \phi} \right) d\phi + \\ & + \varepsilon \left(-\frac{1}{2} q \left(r_1^\nu \frac{\partial r_2^\mu}{\partial \phi} + r_2^\nu \frac{\partial r_1^\mu}{\partial \phi} \right) F_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} q r_1^\zeta r_1^\nu \frac{\partial r_1^\mu}{\partial \phi} \frac{\partial}{\partial x'^\zeta} \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial A'_\mu}{\partial x'^\nu} - \frac{\partial A'_\nu}{\partial x'^\mu} \right) \right) d\phi + o(\varepsilon). \quad (20) \end{aligned}$$

Up to this point there are no differences in the derivation.

We proceed by eliminating from $\delta G'$ all terms oscillating in ϕ . This is done by solving for displacements r_{sp}^μ and the velocity corrections $(\tilde{u}_\nu, \tilde{w})_{sp}$ in each order in ε and λ .

A. Order ε^1

Initially we drop all terms in Eq.(20), which are of order ε^1 or higher, while retaining contributions of order λ . Conditions for ϕ to be ignorable for the gauge-modified functional $\delta G'' = \delta G' - \varepsilon dR$, where R is an arbitrary Gauge function look like

$$\tilde{u}_\mu + \lambda q \tilde{a}_\mu - q r_1^\nu F_{\mu\nu} = 0; \quad (21)$$

$$\left\{ (u_\mu + \lambda q a_\mu - \frac{1}{2} q r_1^\nu F_{\mu\nu}) \frac{\partial r_1^\mu}{\partial \phi} \right\} \sim = \frac{\partial R}{\partial \phi}. \quad (22)$$

Here \tilde{y} denotes the oscillating part of y , namely $\tilde{y} = y - \bar{y}$, where $\bar{y} = \langle y \rangle_\phi$ is the ϕ -independent part of y . By a proper choice of the gauge-function R one can always satisfy equation (22). This means that

$$\tilde{u}_\mu + \lambda q \tilde{a}_\mu - q r_1^\nu F_{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad (23)$$

yields the only essential requirements. The physical meaning of Eq.(23) is the relationship between the first-order gyro-radius, \mathbf{r}_1 , and the oscillating velocity, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$, along the Larmor orbit. The time-like component describes changes in energy due to displacements of charge in the electric field.

If the above requirements (21) and (22) are satisfied and ϕ is ignorable, the hybrid variational principle in our approximation can be expressed as $\delta S'' = 0$ with

$$S'' = \int \delta G'' = \int \left\{ \left(\frac{q}{\varepsilon} A'_\mu + \langle u \rangle_\mu + \lambda q \tilde{a}_\mu \right) dx'^\mu + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle (\tilde{u}_\mu + \lambda q \tilde{a}_\mu) \frac{\partial r_1^\mu}{\partial \phi} \right\rangle_\phi d\phi \right\}. \quad (24)$$

Equation (23) can be formally solved for r_1^ν to yield

$$r_1^\nu = \frac{1}{q} D^{\nu\mu} \tilde{u}_\mu + \lambda D^{\nu\mu} \tilde{a}_\mu, \quad (25)$$

where $D^{\nu\mu} = (F_{\mu\nu})^{-1}$, provided that $F_{\mu\nu}$ is not degenerate, i.e., $E \neq 0$.

Unfortunately, the degenerate case of zero parallel electric field is the only case that is studied by all other gyrokinetic theories.[6] Thus we need to present a solution that would be

applicable in all cases. To do this we split equation (23) in two projections using operators b, c . Taking its products with $b^{\lambda\mu}, c^{\lambda\mu}$ we get

$$b^{\lambda\mu}\tilde{u}_\mu + \lambda qb^{\lambda\mu}\tilde{a}_\mu - qHr_1^{\lambda(b)} = 0, \quad (26)$$

$$c^{\lambda\mu}\tilde{u}_\mu + \lambda qc^{\lambda\mu}\tilde{a}_\mu + qEr_1^{\lambda(c)} = 0, \quad (27)$$

where $r_1^{\lambda(b)}$ has only $(\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{I}'')$ -components, and $r_1^{\lambda(c)}$ - only $(\mathbf{1}, \tau)$.

We obviously do not need all components of \tilde{u}_μ and r_1^λ to satisfy these two equations. Solution is not unique. Our previous choice was to set $\tilde{u}_\mu^{(c)}$ to zero, which becomes incompatible with equations for $E = 0$. Another possible choice, which is applicable for all regimes, is to set $r_1^{\lambda(c)} = 0$. Note, that this choice is one among many with the same applicability, its main advantage being just relative simplicity. Different choices lead to non-equivalent gyrokinetic transformations (see discussion in Section IV,) in particular, our current choice will make the result different from the previous formulation[1] even in the common applicability range.

From the b-projection, (26), we immediately get

$$r_1^\lambda = \frac{1}{qH} [w(l'^{\lambda} \cos \phi - l'^{\lambda} \sin \phi)]^\sim + \frac{\lambda}{H} b^{\lambda\mu} \tilde{a}_\mu. \quad (28)$$

(here the superscript of \mathbf{r}_1 has been dropped since the other projection, $\mathbf{r}_1^{(c)}$, is zero.) The c-projection, (27), yields

$$(\tilde{u}_\mu + \lambda q \tilde{a}_\mu) \tau^\mu = (\tilde{u}_\mu + \lambda q \tilde{a}_\mu) l^\mu = 0, \quad (29)$$

and it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_o &= -\lambda q \tilde{a}_\mu \tau^\mu, \\ \tilde{u}_\parallel &= \lambda q \tilde{a}_\mu l^\mu. \end{aligned}$$

This means that in orders λ^0 (without the wave) the oscillating parts of w, u_\parallel, u_o can be ignored. If $\lambda \neq 0$, restriction (16) causes w to have the oscillating part as well.

After calculating averages with the help of the above solution, the ϕ -independent functional S'' becomes

$$S'' = \int \left\{ \left(\frac{q}{\varepsilon} A'_\mu + \lambda q \bar{a}_\mu + \langle u \rangle_\mu \right) dx'^\mu + \hat{\mu} d\phi \right\}, \quad (30)$$

where

$$\langle u \rangle_\mu = \bar{u}_\parallel l_\mu + \bar{u}_o \tau_\mu + \langle \tilde{w} (l'_\mu \cos \phi + l''_\mu \sin \phi) \rangle, \quad (31)$$

and $\hat{\mu}$ is the wave-field-modified magnetic moment, accurate to order ε^1 ,

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{\langle w^2 \rangle}{2qH} + \frac{\lambda}{H} \left\langle \tilde{a}_\nu b^{\nu\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \left[w(l'_\mu \cos \phi + l''_\mu \sin \phi) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda q \tilde{a}_\mu \right] \right\rangle. \quad (32)$$

Note that only b-projections of the wave-potential enter this definition, unlike the previous formulation, where all components were involved.

The evaluation of the gyrophase averages involving the wave-field a_μ is, of course, the difficult part. The reason for this is the necessity to transform the given function of space-time coordinates $a_\mu(x^\nu)$ into a function of new variables, while the transformation rule (25),(28) is itself dependent on a_μ . Solution of the equation

$$a_\mu = a_\mu \left(x'^\lambda + \frac{\varepsilon}{qH} [w(l''^\lambda \cos \phi - l'^\lambda \sin \phi)] \right) + \frac{\lambda}{H} b^{\lambda\mu} \tilde{a}_\mu \quad (33)$$

can be only obtained by expanding in powers of λ .

B. Order $\varepsilon^1 \lambda^0$

Solution of the problem in the limit $\lambda = 0$ is simple [13]: since the oscillating parts of w, u_\parallel, u_o can be ignored,

$$\hat{\mu} \equiv \frac{w^2}{2qH}, \quad (34)$$

can be interpreted as the magnetic moment. By varying the functional (30) with respect to ϕ , we find $d\hat{\mu} = 0$, i.e., $\hat{\mu}$ is the first integral of motion in this order.

Now the functional (30) can be rewritten as

$$S'' = \int \left\{ \left(\frac{q}{\varepsilon} A'_\mu + u_\parallel l_\mu + u_o \tau_\mu \right) dx'^\mu + \hat{\mu} d\phi \right\}, \quad (35)$$

with $u_o = \sqrt{1 + 2qH\hat{\mu} + u_\parallel^2}$.

C. Order $\lambda^0 \varepsilon^2$

This order of the perturbation theory is less trivial, but, due to vanishing $\tilde{w}, \tilde{u}_\parallel, \tilde{u}_o$, coincides with the derivation provided in our previous paper, [1]. An important feature arising in this order is the solubility condition,

$$\left\{ (u_\parallel l_\mu + u_o \tau_\mu) D^{\mu\nu} (l'_\nu \cos \phi + l''_\nu \sin \phi) \right\}^\sim = 0, \quad (36)$$

which is satisfied identically if the $(\mathbf{I}', \mathbf{I}'')$ -plane is the invariant plane of $F^{\mu\nu}$. This is the only requirement that motivates the “field-related” choice of the basis $(\tau, \mathbf{l}, \mathbf{I}', \mathbf{I}'')$.

In this order the ϕ -independent functional takes the form

$$S'' = \int \left\{ \left(\frac{q}{\varepsilon} A'_\mu + u_\parallel l_\mu + u_o \tau_\mu + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon \hat{\mu} \chi_\mu \right) dx'^\mu + \hat{\mu} d\phi \right\}, \quad (37)$$

where the previous expression for the adiabatic invariant, (34), holds. Thus, the second order modifications to the Lagrangian can be described as inhomogeneity contributions to the effective electromagnetic potential with

$$\chi_\mu = l'_\nu \frac{\partial l''^\nu}{\partial x'^\mu} - l''_\nu \frac{\partial l'^\nu}{\partial x'^\mu} - (l'^\nu l'^\varsigma + l''^\nu l''^\varsigma) \frac{1}{H} \frac{\partial F_{\mu\nu}}{\partial x'^\varsigma}, \quad (38)$$

while the form of the adiabatic invariant remains unchanged. Note that some of the effects of the gravitational field are also contained in χ_μ via derivatives of the basis vectors.

D. Order $\varepsilon^1 \lambda^1$

We proceed by considering the linear approximation in the wave-field amplitude without high-order curvature effects. As noted above, the main problem here is the transformation of the highly-local wave-field $a_\mu(\mathbf{x})$, where \mathbf{x} is the particle position, to the guiding-center coordinates $(x'^\alpha, \phi, \hat{\mu}, u_\parallel)$. The Taylor-expansion procedure used above for transformation of the equilibrium field fails if the wavelength is sufficiently short. Instead, Eq.(33) is solved using Fourier analysis and expansion in powers of λ .

Assume that the wave field is given in terms of its Fourier components $a_\mu(\mathbf{k})$, then Eq.(33) becomes

$$a_\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d^4k a_\mu(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}'} \exp \left\{ i\varepsilon k_\nu \left(\frac{w}{qH} (l''^\nu \cos \phi - l'^\nu \sin \phi) + \frac{\lambda}{H} b^{\nu\mu} \tilde{a}_\mu \right) \right\}, \quad (39)$$

where only the second exponential factor depends on ϕ .

Here the ordering of the wave-vector \mathbf{k} is such that $\varepsilon k \sim O(1)$, as usual [6], but without additional restrictions on the “parallel wavelength” and frequency, which appear in traditional approaches. Namely, we allow $\omega/\Omega \sim O(1)$ and $k_\parallel \rho \sim O(1)$ in place of the usual ordering $\sim O(\varepsilon)$.

We can calculate the required averages in (30) and (32) by extracting the main exponential contribution and expanding it into the Fourier series in ϕ . We use the following identity[20]

$$\exp [i\zeta \sin \psi] = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} J_n (\zeta) \exp (in\psi), \quad (40)$$

to get

$$a_\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d^4k a_\mu(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}'} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} J_n (\xi) \exp (in(\phi_0 - \phi)) \exp (i\varepsilon k_\nu \delta r^\nu), \quad (41)$$

where

$$\delta r^\nu = \left[\frac{\tilde{w}}{qH} (l''^\nu \cos \phi - l'^\nu \sin \phi) \right]^\sim + \frac{\lambda}{H} b^{\nu\mu} \tilde{a}_\mu \quad (42)$$

characterizes the residual terms. We also defined ξ as

$$\xi = k_\perp \rho = (\varepsilon \bar{w} / qH) \sqrt{(k_\nu l''^\nu)^2 + (k_\nu l'^\nu)^2}, \quad (43)$$

where $k_\perp = \sqrt{(k_\nu l''^\nu)^2 + (k_\nu l'^\nu)^2}$ is the length of \mathbf{k}_\perp , which is the projection of \mathbf{k} on the $(\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{l}'')$ -plane; $\phi_0 = \arctan(k_\nu l''^\nu / k_\nu l'^\nu)$ is the angle of \mathbf{k}_\perp with respect to the $(\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{l}'')$ -basis, $\rho = \varepsilon \bar{w} / qH$ is the Larmor radius.

To the order $\varepsilon^1 \lambda^1$, δr^ν in the expression (41) can be set to 0, so that its zero-order solution is just

$$a_\mu^{(0)}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d^4k a_\mu(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}'} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} J_n (\xi) \exp (in(\phi_0 - \phi)). \quad (44)$$

Note, that neglecting the last exponent in equation (41), or solving by expansion in powers of λ , is possible only if the particle displacement from the equilibrium orbit due to the wave field is much smaller than the wavelength.

Now that the oscillating part of the wave-potential is defined, we can find the oscillating parts of the velocity parameters from Eqs.(29),(16). In particular, in this order

$$\tilde{w}^{(1)} = -\frac{\lambda q}{\bar{w}} u'^\nu \tilde{a}_\nu, \quad (45)$$

with

$$\bar{u}^{\nu} = \bar{u}_\parallel l^\nu + \bar{u}_o \tau^\nu. \quad (46)$$

Now the averages, present in expressions (30), (32), become

$$\bar{a}_\mu^{(0)} = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int d^4k a_\mu(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}'} J_0 (\xi), \quad (47)$$

$$\langle (l''^\nu \sin \phi + l'^\nu \cos \phi) \bar{a}_\nu^{(0)} \rangle = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int d^4k a_\nu(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}'} i J_1 (\xi) (l''^\nu \sin \phi_0 - l'^\nu \cos \phi_0), \quad (48)$$

$$\langle \tilde{w} (l'_\mu \cos \phi + l''_\mu \sin \phi) \rangle = -\frac{\lambda q u'^\nu}{4\pi^2 \bar{w}} \int d^4k a_\nu(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}'} i J_1 (\xi) (l'_\mu \sin \phi_0 - l''_\mu \cos \phi_0). \quad (49)$$

so that to the order $\varepsilon^1 \lambda^1$

$$S'' = \int \left\{ \left(\frac{q}{\varepsilon} A'_\mu + \lambda q \bar{a}_\mu + \bar{u}'_\mu + \bar{u}_{\perp\mu} \right) dx'^\mu + \hat{\mu} d\phi \right\}, \quad (50)$$

where $\bar{a}_\mu = \bar{a}_\mu^{(0)}$, and

$$\bar{u}_{\perp\mu} = \frac{\lambda \varepsilon}{2H} b_\mu^\lambda \bar{f}_{\lambda\nu} \bar{u}'^\nu, \quad (51)$$

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{\bar{w}^2}{2qH} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda \varepsilon}{H} b^{\mu\nu} \bar{f}_{\mu\nu} \right), \quad (52)$$

and we have introduced the new notation

$$\bar{f}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int d^4k i [k_\mu a_\nu - k_\nu a_\mu] e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}'} \frac{J_1(\xi)}{\xi} = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int d^4k f_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}'} \frac{J_1(\xi)}{\xi}, \quad (53)$$

thus expressing the adiabatic invariant $\hat{\mu}$ and $\bar{u}_{\perp\mu}$ in terms of the gauge-invariant Faraday tensor of the wave,

$$f_{\mu\nu} = \partial a_\nu / \partial x^\mu - \partial a_\mu / \partial x^\nu.$$

Note that the correction in Eq.(52) is proportional to the averaged parallel component of the magnetic field of the wave, $b^{\mu\nu} \bar{f}_{\mu\nu}$. This effect is obviously necessary, but is usually neglected due to the standard gyrokinetic ordering of the wave-field, so that the first order contribution to the magnetic moment vanishes.

Note also that in this order we can use the relationship

$$\bar{u}_0^2 - \bar{w}^2 - \bar{u}_\parallel^2 = 1 \quad (54)$$

instead of (16).

E. Summary

Finally, we summarize the above results by presenting the transformed variational principle valid through the first order in λ and second order in ε , i.e., with terms of the order $\varepsilon\lambda$ and ε^2 retained: $\delta S = 0$ yields the particle phase-space trajectory with

$$S = \int \left(q A'_\mu + u_\parallel l_\mu + (1 + 2qH^* \hat{\mu} + u_\parallel^2)^{1/2} \tau_\mu + q \bar{a}_\mu + \bar{u}_{\perp\mu} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\mu} \chi_\mu \right) dx'^\mu + \hat{\mu} d\phi, \quad (55)$$

where $(x'^\mu, u_\parallel, \hat{\mu}, \phi)$ or $(x'^\mu, u_\parallel, w, \phi)$ are the new gyrokinetic variables with $\hat{\mu} = w^2/2qH^*$; $q = q_a/m_a c^2$ is the signed charge-to-mass ratio;

$$H^* = H + b^{\mu\nu} \bar{f}_{\mu\nu}, \quad (56)$$

is the effective magnetic field strength, with $\bar{f}_{\mu\nu}$ being the averaged Faraday tensor of the wave, given by Eq.(53). Expressions for the averaged potential of the wave, \bar{a}_μ , the wave-induced drift, $\bar{u}_{\perp\mu}$, and the second-order correction, χ_μ , are given by equations (47),(51), and (38) respectively.

The orthogonal basis $(\tau, \mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}'')$ is chosen in such a way that $(\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{l}'')$ coincides with the space-like invariant plane of the antisymmetric tensor of the electromagnetic field $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial A'_\nu / \partial x'^\mu - \partial A'_\mu / \partial x'^\nu$, with H being the corresponding eigenvalue.

F. Equations of motion

Equations of motion, or the relationships between differentials tangent to the particle orbit, can be obtained as Euler equations of the transformed variational principle (55). Let us find the first variation of S assuming $(x'^\alpha, \phi, \hat{\mu}, u_{\parallel})$ to be independent:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S = & \int (-qF_{\mu\nu} + d_{\nu\mu}) \delta x'^\nu dx'^\mu + \\ & + \left(\frac{q\tau_\mu}{u_0} \frac{\partial (H^* \hat{\mu})}{\partial \hat{\mu}} + q \frac{\partial \bar{a}_\mu}{\partial \hat{\mu}} + \frac{\chi_\mu}{2} \right) [\delta \hat{\mu} dx'^\mu - d\hat{\mu} \delta x'^\mu] + \\ & + \left(l_\mu + \frac{u_{\parallel} \tau_\mu}{u_0} + s_{\perp\mu} \right) [\delta u_{\parallel} dx'^\mu - du_{\parallel} \delta x'^\mu] + \delta \hat{\mu} d\phi - d\hat{\mu} \delta \phi. \end{aligned}$$

Here we dropped bars over u_{\parallel}, u_0 since all oscillating corrections are left behind, and introduced a new tensor notation

$$d_{\nu\mu} \equiv \text{Rot}_\nu \left[u_{\parallel} l_\mu + u_0 \tau_\mu + q \bar{a}_\mu + \bar{u}_{\perp\mu} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\mu} \chi_\mu \right], \quad (57)$$

where the operator Rot_ν is defined by $\text{Rot}_\nu f_\mu \equiv \partial f_\mu / \partial x'^\nu - \partial f_\nu / \partial x'^\mu$. Furthermore, the partial derivative of the wave-induced drift is denoted as

$$s_{\perp\mu} \equiv \frac{\partial \bar{u}_{\perp\mu}}{\partial u_{\parallel}} = \frac{1}{2H} b_\mu^\lambda \bar{f}_{\lambda\nu} l^\nu.$$

Extrema of the functional are achieved for world lines where $\delta S = 0$ for all variations of independent variables. This yields the Euler equations as

$$d\hat{\mu} = 0, \quad (58)$$

$$\left(\frac{q\tau_\mu}{u_0} \frac{\partial (H^* \hat{\mu})}{\partial \hat{\mu}} + q \frac{\partial \bar{a}_\mu}{\partial \hat{\mu}} + \frac{\chi_\mu}{2} \right) dx'^\mu + d\phi = 0, \quad (59)$$

$$\left(l_\mu + \frac{u_{\parallel} \tau_\mu}{u_0} + s_{\perp\mu} \right) dx'^\mu = 0, \quad (60)$$

$$(-qF_{\mu\nu} + d_{\nu\mu}) dx'^{\mu} - \left(l_{\nu} + \frac{u_{\parallel}\tau_{\nu}}{u_0} + s_{\perp\nu} \right) du_{\parallel} = 0. \quad (61)$$

The first equation here confirms that $\hat{\mu}$ is an integral of motion, the second equation determines the rate of rotation along the Larmor orbit and is not needed for our purposes here. By multiplying the 4-vector equation (61) by dx'^{ν} and taking the sum in ν one can recover the third scalar equation (60) multiplied by du_{\parallel} , i.e. out of five equations for four unknown functions dx'^{μ}/du_{\parallel} only four are independent, as it should be for solvability. This allows to determine the non-trivial solutions (at least formally) and use them as coefficients of the gyrokinetic equation.

It is convenient to rewrite the 4-vector equation (61) through its projections on the orthogonal vectors of the basis $(\tau, \mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}', \mathbf{l}'')$. Taking scalar products with $(\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{l}'')$ we get

$$(qHl''_{\mu} + l'^{\nu}d_{\nu\mu}) dx'^{\mu} + s_{\perp\nu}l''^{\nu} du_{\parallel} = 0, \quad (62)$$

$$(-qHl'_{\mu} + l''^{\nu}d_{\nu\mu}) dx'^{\mu} + s_{\perp\nu}l''^{\nu} du_{\parallel} = 0. \quad (63)$$

These two equations determine the drift velocity. Taking the scalar product with \mathbf{l} , we recover the following equation governing acceleration parallel to the magnetic field

$$du_{\parallel} - qE\tau_{\mu} dx'^{\mu} + l^{\nu}d_{\nu\mu} dx'^{\mu} = 0. \quad (64)$$

Then, the last equation looks like

$$u_{\parallel} du_{\parallel} + u_0 q E l_{\mu} dx'^{\mu} - u_0 \tau^{\nu} d_{\nu\mu} dx'^{\mu} = 0, \quad (65)$$

which is the energy conservation law. However, as shown above, instead one can use another, equivalent but much more compact equation (60). It describes the relationship between u_{\parallel} and the differentials of the guiding-center position

$$(u_0 l_{\mu} + u_{\parallel} \tau_{\mu} + u_0 s_{\perp\mu}) dx'^{\mu} = 0. \quad (66)$$

Equations (62),(63) can be rewritten to exclude du_{\parallel} using Eq.(64):

$$(qHl''_{\mu} + l'^{\nu}d_{\nu\mu} + s_{\perp\nu}l''^{\nu} [qE\tau_{\mu} - l^{\nu}d_{\nu\mu}]) dx'^{\mu} = 0, \quad (67)$$

$$(-qHl'_{\mu} + l''^{\nu}d_{\nu\mu} + s_{\perp\nu}l''^{\nu} [qE\tau_{\mu} - l^{\nu}d_{\nu\mu}]) dx'^{\mu} = 0. \quad (68)$$

It is possible to formally solve equations (62)-(66) in terms of the basis vectors. To do this we introduce new notations,

$$v_\mu = u_o l_\mu + u_\parallel \tau_\mu, \quad (69)$$

$$\bar{u}^\mu = u_\parallel l_\mu + u_o \tau_\mu, \quad (70)$$

and

$$d_{pq} \equiv p^\nu d_{\nu\mu} q^\mu, \quad s_p = s_{\perp\nu} p^\nu, \quad (71)$$

for arbitrary four-vectors \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} . Note that $v_\mu \bar{u}^\mu = 0$ and these vectors can be used in place of l_μ, τ_μ .

Searching for the solution in the form $dx'^\mu = \bar{u}^\mu + al'^\mu + bl''^\mu + cv_\mu$, and solving equations (66),(67),(68) with respect to a, b, c up to the first order in $1/qH$, we get

$$dx'^\mu = \left(\bar{u}^\mu + \frac{1}{qH} \left[l''^\mu d_{l'u} - l'^\mu d_{l''u} + \frac{u_o v^\mu}{u_o^2 - u_\parallel^2} (s_{l''} d_{l'u} - s_{l'} d_{l''u}) \right] \right) ds', \quad (72)$$

where ds' is an arbitrary scalar function. Similarly, from Eq.(64) we find

$$du_\parallel = (qE - d_{l\tau}) u_o ds' - \quad (73)$$

$$- \frac{1}{qH} \left[d_{l''} d_{l'u} - d_{l'} d_{l''u} - \frac{u_o u_\parallel}{u_o^2 - u_\parallel^2} (qE - d_{l\tau}) (s_{l''} d_{l'u} - s_{l'} d_{l''u}) \right] ds'. \quad (74)$$

The zero-order terms describe the particle trajectory in quasi-uniform fields. In the non-relativistic limit the $d_{l\tau}$ term in Eq.(73) is responsible for the parallel diamagnetic force $\sim \mu \nabla B$, while \bar{u}^μ contains the parallel velocity as well as the $E \times B$ -drift. The first order corrections (in square brackets) describe drifts due to spatial and temporal inhomogeneities.

Note that the equations of motion in the present formulation result different and significantly more complicated than in the previous formulation.[1] Thus, it should be used only if the $E = 0$ limit is expected to occur in conjunction with the short wavelength wave fields, in which case the previous formulation fails.

In Section V we will need to relate the gyrokinetic displacements to the particle displacement, i.e., express ds' in terms of the particle displacement ds . Below we present a proof that the two displacements coincide in the zero-order approximation.

According to the definitions,

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu \approx g_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}') \left[dx'^\mu + \frac{\partial r_1^\mu}{\partial \phi} d\phi \right] \left[dx'^\nu + \frac{\partial r_1^\nu}{\partial \phi} d\phi \right].$$

This can be expanded to yield

$$ds^2 \approx g'_{\mu\nu} dx'^{\mu} dx'^{\nu} + 2g'_{\mu\nu} dx'^{\nu} \frac{\partial r_1^{\mu}}{\partial \phi} d\phi + \frac{\partial r_1^{\mu}}{\partial \phi} \frac{\partial r_{1\mu}}{\partial \phi} d\phi^2.$$

The differentials in the right-hand side are supposed to be taken along the particle trajectory, i.e., should satisfy the equations of motion, (59),(72). Using them in zero order,

$$\begin{aligned} u'_o d\phi + qH\tau_{\mu} dx'^{\mu} &= 0, \\ dx'^{\mu} - \bar{u}'^{\mu} ds' &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

we obtain

$$ds^2 = \bar{u}'^{\mu} \bar{u}'_{\mu} ds'^2 + \frac{\partial r_1^{\mu}}{\partial \phi} \frac{\partial r_{1\mu}}{\partial \phi} q^2 H^2 ds'^2.$$

Furthermore, available expressions for r_1^{μ} can be used to yield

$$\frac{\partial r_1^{\mu}}{\partial \phi} \frac{\partial r_{1\mu}}{\partial \phi} = -\frac{w^2}{q^2 H^2},$$

so that, finally,

$$ds = ds'. \tag{76}$$

IV. EQUIVALENCE OF GYROKINETIC THEORIES

The gyrokinetic transformation is about finding and using the adiabatic invariant, which corresponds to the fast Larmor rotation, and in the gyrokinetic limit becomes the first integral of motion. As such it splits the phase space into a sequence of hypersurfaces. The invariant hypersurfaces should be the same for all gyrokinetic theories, unless they invoke an additional first integral (adiabatic invariant) of some sort. Thus, we conclude, that in the same phase space the adiabatic invariants of different gyrokinetic theories should be in functional dependence. There is a catch, however. Indeed, the phase space of a canonical theory is not gauge-invariant, since the canonical momenta depend on the gauge of the electromagnetic field. Thus, the adiabatic invariants with different gauges can (and even should) be different. For a non-canonical Lagrangian theory the phase space is chosen in an observable way, but this does not preclude similar ambiguity. Indeed, the gauge invariance of the Lagrangian itself allows for different expressions to appear.

There is another sort of ambiguity in terms related to division of the field into the “background” and the “wave” parts. The use of the two expansion parameters, ε and λ ,

instead of a single one is due to convenience, rather than necessity. It is especially evident in our covariant treatment, where all artificial restrictions on the wave-field introduced in conventional theories are removed. Indeed, both parameters are inversely proportional to the background magnetic field, and the two expansions can be effectively replaced by a single one by assuming that *all* nonuniformity of fields is due to effective “waves”, i.e., by representing the background field via its Fourier expansion rather than its Taylor expansion. Obviously, if the variation of the background field is small on the Larmor scale, i.e., $\varepsilon \ll 1$, then the deviation from the unperturbed orbit will also be small, i.e., $\lambda \ll 1$, and the applicability of the wave-field expansion for the variable part of the background field is ensured. Unlike the Taylor expansion, Fourier expansion is non-local, and as such has potentially better convergence for finite values of the deviation. This is very important for the gyrokinetic theory, which is used primarily for description of effects due to the finite Larmor radius of particles. Unfortunately, non-local theories are far less convenient from the mathematical viewpoint.

The two ambiguities described above are more-or-less controlled by the user, so that they can be counted among advantages rather than difficulties of the theory. If the adiabatic invariant is the only integral of motion, and the gyrophase is defined as its canonically conjugate angle variable, the freedom of variation becomes confined to different transformations within the subspace of the rest of the phase variables. This can be defined as a class of equivalence of different gyrokinetic theories:

If, under the same gauge and the same division of the wave-field, the adiabatic invariants of two theories are in functional dependence, then the theories are “equivalent”,

i.e., the definitions of the gyrophase coincide, and all the difference is just in possible transformations of the “drift” variables. As stressed above, theories should be equivalent if there are no more integrals of motion that could be expressed via local parameters. (Global integrals of motion are here irrelevant, if the derivation procedure is local as usual.)

The above argument holds for any particular power of expansion in ε . However, the definition of the adiabatic invariant of order n may depend on the existence of other approximate integrals of motion of order n , since any function of all integrals of motion is the integral of motion and there is no formal means to distinguish between them. In particular, in the first order the electromagnetic field is uniform, and in theories with slow drifts even the electric field is zero, so that there are at least two more integrals of motion, such as the

parallel velocity and the perpendicular gyrocenter position. As a result, *in the first order*, the definition of the “adiabatic invariant” is very slack, and besides the gauge, allows for two more arbitrary functions to enter the definition. This fact is reflected in our paper,[13] where it has been shown that the gyrokinetic transformation in the first order is defined with six free parameters.

For higher-order theories this is dangerous, because by choosing one of the definitions at an early stage, one can be left without any solution in the next order, where the other approximate integrals of motion may disappear. Thus, the solubility condition for the second order approximation removed all freedom from the definition of the adiabatic invariant in our subsequent papers,[1, 14] (though left some in other respects.) Another possibility is the survival of additional integral(s) of motion in the next order due to some ordering or symmetry assumptions. For example, all previous (except [1, 14]) gyrokinetic theories assume that the parallel electric field and the background field inhomogeneity are zero, and the parallel wavelength of the perturbation is infinite, while describing the effect of the wave. This means, that at least the parallel momentum of the particle is retained as an approximate integral of motion in this order, and there is a possible ambiguity in the definition of the “adiabatic invariant”. (Of course, nobody is so dumb as to insert the parallel momentum in the definition by hand. Still, while using multi-step approximations, it is necessary to keep the possible ambiguity in mind.) At the moment we do not know of any danger related to this possibility, and it seems that, though the adiabatic invariant can be potentially defined in different ways, it is impossible to say which one is “right”. Thus, the gyrokinetic theories are potentially non-equivalent. In particular, different choices of free parameters in Ref.[13] lead to non-equivalent theories, when the corresponding definitions of the magnetic moment are different.

So, why is this “non-equivalence” important? The reason lies in the internal machinery of the derivation. If the gyrokinetic transformations are non-equivalent, the definitions of the gyrophase are different, and, hence, so are the definitions of the gyrocenter/guiding center. As a consequence, the “drift trajectories” in different representations will differ by a distance of the order of the Larmor radius ($\times \varepsilon^{n-1}$), depending on the gyrophase. Drift trajectories are routinely used for confinement analysis. If they form a drift surface, the conclusion is that the confinement is achieved. Now we see that this logic works in only one direction. The reverse is not true: even if the drift trajectories form a surface in one representation, it

will not necessarily be the same one you are using!

If the gyrokinetic theories are not equivalent, they have close but essentially different drift trajectories.

V. CYCLOTRON DAMPING

A fundamental issue of for the kinetic description of relativistic magnetized plasmas is the consistent treatment of cyclotron losses. In this section we describe the radiation losses of a charged particle accelerated by an external electromagnetic field as a single-particle classical process. However, one should keep in mind that in cold, dense plasmas there may be interference of cyclotron radiation from different particles, thus modifying both the outgoing radiation and its net effect on the particle. In this limit the ‘‘cyclotron losses’’ are better described by means of collision integrals and plasma waves.

Radiation damping of the motion of a particle in an electromagnetic field is given by the force [22]

$$f_i = \frac{2q_a^2}{3c} \left(\frac{d^2 u_i}{ds^2} - u_i u^k \frac{d^2 u_k}{ds^2} \right).$$

Normally it should be a small correction to the electromagnetic force, but can also be large for ultra-relativistic particles.

This expression can be translated to the covariant form by substitution of covariant derivatives in place of $d^2 u_i/ds^2$. Using the equations of motion, we get

$$\frac{D^2 u_i}{ds^2} = q^2 F_{ik} F^{kl} u_l + q \frac{D F_{ik}}{\partial x^l} u^l u^k.$$

Substituting it into the expression for the force, we can deduce the four-acceleration caused by radiation as

$$\left(\frac{D u_i}{ds} \right)_r = \frac{2}{3} r_a q \left[q F_{ik} F^{kl} u_l + q u_i (F_{kl} u^l)^2 + \frac{D F_{ik}}{\partial x_l} u^l u^k \right], \quad (77)$$

where $r_a = q_a^2/m_a c^2$ is the electromagnetic ‘‘radius’’ of the particle, and $q = q_a/m_a c^2$ is the normalized charge.

From the normalization it is obvious, that the order of the correction caused by the damping is $\varepsilon^{-1} r_a/\rho_L$, which is, formally, ε^{-2} . However, the ratio r_a/ρ_L is very small in realistic situations, so that we shall assume it sufficient to calculate the trajectory $(u_l(s))$ just in the first order in the Larmor-radius expansion. In this order the electromagnetic

field, as well as the coordinate system are constant, i.e., the last term in the expression (77) can be neglected. Thus

$$(Du_\mu)_r = \frac{2}{3}r_a q^2 [F_{\mu\nu}F^{\nu\lambda}u_\lambda - (u^\alpha F_{\alpha\nu}F^{\nu\lambda}u_\lambda)u_\mu] ds. \quad (78)$$

This expression has a general form of acceleration due to friction versus some medium with characteristic velocity $\mathbf{u}_0 = F^2\mathbf{u}$:

$$\mathbf{a} = \alpha_r [\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}_0)]. \quad (79)$$

It is consistent with (78) for $\alpha_r = 2r_a q^2/3$, and $\mathbf{a} = D\mathbf{u}/ds$. It includes deceleration due to both, the cyclotron/synchrotron radiation, which is proportional to H^2 , and the bremsstrahlung, which is proportional to E^2 .

Note also, that the acceleration due to the mean field is proportional to $F\mathbf{u}$, with F being antisymmetric, while the radiative deceleration is proportional to $T\mathbf{u}$, with a symmetric T , but such that $\mathbf{u}T\mathbf{u} = 0$.

Next step is to rewrite the friction in terms of the gyrokinetic variables. Using the representations of the world-velocity,

$$u_\nu = \bar{u}_\nu + w(l'_\nu \cos \phi + l''_\nu \sin \phi) \equiv u_{\parallel\nu} + u_{\perp\nu}, \quad (80)$$

and of the Faraday tensor, (7), we find

$$\mathbf{a} = \alpha_r [H^2 b b \mathbf{u}_\perp + E^2 c c \mathbf{u}_\parallel - \mathbf{u} (H^2 \mathbf{u}_\perp b b \mathbf{u}_\perp + E^2 \mathbf{u}_\parallel c c \mathbf{u}_\parallel)].$$

Using definitions of b and c , it can be further transformed to

$$\mathbf{a} = \alpha_r [-H^2 \mathbf{u}_\perp + E^2 \mathbf{u}_\parallel - \mathbf{u} (w^2 H^2 + (1 + w^2) E^2)],$$

or

$$\mathbf{a} = -\alpha_r (H^2 + E^2) [(1 + w^2) \mathbf{u}_\perp + w^2 \mathbf{u}_\parallel].$$

Since $\mathbf{u}_\perp^2 = -w^2$ and $\mathbf{u}_\parallel^2 = 1 + w^2$ it is obvious that $\mathbf{a}\mathbf{u} = 0$ as desired.

The cyclotron friction is a small effect, so it can be evaluated in the first-order gyrokinetic approximation, i.e., with all fields being uniform. Also, we can assume components of the metric tensor to be constant in this approximation. In this way we neglect accelerations due

to gravity and the curvature of field lines as compared to the acceleration on the Larmor orbit. Then, the equation

$$D\mathbf{u}_r = \mathbf{ads}$$

can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[(l'_\nu \cos \phi + l''_\nu \sin \phi) + \frac{w}{u_o} \tau_\mu \right] dw_r + \\ & \quad + \left[l_\mu + \frac{u_\parallel}{u_o} \tau_\mu \right] du_{\parallel r} + (-l'_\nu \sin \phi + l''_\nu \cos \phi) w d\phi_r = \\ & = -\alpha_r (H^2 + E^2) \left[w(1 + w^2) (l'_\nu \cos \phi + l''_\nu \sin \phi) + w^2 (u_\parallel l_\mu + u_o \tau_\mu) \right] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Taking scalar products with the basis vectors we find

$$\begin{cases} d\phi_r = 0, \\ dw_r = -\frac{2}{3} r_a q^2 (H^2 + E^2) w(1 + w^2) ds, \\ du_{\parallel r} = -\frac{2}{3} r_a q^2 (H^2 + E^2) w^2 u_\parallel ds. \end{cases} \quad (81)$$

Here the differentials ds can be identified with ds' , which was used in Section III for description of the gyrokinetic trajectory, due to identity (76). As a result, it is easy to “tweak” the equations of motion to include the radiation damping as a small correction:

$$\begin{cases} dx'^\mu = dx'_g{}^\mu + 0 \\ du_\parallel = du_{\parallel g} + du_{\parallel r} \\ d\hat{\mu} = 0 + w dw_r / qH \\ d\phi = d\phi_g + d\phi_r \end{cases}, \quad (82)$$

where $dx'_g{}^\mu du_{\parallel g} d\phi_g$ describe the gyrokinetic trajectory, while $du_{\parallel r}, dw_r, d\phi_r$ are corrections due to the cyclotron damping. All these differentials along the particle orbit are already found in Section III and above, and are ready to use.

VI. KINETIC EQUATION

If equations of motion contain dissipative terms, i.e., the particle energy and momentum are lost along the trajectory, the form of the kinetic equation itself may change. It is necessary to check the Liouville’s theorem, and introduce corrections if the phase volume is not conserved.

First, let us define the phase space as a direct product of the space-time by the four-velocity space. Note, that scalar products are defined in each subspace, and *between* vectors of different subspaces, but not in the phase-space as a whole - you cannot add velocities to distances. However, all trajectories or world-lines of particles, can be parameterized by the proper time s , whose definition involves only the space-time subspace. In effect, zero length is ascribed to displacements in velocity directions.

Coordinates in the phase-space are introduced in accordance with existing scalar products. Namely, initially, for *both* subspaces we use the same systems of basis vectors, i.e., for an 8-dimensional space we use two copies of four-dimensional basis vectors of space-time.

Consider a flux-tube of trajectories. At a given point (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) it could be characterized by the direction of its central line, $(d\mathbf{x}, D\mathbf{u})/ds$, its cross-section, δV , and the flux density, $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$, which is identified as the distribution function of particles. However, the definitions of the flux density and the cross-section area are subject to the definition of the scalar product, which is not fully defined. Ascribing zero length to velocity displacements, as in the standard parameterization, means that the direction of the central line is in effect $(d\mathbf{x}, D\mathbf{u})/ds \rightarrow (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{0})$. Then the phase-space volume δV can be defined as a product of the volume element in the space-time, δV_x , which is orthogonal to \mathbf{u} , and the element of the total velocity subspace, δV_u , so that $\delta V = \delta V_x \delta V_u$. The volume element in the velocity space, δV_u , is also orthogonal to \mathbf{u} , since the motion occurs on the hypersurface $\mathbf{u}^2 = 1$, which is orthogonal to its radius, \mathbf{u} .

The flux of trajectories is continuous, i.e., the flux lines do not end, if the particles do not disappear. This means that $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})\delta V = \text{const}$, i.e.,

$$d(f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})\delta V) = 0,$$

which is a general form of the kinetic equation. If, additionally, the Liouville's theorem holds, i.e.,

$$d\delta V = 0,$$

then the kinetic equation obtains its classic form,

$$df(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) = 0.$$

Note, that the differential d takes place in the 7-dimensional phase-space, while the volume element δV is 6-dimensional, as it describes an element of the hypersurface. Consequently, $f \delta V$ is the density of particles in their rest-frame in one particular moment.

Defined in this way, the phase-space volume and the distribution function coincide with their non-relativistic analogs in the corresponding limit.

The full volume element in the space-time is $\delta V_\sigma = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \delta x_1^\alpha \delta x_2^\beta \delta x_3^\gamma \delta x_4^\delta$, while its sub-volume (section area) orthogonal to the unit vector \mathbf{u} is

$$\delta V_x = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} u^\alpha \left[\delta x_1^\beta \delta x_2^\gamma \delta x_3^\delta + \delta x_0^\beta \delta x_1^\gamma \delta x_3^\delta - \delta x_0^\beta \delta x_1^\gamma \delta x_2^\delta - \delta x_0^\beta \delta x_2^\gamma \delta x_3^\delta \right].$$

Here δx_i^β is the β -component of the i -th box vector, and $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ is the absolutely antisymmetric tensor. Thus, the volume elements are scalars, so that if they are constant in one coordinate system, they are constant in all others. In particular, we can choose the local co-moving reference frame, in which $u^\alpha = 0$ and $u_\alpha = 0$ for all $\alpha \neq 0$ (this requires also $g_{\mu 0} = 0$). Then

$$\delta V_x = \epsilon_{0123} u^0 \delta x^1 \delta x^2 \delta x^3 = u^0 \sqrt{-g} \delta x^1 \delta x^2 \delta x^3, \quad (83)$$

where the box sides are taken along the basis vectors. In words the invariant space subvolume is defined as follows: if there is a particle with velocity \mathbf{u} , go into its rest frame, and put it in a box. This is a unique way of measurement, i.e., a scalar.

The effective volume element in the velocity-subspace we define as

$$\delta V_u = -\epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\kappa} u^\mu \delta u_1^\nu \delta u_2^\lambda \delta u_3^\kappa = -\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\kappa} u_\mu \delta u_{1\nu} \delta u_{2\lambda} \delta u_{3\kappa}. \quad (84)$$

Its definition is important for calculating moments of the distribution function, such as the four-current density. We have defined it as a scalar, i.e., an invariant under Lorentz transformations, and it should coincide with corresponding definitions by other authors. Indeed, in the co-moving frame it becomes

$$\delta V_u = -\epsilon^{0123} u_0 \delta u_1 \delta u_2 \delta u_3 = \frac{\delta u_1 \delta u_2 \delta u_3}{u^0 \sqrt{-g}}, \quad (85)$$

which is listed as an invariant velocity volume in Refs.[12, 21] It can also be expressed via the δ -function as

$$\delta V_u = \delta \left(1 - \sqrt{u_\mu u^\mu} \right) d^4 \mathbf{u} = \delta \left(1 - \sqrt{u_\alpha u^\alpha} \right) \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\kappa} \delta u_{0\mu} \delta u_{1\nu} \delta u_{2\lambda} \delta u_{3\kappa}. \quad (86)$$

Indeed, this is also a scalar expression, and in the co-moving frame it obviously coincides with Eq.(85).

Multiplying the volume elements (83) and (85) we get a simple expression for the phase-space volume in the co-moving frame

$$\delta V = \delta x^1 \delta x^2 \delta x^3 \delta u_1 \delta u_2 \delta u_3. \quad (87)$$

Here the box sides $\delta x^\alpha, \delta u_\alpha$ are defined along the corresponding basis vectors, i.e., are pure-space coordinates and velocities.

The next question is how this box changes along the particle trajectory. To describe it, first note, that each direction in space, \mathbf{n} , specifies a rectangle cross-section of the box, $[\mathbf{x}_\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{u}_\mathbf{n}]$. Such cross-section is initially a rectangle, since the volume is defined by a simple product of the velocity and space boxes. Consider a small evolutionary change of the box, and, hence, of the cross-section. The deformation of the rectangle is small and is due to different velocities (in \mathbf{x}) and different accelerations (in \mathbf{u}) of particles. Since it is small we can consider it linear, and as such it is a superposition of deformations proportional to $\mathbf{u}ds$ and to $\mathbf{a}ds = D\mathbf{u}$.

The velocity-deformation, $x'_\mathbf{n} = x_\mathbf{n} + u_\mathbf{n}ds$, conserves the area, since it acts only in the $\mathbf{x}_\mathbf{n}$ -direction, and \mathbf{u} is independent of \mathbf{x} ,

$$\delta x'_\mathbf{n} = \delta x_\mathbf{n} + \left(\frac{\partial u_\mathbf{n}}{\partial x_\mathbf{n}} \right)_u \delta x_\mathbf{n} ds = \delta x_\mathbf{n}.$$

Deformations due to perpendicular (to \mathbf{n}) components of the velocity cause turns perpendicular to the plane of the initial rectangle, and thus could affect the area in the second order only.

The acceleration-deformation, $u'_\mathbf{n} = u_\mathbf{n} + a_\mathbf{n}ds$, acts only in the $\mathbf{u}_\mathbf{n}$ -direction, but can change the area, since

$$\delta u'_\mathbf{n} = \delta u_\mathbf{n} + \left(\frac{\partial a_\mathbf{n}}{\partial u_\mathbf{n}} \right)_x \delta u_\mathbf{n} ds.$$

Deformations due to perpendicular components of the acceleration have no effect in the first order.

Thus, the change of the area of the cross-section in each direction along the trajectory is

$$dS_\mathbf{n} = \delta x_\mathbf{n} \delta u_\mathbf{n} \left(\frac{\partial a_\mathbf{n}}{\partial u_\mathbf{n}} \right)_x ds.$$

The change of the volume, δV , which can be represented as a product of areas of three perpendicular cross-sections, is, obviously,

$$d\delta V = \delta V ds \cdot \text{div}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{a}. \quad (88)$$

Note, that

- due to the choice of the reference frame, the essence of the derivation is tree-dimensional, i.e., it is valid in the nonrelativistic case as well;

- the Lagrangian phase-space and the volume conservation law, (89), can be generalized to multi-particle systems. In this case the volume will be defined as a product of volumes for each particle, and the rate of change will be equal to the sum of rates for each particle.
- the resulting form can be easily transformed to the general reference frame by replacing the three-dimensional divergence by its four-dimensional analog. Adding derivatives in the direction of \mathbf{u} cannot change the value, since \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{u} are always perpendicular to each other. Thus,

$$d\delta V = \delta V ds \cdot \text{Div}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{a}. \quad (89)$$

- the concept of the four-dimensional divergence is invariant with respect to changes from flat to curved space, and the effect under description is just first order. This means, that even if we lost some generality along the way of derivation, expression (89) should be valid in the curved space as well;
- the divergence of acceleration with respect to velocity is very easy to find, since the metric tensor is independent of velocity. Indeed,

$$\text{Div}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{a} = \frac{\partial a^\alpha}{\partial u^\alpha} = \frac{\partial a_\alpha}{\partial u_\alpha}; \quad (90)$$

- the gravitational ($\mathbf{a}=0$) and electromagnetic ($a^\alpha = qF^{\alpha\beta}u_\beta$) forces always satisfy the Liouville's theorem, since $F^{\alpha\beta}g_{\beta\alpha} = 0$ due to antisymmetry of $F^{\alpha\beta}$. Also, any force, which is independent of velocity, satisfies $d\delta V = 0$ automatically.

The above list of cases, when $d\delta V = 0$, i.e., the phase-space volume is conserved, includes all most often encountered cases of dynamical systems. Besides, it is still incomplete, but also obviously not all-encompassing. In particular, forces due to the cyclotron damping for a particle describing the gyrokinetic trajectory cause nonzero contraction of the phase-volume,

$$\text{Div}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{a} = \alpha_r [F^{\alpha\beta}F_{\beta\alpha} - 3u_\alpha F^{\alpha\beta}F_{\beta\gamma}u^\gamma] = -\alpha_r [H^2(2 + 3w^2) + E^2(1 + 3w^2)]. \quad (91)$$

As expected, the phase-space volume of the system decreases due to emission of electromagnetic waves. The rate of the decrease is constant for particles with non-relativistic

perpendicular velocities, $w \rightarrow 0$, but increases as w^2 in the ultra-relativistic limit. The kinetic equation for this case looks like

$$df + \text{Div}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{a} \cdot f ds = 0. \quad (92)$$

A. The gyrokinetic equation

At this moment we are ready to construct the gyrokinetic equation with due account for the cyclotron losses. Starting from the kinetic equation for a dissipative system, (92), we make a transformation to the gyrokinetic variables, $(x'^\mu, u_{\parallel}, \hat{\mu}, \phi)$, in the phase-space. The transformation rules are standard and result in

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x'^\mu} dx'^\mu + \frac{\partial f}{\partial u_{\parallel}} du_{\parallel} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \hat{\mu}} d\hat{\mu} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi} d\phi + \text{Div}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{a} \cdot f ds = 0. \quad (93)$$

At this point we make an assumption that the motion is almost ideal, i.e., the cyclotron emission can be described as a small perturbation, and its effects can be calculated in zero order in the Larmor radius expansion. As a result, we can define the perturbed trajectory and the divergence term via equations (82) and (91). A nice common feature of these expressions is that they are all independent of the gyrophase ϕ . This allows to reduce the effective number of variables in the following way.

All coefficients of equation (93) are independent of ϕ , while the solution should be periodic in it. If we represent the solution as a Fourier series, different harmonics of the solution will be completely independent. Assuming that all ϕ -dependent harmonics ($m > 0$) were either absent initially, or disappeared due to the phase-mixing, it is possible to consider the behavior of the ϕ -independent part ($m = 0$) alone. It satisfies, obviously,

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x'^\mu} dx'^\mu + \frac{\partial f}{\partial u_{\parallel}} du_{\parallel} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \hat{\mu}} d\hat{\mu} + \text{Div}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{a} \cdot f ds = 0,$$

which is the gyrokinetic equation with due account for the cyclotron emission.

The ‘‘magnetic moment’’ is no longer an exact integral of motion, and is decreasing with time. Note that the rate of decrease, and the emission-caused reduction of the phase volume produce terms of the same order and are both equally important. In contrast, correction to the parallel acceleration seems small and unimportant as compared to its ideal counterpart. It is certainly small, but in some cases describes important physical effects. For example, if the parallel momentum of the particle is conserved, the cyclotron damping

of the perpendicular component of the velocity should be accompanied by the increase of its parallel velocity, since the relativistic mass of the particle decreases.

VII. THE MAXWELL EQUATIONS

In general, kinetic description of plasmas involves a combination of the kinetic equation and the Maxwell equations, which describe the evolution of the collective electromagnetic fields. The same is true for the gyrokinetic theory. However, since the gyrokinetic equation is written in specific gyrokinetic variables, and thus yields the distribution function in terms of these variables, a special procedure of integration in velocity space is necessary to calculate the source terms of Maxwell equations. This procedure is presented below.

The general form of the Maxwell's equations in presence of an arbitrary gravitational field is well known[21]. The second subset

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\nu} (\sqrt{-g} F^{\mu\nu}) = \frac{4\pi}{c} j^\mu, \quad (94)$$

has a source term,

$$j^\mu = c \sum_\alpha q_\alpha \int u^\mu f_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \delta V_u, \quad (95)$$

which is the four-current density, expressed via the distribution function of particle species, f_α , the signed particle charge, q_α and the element of the volume of the velocity-subspace, δV_u . Our current goal is to express $f_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ in terms of the gyrokinetic distribution function, and $u^\mu \delta V_u$ - in terms of the gyrokinetic variables.

Starting with δV_u , we note that the four-velocity can be expressed via Eqs. (13)-(15) as

$$u_\mu = w (l'_\mu \cos \phi + l''_\mu \sin \phi) + u_\parallel l_\mu + u_o \tau_\mu. \quad (96)$$

Taking the box sides along the tetrad vectors, and using Eq.(4), we find

$$\delta V_u = \delta (\sqrt{u^\nu u_\nu} - 1) d^4 \mathbf{u} = -\frac{w dw d\phi du_\parallel}{u_o}, \quad (97)$$

where $u_o = \sqrt{1 + w^2 + u_\parallel^2}$, and $g' = g(\mathbf{x}')$ is the determinant of the metric tensor in the point \mathbf{x}' , where the tetrad is defined.

That is all we need in the $\lambda = 0$ limit, when the differentials in the expression (97) are independent. In the presence of a wave, $\lambda \neq 0$, the gyrokinetic variables are expressed in terms of $\bar{w}, \bar{u}_\parallel$ rather than w, u_\parallel . However, it is more convenient to w, u_\parallel as independent

variables, but transform the distribution function instead. we can make a transformation of variables, $wu_{\parallel}\phi \rightarrow \bar{w}\bar{u}_{\parallel}\phi$, and apply its Jacobian. In order λ^1 we retain linear corrections only, so that

$$\frac{wdwd\phi du_{\parallel}}{u_o} = \frac{\bar{w}d\bar{w}d\phi d\bar{u}_{\parallel}}{\bar{u}_o} \left(1 + \frac{\partial \tilde{w}}{\partial \bar{w}} + \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_{\parallel}}{\partial \bar{u}_{\parallel}} + \frac{\tilde{w}}{\bar{w}} - \frac{\tilde{u}_o}{\bar{u}_o} \right). \quad (98)$$

As a result, the expression for components of the current density can be rewritten as

$$j^{\mu} = - \sum_{\alpha} cq_{\alpha} \int (w (l'^{\mu} \cos \phi + l''^{\mu} \sin \phi) + u_{\parallel} l^{\mu} + u_o \tau^{\mu}) f_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \frac{wdwd\phi du_{\parallel}}{u_o}. \quad (99)$$

Further, the distribution function f_{α} is expressed as the function of the gyrokinetic variables

$$f_{\alpha} = f_{\alpha}(x'^{\mu}, \hat{\mu}, u_{\parallel}),$$

and it is necessary to transform it back to particle coordinates before integrating, as in Eq.(99) the particle position \mathbf{x} , rather than its gyrocenter position \mathbf{x}' , is kept constant while integrating over the particle velocity. This makes it convenient to rewrite Equation (94) as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^{\nu}} (\sqrt{-g} F^{\mu\nu}) = \frac{4\pi}{c} j^{\mu} \sqrt{-g} = Q^{\mu}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (100)$$

where the right-hand side is also evaluated at \mathbf{x} . Then

$$Q^{\mu}(\mathbf{x}) = 4\pi \sum_{\alpha} q_{\alpha} \int [w (l'^{\mu} \cos \phi + l''^{\mu} \sin \phi) + u_{\parallel} l^{\mu} + u_o \tau^{\mu}] f_{\alpha} \left(\mathbf{x} - \sum_{i=1} \varepsilon^i \mathbf{r}_i \right) \sqrt{-g'} \frac{wdwd\phi du_{\parallel}}{u_o}. \quad (101)$$

Also, it is necessary to keep in mind that the components of the basis vectors, as well as the relationship between the magnetic moment $\hat{\mu}$ and the orbital velocity w , are defined through the electromagnetic field tensor at the gyrocenter position, and thus should also be transformed back to the particle position via the inverse transformation

$$x^{\mu} = x'^{\mu} + \sum_{i=1} \varepsilon^i r_i^{\mu} \quad (102)$$

before integrating.

The gyrokinetic transformation has been found by expansion in orders of ε and λ , and this expansion has to be exploited here again. The short-wavelength wave contributions to the distribution function can be separated from the slowly changing background by using the Fourier components as

$$f_{\alpha}(x'^{\mu}, \hat{\mu}, u_{\parallel}) = f_{\alpha}^{(0)} + \frac{\lambda}{4\pi^2} \int f_{\alpha}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}, \hat{\mu}, u_{\parallel}) \exp[ik_{\mu} x'^{\mu}] d^4 \mathbf{k}, \quad (103)$$

while $Q^\mu(\mathbf{x})$ should be expanded in powers of λ and ε as

$$Q^\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i,j=0} \varepsilon^i \lambda^j Q_{(ij)}^\mu. \quad (104)$$

The zero-order current and charge density $Q_{(00)}^\mu$ is easy to find

$$Q_{(00)}^\mu = 8\pi^2 \sum_{\alpha} \frac{q_{\alpha}^2}{m_{\alpha} c^2} \int H^\dagger(x^\mu) \left(\frac{u_{\parallel}}{u_o} l^\mu + \tau^\mu \right) f_{\alpha}^{(0)}(x^\mu, \hat{\mu}, u_{\parallel}) d\hat{\mu} du_{\parallel}, \quad (105)$$

where the basis components are taken at the current position. Here and below we use the following notations:

$$H^\dagger(\hat{\mu}, x^\mu) = \frac{w}{q} \frac{\partial w}{\partial \hat{\mu}}, \quad H^*(\hat{\mu}, x^\mu) = \frac{w^2}{2q\hat{\mu}}, \quad (106)$$

which differ from the magnetic-field invariant due to corrections to the magnetic moment (found above) in a suitable approximation. The use of H^\dagger allows to avoid rewriting corresponding corrections in high- λ contributions to the current density.

A. Order λ^0

The background distribution function $f_{\alpha}^{(0)}$ is slowly changing on the Larmor-radius / gyrotime-scale, and thus can be expanded in the Taylor series around the particle position

$$f_{\alpha}^{(0)}(x'^{\mu}, \hat{\mu}, u_{\parallel}) = f_{\alpha}^{(0)}(x^{\mu}, \hat{\mu}, u_{\parallel}) - \varepsilon r_1^{\mu} \frac{\partial f_{\alpha}^{(0)}}{\partial x^{\mu}} - \varepsilon^2 r_2^{\mu} \frac{\partial f_{\alpha}^{(0)}}{\partial x^{\mu}} + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 r_1^{\mu} r_1^{\nu} \frac{\partial^2 f_{\alpha}^{(0)}}{\partial x^{\mu} \partial x^{\nu}} + o(\varepsilon^2), \quad (107)$$

while the displacements r_i^{μ} are given by the gyrokinetic transformation as functions of $(x'^{\mu}, \hat{\mu}, u_{\parallel})$ and thus should be expanded as well,

$$f_{\alpha}^{(0)}(x'^{\mu}) = f_{\alpha}^{(0)}(x^{\mu}) - \varepsilon r_1^{\mu} \frac{\partial f_{\alpha}^{(0)}}{\partial x^{\mu}} + \varepsilon^2 r_1^{\nu} \frac{\partial r_1^{\mu}}{\partial x^{\nu}} \frac{\partial f_{\alpha}^{(0)}}{\partial x^{\mu}} - \varepsilon^2 r_2^{\mu} \frac{\partial f_{\alpha}^{(0)}}{\partial x^{\mu}} + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 r_1^{\mu} r_1^{\nu} \frac{\partial^2 f_{\alpha}^{(0)}}{\partial x^{\mu} \partial x^{\nu}} + o(\varepsilon^2). \quad (108)$$

Here, finally, all functions in the right-hand side can be regarded as functions of the particle position x^{μ} . The same expansion should be applied to the other factor under the integral, namely,

$$G^{\mu} = \left(\sqrt{2qH^* \hat{\mu}} (l^{\mu} \cos \phi + l'^{\mu} \sin \phi) + u_{\parallel} l^{\mu} + \tau^{\mu} \right) \frac{H^{\dagger}}{u_o}. \quad (109)$$

We have

$$G^{\lambda}(x'^{\mu}, \hat{\mu}, u_{\parallel}) = G^{\lambda}(x^{\mu}, \hat{\mu}, u_{\parallel}) - \varepsilon r_1^{\mu} \frac{\partial G^{\lambda}}{\partial x^{\mu}} + \varepsilon^2 r_1^{\nu} \frac{\partial r_1^{\mu}}{\partial x^{\nu}} \frac{\partial G^{\lambda}}{\partial x^{\mu}} - \varepsilon^2 r_2^{\mu} \frac{\partial G^{\lambda}}{\partial x^{\mu}} + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 r_1^{\mu} r_1^{\nu} \frac{\partial^2 G^{\lambda}}{\partial x^{\mu} \partial x^{\nu}} + o(\varepsilon^2),$$

and thus

$$G^\lambda f_\alpha^{(0)}(x'^\mu) = G^\lambda f_\alpha^{(0)}(x^\mu) - \left(\varepsilon r_1^\mu - \varepsilon^2 r_1^\nu \frac{\partial r_1^\mu}{\partial x^\nu} + \varepsilon^2 r_2^\mu \right) \left(f_\alpha^{(0)} \frac{\partial G^\lambda}{\partial x^\mu} + G^\lambda \frac{\partial f_\alpha^{(0)}}{\partial x^\mu} \right) + \varepsilon^2 r_1^\mu r_1^\nu \frac{\partial G^\lambda}{\partial x^\mu} \frac{\partial f_\alpha^{(0)}}{\partial x^\nu} + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 r_1^\mu r_1^\nu \left(f_\alpha^{(0)} \frac{\partial^2 G^\lambda}{\partial x^\mu \partial x^\nu} + G^\lambda \frac{\partial^2 f_\alpha^{(0)}}{\partial x^\mu \partial x^\nu} \right) + o(\varepsilon^2).$$

The first order displacement of the gyrocenter is given by

$$r_1^\mu = \frac{w}{qH} (l'^{\mu} \cos \phi - l^\mu \sin \phi) + \lambda D^{\mu\nu} \tilde{a}_\nu, \quad (110)$$

and, substituting it into the above expression, we find the first-order current density

$$Q_{(10)}^\mu = \sum_\alpha \frac{8\pi^2 q_\alpha^2}{m_\alpha c^2} \int \frac{\hat{\mu}}{\sqrt{H}} \left(l'^{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\nu} \left(\frac{H^{3/2} f_\alpha^{(0)}}{u_o} l'^\mu \right) - l'^\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\nu} \left(\frac{H^{3/2} f_\alpha^{(0)}}{u_o} l'^{\mu} \right) \right) d\hat{\mu} du_{\parallel}. \quad (111)$$

Similarly, it is necessary to solve the equation (18) for r_2^μ in order to calculate the second-order current density. The form of this equation (for $\lambda = 0$) is such that r_2^ν may have components proportional to trigonometric functions of ϕ and of 2ϕ . However, due to the integration in ϕ , only the first type of terms will produce a non-zero contribution to the second-order current density. Thus, it is sufficient to solve for r_{21}^ν , which satisfies

$$q r_{21}^\nu F_{\mu\nu} - (u_{\parallel} l_\nu + u_o \tau_\nu) \frac{\partial r_1^\nu}{\partial x'^\mu} = 0, \quad (112)$$

or

$$r_{21}^\lambda = \frac{1}{q} D^{\lambda\mu} \tilde{u}_\nu \frac{\partial r_1^\nu}{\partial x'^\mu} = \frac{1}{q} D^{\lambda\mu} (u_{\parallel} l_\nu + u_o \tau_\nu) \frac{\partial}{\partial x'^\mu} \frac{w}{qH} (l'^{\nu} \cos \phi - l^\nu \sin \phi). \quad (113)$$

Using this expression we get

$$Q_{(20)}^\mu = -4\pi^2 \sum_\alpha m_\alpha c^2 \int \hat{\mu} d\hat{\mu} du_{\parallel} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\nu} \left[\frac{(l'^\nu l'^\lambda + l'^{\nu\lambda})}{H} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\lambda} \left(H f_\alpha^{(0)} \frac{\tilde{u}^\mu}{u_o} \right) \right] - 2D^{\lambda\varsigma} \tilde{u}_\nu \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\varsigma} \left(\frac{l'^{\nu\lambda}}{\sqrt{H}} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\lambda} \left(\frac{H^{3/2} f_\alpha^{(0)}}{u_o} l'^\mu \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\varsigma} \left(\frac{l'^\nu}{\sqrt{H}} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\lambda} \left(\frac{H^{3/2} f_\alpha^{(0)}}{u_o} l'^{\mu} \right) \right] \right\}. \quad (114)$$

B. Order λ^1

First we calculate the transform to the particle position variables

$$f_\alpha^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mu}, u_{\parallel}, \phi) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int f_\alpha^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}, \hat{\mu}, u_{\parallel}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} \exp \left[-ik_\mu \sum_s \varepsilon^s r_s^\mu \right] d^4 k. \quad (115)$$

Retaining in the exponent terms of order ε^0 only [while $k\varepsilon \sim O(1)$], we get

$$f_\alpha^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int f_\alpha^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} \exp \left[-i\varepsilon k_\mu \left(\frac{w}{qH} (l^{\mu\mu} \cos \phi - l^\mu \sin \phi) + \lambda D^{\mu\nu} \tilde{a}_\nu \right) \right] d^4k. \quad (116)$$

The last term in the exponent can be neglected in this order, and the rest can be expanded into the Fourier series using Eq.(40) as

$$f_\alpha^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int f_\alpha^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} J_n(\xi) e^{in(\phi-\phi_0)} d^4k, \quad (117)$$

where $\xi = k_\perp \rho$, $\rho = \varepsilon w / qH = \varepsilon \sqrt{2\hat{\mu}/qH}$, $k_\perp = \sqrt{(k_\nu l^\nu)^2 + (k_\nu l^{\nu\nu})^2}$, as before, $\tan \phi_0 = (k_\mu l^{\mu\mu}) / (k_\mu l^\mu)$. Then,

$$Q_{(01)}^\mu = -2 \sum_\alpha \frac{q_\alpha^2}{m_\alpha c^2} \int H^\dagger \frac{d\hat{\mu} du_\parallel}{u_o} \int d^4k f_\alpha^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} \left\{ (u_\parallel l^\mu + u_o \tau^\mu) J_0(\xi) + 2i\varepsilon \hat{\mu} b^{\mu\nu} k_\nu \frac{J_1(\xi)}{\xi} \right\}. \quad (118)$$

Here we have again used H^\dagger instead of H to take into account the $\hat{\mu}$ -related corrections in future orders.

VIII. CONCLUSION

This work has been conducted via the cooperation program between the Trieste University, Italy, and the Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk, Russia, and supported by a grant of INdAM (Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica, Italy).

¹ A. Beklemishev, M. Tessarotto, *A&A* (2004)

² R. G. Littlejohn, *J. Math. Phys.* **20**, 2445 (1979)

³ W. W. Lee, *Phys. Fluids* **26**, 556 (1983)

⁴ D. H. E. Dubin, J. A. Krommes, C. Oberman and W. W. Lee, *Phys. Fluids* **26**, 3524 (1983)

⁵ T. S. Hahm, W. W. Lee, and A. Brizard, *Phys. Fluids* **31**, 1940 (1988)

⁶ R. G. Littlejohn, *Phys. Fluids*, **27**, 976 (1984)

⁷ C. Grebogi, R. G. Littlejohn, *Phys. Fluids* **27**, 1996 (1984)

⁸ R. G. Littlejohn, *Phys. Fluids* **28**, 2015 (1985)

⁹ A. H. Boozer, *Phys. Plasmas* **3**, 3297 (1996)

- ¹⁰ W. A. Cooper, *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **39**, 931 (1997)
- ¹¹ J. Frank, A. King, D. Raine, *Accretion Power in Astrophysics*, (Cambridge Astrophysics Series:20), 2nd ed., (Cambridge University Press, 1992)
- ¹² C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, (San Francisco; W.H.Freeman and Co., 1973)
- ¹³ A. Beklemishev, M. Tessarotto, *Phys. Plasmas* **6**, 4487 (1999)
- ¹⁴ A. Beklemishev, M. Tessarotto, Montreu
- ¹⁵ T. G. Northrop, *The Adiabatic Motion of Charged Particles*, (New York; Interscience, 1963), pp.27-34
- ¹⁶ D. M. Fradkin 1978, *J. of Physics A*, **11**, 1069
- ¹⁷ B. M. Boghosian, *Covariant Lagrangian methods of relativistic plasma theory*, (University of California, Davis, 1987).
- ¹⁸ A. J. Brizard and A. A. Chan, *Phys. Plasmas* **6**, 4548 (1999).
- ¹⁹ J. R. Cary, R. G. Littlejohn, *Annals of Physics* **151**, 1 (1983).
- ²⁰ *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, Ed. Abramovitz and Stegun.
- ²¹ L. D. Landau, E. M. Lifshits *The Classical Theory of Fields*, (*Course of Theoretical Physics; v.2*), 4th ed., (Pergamon, Oxford, 1975)
- ²² *Ibid.*, p.224.