

The role of magnetic flux and wall current drain on anomalous diffusion

Mario J. Pinheiro

*Department of Physics and Center for Plasma Physics,
& Instituto Superior Tecnico, Av. Rovisco Pais, & 1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal**

(Dated: October 30, 2018)

A theoretical analysis of the anomalous diffusion transport mechanism suggests a possible connection between wall current drain and magnetic flux through the orbital trajectories of charged particles in a plasma submitted to a strong magnetic field. Then Bohm diffusion coefficient is straightforwardly obtained.

PACS numbers: 05.70.-a,52.25.Fi,52.55.-s,55.55.Dy,52.40.Hf

The problem of the plasma-wall interactions is of fundamental importance in plasma physics. Studying the anomalously high diffusion of ions across magnetic field lines in Calutron ion sources (electromagnetic separator used by E. Lawrence for uranium isotopes) gave the first indications of the onset of a new mechanism [1]. Simon advanced first with a suggestion that the observed losses could be explained by the highly anisotropic medium induced by the magnetic field lines, favoring electron current to the conducting walls - the electron "short-circuit" problem [2]. Experiments done by Geissler [3] in the 1960's have shown that diffusion in a plasma across a magnetic field was nearly classical (standard) diffusion when insulating walls impose plasma ambipolarity, but in the presence of conducting walls charged particles diffuse at a much higher rate.

This problem of plasma-wall interaction becomes more complex when a complete description is aimed of a magnetized nonisothermal plasma transport in a conducting vessel [4]. In the area of fusion reactors, there is strong indication that for plasmas large but finite Bohm-like diffusion coefficient appears above a certain range of B [5].

Progress in the understanding of the generation of confinement states in a plasma is fundamental [6] to pursue the dream of a fusion reactor [7, 8]. Anomalous diffusion is a cornerstone in this quest, as recent research with tokamaks suggest that the containment time $\tau \approx 10^8 R^2 / 2D_B$, with R denoting the minor radius of a tokamak plasma and D_B is the Bohm diffusion coefficient [9]. Controlled nuclear fusion experiments have shown that transport of energy and particles across magnetic field lines is anomalously large (i.e., not predicted by classical collision theory).

The conjecture made by Bohm is that the diffusion coefficient is $D_B = \alpha kT / eB$, where T is the plasma temperature and α is a numerical coefficient, empirically taken to be 1/16 [1]. Usually the origin of the anomalous diffusion has been assumed to be due to the turbulence of small-scale instabilities (see, for example,

Refs. [5, 10, 11]).

In a seminal paper [12] a conjecture was proposed based on the principle of minimum entropy-production rate, stating that a plasma will be more stable whenever the internal product of the current density by an elementary conducting area $d\mathcal{A}$ at every point of the boundary - excluding the surface collecting the driving current - is null, $(\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathcal{A}) = 0$.

The work reported in this Letter proposes a mechanism of wall current drain set up together with the frozen-in effect of the magnetic field as a possible alternative explanation of the anomalous diffusion mechanism. From collisional low temperature plasmas to a burning fusion plasma subject the plasma confinement vessel to strong wall load, both in stellarator or tokamak operating modes, this explanation could be of considerable interest.

The general idea proposed by Robertson [12] assume that the plasma boundary is composed of small elements of area \mathcal{A}_i , each one isolated from the others but each one connected to the exterior circuit through its own resistor R_i and voltage V_i . The entropy production rate in the external circuits is

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \sum_i \frac{1}{T} (\mathbf{j}_i \cdot \mathcal{A}_i)^2 R_i, \quad (1)$$

where T is the temperature of the resistors, supposed to be in thermal equilibrium with all the others.

In fact, a straightforward application of Eq. 1 to a cold plasma made of electrons and just one ion component gives

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \frac{e^2}{T} (-n_e \mu_e \mathbf{E} + D_e \nabla n_e + n_i \mu_i \mathbf{E} - D_i \nabla n_i)^2 \mathcal{A}^2 R. \quad (2)$$

Under the usual assumptions of quasi-neutrality and quasi-stationary plasma (see, for example, Ref. [13])

$$\frac{n_i}{n_e} = \epsilon = const.; \quad n_e \mathbf{v}_e = n_i \mathbf{v}_i. \quad (3)$$

Hence, Eq. 1 becomes

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \frac{e^2}{T} [\mathbf{E}(\epsilon \mu_i - \mu_e) n_e + \nabla n_e (D_e - D_i \epsilon)]^2 \mathcal{A}^2 R. \quad (4)$$

*Electronic address: mpinheiro@ist.utl.pt; We acknowledge partial financial support from Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian and the Rectorate of the Technical University of Lisbon.

If there is no entropy production $\dot{S} = 0$, and then the ambipolar electric field is recovered [13]

$$\mathbf{E} = \frac{D_e - \epsilon D_i}{\mu_e - \mu_i \epsilon} \frac{\nabla n_e}{n_e}. \quad (5)$$

This conceptual formulation provides new insight regarding ambipolar diffusion. In a thermal equilibrium state, a plasma confined by insulating walls will have an effective coefficient given by the above Eq. 5, a situation frequently encountered in industrial applications. This example by itself relates ambipolar diffusion with no entropy production in the plasma. Allowing plasma currents to the walls, entropy production is greatly enhanced, generating altogether instabilities and plasma losses [12].

But confined plasmas are in a far-nonequilibrium state (with external surroundings) and it is necessary to establish a generalized principle that rule matter, which we develop in the next lines.

Experiments give evidence of transport of particles and energy to the walls [14]. At the end of the 1960s, experimental results obtained in weakly ionized plasma [3] and in a hot electron plasma [15] (this one proposing a possible mechanism of flute instability) indicated the strong influence conducting walls have on plasma losses across magnetic field lines. Geissler [3] suggested that the most probable explanation was due to the existence of diffusion-driven current flow through the plasma to the walls. Beilinson *et al.* [4] shown the possibility to control the profiles of plasma parameters by applying potential difference to various parts of the conducting walls. Concerning fusion reactions, Taylor [10] provided a new interpretation of tokamak fluctuations as due to an inward particle flux resulting from the onset of filamentary currents.

We consider a simple axisymmetric magnetic configuration with magnetic field lines parallel to z-axis with a plasma confined between two electrodes (see Fig.1). In general terms, a particle motion in a plasma results in a massive flux. As long as the flux is installed, the flux will depend naturally on a force \mathbf{F} - in this case the pressure gradient-driven process of diffusion to the wall - responsible of the wall driven current \mathbf{j} . According to the fundamental thermodynamics relation, the plasma internal energy variation dU is related to the amount of entropy supplied or rejected and the work done by the driven force, through the equation

$$\frac{dU}{dt} = (\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathcal{A})^2 R + \left(\mathbf{F} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{dt} \right). \quad (6)$$

The last term we identify with the macroscopic diffusion velocity \mathbf{v}_d depicting the process of plasma expansion to the wall. To simplify somehow the calculations we assume a single plasma fluid under the action of a pressure gradient ($\mathbf{F} = \mathcal{A} L dp/dy$).

In the presence of steady and uniform magnetic field lines (this simplifies the equations, but do not limit the applicability of the model), the particles stream freely

along them. From magnetohydrodynamic we have a kind of generalized Ohm's law (see, for example, Ref. [16])

$$\nabla p = -en\mathbf{E} - en[\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}] + [\mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B}] - \frac{en\mathbf{j}}{\sigma}, \quad (7)$$

where $\sigma = e^2 n \tau_e / m_e$ is the electric conductivity, with τ_e denoting the average collision time between electrons and ions. Under the equilibrium condition

$$\nabla p = [\mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B}], \quad (8)$$

holds. Therefore, after inserting Eq. 8 into Eq. 7 it is obtained the y component of velocity

$$v_y = -\frac{E_x}{B} - \frac{1}{\sigma B^2} \frac{dp}{dy}. \quad (9)$$

From Eq. 9 we have the classical diffusion coefficient scaling with $1/B^2$ and thus implying a random walk of step length r_L (Larmor radius). To get the anomalous diffusion coefficient we must consider the process of diffusion to the wall - in the presence of an entropy source - with the combined action of the wall current drain, as already introduced in Eq. 6.

Therefore, using the guiding center plasma model the particle motion is made with velocity given by

$$\mathbf{j} = en\mathbf{v}_d = -\frac{[\nabla p \times \mathbf{B}]}{B^2}. \quad (10)$$

This equation form the base of a simplified theory of magnetic confinement. In fact, the validity of Eq. 10 is restrained to the high magnetic field limit, when the Larmor radius is shorter than the Debye radius.

Considering motion along only one direction perpendicular to the wall (y-axis), it is clear that

$$(\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathcal{A})^2 = \frac{\mathcal{A}^2}{B^2} \left(\frac{dp}{dy} \right)^2. \quad (11)$$

If we consider a quasi-steady state plasma operation, the plasma total energy should be sustained. Hence, $dU/dt = 0$, and the power associated with the driven pressure-gradient is just maintaining the dissipative process of plasma losses on the wall. Eq. 6 govern the evolution of diffusion velocity. Hence, we have

$$nv_d = -\frac{nRA}{L} \frac{kT}{B^2} \frac{dn}{dy} = -D_T \frac{dn}{dy}, \quad (12)$$

with D_T denoting the transverse (across the magnetic field) diffusion coefficient given by

$$D_T = \frac{nRA}{L} \frac{kT}{B^2}. \quad (13)$$

This new result coincides with the classical diffusion coefficient [13] whenever $nRA/L \equiv m\nu_{ei}/e^2$, containing a dependence on collision frequency and particle number density. Others theoretical approaches to this problem were

advanced by Bohm [1], who proposed an empirically-driven diffusion coefficient associating plasma oscillations as the source of the enhanced diffusion, while Tonks [17] have shown that the current density that is present in a magnetically immobilized plasma is only generated by the particle density gradient, not being associated with any drift of matter. Simon electron "short-circuit" [2] proposes an explanation for the different rates of diffusion electrons and ions do experiment across the magnetic field as due to an unbalance of currents flowing to the wall.

In the absence of collisions, the guiding centers of charged particles behave as permanently attached to the same lines of force. On the contrary, as a result of collisions with others charged particles the guiding centers shift from one line of force to another resulting in a diffusion of plasma across the field lines. In our model, each orbit constitutes an elementary current I eventually crossing the wall.

However, the particle diffusion coefficient as shown in Eq. 13 gives evidence of an interplay between the resistance the elementary circuit is submitted when in contact with the walls in the presence of the frozen-in effect. In fact, for sufficiently strong magnetic fields apparently a hydrodynamic behavior of the plasma is installed [5, 18], with the appearance of "convective cells" and the $1/B$ behavior dominates, giving birth to the anomalous diffusion mechanism. The onset of freezing magnetic lines is valid whenever the Lundquist number $S \gg 1$ (convection of the magnetic field dominated medium). In this case the magnetic field lines are frozen-in in the medium (consequence of a vortex type of character of the magnetic field \mathbf{B}) and the flux of them across a given surface is constant:

$$\Phi = B\mathcal{A}' = BL^2\alpha. \quad (14)$$

Remark that \mathcal{A}' is now the surface delimited by the elementary circuit γ (see Fig. 1) and $\alpha \lesssim 1$ is just a geometrical factor (e.g. $\alpha = \pi/4$ at the limit of a circular orbit). This situation is fundamental to the onset of anomalous diffusion. Free electrons orbits are helical, but as Fig. 1 shows, their projections at right angles to the field are circular. Each particle orbit constitute an elementary circuit with B -field cutting its surface being associated with it an elementary flux Φ . At the same time we can envisage each orbit as constituting by itself an elementary circuit, some of them intersecting the wall and thus the circuit is closed inside the wall. Therefore a resistance R drags the charged flow at the conducting wall. It is therefore plausible to associate to this elementary circuit a potential drop V and the all process being equivalent to a current I flowing through the elementary circuit.

Assuming the plasma is a typical weakly coupled, hot diffuse plasma with a plasma parameter (number of particles in Debye sphere) $\Lambda = n\lambda_{De}^3 \approx 1$, it is more likely to expect nearly equal average kinetic and potential energy. However, the typical plasma parameter encountered in glow discharges or in nuclear fusion is $\Lambda \gg 1$. This means




FIG. 1: Schematic of the geometry for the plasma-wall current drain model. The uniform magnetic field points downward along Oz. Particles describe orbits in the plane xOy intersecting the wall (plan xOz). Orbits are represented by a semi-circular line for convenience. L is the maximum distance the trajectory attains from the wall.

that the average kinetic energy is larger than the average potential energy. To contemplate all range of Λ we can relate them through the relationship

$$\rho V = (\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{A})\delta. \quad (15)$$

Here, ρ is the charge density, \mathbf{A} is the vector potential, \mathbf{J} is the current density and $\delta \leq 1$ is just a parameter representing the ratio of potential to kinetic energy. Of course, when $\Lambda \geq 1$, then $\delta \leq 1$. This basic assumption is consistent with the hydrodynamic approximation taken in the development of equations. The limitations of the model are related with the unknowns Λ and δ that can be uncovered only through a self-consistent model of the plasma. However, our analysis of anomalous diffusion remains general and added new insight to the phenomena.

Now suppose that the diffusion current is along y-axis $\mathbf{J} = -J_y\mathbf{u}_y$ (see Fig.1). Consequently, $\mathbf{A} = -A_y\mathbf{u}_y$, and then the potential drop will depend on x-coordinate:

$$\rho[V(x_1) - V(x_0)] = J_y[A_y(x_1) - A_y(x_0)]\delta. \quad (16)$$

Multiplying both members by the area $\mathcal{A}' = x_1z_1$ and

length $L = y_1$, we have

$$Q\Delta V = Iy_1[A_y(x_1) - A_y(x_0)]\delta = I\Phi\delta. \quad (17)$$

$\Phi = \oint_{\gamma} (\mathbf{A} \cdot d\mathbf{x})$ is the flux of the magnetic field through the closed surface bounded by the line element $d\mathbf{x}$ (elementary circuit γ , see also Fig.1). By other side, naturally, the total charge present on the volume $\mathcal{V} = x_1y_1z_1$ is such as $Q = ie$, with i an integer. This integer must be related to ions charge number. From Eq. 17 we obtain

$$R = \frac{\Delta V}{I} = \delta \frac{\Phi}{Q} = \alpha\delta \frac{BL^2}{ie}. \quad (18)$$

But, the particle density is given by $n = N/L\mathcal{A}$, with N being now the total number of charged particles present in volume $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{A}L$. Since $i = N$, we retrieve finally the so-called Bohm-diffusion coefficient

$$D_B = \alpha\delta \frac{kT}{eB}. \quad (19)$$

However, this expression suffers of the indetermination of the geometrical factor α . This factor is related to the ions charge number, it depends on the magnetic field magnitude and as well the external operating conditions (due to increased collisional processes, for ex.). The exact value of the product $\alpha\delta$ can only be determined through a self-consistent plasma model, but we should expect from the above discussion that $\alpha\delta < 1$. Furthermore, Eq. 18 can be used as a boundary condition (simulating an electrically floating surface) imposed when solving Poisson equation.

Also it worth to emphasize that when inserting Eq. 18 into Eq. 13, and considering the usual definition of momentum transfer cross section, then it can be obtained a new expression for the classical diffusion coefficient as a function of the ratio of collisional ν and cyclotron frequency Ω , although (and in contrast with the standard expression), now also dependent on the geometrical factor α and energy ratio δ :

$$D_T = (\alpha\delta) \frac{\nu}{\Omega} \frac{kT}{m}. \quad (20)$$

This explains the strong dependence of the classical diffusion coefficient on ν/Ω showing signs of anomalous diffusion as discussed in Ref. [19] (obtained with a time resolved Monte Carlo simulation in an infinite gas under uniform fields) and, in addition, the strong oscillations shown up in the calculations of the time dependence of the transverse component of the diffusion tensor for electrons in low-temperature rf argon plasma. Those basic features result on one side from its dependence on R , which is proportional to the flux. Therefore, a flux variation can give an equivalent effect to the previously proposed mechanism: whenever a decrease (or increase) in the flux is onset through time dependence of electric and magnetic fields, it occurs a strong increase (or decrease) of the diffusion coefficient. By other side, when the resistance increases it occurs a related decrease of charged particles tangential velocity and its mean energy. So far, this model gives a new insight into the results referred in [19] and also it explains why the same effect is not obtained from the solution of the non-conservative Boltzmann equation as applied to an oxygen magnetron discharges with constant electric and magnetic fields [20].

To summarize, we introduced in this Letter a simple mechanism providing an interpretation of the anomalous diffusion in a magnetized confined plasma. In fact, above a certain range of B the magnetic field frozen-in effect is settled in the plasma, implying a constant magnetic field flux through the elementary orbits of the charge carriers. Whenever conducting walls are bounding the plasma current drain to the walls occurs naturally and a Bohm-like behavior of the transverse diffusion coefficient results. The suggested mechanism could lead to a better understanding of the mechanism of plasma-wall interaction and help to develop a full-scale numerical modelling of present fusion devices or collisional low-temperature plasmas.

The author would like to thank Elena Tatarova and Marques Dias for their elucidating discussions.

-
- [1] Bohm, Burhop and Massey, *Characteristics of Electrical Discharges in Magnetic Fields*, edited by A. Guthrie and R. K. Wakcrling (MacGraw-Hill, New York,1949)
 - [2] Albert Simon, *Phys. Rev.* **98** (2) 317 (1955)
 - [3] Klaus H. Geissler, *Phys. Rev.* **171**(1) 179 (1968)
 - [4] L. L. Beilinson, V. A. Rozhansky, and L. D. Tsendin, *Phys. Rev. E* **50** (4) 3033 (1994)
 - [5] David Montgomery, C.-S. Liu, and George Vahala, *Phys. Fluids* **15** (5), 815 (1972)
 - [6] Kimitaka Itoh, Sanae-I. Itoh, Atsushi Fukuyama and Matsutoshi Yagi, *J. Plasma Fusion Res.* **79** (6) 608 (2003)
 - [7] R. J. Bickerton, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A* **375** 397 (1999)
 - [8] V. D. Shafranov, *Physics-Uspekhi* **44** (8) 835 (2001)
 - [9] Norman Rostoker, Michl W. Binderbauer, Hendrik J. Monkhorst, *Science* **278** 1419 (1997)
 - [10] J. B. Taylor and B. McNamara, *Phys. Fluids* **14** (7) 1492 (1971)
 - [11] David Montgomery and Frederick Tappert, *Phys. Fluids* **15** (4) 683 (1972)
 - [12] Harry S. Robertson, *Phys. Rev.* **118** (1) 288 (1969)
 - [13] J. Reece Roth, *Industrial Plasma Engineering, Vol 1 - Principles* (Institute of Physics Publishing, Bristol, 1995)
 - [14] T. C. Luce, C. C. Petty, and J. C. M. de Haas, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68** (1) 52 (1992)
 - [15] L. A. Ferrari and A. F. Kuckes, *Phys. Fluids* **12** 836

- (1969)
- [16] B. B. Kadomtsev, *Phénomènes collectifs dans les plasmas* (Mir Editions, Moscow, 1979)
- [17] Lewi Tonks, Phys. Rev. **97** (6) 1443 (1955)
- [18] P. B. Corkum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **31** (13) 809 (1973)
- [19] Z. M. Raspopović, S. Dujko, T. Makabe, and Z. Lj. Petrović, Plasma Sources Sci. Technol. **14** 293 (2005)
- [20] R. D. White, R. E. Robson, K. F. Ness and T. Makabe, J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys. **38** 997 (2005)