

Nonlinear interaction between three inertial Alfvén waves.

G. Brodin, L. Stenflo and P. K. Shukla

Department of Physics, Umeå University, SE-901 87 Umeå, Sweden

The resonant coupling between Alfvén waves is reconsidered. New results are found for cold plasmas there temperature effects are negligible.

The nonlinear interaction between Alfvén waves (Sagdeev and Galeev, 1969; Hasegawa and Uberoi, 1982; Petviashvili and Pokhotelov, 1992) is a key subject within modern plasma science (Shukla, 2004) that is still a matter of subtle analysis (e.g. Fedun et al. 2004; Voitenko and Goossens, 2005; Shukla and Stenflo, 2005). In order to put the theory on a firm theoretical basis, we shall in the present paper consider the resonant interaction between three inertial Alfvén waves in a uniform *cold* magnetized plasma, starting our analysis from the *exact* expressions for the coupling coefficients in such a plasma. Considering the appropriate frequency limits we shall then derive results which have not been presented previously.

Let us thus investigate the resonant interaction between three waves with frequencies ω_j ($j = 1, 2, 3$) and wave vectors \mathbf{k}_j , and assume that the matching conditions

$$\omega_3 = \omega_1 + \omega_2 \quad (1)$$

and

$$\mathbf{k}_3 = \mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2 \quad (2)$$

are satisfied. The development of, for example, the z-components (E_{jz}) of the wave electric field amplitudes is then governed by the three coupled bilinear equations (e.g. Stenflo, 1994)

$$\frac{dE_{1z}^*}{dt} = \alpha_1 E_{2z} E_{3z}^* \quad (3a)$$

$$\frac{dE_{2z}^*}{dt} = \alpha_2 E_{1z} E_{3z}^* \quad (3b)$$

and

$$\frac{dE_{3z}}{dt} = \alpha_3 E_{2z} E_{1z} \quad (3c)$$

where the z-axis is along the external magnetic field ($B_0 \hat{\mathbf{z}}$), the star denotes complex conjugate, α_j are the coupling coefficients, $d/dt = \partial/\partial t + \mathbf{v}_{gj} \cdot \nabla + \nu_j$ where \mathbf{v}_{gj} is the group velocity of wave j , and ν_j accounts for the linear damping rate. As shown by Stenflo and Brodin (2005) the coefficients α_j for a cold plasma are

$$\alpha_{1,2} = \frac{M_{1,2}}{\partial D(\omega_{1,2}, \mathbf{k}_{1,2})/\partial \omega_{1,2}} C \quad (4a,b)$$

and

$$\alpha_3 = -\frac{M_3}{\partial D(\omega_3, \mathbf{k}_3)/\partial \omega_3} C \quad (4c)$$

where

$$C = \sum_{\sigma} \frac{q\omega_p^2}{m\omega_1\omega_2\omega_3 k_{1z} k_{2z} k_{3z}} \left[\frac{\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot \mathbf{K}_1}{\omega_1} \mathbf{K}_2 \cdot \mathbf{K}_3^* + \frac{\mathbf{k}_2 \cdot \mathbf{K}_2}{\omega_2} \mathbf{K}_1 \cdot \mathbf{K}_3^* + \frac{\mathbf{k}_3 \cdot \mathbf{K}_3^*}{\omega_3} \mathbf{K}_1 \cdot \mathbf{K}_2 - \frac{i\omega_c}{\omega_3} \left(\frac{k_{2z}}{\omega_2} - \frac{k_{1z}}{\omega_1} \right) \mathbf{K}_3^* \cdot (\mathbf{K}_1 \times \mathbf{K}_2) \right] \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{K} = - \left[\mathbf{k}_\perp + i \frac{\omega_c}{\omega} \mathbf{k} \times \hat{\mathbf{z}} + \left(\frac{\sum i \frac{\omega_c}{\omega} \frac{\omega_p^2}{\omega^2 - \omega_c^2}}{1 - \frac{k^2 c^2}{\omega^2} - \sum \frac{\omega_p^2}{\omega^2 - \omega_c^2}} \right) (\mathbf{k} \times \hat{\mathbf{z}} - i \frac{\omega_c}{\omega} \mathbf{k}_\perp) \right] \frac{\left(1 - \frac{k_\perp^2 c^2}{\omega^2} - \sum \frac{\omega_p^2}{\omega^2}\right) \omega^4}{(\omega^2 - \omega_c^2) k_\perp^2 c^2} + k_z \hat{\mathbf{z}} \quad (6)$$

$$D(\omega, \mathbf{k}) = \left(1 - \frac{k^2 c^2}{\omega^2} - \sum \frac{\omega_p^2}{\omega^2 - \omega_c^2}\right) \left[\left(1 - \frac{k_z^2 c^2}{\omega^2} - \sum \frac{\omega_p^2}{\omega^2 - \omega_c^2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{k_\perp^2 c^2}{\omega^2} - \sum \frac{\omega_p^2}{\omega^2}\right) - \frac{k_\perp^2 k_z^2 c^4}{\omega^4} \right] - \left(\sum \frac{\omega_p^2 \omega_c}{\omega(\omega^2 - \omega_c^2)} \right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{k_\perp^2 c^2}{\omega^2} - \sum \frac{\omega_p^2}{\omega^2}\right) \quad (7)$$

and

$$M_j = \left(1 - \frac{k_j^2 c^2}{\omega_j^2} - \sum \frac{\omega_p^2}{\omega_j^2 - \omega_c^2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{k_{jz}^2 c^2}{\omega_j^2} - \sum \frac{\omega_p^2}{\omega_j^2 - \omega_c^2}\right) - \left(\sum \frac{\omega_p^2 \omega_c}{\omega_j(\omega_j^2 - \omega_c^2)} \right)^2 \quad (8)$$

where $k = (k_z^2 + k_\perp^2)^{1/2}$, \mathbf{k}_\perp is the perpendicular (to $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$) part of the wave-vector, ω_p is the plasma frequency (ω_{pe} for the electrons and ω_{pi} for the ions), $\omega_c = qB_0/m$ is the cyclotron frequency, q and m are the particle charge and mass, and c is the speed of light in vacuum. For notational convenience, the subscript σ denoting the various particle species has been left out in the above formulas.

Equations (3)-(8) can be used to study the high-frequency coherent generation (Christiansen et al., 1981) or the energy transfer from a large amplitude electromagnetic wave into an electrostatic electron wave and a lower hybrid wave (e.g. Larsson et al., 1976; Stenflo, 1994; Kuo 2003; Stenflo, 2004). In the present paper we shall, however, only adopt the above results to investigate wave couplings in the MHD regime. In a previous work (Brodin and Stenflo, 1988) we noted that in the ideal MHD regime, there is no coupling between three shear Alfvén waves. We will therefore show below that the more accurate two fluid model gives predictions significantly different from ideal MHD. To demonstrate this fact, we will consider low-frequency waves where the parameters have the standard MHD ordering $\omega \sim k_z V_A \ll \omega_{ci}$ and $\omega_{ci} \ll \omega_{pi}$, where V_A is the Alfvén velocity. However, in contrast to ideal MHD, we shall here also allow for large perpendicular wave numbers, reaching up to $k_\perp \sim \omega_{pe}/c$. Applying this scaling to Eq. (7), we find that the usual shear Alfvén waves are modified to inertial Alfvén waves, with frequencies

$$\omega \simeq \frac{k_z V_A}{1 + k_\perp^2 \lambda_e^2} \quad (9)$$

where $\lambda_e = c/\omega_{pe}$. Next we assume that all the three interacting modes are described by (9). In order to keep contact with the ideal MHD regime where $\omega \simeq k_z V_A$, we will allow for $k_\perp^2 \lambda_e^2 \ll 1$ as well as for $k_\perp^2 \lambda_e^2 \sim 1$. Applying the above assumptions to (6), we thus make the approximations

$$\mathbf{K}_e \simeq - \frac{i\omega}{\omega_{ce}} \frac{(1 + k_\perp^2 \lambda_e^2)}{k_\perp^2 \lambda_e^2} \mathbf{k} \times \hat{\mathbf{z}} + k_z \hat{\mathbf{z}} \quad (10)$$

and

$$\mathbf{K}_i \simeq - \frac{i\omega}{\omega_{ci}} \frac{(1 + k_\perp^2 \lambda_e^2)}{k_\perp^2 \lambda_e^2} \mathbf{k} \times \hat{\mathbf{z}} + k_z \hat{\mathbf{z}} \quad (11)$$

Substituting (10) and (11) into (5), we find that the ion contribution is negligible compared to the electron contribution, and that the coupling coefficient reduces to

$$C_{IAW} = \frac{q_e \omega_{pe}^2}{m_e \omega_1 \omega_2 \omega_3} \left(\frac{k_{1z}}{\omega_1} + \frac{k_{2z}}{\omega_2} + \frac{k_{3z}}{\omega_3} \right) \quad (12)$$

and that the dispersion function (7) can be approximated by

$$D(\omega, \mathbf{k}) = - \frac{c^4 (\omega^2 - k^2 V_A^2) (k_\perp^2 c^2 + \omega_{pe}^2)}{\omega^6 V_A^4} \left[\omega^2 - \frac{k_z^2 V_A^2}{1 + k_\perp^2 c^2 / \omega_{pe}^2} \right]. \quad (13)$$

Similarly (8) reduces to

$$M = \frac{c^4}{\omega^4 V_A^4} (\omega^2 - k^2 V_A^2) (\omega^2 - k_z^2 V_A^2). \quad (14)$$

Thus

$$\alpha_{1,2} = \frac{\omega_{1,2}^3 k_{1,2\perp}^2 c^2}{2 (k_{1,2\perp}^2 c^2 + \omega_{pe}^2)} C_{IAW} \quad (15)$$

and

$$\alpha_3 = -\frac{\omega_3^3 k_{3\perp}^2 c^2}{2 (k_{3\perp}^2 c^2 + \omega_{pe}^2)} C_{IAW} \quad (16)$$

For easy comparison with the MHD-results, it is convenient to eliminate E_z , and to work with the magnetic field amplitudes. The magnitude of the magnetic field perturbation is thus

$$B_j = \frac{E_{jz}}{\omega k_{j\perp} \lambda_e^2} \quad (17)$$

where the magnetic field is directed in the $-\mathbf{k} \times \hat{\mathbf{z}}$ -direction, to a good approximation. The coupled equations (3,a,b,c) can therefore be rewritten as

$$\frac{dB_{1,2}}{dt} = \frac{\omega_{1,2} k_{1\perp} k_{2\perp} k_{3\perp} V_A^2}{2 (k_{1,2\perp}^2 + \lambda_e^{-2}) \omega_{ci}} \left(\frac{k_{1z}}{\omega_1} + \frac{k_{2z}}{\omega_2} + \frac{k_{3z}}{\omega_3} \right) \frac{B_{1,2}^* B_3}{B_0} \quad (18)$$

and

$$\frac{dB_3}{dt} = -\frac{\omega_3 k_{1\perp} k_{2\perp} k_{3\perp} V_A^2}{2 (k_{3\perp}^2 + \lambda_e^{-2}) \omega_{ci}} \left(\frac{k_{1z}}{\omega_1} + \frac{k_{2z}}{\omega_2} + \frac{k_{3z}}{\omega_3} \right) \frac{B_1 B_2}{B_0} \quad (19)$$

Choosing wave 3 as a pump wave, the maximum growth rate γ_{\max} deduced from (18) is thus of the order

$$\gamma_{\max} \sim \frac{\omega_3 k_{3\perp} V_A}{\omega_{ci}} \frac{|B_3|}{B_0} \quad (20)$$

where the fastest growth occurs for decay products that are inertial Alfvén waves with wavenumbers $k_{1,2\perp}$ of the order of λ_e^{-1} . We note that for decay into standard ideal Alfvén waves with $k_{1,2\perp} \sim k_{1,2z} = \omega_{1,2}/V_A$, the growth rate thus is reduced by a factor $\sim \omega_3^2 m_e / \omega_{ci}^2 m_i$. As a special limit of (20) we consider a pump wave which is a standard ideal Alfvén wave with $k_{3\perp} \sim k_{3z} = \omega_3/V_A$. This gives

$$\gamma_{\max} \sim \frac{\omega_3^2}{\omega_{ci}} \frac{|B_3|}{B_0} \quad (21)$$

As another example, we let the pump wave be an inertial Alfvén pump wave with perpendicular wavenumber $k_{3\perp} \sim \lambda_e^{-1}$, in which case (20) reduces to

$$\gamma_{\max} \sim \omega_3 \frac{|B_3|}{B_0} \left(\frac{m_i}{m_e} \right)^{1/2} \quad (22)$$

To summarize, we have considered the interaction of Alfvén waves using results from the exact two-fluid equations for a cold magnetized plasma. We note that for an Alfvén pump wave in the inertial regime ($k_{3\perp} \sim \lambda_e^{-1}$), the maximum growth rate for decay into inertial Alfvén waves is larger than the usual MHD growth rates (including interaction between all sorts of ideal MHD waves) by a factor of the order of $(m_i/m_e)^{1/2}$. Furthermore, for an ordinary Alfvén pump wave ($k_{3\perp} \ll \lambda_e^{-1}$), we point out that the cold ideal MHD theory does not allow for resonant decay processes at all (Brodin and Stenflo, 1988), since the Manley-Rowe relations prevent decay into modes of higher frequencies, and the coupling coefficients for interaction with two other Alfvén waves are zero in the framework of ideal MHD. Thus

the growth rate found in (21) is the fastest decay possible in a cold plasma for an Alfvén pump wave in the ideal MHD regime ($k_{3\perp} \ll \lambda_e^{-1}$). Furthermore, since the decay products have short scale lengths, we note that the ideal MHD equations are unable to describe the *nonlinear* evolution, even if the initial conditions lie well inside the usual validity conditions of those equations. We point out that resistivity eventually leads to dissipation of the shorter scale waves. Thus we conclude that the parametric processes considered in this paper can be important for understanding the heating of low-beta plasmas. Finally we stress that high-beta plasmas require a separate analysis (Brodin and Stenflo, 1990) and that extensions to three-wave interactions in a turbulent plasma (Vladimirov and Yu, 2004) are comparatively straightforward.

-
- [1] Brodin G. and Stenflo L. 1988 *J. Plasma Phys.* **39**, 277.
 - [2] Brodin G. and Stenflo L. 1990 *Contr. Plasma Phys.* **30**, 413.
 - [3] Christiansen P. J., Jain V. K. and Stenflo L. 1981, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **46**, 1333.
 - [4] Fedun V. N., Yukhimuk A. K. and Voitsekhocskaya A. D. 2004 *J. Plasma Phys.* **70**, 699.
 - [5] Hasegawa A. and Uberoi C., *The Alfvén wave*. DOE Review Series-Advances in Fusion Science and Engineering (U.S. Department of Energy, Washington D. C., 1982).
 - [6] Kuo S. P. 2003 *Phys. Lett. A* **307**, 244.
 - [7] Larsson J., Stenflo L. and Tegeback R. 1976 *J. Plasma Phys.* **16**, 37.
 - [8] Petviashvili V. I. and Pokhotelov O. A., *Solitary Waves in Plasmas and in the Atmosphere* (Gordon and Breach, Philadelphia, 1992).
 - [9] Sagdeev R. Z. and Galeev A. A., *Nonlinear plasma theory* (Benjamin, New York, 1969).
 - [10] Shukla P.K. (Ed.) 2004 *Nonlinear Physics in Action, Physica Scripta* **T113**.
 - [11] Shukla P.K. and Stenflo L. 2005 *Phys. Plasmas* **12**, 084502.
 - [12] Stenflo L. 1994 *Phys. Scripta* **T50**, 15.
 - [13] Stenflo L. 2004 *Phys. Scripta* **T107**, 262.
 - [14] Stenflo L. and Brodin G. 2005 *J. Plasma Phys.* **72**, 143.
 - [15] Vladimirov S. V. and Yu M. Y. 2004 *Physica Scripta* **T113**, 32.
 - [16] Voitenko Y. M. and Goossens M 2005 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 135003.