

Nonlinear Debye-Onsager-Relaxation-Effect

K. Morawetz

Fachbereich Physik, Universität Rostock, 18051 Rostock, Germany

Abstract

The quantum kinetic equation for charged particles in strong electric fields is used to derive the nonlinear particle flux. The relaxation field is calculated quantum mechanically up to any order in the applied field provided a given Maxwellian plasma. The classical limit is given in analytical form. In the range of weak fields the deformation of the screening cloud is responsible for the Debye-Onsager relaxation effect.

High field transport has become a topic of current interest in various fields of physics. Especially, the nonlinear current or the electrical conductivity gives access to properties of dense nonideal plasmas. At low fields we expect the linear response regime to be valid. Then the contribution of field effects to the conductivity can be condensed into the Debye-Onsager relaxation effect [1–5] which was first derived within the theory of electrolytes [6–8]. Debye has given a limiting law of electrical conductivity which stated that the external electric field E on a charge e is diminished by the amount $\delta E = E(1 - \frac{\kappa e^2}{6\epsilon_0 T})$ where κ is the inverse screening radius of the screening cloud. Later it has been shown by Onsager that this result has to be corrected if the dynamics of ions is considered. In this paper we will give the complete result beyond linear response for the static case $E(1 - \frac{\kappa e^2}{6\epsilon_0 T} F(E))$ similar to the theoretical explanation of the Wien effect [8]. We start from the kinetic equation derived with the help of the gauge invariant formulation of Green's function, [9,10]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} f_a + e\mathbf{E}\nabla_{\mathbf{k}_a} f_a &= \sum_b I_{ab} \\ I_{ab} &= \frac{2}{\hbar^2} \int \frac{d\mathbf{k}'_a d\mathbf{k}_b d\mathbf{k}'_b}{(2\pi\hbar)^6} V_{ab}^2(\mathbf{k}_a - \mathbf{k}'_a) \delta(\mathbf{k}_a + \mathbf{k}_b - \mathbf{k}'_a - \mathbf{k}'_b) \\ &\times \int_0^\infty d\tau \cos \left\{ \left(\epsilon_a + \epsilon_b - \epsilon'_a - \epsilon'_b \right) \frac{\tau}{\hbar} - \frac{\mathbf{E}\tau^2}{2\hbar} \left(\frac{e_a \mathbf{k}_a}{m_a} + \frac{e_b \mathbf{k}_b}{m_b} - \frac{e_a \mathbf{k}'_a}{m_a} - \frac{e_b \mathbf{k}'_b}{m_b} \right) \right\} \\ &\times \{ f'_a f'_b (1 - f_a)(1 - f_b) - f_a f_b (1 - f'_a)(1 - f'_b) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here we have written, e.g., f_b for $f_b(k_b - e_b E \tau, t - \tau)$ for simplicity. We use the static screened Debye potential here, which restriction can be released to dynamical screening [11]. Generalizations can be found for the T-matrix [12] approximation resulting into a field dependent Bethe-Salpeter equation or for the RPA approximation [10] resulting into a Lenard-Balescu kinetic equation. We are now interested in corrections to the particle flux, and therefore obtain from (1) the balance equation for the momentum

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \langle \mathbf{k}_a \rangle - n e_a \mathbf{E} = \sum_b \langle \mathbf{k}_a I_B^{ab} \rangle \equiv n_a e_a \mathbf{E} \frac{\delta E_a}{E}. \quad (2)$$

We assume a nondegenerate situation, such that the Pauli blocking effects can be neglected and assume a quasistationary plasma with Maxwellian distributions, which in principle restricts the applied fields [13]. The angular integrations can be carried out trivially and we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{p} I_B^{ab} \rangle &= \frac{\mathbf{E}}{E} \sum_b \frac{8 n_a n_b e_a^2 e_b^2}{\tilde{T} \epsilon_0^2} I_3 \\ I_3 &= 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{k+1} \frac{k+1}{(2k+3)!} x^{2k+1} I_3^{2k+1} \\ I_3^{2k+1} &= \int_0^{\infty} dz \frac{z^{2k+4}}{(z^2+1)^2} \int_0^{\infty} dl l^{4k+2} \frac{\sin(z^2 l b)}{b} e^{-z^2 l^2} \\ &= \frac{(2k+1)!}{2} \int_0^{\infty} dz \frac{z^{2-2k}}{(z^2+1)^2} {}_1F_1\left(2+2k, \frac{3}{2}, -\frac{b^2 z^2}{4}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

with $\tilde{T} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{m_b}{m_a+m_b} T_a + \frac{m_a}{m_a+m_b} T_b \right)$ and the quantum parameter $b^2 = \frac{\hbar^2 \kappa^2}{4\mu T}$ and the classical field parameter $x = \frac{E}{2\tilde{T}\kappa} \left(\frac{m_a}{m_a+m_b} e_b - \frac{m_b}{m_a+m_b} e_a \right)$. First we give here an exact expression for the classical limit. We observe that (3) for $b \rightarrow 0$ diverges. However, we can calculate the classical limit directly

$$\begin{aligned} I_{3c} &= -\frac{\pi x}{24} F(|x|) \\ F^{\text{static}}(x) &= -\frac{3}{x^2} \left[3 - x + \frac{1}{1+x} - \frac{4}{x} \ln(1+x) \right] = 1 + o(x) \\ F^{\text{dyn}}(x) &= -\frac{3}{x^2} \left[2 - x + \frac{2}{x} \ln(1+x) \right] = 2 + o(x). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The second result we calculated for inclusion of dynamical screening within the approximation [3] which replaces $\overline{\epsilon(\omega, q)^{-2}}$ by $(1 + \kappa^2 V_{aa}(q)/4\pi)^{-1}$. This result gives the classical field dependent Debye- Onsager- relaxation- effect up to field strengths $x < 1$. Introducing the classical result (4) into (2) the following relaxation field appears

$$\frac{\delta E_a}{E} = \frac{e_a \pi}{12\kappa} \sum_b \frac{4n_b e_b^2}{\epsilon_0^2 \mu} \frac{\frac{e_b}{m_b} - \frac{e_a}{m_a}}{\left(\frac{T_b}{m_b} + \frac{T_a}{m_a}\right)^2} F\left(\frac{E}{\kappa} \frac{\frac{e_b}{m_b} - \frac{e_a}{m_a}}{\frac{T_a}{m_a} + \frac{T_b}{m_b}}\right). \quad (5)$$

No relaxation field appears for particles with equal charge to mass ratios. The link to the known Debye- Onsager relaxation effect can be found if we assume that we have a plasma consisting of heavy ion (a) with charge one and oppositely charge light ions (b) and temperatures $T_a = T_b = T$. Then (5) reduces to $\frac{\delta E_a}{E} = -\frac{\kappa e_a^2}{12\epsilon_0 T} F\left(\frac{eE}{T\kappa}\right)$ and $F(x)$ from (4). Within the linear response the dynamical result leads to the known Debye relaxation field [11] while the static result here underestimates the value about one half. The high field result $F(x)$ is monotonously approaching zero for high fields and can be compared with the known result from electrolyte theory, recently [14]. The result (5) with (4) is an extension to the work of [5] in that it gives the relaxation field up to any field strength, not restricting to linear response and an extension to [15] that dynamical screening is included. The complete quantum case of (3) can be given by performing the integral. The result gives a series in field strength x , which however does not converge for $x = 1$. In the following we give only the first two parts of the expansion with respect to the field. The quantum effects are included completely. The quantum linear response reads

$$I_3^1(k=0) = \frac{\pi}{8} \left(1 + b_1^2 - b_1 \sqrt{\pi} e^{b_1^2} \left(\frac{3}{2} + b_1^2\right) \operatorname{erfc}(b_1)\right) \quad (6)$$

with $b_1 = b/2$. This result reproduces [5] by a different way of calculation. All higher order terms can be given in analytical form as well. In the Fig. 1a we plot the quantum versus classical result for linear response and cubic response versus the quantum parameter b . We see that the cubic response is less influenced by quantum effects than the linear response result. The general observation is that the quantum effects lower the classical result for the relaxation effect. A detailed analysis of quantum effects on the linear response can be found in [5,15].

In Fig. 1b we give the ratio of quantum to classical result for the relaxation effect up to cubic terms in fields for different field strengths x . We see that the quantum effects become more important with increasing field strength. The effect of sign change can be seen in the quantum effects at certain values of b . We remark that the electric field is limited to values $x < 1$ or $E < \frac{\kappa T}{e}$ beyond no quasi equilibrated transport is possible, i.e. no thermal distributions are pertained in the system. Then we have to take into account nonthermal field dependent distributions which have been employed to study nonlinear conductivity [16,13].

This work was supported from the BMBF (Germany) under contract Nr. 06R0884.




Fig. 1. The ratio of quantum to classical Debye-Onsager relaxation effect (5) versus quantum parameter b . In the left hand figure the linear (3) and cubic response term in the expansion of x is plotted separately. In the right hand figure we give the relaxation effect up to cubic terms for different field strength x .

References

- [1] B. B. Kadomtsev, Zh.Eksp.Teor.Fiz. **33**, 151 (1958), sov. Phys. -JETP 33,117(1958).
- [2] Y. L. Klimontovich and W. Ebeling, Jh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **63**, 904 (1972).
- [3] W. Ebeling and G. Röpke, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) **36**, 429 (1979).
- [4] G. Röpke, Phys.Rev.A **38**, 3001 (1988).
- [5] K. Morawetz and D. Kremp, Phys. Lett. A **173**, 317 (1993).
- [6] P. Debye and E. Hückel, Phys. Zeitsch. **15**, 305 (1923).
- [7] L. Onsager, Phys. Zeitsch. **8**, 277 (1927).
- [8] H. Falkenhagen, *Elektrolyte* (S. Hirzel Verlag, Leipzig, 1953).
- [9] A. P. Jauho and J. W. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. B **29**, 1919 (1984).
- [10] K. Morawetz, Phys. Rev. E **50**, 4625 (1994).
- [11] K. Morawetz and J. Ortner, Phys. Rev. E (1997), sub.
- [12] K. Morawetz and G. Röpke, Zeit. f. Phys. A **355**, 287 (1996).
- [13] K. Morawetz and D. Kremp, Phys. Fluids B **1**, 225 (1994).
- [14] J. Ortner, Phys. Rev. E **56**, N5 (1997).
- [15] K. Morawetz, Contrib. to Plasma Physics **37**, 195 (1997), errata:37(97).
- [16] D. Kremp, K. Morawetz, M. Schlanges, and V. Rietz, Phys. Rev. E **47**, 635 (1993).