ÉCOLE DE PHYSIQUE des HOUCHES

5 March 2013

xford



Kinetic Turbulence in Magnetised Plasma

Alexander Schekochihin hvsics... with S. Cowley (Culham), G. Howes, J. TenBarge (Iowa), W. Dorland, A. Kanekar (Maryland), T. Tatsuno (Tokyo), G. Hammett (Princeton), G. Plunk (IPP Greifswald), E. Quataert, S. Bale, C. Chen (Berkeley), N. Loureiro (Lisbon), A. Zocco (Culham), T. Horbury (Imperial), R. Wicks (NASA), A. Mallet (Oxford)

AAS et al. 2008, *PPCF* **50**, 124024 [arXiv:0806.1069] AAS et al. 2009, Astrophys. J. Suppl. 182, 310 [arXiv:0704.0044]

Forget Fluid Dynamics



Strictly speaking, fluid (hydro, MHD, two-fluid/Braginskii...) equations are only valid in the collisional limit:

$$l \gg \lambda_{
m mfp}$$
 $\omega \ll
u_{ii}$

because they rely on particles being in local Maxwellian equilibrium, so they can be described by a few fluid moments: density, flow velocity, temperature (++perhaps fields: magnetic, electric)

This means they are OK in dense, cold environments: wind in Chamonix valley, sodium dynamo, Earth mantle, solar convective zone, molecular clouds, some accretion discs...

They are NOT OK in hot, dilute astro and laboratory plasmas: solar wind, warm/hot ISM, intergalactic, tokamaks, LAPD, MPDX...

 $f = F_0 + \delta f$



In fact, fluid description is perhaps OK at large scales, but virtually never on small (turbulence scales):



large-scale local equilibrium (Maxwellian)

NB: even that is often not quite so, but I will not deal with non-Maxwellian equilibria in this lecture (see lectures by Kunz, Sulem, Passot on effects of pressure anisotropies: a difficult poorly chartered terrain, exciting area of current research)

Fast collisionless fluctuations (turbulence), often driven by gradients in the equilibrium profiles $(\nabla T, \text{flow shear, etc...})$

Plasma Turbulence Extends to Collisionless Scales Ψ_{hysics}

Turbulence in the solar wind

[Sahraoui et al. 2009, PRL 102, 231102]



Plasma Turbulence Extends to Collisionless Scales Ψ_{hysics}

Turbulence in the solar wind

[Alexandrova et al. 2009, PRL 103, 165003]



Plasma Turbulence Extends to Collisionless Scales



Plasma Turbulence Extends to Collisionless Scales Q_{hysics}

Intracluster (intergalactic) medium Hydra A cluster [Vogt & Enßlin 2005, A&A **434**, 67]

$$L \sim 10^{19} \text{ km} (\sim 1 \text{ Mpc})$$

$$\lambda_{mfp} \sim 10^{16} \text{ km} (\sim 1 \text{ kpc})$$

$$\rho_i \sim 10^4 \text{ km}$$





What Is Turbulence in Such Systems?





The T_i/T_e Problem



- We know that $T_i \neq T_e$ is a non-equilibrium situation (entropy will increase if temperatures equalise)
- ➤ We know of no mechanism other than *i-e* Coulomb collisions that would equalise temperatures (e.g., no instabilities or fluxes, like with gradients). But *v_{ie}* is very small in weakly collisional plasmas
- Where we can measure both temperatures (lab, space), they tend to be within a factor of order unity of each other
- ➤ In extrasolar or extragalactic plasmas, we normally assume $T_i = T_e$ unless it is opportune to assume otherwise $(T_i >> T_e$ in some models of some accretion discs), but actually we have no idea what they are
- Fundamental question:

Will turbulence equalise (or drive apart) T_i and T_e ? I.e.,

- If $T_i > T_e$ then ion heating < electron heating
- If $T_i < T_e$ then ion heating > electron heating

If not, can we predict T_i/T_e as a function of β ?

Turbulence Is a Nonlinear Route to Dissipation

 $\partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u = -\nabla p + \nu \nabla^2 u + f, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0,$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\int \frac{\mathrm{d}^3 r}{V} \frac{u^2}{2} = \varepsilon - \nu \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^3 r}{V} |\boldsymbol{\nabla} \boldsymbol{u}|^2$$

$$arepsilon = (1/V) \int \mathrm{d}^3 r \, \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{f}$$

If cascade is local, intermediate scales fill up ⇒K41, spectra, and all that (see Boldyrev's lecture)





$$\frac{\partial f_s}{\partial t} + \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} f_s + \frac{q_s}{m_s} \left(\boldsymbol{E} + \frac{\boldsymbol{v} \times \boldsymbol{B}}{c} \right) \cdot \frac{\partial f_s}{\partial \boldsymbol{v}} = \left(\frac{\partial f_s}{\partial t} \right)_{\rm c}$$

$$oldsymbol{
abla} oldsymbol{
abla} oldsymbol{
abla} oldsymbol{
abla} oldsymbol{
abla} oldsymbol{
abla} = -c oldsymbol{
abla} \times oldsymbol{B} = 0. \end{array}^{ ext{energy injection (model)}} n_s = \int \mathrm{d}^3 v \, f_s, \ n_s = \int \mathrm{d}^3 v \, f_s, \ j = \sum_s q_s \int \mathrm{d}^3 v \, v f_s, \ j = \sum_s q_s \int \mathrm{d}^3 v \, v f_s,$$



Plasma Turbulence Ab Initio





$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}r}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3}v \, \frac{m_{s}v^{2}}{2} f_{s} = \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}r}{V} E \cdot j = \varepsilon - \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}r}{V} \frac{E^{2} + B^{2}}{8\pi}$$
Work done
$$\varepsilon = -(1/V) \int \mathrm{d}^{3}r E \cdot j_{\text{ext}}$$
energy injection (model)
Entropy produced:
$$\frac{\mathrm{d}S_{s}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \left[-\int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}r}{V} \int \mathrm{d}^{3}v f_{s} \ln f_{s} \right] = -\int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}r}{V} \int \mathrm{d}^{3}v \ln f_{s} \left(\frac{\partial f_{s}}{\partial t} \right)_{c} \ge 0$$

$$f_{s} = F_{0s} + \delta f_{s} \quad F_{0s} = n_{0s}(\pi v_{\text{ths}}^{2})^{-3/2} \exp(-v^{2}/v_{\text{ths}}^{2})$$
Then
$$v_{\text{ths}} = (2T_{0s}/m_{s})^{1/2}$$

$$f_{s} \ln f_{s} = (F_{0s} + \delta f_{s}) \ln \left[F_{0s} \left(1 + \frac{\delta f_{s}}{F_{0s}} \right) \right]$$

$$\approx (F_{0s} + \delta f_{s}) \ln F_{0s} + \delta f_{s} - \frac{\delta f_{s}^{2}}{2F_{0s}} \quad \text{(to second order)}$$
PPCF **50**, 124024 (2008)



$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}r}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3}v \, \frac{m_{s}v^{2}}{2} f_{s} = \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}r}{V} E \cdot \mathbf{j} = \varepsilon - \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}r}{V} \frac{E^{2} + B^{2}}{8\pi}$$
Work done
$$\varepsilon = -(1/V) \int \mathrm{d}^{3}r E \cdot \mathbf{j}_{\text{ext}}$$
energy injection (model)
Entropy produced:
$$T_{0s} \frac{\mathrm{d}S_{s}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \left[\int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}r}{V} \int \mathrm{d}^{3}v \, \frac{m_{s}v^{2}}{2} \left(F_{0s} + \delta f_{s}\right) - \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}r}{V} \int \mathrm{d}^{3}v \, \frac{T_{0s}\delta f_{s}^{2}}{2F_{0s}} \right]$$

$$= -\int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}r}{V} \int \mathrm{d}^{3}v \, \frac{T_{0s}\delta f_{s}}{F_{0s}} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{\partial t} \right)_{c} - n_{0s}\nu_{E}^{ss'}(T_{0s} - T_{0s'})$$

$$f_{s} \ln f_{s} = (F_{0s} + \delta f_{s}) \ln \left[F_{0s} \left(1 + \frac{\delta f_{s}}{F_{0s}} \right) \right]$$
$$\approx (F_{0s} + \delta f_{s}) \ln F_{0s} + \delta f_{s} - \frac{\delta f_{s}^{2}}{2F_{0s}} \quad \text{(to second order)}$$



$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{r}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{m_{s} v^{2}}{2} \, f_{s} = \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{r}}{V} \, \boldsymbol{E} \cdot \boldsymbol{j} = \varepsilon - \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{r}}{V} \, \frac{E^{2} + B^{2}}{8\pi}$$
Work done
$$\varepsilon = -(1/V) \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{r} \, \boldsymbol{E} \cdot \boldsymbol{j}_{\text{ext}}$$
energy injection (model)
Entropy produced:
$$T_{0s} \, \frac{\mathrm{d}S_{s}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \left[\int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{r}}{V} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{m_{s} v^{2}}{2} \left(F_{0s} + \delta f_{s}\right) - \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{r}}{V} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}^{2}}{2F_{0s}} \right]$$

$$= -\int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{r}}{V} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}}{F_{0s}} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{\partial t} \right)_{c} - n_{0s} \nu_{E}^{ss'} (T_{0s} - T_{0s'})$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^3 r}{V} \left[\sum_s \int \mathrm{d}^3 v \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_s^2}{2F_{0s}} + \frac{E^2 + B^2}{8\pi} \right].$$

$$PPCF 50, 124024 (2008)$$

$$= \varepsilon + \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^3 r}{V} \sum_s \int \mathrm{d}^3 v \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_s}{F_{0s}} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_s}{\partial t} \right)_{\mathrm{c}}$$



$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}\boldsymbol{r}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3}\boldsymbol{v} \frac{m_{s}v^{2}}{2} f_{s} &= \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}\boldsymbol{r}}{V} \boldsymbol{E} \cdot \boldsymbol{j} = \varepsilon - \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}\boldsymbol{r}}{V} \frac{E^{2} + B^{2}}{8\pi} \end{aligned}$$
Work done
$$\varepsilon &= -(1/V) \int \mathrm{d}^{3}\boldsymbol{r} \boldsymbol{E} \cdot \boldsymbol{j}_{\text{ext}} \text{ energy injection (model)} \text{Heating:} \\ \frac{3}{2} n_{0s} \frac{\mathrm{d}T_{0s}}{\mathrm{d}t} &= -\overline{\int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}\boldsymbol{r}}{V} \int \mathrm{d}^{3}\boldsymbol{v} \frac{T_{0s}\delta f_{s}}{F_{0s}} \left(\frac{\partial\delta f_{s}}{\partial t}\right)_{c}} - n_{0s} \nu_{E}^{ss'}(T_{0s} - T_{0s'}) \text{Fluctuation energy budget:} \end{aligned}$$
PPCF **50**, 124024 (2008)
$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}\boldsymbol{r}}{V} \left[\sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3}\boldsymbol{v} \frac{T_{0s}\delta f_{s}^{2}}{2F_{0s}} + \frac{E^{2} + B^{2}}{8\pi} \right] \underset{\text{energy}}{\varepsilon} \underset{\text{energy}}{\varepsilon} \int \mathrm{d}^{3}\boldsymbol{v} \frac{T_{0s}\delta f_{s}}{F_{0s}} \left(\frac{\partial\delta f_{s}}{\partial t}\right)_{c} \end{aligned}$$



"Energy" in Plasma Turbulence



Generalised energy = free energy of the particles + fields

Kruskal & Oberman 1958 Fowler 1968 **Krommes & Hu 1994** Krommes 1999 Sugama et al. 1996 Hallatschek 2004 Howes et al. 2006 Schekochihin et al. 2007 Scott 2007 Abel et al. 2013

"Energy" in Plasma Turbulence





Generalised energy = free energy of the particles + fields

Kruskal & Oberman 1958 Fowler 1968 **Krommes & Hu 1994** Krommes 1999 Sugama et al. 1996 Hallatschek 2004 Howes et al. 2006 Schekochihin et al. 2007 Scott 2007 Abel et al. 2013

NB: Landau damping is a redistribution between the e-m fluctuation energy and (negative) perturbed entropy (free energy). It was pointed out already by Landau 1946 that δf_s does not decay: "ballistic response" $\delta f_s \propto e^{-ik \cdot vt}$



Analogous to Fluid, But...

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}\boldsymbol{r}}{V} \left[\sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3}\boldsymbol{v} \frac{T_{0s}\delta f_{s}^{2}}{2F_{0s}} + \frac{E^{2} + B^{2}}{8\pi} \right]_{-T\delta S} = \varepsilon + \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}\boldsymbol{r}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3}\boldsymbol{v} \frac{T_{0s}\delta f_{s}}{F_{0s}} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{\partial t} \right)_{\mathrm{c}}$$
injection

small scales in 6D phase space

$$\partial_t \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \boldsymbol{u} = -\boldsymbol{\nabla} p + \nu \nabla^2 \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{f}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^3 \boldsymbol{r}}{V} \frac{\boldsymbol{u}^2}{2} = \varepsilon - \nu \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^3 \boldsymbol{r}}{V} |\boldsymbol{\nabla} \boldsymbol{u}|^2 + \frac{\text{small scales in 3D}}{\text{physical space}}$$

$$\varepsilon = (1/V) \int \mathrm{d}^3 \boldsymbol{r} \, \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{f} \qquad \text{PPCF 50, 124024 (2008)}$$



Analogous to Fluid, But...

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{r}}{V} \left[\sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}^{2}}{2F_{0s}} + \frac{E^{2} + B^{2}}{8\pi} \right]_{\text{energy}} = \varepsilon + \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{r}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}}{F_{0s}} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{\partial t} \right)_{c} + \varepsilon + \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{r}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}}{F_{0s}} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{\partial t} \right)_{c} + \varepsilon + \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{r}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}}{F_{0s}} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{\partial t} \right)_{c} + \varepsilon + \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}}{V} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{\partial t} \right)_{c} + \varepsilon + \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}}{V} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{\partial t} \right)_{c} + \varepsilon + \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}}{V} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{\partial t} \right)_{c} + \varepsilon + \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}}{V} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{\partial t} \right)_{c} + \varepsilon + \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}}{V} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{\partial t} \right)_{c} + \varepsilon + \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}}{V} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{\partial t} \right)_{c} + \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}}{V} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{V} \right)_{c} + \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}}{V} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{V} \right)_{c} + \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}}{V} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{V} \right)_{c} + \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v}}{V} \sum_{s} \int \mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v} \, \frac{T_{0s} \delta f_{s}}{V} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{V} \right)_{c} + \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v}}{V} \sum_{s} \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v}}{V} \sum_{s} \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v}}{V} \left(\frac{\partial \delta f_{s}}{V} \right)_{s} + \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v}}{V} \sum_{s} \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \boldsymbol{v}}{V}$$

Small scales in velocity space (**phase mixing**)





Linear Phase Mixing





So small-scale structure forms and is eventually wiped out by collisions (but we will see that there is a much faster nonlinear mechanism for that: **turbulence**)

From MHD to Kinetic Scales



Let us now see what happens nonlinearly: the turbulent cascade starts as MHD turbulence and gets to collisionless scales, then what?



MHD Cascade Is Anisotropic







 $\frac{k_{\parallel}}{-} \ll 1$ In magnetised plasma, • Strong anisotropy: confirmed by numerics (MHD) k_{\perp} and observations (solar wind, ISM) $\omega \sim k_{\parallel} v_A \sim k_{\perp} u_{\perp}$ • Strong nonlinearity: $\omega_{\text{linear}} \sim \omega_{\text{nonlinear}}$ SOLAR WIND <u>Critical balance</u> as a physical princip. 10² (see Boldyrev's lectures) r−1.62 10⁰ • (2+1)D route through 10⁻² f −0.38 phase space 10-4 • Stuff happens at $k_{\perp}\rho_i \sim 1$ 10^{-6} -2.5 -4.01 ρp 10^{-8} [Sahraoui et al. 2009, 10⁻¹⁰ PRL 102, 231102] Dе 10.00 100.00 0.01 0.10 1.00

frequency (Hz)

- Strong anisotropy:
- Strong nonlinearity:

$$\frac{k_\parallel}{k_\perp} \ll 1$$

In magnetised plasma, confirmed by numerics (MHD) and observations (solar wind, ISM)

$$\omega \sim k_{\parallel} v_A \sim k_{\perp} u_{\perp}$$

 $\omega_{\text{linear}} \sim \omega_{\text{nonlinear}}$ <u>Critical balance</u> as a physical principle (see Boldyrev's lectures)

- (2+1)D route through phase space
- Stuff happens at $k_\perp
 ho_i \sim 1$

NB: This transition is also key in fusion plasmas, whence comes much of the appropriate theoretical machinery (see Jenko's lecture)







(see Jenko's lecture)

- Strong anisotropy:
- Strong nonlinearity:

$$\frac{k_\parallel}{k_\perp} \ll 1$$

 $\omega \sim k_{||} v_A \sim k_{\perp} u_{\perp}$

In magnetised plasma, confirmed by numerics (MHD) and observations (solar wind, ISM)

- ω_{linear} ~ ω_{nonlinear} <u>Critical balance</u> as a physical principle (see Boldyrev's lectures)
- (2+1)D route through phase space
- Stuff happens at $k_\perp
 ho_i \sim 1$

NB: This transition is also key in fusion plasmas, whence comes much of the appropriate theoretical machinery (see Jenko's lecture)



Critical Balance as an Ordering Assumption Hysics.





• Strong anisotropy:
$$\epsilon \sim \frac{k_{\parallel}}{k_{\perp}} \ll 1$$
 (this is the small parameter!)

- Strong nonlinearity: $\omega \sim k_{\parallel} v_A \sim k_{\perp} u_{\perp} \rightarrow$ (critical balance as an ordering assumption)
- Finite Larmor radius: $k_{\perp}\rho_i \sim 1$

$$\frac{\omega}{\Omega_i} \sim \frac{k_{\parallel} v_A}{\Omega_i} \sim \frac{k_{\perp} \rho_i}{\sqrt{\beta_i}} \epsilon$$

Low frequency

• Weak collisions: $\frac{\omega}{\nu_{ii}} \sim \frac{k_\parallel \lambda_{\rm mfp}}{\sqrt{\beta_i}} \sim 1$

GK ORDERING: $f_s = F_{0s} + \delta f_s$

$$\frac{\delta f_s}{F_{0s}}\sim \frac{\delta B}{B_0}\sim \frac{e\varphi}{T_e}\sim \frac{k_\parallel}{k_\perp}\sim \frac{\rho_i}{\lambda_{\rm mfp}}\sim \frac{\omega}{\Omega_i}\sim \epsilon$$

[Howes et al. 2006, ApJ **651**, 590 & refs. therein]



[Howes et al. 2006, ApJ **651**, 590 & refs. therein]



& refs. therein]

Gyrokinetics: Kinetics of Larmor Rings







GK Phase Mixing (Entropy Cascade)



• Gyroveraged fluctuations mix h_i via this term, so h_i developes small (perpendicular) scales in the gyrocenter space: $k_{\perp}\rho_i \gg 1$





GK Phase Mixing (Entropy Cascade)



- Gyroveraged fluctuations mix h_i via this term, so h_i developes small (perpendicular) scales in the gyrocenter space: $k_{\perp}\rho_i \gg 1$
- In this limit, free energy conservation is

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int d^3 \mathbf{R}_i d^3 \mathbf{v} \, \frac{h_i^2}{2F_{0i}} = \int d^3 \mathbf{R}_i d^3 \mathbf{v} \, \frac{h_i}{F_{0i}} \left(\frac{\partial h_i}{\partial t}\right)_c \le 0$$

This is (minus) the entropy of the perturbed distribution; it is damped only by collisions (Boltzmann!), so h_i must be phase mixed to small scales in velocity space. HOW?




GK Phase Mixing (Entropy Cascade)



- Gyroveraged fluctuations mix h_i via this term, so h_i developes small (perpendicular) scales in the gyrocenter space: $k_{\perp}\rho_i \gg 1$
- Two values of the gyroaveraged potential $\langle \varphi \rangle_{\mathbf{R}_i}(\mathbf{v})$ and $\langle \varphi \rangle_{\mathbf{R}_i}(\mathbf{v}')$ come from spatially decorrelated fluctuations if

$$\frac{v_{\perp}}{\Omega_i} - \frac{v_{\perp}'}{\Omega_i} \sim \frac{1}{k_{\perp}} \Rightarrow \frac{\delta v_{\perp}}{v_{\mathrm{th}i}} \sim \frac{1}{k_{\perp}\rho_i}$$

[This perpendicular nonlinear phase-mixing mechanism was anticipated by Dorland & Hammett 1993]



PPCF 50, 124024 (2008)



GK Phase Mixing (Entropy Cascade)



- Gyroveraged fluctuations mix h_i via this term, so h_i developes small (perpendicular) scales in the gyrocenter space: $k_{\perp}\rho_i \gg 1$
- Two values of the gyroaveraged potential $\langle \varphi \rangle_{\mathbf{R}_i}(\mathbf{v})$ and $\langle \varphi \rangle_{\mathbf{R}_i}(\mathbf{v}')$ come from spatially decorrelated fluctuations if

$$\frac{v_{\perp}}{\Omega_i} - \frac{v_{\perp}'}{\Omega_i} \sim \frac{1}{k_{\perp}} \Rightarrow \frac{\delta v_{\perp}}{v_{\text{th}i}} \sim \frac{1}{k_{\perp}\rho_i}$$

[This perpendicular nonlinear phase-mixing mechanism was anticipated by Dorland & Hammett 1993] [Tatsuno et al. 2009, *PRL* **103**, 015003]



PPCF 50, 124024 (2008)



• **G. Plunk** has developed a spectral formalism to quantify perpendicular velocity-space structure via Hankel transforms:

$$egin{aligned} \hat{h}_i(\mathbf{k},p,v_\parallel) &= 2\pi \int dv_\perp v_\perp J_0(pv_\perp) h_i(\mathbf{k},v_\perp,v_\parallel) \ & E(k,p) &= p \langle |\hat{h}_i(\mathbf{k},p)|^2
angle \end{aligned}$$
 [Plunk et a

• **T. Tatsuno** found the cascade along the (*k*, *p*) diagonal in his 2D GK DNS

[Tatsuno et al. 2009, *PRL* **103**, 015003; more detail in arXiv:1003.3933]

Plunk et al. 2009, arXiv:0904.0243]

ford

hysics.





• **G. Plunk** has developed a spectral formalism to quantify perpendicular velocity-space structure via Hankel transforms:

• **T. Tatsuno** found the cascade along the (*k*, *p*) diagonal in his 2D GK DNS

[Tatsuno et al. 2009, *PRL* **103**, 015003; more detail in arXiv:1003.3933]



ford

hysics.



• **G. Plunk** has developed a spectral formalism to quantify perpendicular velocity-space structure via Hankel transforms:

• **T. Tatsuno** found the cascade along the (*k*, *p*) diagonal in his 2D GK DNS

[Tatsuno et al. 2009, *PRL* **103**, 015003; more detail in arXiv:1003.3933]



ford

hysics.



- The cascade is now in phase space, involving both position and velocity, because entropy must get to small scales in velocity
- Kolmogorov-style constant-flux argument gives

spectrum of $h_i \sim k_{\perp}^{-4/3}$ spectrum of $\varphi \sim k_{\perp}^{-10/3}$

PPCF **50**, 124024 (2008)

• 2D GK DNS by **T. Tatsuno** confirm these scalings

[Tatsuno et al. 2009, PRL 103, 015003; more detail in arXiv:1003.3933]





- The cascade is now in phase space, involving both position and velocity, because entropy must get to small scales in velocity
- Kolmogorov-style constant-flux argument gives

spectrum of $h_i \sim k_{\perp}^{-4/3}$ spectrum of $\varphi \sim k_{\perp}^{-10/3}$

PPCF **50**, 124024 (2008)

- 2D GK DNS by **T. Tatsuno** confirm these scalings [Tatsuno et al. 2009, *PRL* **103**, 015003; more detail in arXiv:1003.3933]
- It is attractive to think of this as a universal theory of sub-Larmor turbulence and, for example, attribute to it the sub-Larmor scalings seen in 3D GK DNS of tokamak turbulence by by Görler & Jenko (2008)





- The cascade is now in phase space, involving both position and velocity, because entropy must get to small scales in velocity
- Kolmogorov-style constant-flux argument gives

spectrum of $h_i \sim k_{\perp}^{-4/3}$ spectrum of $\varphi \sim k_{\perp}^{-10/3}$

PPCF **50**, 124024 (2008)

- 2D GK DNS by **T. Tatsuno** confirm these scalings [Tatsuno et al. 2009, *PRL* **103**, 015003; more detail in arXiv:1003.3933]
- G. Plunk has developed a ful Kolmogorov-style theory for the 2D version of this turbulence, complete with third-order exact laws, direct and inverse cascades, scalings in phase space etc.
 [Plunk et al. 2010, *JFM* 664, 407]



- The cascade is now in phase space, involving both position and velocity, because entropy must get to small scales in velocity
- Kolmogorov-style constant-flux argument gives

spectrum of $h_i \sim k_{\perp}^{-4/3}$ spectrum of $\varphi \sim k_{\perp}^{-10/3}$

PPCF **50**, 124024 (2008)

- 2D GK DNS by **T. Tatsuno** confirm these scalings [Tatsuno et al. 2009, *PRL* **103**, 015003; more detail in arXiv:1003.3933]
- **G. Plunk** has developed a ful Kolmogorov-style theory for the 2D version of this turbulence, complete with **third-order exact laws**, **direct and inverse cascades**, **scalings in phase space** etc.

[Plunk et al. 2010, JFM 664, 407]

• Dissipation scale in phase space

(cf. Kolmogorov scale vs. Re)

$$\frac{\delta v_{\perp c}}{v_{\text{th}i}} \sim \frac{1}{k_{\perp c} \rho_i} \sim \text{Do}^{-3/5} \qquad \begin{array}{l} Dorland \ Number\\ \text{Do} = \frac{1}{\nu_{ii} \tau_{\rho_i}} \begin{array}{c} \text{characteristic}\\ \text{time at the ion}\\ \text{gyroscale} \end{array}$$



- The cascade is now in phase space, involving both position and velocity, because entropy must get to small scales in velocity
- Kolmogorov-style constant-flux argument gives

spectrum of $h_i \sim k_{\perp}^{-4/3}$ spectrum of $\varphi \sim k_{\perp}^{-10/3}$

PPCF **50**, 124024 (2008)

• Just last week a PRL by **E. Kawamori** came out claiming a laboratory measurement that confirms the entropy cascade:



Linear vs. Nonlinear (GK) Phase Mixing



gyroscale

Since cascade is nonlinear, mixing occurs in one turnover time (fast)

Linear vs. Nonlinear (GK) Phase Mixing hysics





Since cascade is nonlinear, mixing occurs in one turnover time (fast)



xford

"ballistic response": $h_i \propto e^{ik_{\parallel}v_{\parallel}t}$

$$rac{\delta v_\parallel}{v_{ ext{th}i}}\sim rac{1}{k_\parallel v_{ ext{th}i}t}\sim 1$$

after one turnover time if "critical balance" holds, so linear phase mixing is slow

So How Do MHD and GK Tie Together? $\Psi_{hysics.}^{xford}$



Gyrokinetics: Long-Wavelength Limit

xford

hvsics...



Gyrokinetics: Long-Wavelength Limit

xford

hvsics.





Gyrokinetics: Long-Wavelength Limit





Gyrokinetics: Larmor-Scale Transition

xford

hysics



Gyrokinetics: Larmor-Scale Transition

xford

hysics



Free Energy Cascade





Larmor Transition: 3D GK DNS (by G. Howes)







Start with GK, consider the scales such that $k_{\perp}\rho_i \gg 1$, $k_{\perp}\rho_e \ll 1$ This is not a very wide interval, but an important one:

$$\sqrt{\frac{m_i}{m_e}}\approx 42$$

(answer to the general question of life, Universe and everything)



$$\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} = v_A \left(1 + Z/\tau\right) \mathbf{\hat{b}} \cdot \nabla \Phi,$$

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = -\frac{v_A}{2 + \beta_i \left(1 + Z/\tau\right)} \mathbf{\hat{b}} \cdot \nabla \left(\rho_i^2 \nabla_{\perp}^2 \Psi\right)$$
This is the anisotropic version of EMHD
[Kingsep *et al.* 1990, *Rev. Plasma Phys.* **16**, 243],
which is derived (for $\beta_i >>1$) by assuming
magnetic field frozen into electron fluid and
doing a RMHD-style anisotropic expansion:

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t} = -\frac{c}{4\pi e n_{0e}} \nabla \times \left[(\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \times \mathbf{B} \right]$$

$$\frac{\delta n_e}{n_{0e}} = -\frac{Ze\phi}{T_{0i}} = -\frac{2}{\sqrt{\beta_i}} \frac{\Phi}{\rho_i v_A}$$
Boltzmann ions
$$\frac{\delta B_{\parallel}}{B_0} = \frac{\beta_i}{2} \left(1 + \frac{Z}{\tau} \right) \frac{Ze\phi}{T_{0i}} = \sqrt{\beta_i} \left(1 + \frac{Z}{\tau} \right) \frac{\Phi}{\rho_i v_A}$$
pressure balance

$$\frac{B_0 \delta B_{\parallel}}{4\pi} = -\delta_{p_i} - \delta_{p_e} = -T_{0i} \delta n_i - T_{0e} \delta n_e.$$

$$u_{\parallel e} = \frac{c}{4\pi e n_{0e}} \nabla_{\perp}^2 A_{\parallel} = -\frac{\rho_i \nabla_{\perp}^2 \Psi}{\sqrt{\beta_i}}$$
no parallel ion current
[Ions more or less an immobile]

neutralising background]



$$\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} = v_A \left(1 + Z/\tau \right) \mathbf{\hat{b}} \cdot \nabla \Phi,$$
$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = -\frac{v_A}{2 + \beta_i \left(1 + Z/\tau \right)} \mathbf{\hat{b}} \cdot \nabla \left(\rho_i^2 \nabla_{\perp}^2 \Psi \right)$$

Linear wave solutions:

$$\omega = \pm \sqrt{\frac{1 + Z/\tau}{2 + \beta_i \left(1 + Z/\tau\right)}} k_{\perp} \rho_i k_{\parallel} v_A$$



- Right-hand elliptically polarized
- $\delta E \sim k_{\perp} \phi \propto k_{\perp} \delta B$
- Landau-damped



$$\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} = v_A \left(1 + Z/\tau \right) \mathbf{\hat{b}} \cdot \nabla \Phi,$$
$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = -\frac{v_A}{2 + \beta_i \left(1 + Z/\tau \right)} \mathbf{\hat{b}} \cdot \nabla \left(\rho_i^2 \nabla_{\perp}^2 \Psi \right)$$

Linear wave solutions:

$$\omega = \pm \sqrt{\frac{1 + Z/\tau}{2 + \beta_i \left(1 + Z/\tau\right)}} k_{\perp} \rho_i k_{\parallel} v_A$$





$$\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} = v_A \left(1 + Z/\tau \right) \mathbf{\hat{b}} \cdot \nabla \Phi, \qquad \text{Linear wave solutions:} \\ \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = -\frac{v_A}{2 + \beta_i \left(1 + Z/\tau \right)} \mathbf{\hat{b}} \cdot \nabla \left(\rho_i^2 \nabla_{\perp}^2 \Psi \right) \qquad \omega = \pm \sqrt{\frac{1 + Z/\tau}{2 + \beta_i \left(1 + Z/\tau \right)}} k_{\perp} \rho_i k_{\parallel} v_A$$

- There is a cascade of KAW, $\delta B_{\parallel}/B_0 \sim \Phi/\rho_i v_A \sim k_{\perp} \Psi/v_A \sim \delta B_{\perp}/B_0$
- Critical balance + constant flux argument à la K41/GS95 give $k_{\perp}^{-7/3}$ spectrum of magnetic field with anisotropy $k_{\parallel} \sim k_{\perp}^{1/3}$ [Biskamp et al. 1996, PRL 76, 1264; Cho & Lazarian 2004, ApJ 615, L41]
- <u>Electric field</u> has $k_{\perp}^{-1/3}$ pectrum because $\delta E \sim k_{\perp} \phi \propto k_{\perp} \delta B$
- Recent modification of the theory by Boldyrev amends the spectrum to $k_{\perp}^{-8/3}$ by restricting cascade to 2D sheets [arXiv:1204.5809]
- NB: none of this takes into account Landau damping



1. Power law spectra all the way to electron gyroscale <u>despite</u> <u>electron Landau damping</u>





 Power law spectra all the way to electron gyroscale <u>despite</u> <u>electron Landau damping</u>
 Strong turbulence, but <u>linear</u> <u>KAW relationships between</u> <u>fluctuating fields survive</u>



 Power law spectra all the way to electron gyroscale <u>despite</u> <u>electron Landau damping</u>
 Strong turbulence, but <u>linear</u>
 KAW relationships between <u>fluctuating fields survive</u>
 <u>Ions are heated via entropy</u> <u>cascade at collisional scale,</u> even though ion Landau damping is at ion gyroscale



1. Power law spectra all the way to electron gyroscale despite electron Landau damping 2. Strong turbulence, but linear KAW relationships between fluctuating fields survive 3. <u>Ions are heated via entropy</u> cascade at collisional scale, even though ion Landau damping is at ion gyroscale 4. Magnetic spectrum ~ $|k_{\perp}^{-2.8}|$ which is steeper than KAW standard result -7/3 (perhaps closer to Boldyrev's -8/3) and in close agreement with solar wind data





1. Power law spectra all the way to electron gyroscale <u>despite</u> electron Landau damping 2. Strong turbulence, but linear KAW relationships between fluctuating fields survive 3. <u>Ions are heated via entropy</u> cascade at collisional scale, even though ion Landau damping is at ion gyroscale 4. Magnetic spectrum ~ $k_{\perp}^{-2.8}$ which is steeper than KAW standard result -7/3 (perhaps closer to Boldyrev's -8/3) and in close agreement with solar wind data





1. Power law spectra all the way to electron gyroscale despite electron Landau damping 2. Strong turbulence, but linear KAW relationships between fluctuating fields survive 3. <u>Ions are heated via entropy</u> cascade at collisional scale, even though ion Landau damping is at ion gyroscale 4. Magnetic spectrum ~ $|k_{\perp}^{-2.8}|$ which is steeper than KAW standard result -7/3 (perhaps closer to Boldyrev's -8/3) and in close agreement with solar wind data



- Kinetic turbulence is a free-energy cascade in phase space towards collisional scales
- Gyrokinetics is a good approximation for magnetised turbulence
- In gyrokinetic turbulence, a fast nonlinear perpendicular phase-mixing mechanism allows small-scale structure to emerge simulataneously in physical and velocity space ("entropy cascade")
- We still need to understand how linear (||) and nonlinear (⊥) phase mixing compete/coexist
- The free energy cascade splits into various channels: AW + compressive above ion gyroscale ("inertial range") KAW + entropy cascade below ion gyroscale ("dissipation range")
- The splitting at the ion gyroscale determines the relative heating of the two species \rightarrow energy partition
- Structure of kinetic cascades (KAW turbulence, entropy cascade, compressive cascade) is interesting in its own right (and measurable!) AAS et al. 2008, *PPCF* **50**, 124024 [arXiv:0806.1069] AAS et al. 2009, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **182**, 310 [arXiv:0704.0044]

Free Energy Cascade



