Dreicer Electric Field Definition and Runaway Electrons in Solar Flares (Postprint)

Authors: Yu. T. Tsap, A. V. Stepanov and Yu. G. Kopylova

Date: 2024-02-28T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

We analyze electron acceleration by a large-scale electric field E in a collisional hydrogen plasma under the solar flare coronal conditions based on approaches proposed by Dreicer and Spitzer for the dynamic friction force of electrons. The Dreicer electric field EDr is determined as a critical electric field at which the entire electron population runs away. Two regimes of strong (E EDr) and weak (E EDr) electric fields are discussed. It is shown that the commonly used formal definition of the Dreicer field leads to an overestimation of its value by about five times. The critical velocity at which the electrons of the "tail" of the Maxwell distribution become runaway under the action of the sub-Dreiser electric fields turns out to be underestimated by times in some works because the Coulomb collisions between runaway and thermal electrons are not taken into account. The electron acceleration by sub-Dreicer electric fields generated in the solar corona faces difficulties.

Full Text

Preamble

Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 24:025015 (5pp), 2024 February

https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-4527/ad1bd5

Dreicer Electric Field Definition and Runaway Electrons in Solar Flares

Yu. T. Tsap[1], A. V. Stepanov[2], and Yu. G. Kopylova[2]

[1] Crimean Astrophysical Observatory of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Nauchny, 298409, Russia; yuratsap2001@gmail.com

[2] Pulkovo Observatory of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Pulkovskoje Shosse, 65/1, St. Petersburg, 196140, Russia

Received 2023 November 16; revised 2023 December 30; accepted 2024 January 4; published 2024 January 31

Abstract

We analyze electron acceleration by a large-scale electric field E in a collisional hydrogen plasma under the solar flare coronal conditions based on approaches proposed by Dreicer and Spitzer for the dynamic friction force of electrons. The Dreicer electric field E_{Dr} is determined as a critical electric field at which the entire electron population runs away. Two regimes of strong ($E \gtrsim E_{Dr}$) and weak ($E = E_{Dr}$) electric field are discussed. It is shown that the commonly used formal definition of the Dreicer field leads to an overestimation of its value by about five times. The critical velocity at which the electrons of the "tail" of the Maxwell distribution become runaway under the action of the sub-Dreiser electric fields turns out to be underestimated by 3 times in some works because the Coulomb collisions between runaway and thermal electrons are not taken into account. The electron acceleration by sub-Dreicer electric fields generated in the solar corona faces difficulties.

Key words: acceleration of particles –Sun: flares –Physical Data and Processes

1. Introduction

Solar flares are a conversion process of free magnetic energy to kinetic and thermal energy. Moreover, they are a major particle accelerator in the solar system (Reames 2015). Almost all electrons contained in flare coronal loops should be accelerated (Miller et al. 1997). This suggests that a very effective electron acceleration mechanism should be implemented during the flare energy release, for example, associated with the large-scale electric field generation (Zaitsev et al. 2016; Fleishman et al. 2022).

In a fully ionized plasma, the collisional friction force is inversely proportional to the square of the electron velocity v if it exceeds the most probable thermal velocity v_{Te} (see, e.g., Trubnikov 1965). As a result, a strong electric field acceleration force can overcome the collisional damping, accelerating high energy (runaway) electrons to relativistic speeds. The Dreicer electric field is the fundamental concept of this phenomenon (Dreicer 1958, 1959; Harrison 1960, Trubnikov 1965, Gurevich & Dimant 1978; Knoepfel & Spong 1979; Kaastra 1983; Benz 2002; Aschwanden 2004; Bellan 2006; Zhdanov et al. 2007; Fleishman & Toptygin 2013; Marshall & Bellan 2019).

According to the generally accepted definition, the Dreicer electric field E_{Dr} (or Dreicer field) is a critical electric field at which electrons in a collisional plasma with $v \approx v_{Te}$ can be accelerated, i.e., the entire electron population runs away (e.g., Holman 1985). The field E_{Dr} was named after Harry Dreicer who derived the corresponding expression for the critical electric field in 1958 (Dreicer 1958, 1959).

For the first time, the idea of runaway electrons was outlined by the Nobel Prize laureate Wilson (Wilson 1924) to explain thunderbolts in the Earth’ s atmosphere and was further developed by Gurevich (e.g., Gurevich & Zybin 2001). Gurevich’ s theory was applied by Tsap et al. (2022) (see also Tsap et al. 2020) in relation to the acceleration of electrons in the lower solar atmosphere during flares. However, the origin of strong electric fields was not considered.

The mechanism for ion runaway is different from electron runaway (e.g., Gibson 1959; Gurevich 1961; Furth & Rutherford 1972; Holman 1995; Fleishman & Toptygin 2013). The positive test charge experiences two opposite forces: acceleration due to E, and friction with the moving electrons. If the test charge has the same charge as the bulk ions, these two forces must be equal and opposite when the electric field $E < E_{Dr}$. However, if the ionic charge Z differs from the charge of bulk ions Z_b, the forces scale differently with Z: electric field acceleration scales as Z, while friction on the drifting electrons scales as Z^2. Therefore, for $Z > Z_b$, the dominant force on the test charge will be electron friction, and the charge will be dragged to high energies as its velocity equilibrates with the electron mean flow. For $Z < Z_b$, friction becomes unimportant, so the test charge accelerates along E. Note that the total drag force on an ion does not monotonically fall off below v_{Te}, but has a minimum and in a multispecies plasma “partial runaway” can occur. As to the solar flares, Holman (1995) has shown that the ions will be freely accelerated to energies greater than \$ \$1 MeV only if they are able to overcome the electron drag or if the entire electron population is freely accelerated, i.e., the electric field exceeds the Dreicer field.

Despite the concept of the Dreicer electric field being quite essential physics, there are common inconsistencies in the formulae for the Dreicer field across different works. In particular, the electric field can differ by a factor of 4.7 (e.g., Aschwanden 2004, Equation (11.3.2); Bellan 2006, Equation (13.85)). Therefore, this issue requires a more detailed analysis.

The purpose of this work is to clarify the reason for the existing inconsistencies and to discuss the consequences of the results in light of the electron accelerations in solar flares.

2. Dynamic Friction Force and Dreicer Electric Field

Let us consider two regimes in the motion of electrons under the action of an electric field. In the limit of the strong field regime ($E \gtrsim E_{Dr}$), the encounters between alike particles do not contribute to dynamical friction. In the weak field regime ($E = E_{Dr}$), as distinguished from the previous case, acceleration of runaway electrons is possible only in the “tail” of the Maxwellian distribution function, and we take into account the Coulomb collisions of accelerated electrons not only with thermal ions but also with thermal electrons of the background plasma.

2.1. Strong Field Regime

Following Dreicer (Dreicer 1958, 1959) (see also Trubnikov 1965) for the Maxwellian distribution function of electrons at the initial moment of time and ion (proton) gas with zero temperature, neglecting the interaction between alike particles and using the standard notation, the solution of the Boltzmann equation can be represented as the displaced Maxwellian distribution function. Here the average electron velocity $v(t)$ is the solution of an equation of motion which includes the effects of collisions and has the form shown in Equations (3) and (4), where the Chandrasekhar function $G(x)$ and the critical electric field E_c are defined. Note that Dreicer (Dreicer 1958, 1959) used the function $\Psi(x) = 2G(x)$ instead of $G(x)$.

It should be stressed that the electric field E_c (Norman & Smith 1978; Holman 1985; de Jager 1986; Benz 2002, Equation (9.2.6); Aschwanden 2004, Equation (11.3.2); Tsap & Kopylova 2017) or $E_c/2$ (Kuijpers et al. 1981; Moghaddam-Taaheri & Goertz 1990) is called the Dreicer electric field E_D in the papers devoted to the electron acceleration in solar flares.

Meanwhile, the Chandrasekhar function $G(x)$ reaches its maximum at $x \approx 1$ ($v \approx v_{Te}$) and $G(1) \approx 0.214$ (see, e.g., Trubnikov 1965). As a result, the condition for the acceleration of runaway electrons with $v \approx v_{Te}$, in view of Equations (3) and (4), takes the form shown in Equation (5) (see also Dreicer 1958, 1959; Trubnikov 1965; Golant et al. 1977, Equation (7.174); Bellan 2006, Equation (13.85)), where $\alpha = 0.214$ and the Debye radius is defined as usual. The inequality $E > E_{Dr}$ can be considered as a condition for runaway acceleration when all electrons accelerate to high energy.

It is interesting to note that sometimes for the definition of the Dreicer electric field, kinetic effects connected with the velocity distribution functions of charged particles are not taken into account and the thermal electron velocity $\bar{v}$, instead of the most probable one v_{Te}, is used (e.g., Holman 1985; Tsap & Kopylova 2017). In this case, $\bar{v}/v_{Te} = 0.71$ and the Chandrasekhar function $G(0.71) \approx 0.198$ (Spitzer 1962). Since $G(1) > G(0.71)$, the acceleration of the entire electron population is formally impossible in this case because, according to Equation (3), the braking force $F = eEG(x)$ reaches its maximum at $x \approx 1$.

Thus, if we proceed from the definition that the Dreicer electric field E_{Dr} is the minimum electric field E_{min} at which all electrons undergo free acceleration, then $E_{Dr} = E_{min}$. This approach seems to be more justified than the approach based on $E_D = E_c$ and agrees with the definition of the Dreicer electric field E_{Dr} proposed in Bellan (2006, Equation 13.85); Zhdanov et al. (2007, Equation 1.107); Marshall & Bellan (2019). The commonly used formal Dreicer electric field is given in Holman (1985); Benz (2002, Equation (9.2.7)); Aschwanden (2004, Equation (11.3.2)), and it turns out to be approximately 4.7 times greater than the Dreicer electric field E_{Dr} because, according to Equations (5) and (6), the ratio $E_{Dr}/E_D \approx \alpha$.

The obtained difference is partially caused by different approaches which are used for the dynamic friction force calculation. For example, according to Spitzer (Spitzer 1962), the dynamic friction force for the electron flux (test particle) caused by the Coulomb collisions with Maxwellian thermal protons is given by Equation (7) (Harrison 1960; Spitzer 1962, Equation (5.15); Knoepfel & Spong 1979), where M is the mass of a proton.

Assuming $M \gg m$ and using Equation (7), we have the friction force expression, which differs from the Dreicer approach. Note that from Equations (6)-(8) with $v = v_{Te}$ $(x = 1)$, we find the "Dreicer electric field" expression that agrees with the appropriate expressions in Kuijpers et al. (1981); Moghaddam-Taaheri & Goertz (1990).

It should be stressed that Spitzer (1962) did not take into consideration the velocity distribution of electrons exposed to an external electric field. In spite of this, the formulae for dynamic friction forces obtained with Spitzer' s and Dreicer' s approaches coincide at $x = v/v_{Te} \gg 1$, because Equations (3), (4) and (8) give consistent results. In fact, in accordance with Equation (7), the friction force F_{ep} reaches its maximum value when the electron velocity v is comparable to the thermal proton velocity. Since $M \gg m$, we can conclude that Spitzer' s approach does not work for slow ($v \lesssim v_{Te}$) electrons in the strong field regime (see also Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper], Holman 1995).

2.2. Weak Field Regime

In the general case, Spitzer (1962) has shown that the total dynamic friction force for the electron flux with the same initial velocity due to the Coulomb collisions with thermal electrons and protons of a Maxwellian hydrogen fully ionized plasma is given by Equation (10) (Harrison 1960; Spitzer 1962, Equation (5.15); Knoepfel & Spong 1979), where the first term on the right-hand side of Equation (10) corresponds to the friction force caused by electron-electron collisions F_{ee}.

Then it follows from Equation (10) that at $x \gg 1$ we have the approximation shown in Equation (11) (Golant et al. 1977, Section 7.11). This allows us to find the critical velocity v_{cr} for runaway electrons based on the equality between the electric and the dynamic friction force, which has the form shown in Equation (12). Consequently, using Equation (11), we get the expression for v_{cr} that agrees well with the appropriate expression in Golant et al. (1977, Equation (7.176)). After that, in view of Equations (6) and (12), we find the relationship between the critical velocity and the Dreicer field.

It should be stressed that according to Knoepfel & Spong (1979), the square of the critical velocity is given by Equation (14). Comparing Equations (13) and (14), it is easy to conclude that the critical velocity in Knoepfel & Spong (1979) was underestimated by a factor of 3 because the authors did not take into account collisions between runaway and thermal electrons, as distinguished from our approach and that of Golant et al. (1977).

A small difference between values of v_{cr} and v_c can be very important for estimating the number of runaway electrons in the "tail" of the Maxwellian distribution function. Indeed, as follows from Kaplan & Tsytovich (1972, Equation (9.10); Holman 1985), the ratio of the accelerated electrons to their total number is given by Equation (15). Then, from Equation (15) we derive Equation (16). Supposing $v_{cr} = 3v_{Te}$, we find from Equation (16) $n_{cr}/n_c \approx 2.5 \times 10^{-3}$ because the total friction force F_S is greater than F_{ep}. Therefore, the difference in the number of runaway electrons can reach orders of magnitude in spite of the small difference between values of v_{cr} and v_c. This means that the electron acceleration in solar flare coronal loops by sub-Dreicer electric fields faces difficulties (for details see Tsap et al. 2022).

3. Discussion and Conclusion

We have shown that the definitions of the Dreicer electric field differ in diverse works. This is partly explained by different approaches proposed by Dreicer (1958, 1959) and Spitzer (1962). In particular, Dreicer considered the interaction between electrons with the displaced Maxwellian distribution and an ion gas at zero temperature, while Spitzer investigated the evolution of the electron flux with the same initial velocity in the Maxwellian plasma. These approaches complement each other, but Equation (5) for the Dreicer electric field E_{Dr} seems to be the most adequate because the distortion of the distribution function of electrons under the action of an electric field is taken into account in this case. Note that some authors are restricted to the approximation of pair collisions and do not take into account the kinetic effects connected with the velocity distribution of charged particles (e.g., Tsap & Kopylova 2017).

The energy of runaway electrons can be essentially different because of different definitions of the Dreicer electric field. This may be quite an important point for electron acceleration in solar flares. The Dreicer electric field can be considered as a rough estimate of the peak electric field in the coronal collisional plasma. This suggests that the maximum energy of a runaway electron W_m under the action of electric field is $W_m = eEL$, where L is the characteristic length of a coronal loop. Therefore, using Equation (5), we find the relationship between energy and loop length. Assuming $W = 100$ keV, $n_e = 10^8 - 10^{10}$ cm^{-3}, $T = 3\times10^6 - 10^7$ K, from Equation (17) we get $L = 2.5\times10^9 - 6.7\times10^{11}$ cm. Since the characteristic length of flare coronal loops $L = 3 \times 10^9$ cm (Stepanov & Zaitsev 2018) and $n_{cr}/n_c = 1$ (see Equation (16)), the obtained estimates suggest that the electron acceleration by sub-Dreicer electric fields seems unlikely in solar flares (see also Fleishman & Toptygin 2013).

However, we did not take into account the possible important role of the electron acceleration by the induced electric field for the betatron mechanism (Tsap & Melnikov 2023). The essential increase of the Dreicer electric field can be caused by the ion-neutral collisions (Stepanov & Zaitsev 2018) and the interaction of accelerated electrons with turbulent pulsations (Kaplan & Tsytovich 1972). Note that some details on the electron acceleration by the super-Dreicer field

($E > E_{Dr}$) are discussed in Fleishman & Toptygin (2013).

We used a quite rough approach for the estimates of the number of accelerated electrons in the "tail" of the Maxwellian distribution function and did not take into consideration the Joule dissipation and plasma heating. This should lead to a reduction of the Dreicer field E_{Dr} due to a temperature increase and, hence, runaway electrons should also be increased. Besides, runaway electrons can be generated due to collisions between runaways and thermal electrons. Such collisions might be infrequent, but if they do occur, there is a high chance that after the collision both electrons will have a velocity greater than the critical momentum. This amplification of the runaway electron population is called the avalanche mechanism (Smith & Verwichte 2008). In addition, for relativistic runaway the friction attains a minimum value, i.e., the friction force increases for electrons with velocities $v \approx c$ (see, e.g., Gurevich & Zybin 2001), and additional physical effects such as radiation losses become important.

These issues need further detailed investigations.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the anonymous referee for valuable remarks. The study was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research and the Czech Science Foundation (project No. 20-52-26006, Tsap Yu.T.) and the Russian Science Foundation (project No. 22-12-00308, Stepanov A.V. and Tsap Yu.T.).

ORCID iDs

Yu. T. Tsap https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5074-7514

A. V. Stepanov https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7498-1724

Yu. G. Kopylova https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2301-1146

References

Aschwanden, M. J. 2004, Physics of the Solar Corona: An Introduction (Berlin: Springer)

Bellan, P. M. 2006, Fundamentals of Plasma Physics (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press)

Benz, A. O. 2002, in Plasma Astrophysics. Kinetic Processes in Solar and Stellar Coronae, ed. A. Benz (2nd ed.; Dordrecht: Kluwer)

de Jager, C. 1986, SSRv, 44, 43

Dreicer, H. 1958, in Proc. Second Int. Conf., 31 on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy (Geneva: United Nations), 57

Dreicer, H. 1959, PhRv, 115, 238

Fleishman, G. D., Nita, G. M., Chen, B., Yu, S., & Gary, D. E. 2022, Natur, 606, 674

Fleishman, G. D., & Toptygin, I. N. 2013, Cosmic Electrodynamics: Electrodynamics and Magnetic Hydrodynamics of Cosmic Plasmas (New York: Springer), 388

Furth, H. P., & Rutherford, P. H. 1972, PhRvL, 28, 545

Gibson, A. 1959, Natur, 1, 101

Golant, V. E., Zhilinskii, A. P., & Sakharov, S. A. 1977, Osnovy fiziki plazmy (Foundations of Plasma Physics), (Atomizdat, Moskva), in Russian (New York: Wiley)

Gurevich, A. V. 1961, JETP, 13, 1282

Gurevich, A. V., & Dimant, Ya. S. 1978, NucFu, 18, 629

Gurevich, A. V., & Zybin, K. P. 2001, PhyU, 44, 1119

Harrison, E. R. 1960, J. Nucl. Eng. Part C:, 1, 105

Holman, G. D. 1985, ApJ, 293, 584

Holman, G. D. 1995, ApJ, 452, 451

Kaastra, J. S. 1983, JPlPh, 29, 287

Kaplan, S. A., & Tsytovich, V. N. 1972, Plasma Astrophysics (Nauka, Moskva) (Oxford: Pergamon Press)

Knoepfel, H., & Spong, D. A. 1979, NucFu, 19, 785

Kuijpers, J., van der Post, P., & Slottje, C. 1981, A&A, 103, 331

Marshall, R. S., & Bellan, P. M. 2019, PhPl, 26, 042102

Miller, J. A., Cargill, P. J., Emslie, A. G., et al. 1997, JGRA, 102, 14631

Moghaddam-Taaheri, E., & Goertz, C. K. 1990, ApJ, 352, 361

Norman, C. A., & Smith, R. A. 1978, A&A, 68, 145

Reames, D. V. 2015, SSRv, 194, 303

Smith, H. M., & Verwichte, E. 2008, PhPl, 15, 072502

Spitzer, L. 1962, Physics of Fully Ionized Gases (New York: Interscience Publishers)

Stepanov, A. V., & Zaitsev, V. V. 2018, Magnetospheres of Active Regions of the Sun and Stars (Moskva: Publishing House Fizmatlit)

Trubnikov, B. A. 1965, in Reviews of Plasma Physics, ed. M. A. Leontovich (New York: Consultants Bureau), 105, University of Maryland, USA

Tsap, Yu., Stepanov, A., & Kopylova, Yu. 2022, OAst, 30, 216

Tsap, Yu. T., & Kopylova, Yu. G. 2017, Ge&Ae, 57, 996

Tsap, Yu. T., & Melnikov, V. F. 2023, AstL, 49, 200

Tsap, Yu. T., Stepanov, A. V., & Kopylova, Yu. G. 2020, Ge&Ae, 59, 789

Wilson, C. T. R. 1924, PPSL, 37, 32D

Zaitsev, V. V., Kronshtadtov, P. V., & Stepanov, A. V. 2016, SoPh, 291

Zhdanov, S. K., Kurnaev, V. A., Romanovsky, M. K., & Tsvetkov, I. V. 2007, Osnovy fizicheskih processov v plazme i plazmennyh ustanovkah (Fundamentals of physical processes in plasma and plasma installations), (MEPhI, Moskva), in Russian

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv —Machine translation. Verify with original.