LAWRENCE
LIVERMORE
NATIONAL
LABORATORY

LLNL-CONF-404028

Assessing Risk of Plasma-Wave Trapping Nonlinearities in Stimulated Raman Scattering

D. J. Strozzi, E. A. Williams, H. A. Rose, A. B. Langdon, D. E. Hinkel

May 20, 2008

38th Anomalous Absorption Conference
Williamsbirg, VA, United States
June 1, 2008 through June 6, 2008

Disclaimer

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

Assessing risk of plasma-wave trapping nonlinearities in stimulated Raman scattering

David J. Strozzi[1], Ed A. Williams[1], Harvey A. Rose[2], A. Bruce Langdon[1], Denise E. Hinkel[1]

[1]A/X Division, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
[2]Los Alamos National Laboratory

Talk 23
4 June 2008
38th Anomalous Absorption Conference
Williamsburg, VA USA

Work supported by LLNL LDRD project 08-ERD-017.

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

P. O. Box 808, Livermore, CA 94551

This work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344

LLNL-CONF-404028

Electron trapping nonlinearities in SRS have attracted significant attention in recent years

Electron trapping nonlinearities:

- inflation[1-2].
- frequency shift[3-5].
- modulational instability[6].
- Langmuir-wave self-focusing[7-8].





Trapping is effective only if electrons resonant w/ plasma wave complete ~ one bounce orbit before being detrapped.

Detrapping processes:

- Speckle sideloss, endloss (geometric effects).
- Collisions: both electron-electron and electron-ion treated together.
- SSD (temporal decorrelation).

[1]H. X. Vu, D. F. DuBois, and B. Bezzerides; PRL **86**, 4306 (2001); [2]D.S. Montgomery et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 155001 (2001);
[3]G. J. Morales and T. M. O'Neil, PRL 28, 417 (1972); [4]D. Bénisti, D. J. Strozzi, L. Gremillet, PoP **15**, 030701 (2008);
[5]J.L. Kline et al., PRL **94**, 175003 (2005); [6]S. Brunner and E. J. Valeo, PRL **93**,145003 (2004); [7]L. Yin, B. J. Albright, et al., PRL **99**, 265004 (2007);
8 H. A. Rose and L. Yin, PoP 15, 042311 (2008)

Bounce number = number of bounce orbits resonant electrons complete before being detrapped

Bounce number[1]: $$N_B \equiv \frac{\tau_{de}}{\tau_B}$$

bounce orbits a resonant e- completes before it's detrapped.

Bounce period: $$\tau_B \equiv \frac{2\pi}{\omega_{pe}} \delta N^{-1/2}$$

$$\delta N \equiv \delta n / n_e$$

Total detrapping time:

$$\tau_{de} \equiv 1/\nu_{de}$$

$$\nu_{de} \equiv \sum_i \nu_i$$

Sum rates for each detrapping process: probability e- detrapped in time dt = sum of prob. detrapped by each process

Bounce number for one detrapping process: $$N_{Bi} \equiv \frac{1}{\tau_B \nu_i}$$

$$N_B^{-1} = \sum_i N_{Bi}^{-1}$$

bounce numbers add in reciprocal; dominated by fastest detrapping process

[1]D. J. Strozzi, E. A. Williams, A. B. Langdon, and A. Bers; Phys. Plasmas **14**, 013104 (2007).

Detrapping due to speckle sideloss, and perhaps collisions, can be approximately modeled in 1D by a Krook operator

Krook operator:

$$\partial_t f = \nu_K(\delta N) \cdot \left[n\hat{f}_0 - f \right]$$

$\hat{f}_0 =$ normalized Maxwellian

- e-folding decay time for a feature in f is $\tau_e = 1/\nu_K$.
- For collisional loss, effective ν_K depends on wave amplitude δN.

τ_e = detrapping time $\longrightarrow$ $N_B = \dfrac{\tau_e(\delta N)}{\tau_B}$

Trapping threshold for "NIF inner SRS" parameters from 1D Vlasov simulations with ELVIS code

$$\partial_t f = \nu_K \cdot \left[n\hat{f}_0 - f \right]$$ **Krook operator**

- "NIF inner SRS" parameters: $n_e/n_c = 0.115$, $T_e = 2.1$ keV; $k_{epw}\lambda_D = 0.275$.
- Backscattered seed: $I_1/I_0 = 10^{-6}$; bandwidth $0.04\omega_p$.
- Focusing factor: FWHM = $181\lambda_0$ (= $5F^2\lambda_0$ for F=6).

No Krook: Trapping threshold: speckle endloss



Absolute instability threshold: $I_{ab} = 2\cdot10^{15}$ W/cm^2

With Krook; $I_0=10^{15}$ W/cm^2



Time-dependent reflectivites and bounce numbers for "NIF inner SRS" parameters: N_B = 1 is a decent estimate for inflation



Detrapping due to speckle sideloss

- Speckle diameter L ≈ Fλ_0; lifetime of resonant e- w/ transverse speed v_e:

$$\tau_{sl} \approx L / v_e$$

- Kinetic calculations by Ed Williams [prior talk] shows the time for 1/e of the particles with a given longitudinal velocity to leave a cylinder of diameter L is:

2D: τ_{e2} = 0.88 L/v_e 3D: τ_{e3} = 0.48 L/v_e ← we use this below

- Rose 3D calculations show, 50% reduction in transit-time damping for $\tau_{e3,tt} \approx L/v_e$.
- NIF example: F=8, λ_0=351 nm, τ_{e3}= 0.10 ps / $T_{e,kV}^{1/2}$

- Using τ_{e3} and L = Fλ_0:

$$N_B = \frac{\tau_{e3}}{\tau_B} = \left[\frac{\delta N}{\delta N_{sl}}\right]^{1/2} \qquad \delta N_{sl} \equiv 1.33 \cdot 10^{-4} \left[\frac{8}{F}\right]^2 \frac{n_c}{n_e} T_{e,kV}$$

Calculation of nonlinear transit-time damping in finite speckle by Rose give $N_B \approx 1$ for significant damping reduction

Transit time damping decreases faster in 2D than 3D



Transit time damping depends weakly on $k\lambda_D$



$$\frac{\nu_L(\phi)}{\nu_L(\phi=0)} \approx G\left(\frac{\omega_b}{\nu_{\text{side loss}}}\right)$$

$$\nu_{\text{side loss}} \sim v_e/(\text{Langmuir wave scale length})$$

Electron-electron and electron-ion collisions provide a threshold, which we compute in a unified way

- Collision operator:

$$\partial_t f = \nu_{ei}\partial_\mu\left[(1-\mu^2)\partial_\mu f\right] + 2\nu_{ee}\frac{v_T^{\,3}}{v^2}\partial_v\left[f + \frac{v_T^{\,2}}{v}\partial_v f\right]$$

$$\nu_{ee} = \frac{1}{8\pi n_e \lambda_{De}^{\,3}}\left[\frac{v_T}{v}\right]^3 \ln\Lambda_{ee} \qquad \nu_{ei} = \nu_{ee}\hat{Z} \qquad \hat{Z} \equiv 1 + \sum_{i=\text{ions}} Z_i^{\,2}\frac{n_i}{n_e}\frac{\ln\Lambda_{ei}}{\ln\Lambda_{ee}}$$

- Ed Williams analysis [prior talk]: time for half e- to escape:

$$\nu_{ei}(v = v_T)t_{1/2} = \left(k\lambda_D\right)^{-2} G\left[v_p / v_T, \hat{Z}\right]\cdot \delta N$$

- Detrapping rate (= e-fold time):

$$\tau_{coll} = \frac{t_{1/2}}{\ln 2}$$

- Bounce number:

$$N_{B,coll} = \frac{\tau_{coll}}{\tau_B} = \left[\frac{\delta N}{\delta N_{coll}}\right]^{3/2} \qquad \delta N_{coll} \equiv \left[2\pi \ln 2 \frac{\nu_{ei}(v = v_T)}{\omega_p}\frac{(k\lambda_D)^2}{G}\right]^{2/3}$$

Rose collisions analysis: e-e collisions weakly modify the transit-time (Landau) damping rate

e-e collisions

$$\frac{\dfrac{d(KE)}{dt}}{\text{Transit time damping}} \propto \frac{\nu_{\text{coll}} \times \phi^{3/2}\,\nu_{\text{Landau}}}{\nu_{\text{Landau}}\phi^{2}} \propto \frac{\nu_{\text{coll}}}{\sqrt{\phi}} \propto \frac{\nu_{\text{coll}}}{\omega_p} F \frac{\lambda_0}{\lambda_D}$$

Distribution for BGK mode, used to calculate heating rate



At strong trapping onset



When e-e heating rate ~ transit-time damping rate, e-e heating matters when trapping has reduced t-t damping rate by 50% (rough inflation criterion).

SSD imposes a very low threshold due to temporal decorrelation of pump field, will not affect trapping

$$N_{B,ssd} \equiv \frac{\tau_{ssd}}{\tau_B} = \left[\frac{\delta N}{\delta N_{ssd}}\right]^{1/2} \qquad \delta N_{ssd} \equiv \frac{n_c}{n_e}\left[\frac{\Delta\lambda_{\mathrm{red}}}{\lambda_{\mathrm{red}}}\right]^2$$

λ_{red} = 1054 nm

$$\tau_{ssd} \equiv \tau_{\mathrm{blue}} \frac{\lambda_{\mathrm{red}}}{\Delta\lambda_{\mathrm{red}}}$$

Approximate intensity auto-correlation time, in blue (3ω).

= 6.2 ps for $\Delta\lambda_{red}$ = 2 Ang.

SSD threshold for $\Delta\lambda_{red}$ = 2 Ang.



Much lower than thresholds due to sideloss or collisions.

Trapping threshold for sideloss usually dominant, but collisions can be larger in high-Z material



NIF design "test24": Rev 3, T_{rad} = 300 eV, CH ablator, at 15.5 ns (peak power)



pF3D run: srs matching: n_e=0.105n_c, T_e=5.2 keV -> $k\lambda_D$=0.44

gold "bubble" due to outer beam

Design by D. Callahan (LLNL)

"test24" (300 eV, CH ablator): collisions matter for threshold in high-Z material

δN_{joint} (sideloss+collisions)



$\delta N_{joint} / \delta N_{sideloss}$:
sideloss within 2x of joint threshold



pF3D backscatter simulation on 50° cone of "test24" design: full beam path length and







pF3D run "tg50t24_l01"

pF3D 50° cone run: bounce number well below threshold of ~ 1; trapping seems to not be a concern



But there may be brief times when intense speckles do inflate.

Summary and other talks

- **N_B bounce number:** ≈1 for trapping nonlinearity in SRS Langmuir waves.
  - Includes speckle sideloss and collisions.

- **Speckle sideloss:** typically the dominant detrapping mechanism, but collisions can matter in high-Z plasmas.

- **SSD:** too slow to affect trapping for Langmuir-wave amplitudes $\delta n/n_e > 10^{-6}$.

- **NIF:** Rev 3, T_{rad} = 300 eV, CH ablator, outer (50°) beam:
  - Trapping threshold: Langmuir wave $\delta n/n_e > 5 \cdot 10^{-3}$.
  - pF3D simulations give amplitudes generally far below this; very few points having bounce numbers above 0.5.

- **Inner beam:** under investigation; SRS generally more active than on outer beam.

Other related SRS presentations:

• Dodd: poster Tues. night
• Everything this session: Langdon, Yin, Williams, Vu
• Fahlen, Winjum posters