Onset of magnetic reconnection in a collisionless, high-beta plasma
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In a magnetized, collisionless plasma, the magnetic moment of the constituent particles is an adiabatic invariant. An increase in the magnetic-field strength in such a plasma thus leads to an increase in the thermal pressure perpendicular to the field lines. Above a $\beta$-dependent threshold (where $\beta$ is the ratio of thermal to magnetic pressure), this pressure anisotropy drives the mirror instability, producing strong distortions in the field lines on ion-Larmor scales. The impact of this instability on magnetic reconnection is investigated using a simple analytical model for the formation of a current sheet (CS) and the associated production of pressure anisotropy. The difficulty in maintaining an isotropic, Maxwellian particle distribution during the formation and subsequent thinning of a CS in a collisionless plasma, coupled with the low threshold for the mirror instability in a high-$\beta$ plasma, imply that the geometry of reconnecting magnetic fields can differ radically from the standard Harris-sheet profile often used in kinetic simulations of collisionless reconnection. As a result, depending on the rate of CS formation and the initial CS thickness, tearing modes whose growth rates and wavenumbers are boosted by this difference may disrupt the sheet before standard tearing modes are able to develop. A quantitative theory is developed to illustrate this process, which may find application in the tearing-mediated disruption of kinetic magnetorotational “channel” modes.

1. Introduction

Magnetic reconnection is the process by which magnetic energy is converted to plasma energy via a rapid topological rearrangement of magnetic-field lines (Zweibel & Yamada 2009; Yamada et al. 2010; Loureiro & Uzdensky 2016). It is usually preceded by a slow phase in which magnetic flux is accumulated in an increasingly thin current sheet (CS). Recently, it has been conjectured that this preparatory phase of CS formation, along with the material properties of the host plasma, determine the characteristics of the tearing modes that ultimately disrupt the sheet and thereby set the maximum aspect ratio above which CSs cannot survive (Pucci & Velli 2014; Loureiro & Uzdensky 2016; Uzdensky & Loureiro 2016; Comisso et al. 2017; Huang et al. 2017). This maximum aspect ratio is important for (at least) two reasons. First, the large aspect ratio of the Sweet–Parker CS (Parker 1957; Sweet 1958) in high-Lundquist-number plasmas, being violently unstable to the plasmoid instability (Loureiro et al. 2007; Bhattacharjee et al. 2009), may not be realizable during CS formation. Second, the maximum aspect ratio may define a disruption scale in critically balanced Alfvénic turbulence, below which the intense, sheet-like structures become tearing unstable and break up (Boldyrev & Loureiro 2017; Loureiro & Boldyrev 2017a,b; Mallet et al. 2017a,b).
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All of the work thus far on CS formation and tearing-mediated disruption was either couched within a collisional magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) framework or focused on collisionless plasmas with $\beta \lesssim 8\pi n T / B^2 \lesssim 1$ ($n$ is the plasma density, $T$ the temperature, and $B$ the magnetic-field strength). The latter restriction precludes application of those results to many dilute, weakly collisional astrophysical plasmas, whose large temperatures and relatively weak magnetic fields imply $\beta \gg 1$; e.g. $n \sim 10^{-3} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, $T \sim 10 \text{ keV}$, and $B \sim 1 \mu \text{G}$ in the hot intracluster medium (ICM) of galaxy clusters imply $\beta \sim 10^2$ (Carilli & Taylor 2002; Schekochihin & Cowley 2006). The hallmark of such plasmas is that the embedded magnetic field, while energetically subdominant, nevertheless has a strength $\gg \beta i \rho / \Omega$ tens of orders of magnitude above that required to magnetize the plasma (i.e. $\Omega_i \tau \gg 1$ and $\rho_i \ll L$, where $\Omega_i \equiv e B / m_i c$ is the ion Larmor frequency, $m_i$ is the ion mass, $\rho_i \equiv v_{\text{thi}} / \Omega_i$ is the ion Larmor radius, $v_{\text{thi}} \equiv (2T / m_i)^{1/2}$ is the ion thermal speed, and $\tau$ and $L$ are representative macroscopic time and length scales, respectively). This hierarchy of scales, particularly in weakly collisional plasmas with collision frequencies $\nu$ satisfying $\nu \tau \ll 1$, biases the plasma properties with respect to the magnetic-field direction (Braginskii 1965). Notably, the thermal pressure becomes anisotropic.

There is a relatively large body of work on the impact of pressure anisotropy on tearing modes (Chen & Davidson 1981; Coppi 1983; Chen & Palmedesso 1984; Chen & Lee 1985; Ambrosiano et al. 1986; Shi et al. 1987; Karimabadi et al. 2005; Haijima et al. 2008; Quest et al. 2010; Matteini et al. 2013; Gingell et al. 2015), as well as on the production and impact of pressure anisotropy during the reconnection process itself (Drake et al. 2006; Le et al. 2009; Schoeffler et al. 2011; Egedal et al. 2013; Cassak et al. 2015; Le et al. 2016). Here we focus instead on the pressure anisotropy adiabatically produced during the CS formation, prior to the reconnection event. Namely, as the CS thins, the magnetic-field strength in the in-flowing fluid elements increases. An increase in field strength in a weakly collisional, magnetized plasma leads, by adiabatic invariance, to an increase (decrease) in the thermal pressure perpendicular (parallel) to the field lines (Chew et al. 1956). Above an $O(1 / \beta)$ threshold, this pressure anisotropy drives the mirror instability (Barnes 1966; Hasegawa 1969; Southwood & Kivelson 1993), which produces strong distortions in the field lines and traps particles on ion-Larmor scales (Kunz et al. 2014; Riguelle et al. 2015). In what follows, we ask how the production of pressure anisotropy during CS formation and the consequent triggering of ion-Larmor-scale mirror instabilities in a $\beta \gg 1$ plasma impacts the onset of tearing-mediated reconnection.

2. Prerequisites

2.1. CS formation and pressure anisotropy

We first establish that pressure anisotropy is produced during CS formation. For that, we adopt a simple local model for CS formation based on the one-dimensional Chapman–Kendall solution (Chapman & Kendall 1963). A sheared magnetic field $B(x,t) = B_x [x/a(t)] \hat{y} + B_y \hat{z}$ is frozen into an incompressible, time-independent fluid velocity $u(x,y) = -(\hat{x} x - \hat{y} y) / 2 \tau_{cs}$, where $B_x$ and $B_y \equiv \theta B_x$ are constants describing the strengths of the reconnecting and guide components of $B$, respectively, and $\tau_{cs}$ is the characteristic CS-formation timescale. These expressions satisfy the reduced MHD equations provided that the CS half-thickness $a(t)$ and length $L(t)$ satisfy $a(t) / a_0 = L_0 / L(t) = \exp(-t / \tau_{cs})$, where the “0” subscript denotes an initial value. This model may be regarded as a Taylor expansion about the neutral line ($x = 0$) of a more complicated (e.g. Harris) CS profile, and so we restrict its validity to $|x| \lesssim a(t)$, beyond which $B$ is taken to be spatio-temporally constant. We assume $\sqrt{\rho_i \tau / a} \ll \theta \lesssim 1$ and
\( \Omega_i \tau_{cs} \gg 1 \), where \( \rho_{i,r} \) is the ion-Larmor radius computed using \( B_r \), so that the entire CS is well magnetized (even near \( x = 0 \))\(^1\).

Using these fields, it is straightforward to show that the magnetic-field strength in a fluid element starting at \( x = \xi_0 \) (with \( |\xi_0| \leq a_0 \)) and moving towards \( x = 0 \) is

\[
B(\xi(t), t) = B_r \left[ \theta^2 + \exp(t/\tau_{cs})(\xi_0/a_0)^2 \right]^{1/2}, \tag{2.1}
\]

where \( \xi(t) = \xi_0 \exp(-t/2\tau_{cs}) \) is a Lagrangian coordinate co-moving with the fluid element. This change in \( B \) drives field-aligned pressure anisotropy, \( \Delta_p = p_\perp/p_\parallel - 1 \), adiabatically in the fluid frame. Using \( \mu \) conservation in the form \( p_\perp \propto B \) and assuming \( \Delta_p(x, t = 0) = 0 \),

\[
\Delta_p(\xi(t), t) = \left[ \frac{\theta^2 + \exp(t/\tau_{cs})(\xi_0/a_0)^2}{\theta^2 + (\xi_0/a_0)^2} \right]^{1/2} - 1 \approx \frac{t}{2\tau_{cs}} \frac{(\xi_0/a_0)^2}{\theta^2 + (\xi_0/a_0)^2} \approx \frac{t}{\tau_{pa}} \tag{2.2}
\]

for \( t/\tau_{cs} \ll 1 \).\(^2\) Thus, pressure anisotropy increases in all fluid elements.

If nothing interferes with the adiabatic increase in pressure anisotropy, the plasma in a fluid element will eventually become mirror unstable when \( \Delta_p \gtrsim 1/\beta_\perp \), where

\[
\beta_\perp(\xi(t), t) = \beta_0(\xi_0) \left[ \frac{\theta^2 + (\xi_0/a_0)^2}{\theta^2 + \exp(t/\tau_{cs})(\xi_0/a_0)^2} \right]^{1/2} \approx \beta_0 \left( 1 - \frac{t}{3\tau_{pa}} \right) \tag{2.3}
\]

is the adiabatically evolving perpendicular plasma beta in the fluid frame (\( \beta_0 \) is its initial value). Comparing (2.2) and (2.3), this occurs at \( t_m \sim \tau_{pa}/\beta_0 \) for \( \beta_0 \gg 1 \). If the guide field is small compared to the local reconnecting field (\( \theta \ll \xi_0/a_0 \)), this time is a small fraction of the CS-formation time scale, \( t_m \sim \tau_{cs}/\beta_0 \), and so the CS becomes mirror-unstable early in its evolution. With a larger guide field (\( \theta \gg \xi_0/a_0 \)), \( t_m \sim \tau_{cs}(a_0^2/\xi_0^2)\theta^2/\beta_0 \). This time is also early in the CS evolution for \( \xi_0 \lesssim a_0 \), since \( \theta \ll \beta_\perp^{1/2} \) is required in this model for the plasma to reliably exceed the mirror-instability threshold.\(^3\)

These times must be compared to the characteristic time scales for tearing modes that facilitate magnetic reconnection in the forming CS. Before doing so, we review the basic properties of the mirror instability.

### 2.2. Mirror instability

As \( B \) increases, adiabatic invariance drives \( \Delta_p > 0 \), with plasma becoming mirror-unstable when \( \Lambda_m = \Delta_p - 1/\beta_\perp > 0 \). Just beyond this threshold (\( 0 < \Lambda_m \ll 1 \)), oblique modes with wavenumbers \( k_{\parallel,m}\rho_i \sim (k_{\perp,m}\rho_i)^2 \sim \Lambda_m \) and polarization \( \delta B_\parallel/\delta B_\parallel \sim \Lambda_m^{1/2} \) grow exponentially at a maximum rate \( \gamma_m \sim \Omega_i A_m^2 \) (Hellinger 2007). Once this growth rate becomes larger than the rate at which \( \Delta_p \) is produced (\( \gamma_m \tau_{pa} \gtrsim 1 \)), the growth of \( \Delta_p \) stops. This yields a maximum mirror-instability parameter, \( \Lambda_m \gtrsim (\Omega_i \tau_{pa})^{-1/2} \approx \Lambda_{m,max} \). Kinetic simulations show that, once \( \Lambda_m(t) \sim \Lambda_{m,max} \), mirrors rapidly drain \( \Lambda_m(t) \to 0^+ \)

---

\(^1\)This guarantees that any particle whose guiding center lies near \( x = 0 \) executes Larmor motion about \( B_r \) rather than a betatron orbit with turning points at \( \sim \sqrt{\rho_{i,r}a} \) (as in Dobrowolny 1968).

\(^2\)If the second adiabatic invariant, \( J_1 \), were also conserved – unlikely in a \( \beta \gg 1 \) plasma with Alfvénic, incompressible flows – the exponent 1/2 in (2.2) becomes 3/2 and \( \tau_{pa} \) changes by an inconsequential factor of 3.

\(^3\) If the asymptotic value of the reconnecting field, \( B_r \), is constant, then the maximum change of \( B \) in a fluid element is bounded, \( B(t)/B(0) < (1 + \theta^{-2})^{1/2} \), and so \( \Delta_p < (1 + \theta^{-2})^{1/2} - 1 \). Therefore, \( \theta \lesssim \beta_\perp^{1/2} \) is required to reach the mirror threshold. In other models where \( B_r \) increases in time (e.g. Tolman et al. 2018), no such limit on \( \theta \) exists.
and attain amplitudes $\delta B_\parallel /B \sim A_{m,\text{max}}^{1/2}$ (Kunz et al. 2014). This is the end of the linear stage; for $\beta_0 \gg 1$, this occurs at $t/\tau_{\text{pa}} \sim 1/\beta_0 + A_{m,\text{max}}$.

As the CS continues to thin, $\Delta_p > 0$ is continuously driven. Mirror modes then maintain marginal stability ($A_m \approx 0^+$) by growing secularly, $\delta B_\parallel \propto t^{4/3}$, and trapping an increasing fraction of particles (Schekochihin et al. 2008; Kunz et al. 2014; Rincon et al. 2015). Independent of $A_{m,\text{max}}$, saturation occurs at $t \sim \tau_{\text{pa}}$ and $\delta B/B \sim 1$, when these particles pitch-angle scatter off sharp bends in the magnetic field occurring at the mirror boundaries at a rate $\nu_m \sim \beta/\tau_{\text{pa}}$; this maintains marginal stability by severing the adiabatic link between $\Delta_p$ and changes in $B$ (Kunz et al. 2014; Riquelme et al. 2015). Thereafter, $\Delta_p \approx 1/\beta_{\perp}$, even as $B$ changes.

This evolution was found for situations in which $\tau_{\text{pa}}$ is comparable to the dynamical time in the system (e.g., linear shear flows). However, for locations $\xi_0 \ll \theta a_0$ deep inside the CS, $\tau_{\text{pa}} \gg \tau_{cs}$. In this case, local mirror growth cannot outpace CS formation, and any potential mirrors are advected and distorted faster than they can grow. When $\theta \gg 1$, $\tau_{\text{pa}} \gg \tau_{cs}$ in the entire CS. We thus focus only on cases with $\theta \lesssim 1$ and locations $\xi_0 \gtrsim \theta a_0$.

### 2.3. Collisionless tearing instability

Next we review the theory of collisionless tearing modes, applicable when the inner-layer thickness of the tearing CS, $\delta_{in} \lesssim \rho_e$. To determine under what condition this criterion is satisfied, we use standard MHD tearing theory (Furth et al. 1963) to estimate

$$\delta_{in}^{\text{MHD}} = \left[ \gamma_t (k_t v_{A,r})^{-2} a^2 \eta \right]^{1/4} = a \left[ \gamma_t \tau_{A,r} (k_t a)^{-2} S_a^{-1} \right]^{1/4},$$

where $v_{A,r} \equiv B_\parallel /\left(4\pi m_i n_i\right)^{1/2}$ is the Alfvén speed of the reconnecting field, $\tau_{A,r} \equiv a/v_{A,r}$ is the Alfvén crossing time of the CS, $\eta$ is the (collisional) resistivity, and $S_a = a v_{A,r}/\eta$ is the Lundquist number. Using an estimate for the growth rate $\gamma_t$ of the fastest-growing collisional tearing mode with wavenumber $k_t$, oriented along the CS (Furth et al. 1963; Coppi et al. 1976; Uzdensky & Loureiro 2016), the validity condition for collisionless tearing theory to hold becomes

$$S_a \gtrsim (a/\rho_e)^4.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.5)

This gives $a \lesssim 10^{-6}$ pc for the ICM parameters listed in §1, a satisfiable constraint given that $\rho_i \sim 10^{-9}$ pc and the outer scale of ICM magnetic-field fluctuations is observationally inferred to be $\sim 10$ kpc (Enßlin & Vogt 2006; Guidetti et al. 2008; Bonafede et al. 2010; Vacca et al. 2012; Govoni et al. 2017), comparable to the collisional mean free path. As long as (2.5) is satisfied (which becomes easier as $a$ shrinks), $\gamma_t$ and $k_t$ are estimated as follows.

In a $\beta \gtrsim 1$ plasma when the tearing-mode instability parameter $\Delta'(k_t)$ (Furth et al. 1963) satisfies $\Delta' \delta_{in} \sim (\Delta'd_e)^2 \ll 1$ ("FKR-like"; Karimabadi et al. 2005)),

$$\gamma_{t}^{\text{FKR}} \tau_{A,r} \sim \left( m_e / m_i \right) ^{1/2} \left( d_e / a \right) ^2 k_t a \Delta' a,$$

where $d_e$ and $d_i \equiv \rho_e / \beta_i^{1/2} = d_e (m_i / m_e)^{1/2}$ are, respectively, the electron and ion skin depths (Fitzpatrick & Porcelli 2004, 2007). (Our CS formation model leaves $d_e, d_i$ constant.) This growth rate is approximately independent of $k_t$ in a Harris sheet, for which $\Delta' a = 2(1/k_t a - k_t a) \sim (k_t a)^{-1}$ at $k_t a \ll 1$. The large-$\Delta'$ ("Coppi-like") growth rate satisfies

$$\gamma_{t}^{\text{Coppi}} \tau_{A,r} \sim \left( m_e / m_i \right) ^{1/5} \left( d_i / a \right) k_t a,$$
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independent of \( \Delta' \) (Fitzpatrick & Porcelli 2007). An estimate for \( \gamma_t \) and \( k_t \) of the fastest-growing Coppi-like mode in a Harris sheet can be obtained by balancing (2.6) and (2.7) (e.g. Uzdensky & Loureiro 2016):

\[
\gamma_{\text{Coppi},\text{max}} t_A r \sim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{d_i}{a} \right), \tag{2.8a}
\]

\[
k_{\text{Coppi},\text{max}} a \sim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{3/10} \left( \frac{d_i}{a} \right). \tag{2.8b}
\]

These modes are the fastest growing provided they fit into the length \( L \) of the CS, i.e. \( k_{\text{Coppi}} L > 1 \). Otherwise, the fastest-growing mode is FKR-like.

In what follows, we assume that pressure anisotropy does not appreciably modify these growth rates. This is because saturated mirrors maintain \( \Delta_p \approx 1/\beta_\perp \ll 1 \), and so the resulting viscous stress effectively enhances the magnetic tension responsible for driving the tearing by a factor of only \( \approx 3/2 \). Other works that postulate an initial \( \Delta_p \) (customarily taken to be uniform and thus non-zero even at \( x = 0 \)) do not consider its rapid regulation by the mirror instability prior to the onset of tearing, and the enhanced \( \gamma_t \) often found in linear calculations when \( \Delta_p > 0 \) is largely because the assumption \( B_g = 0 \) permits axis-crossing particle orbits in the inner regions of the CS and allows threshold-less instabilities such as the Weibel instability (e.g. Chen & Palmadesso 1984).

3. Reconnection onset when \( \Delta_p = 0 \)

Before determining how mirror-unstable pressure anisotropy affects a gradually forming CS, we recapitulate the theory of CS disruption by tearing modes (Pucci & Velli 2014; Loureiro & Uzdensky 2016; Uzdensky & Loureiro 2016; Comisso et al. 2017), specialized to the case of collisionless tearing in a high-\( \beta \) plasma. That is, we ignore the production of pressure anisotropy during CS formation and instead determine when \( L/a \) has increased enough for tearing modes to prompt reconnection.

As the CS’s aspect ratio \( L/a \) increases in time, modes with progressively larger mode number \( N \approx k_t(t)L(t) = \text{const} \) become unstable and undergo linear evolution with \( \gamma_t(N, t) \) increasing (see figure 1). Uzdensky & Loureiro (2016) argued that the first tearing mode \( N \) to reach the end of its linear stage at the critical time \( t_{\text{cr}}(N) \) (when \( \gamma_t \tau_{\text{cs}} \gtrsim 1 \), neglecting logarithmic corrections (Comisso et al. 2017)) will also be the first to undergo X-point collapse (defined by when the island width \( w \sim 1/\Delta' \)) and, soon thereafter, disrupt the CS (\( w \sim a \)). We adopt this argument and estimate the CS disruption time \( t_{\text{disrupt}} \) for a collisionless Harris sheet with \( L(t)a(t) = \text{const} \). (The same procedure can be used to investigate alternative CS profiles and evolution.) Note that, for the Harris-sheet

---

\(^4\) Fitzpatrick & Porcelli (2004, 2007) obtained (2.6) and (2.7) using a two-fluid model assuming cold ions and that the compressional Alfvén wave propagates much faster than any other wave in the system (as it would in a high-\( \beta \) plasma), thus guaranteeing pressure balance along field lines and nearly incompressible flow. The former (small-\( \Delta' \)) growth rate agrees with the corresponding kinetic expression in Drake & Lee (1977a, their equation (16)) up to a factor of \( 1/\sqrt{1 + \beta_g} \), which is \( \sim 1 \) given those authors’ assumption of small \( \beta \) and large guide field. Both results assumed a Maxwellian background. Alternatively, Chen & Palmadesso (1984) allowed for a spatially uniform \( \Delta_p \neq 0 \) in their linear kinetic tearing calculation, but assumed \( B_g = 0 \) and thus obtained different scalings after accounting for axis-crossing particle orbits (see also Chen & Lee (1985) and Quest et al. (2010)). While we have opted to use the Fitzpatrick & Porcelli (2004, 2007) expressions for \( \gamma_t \), our analysis can be generalized for any alternative scalings without a significant change in the main qualitative conclusions summarized in §5.
Figure 1. Qualitative plot of tearing growth rate $\gamma_t$ vs. mode number $N$ (see (2.6) and (2.7)) shortly after mirror production at $k_{t,\text{max}} a > 1$. Arrows indicate evolution as the CS aspect ratio $(L/a)$ increases, with $\gamma_t$ approaching $\tau_{cs}^{-1}$ (red dashed line), $k_t$ approaching the large-$\Delta'$ ("Coppi-like") regime ($k_t \lesssim k_{\text{Coppi}, \text{max}}$), and mirrors affecting an increasing number of tearing modes (those with $k_t \gtrsim k_{y,m}$).

profile, $\gamma_{\text{Coppi}, \text{max}} \approx \gamma_{\text{FKR}}$ for $k_t a \ll 1$ (see (2.6) and (2.8a)), so the only difference between these modes are their wavenumbers and, thus, their $\Delta' \sim 1/k_t a^2$.

Each unstable mode $N$ starts in the small-$\Delta'$ "FKR-like" regime ($N > N_{\text{Coppi}}(t)$), with $\gamma_t$ roughly independent of $k_t$ for $k_t a \ll 1$. However, because $N_{\text{max}} \propto (L/a)(d_i/a) \propto a^{-3}$ increases in time, these FKR-like modes approach the Coppi regime, making the transition at $t = t_{tr}(N)$ when

$$a(t_{tr}(N)) \sim \left(m_e/m_i\right)^{1/10} \left(L_0 d_i/a_0^2\right)^{1/3} N^{-1/3}. \quad (3.1)$$

Larger $N$ corresponds to larger $t_{tr}(N)$, and so the first mode to make this transition is $N = 1$; i.e. at $t = t_{tr}(1)$, the fastest Coppi-like mode (see (2.8b)) just fits inside the CS. All modes satisfying $k_{\text{Coppi}, \text{max}} a \gtrsim k_t a \ll 1$ obtain growth rates $\gamma_t \tau_{cs} \gtrsim 1$ at roughly the same time, $t = t_{cr}$, when (using (2.8a))

$$a(t_{cr}) \lesssim \left(m_e/m_i\right)^{1/6} \left(d_i/a_0\right)^{2/3} M_{A,0}^{-1/3}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $M_{A,0} \equiv \tau_{A,r}(t = 0)/\tau_{cs}$ is the initial Alfvénic Mach number of the CS formation. These modes have

$$L(t_{cr})/a(t_{cr}) \gg N \gg N_{cr} \equiv \left(m_e/m_i\right)^{-1/5} \left(L_0/d_i\right) M_{A,0}. \quad (3.3)$$

This is an important distinction from the collisional MHD case (Uzdensky & Loureiro 2016), in which larger $N > N_{cr}$ corresponds to larger $t_{cr}(N)$ (since $\gamma_{t,\text{FKR}} \propto k_t^{-2/5}$ at $k_t a \ll 1$ instead of $k_t^0$).

Another important distinction from the MHD case lies in the nonlinear evolution, during which the MHD FKR modes behave differently than the MHD Coppi modes. While the latter are expected to rapidly evolve towards X-point collapse soon after $t = t_{cr}$ due to their large $\Delta'$, the former undergo secular “Rutherford” evolution that increases $\Delta'(k_N)w_N$ for a given mode $N$ until $w_N \sim 1/\Delta'$ (Rutherford 1973; Waelbroeck 1989, 1993; Loureiro et al. 2005; Arcis et al. 2009). However, in the collisionless case, the “FKR-like” modes reach $\gamma_t \tau_{cs} \sim 1$ at the same time as the fastest “Coppi-like” mode. If the latter is accessible, then the fastest-growing mode $N_{\text{Coppi}}$ already has $\Delta'd_e \sim 1$
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Figure 2. Qualitative illustration of magnetic-field lines in an evolving, mirror-infested Harris CS with $\theta \ll 1$.

at $t_{\text{cr}}(N_{\text{max}}^{\text{Coppi}})$ and so X-point collapse likely occurs soon after (3.2) is satisfied. The CS is then said to be “disrupted” at $t_{\text{disrupt}} \sim t_{\text{cr}}(N_{\text{max}}^{\text{Coppi}})$. For there to be no Coppi-like modes when (3.2) is satisfied (i.e. $N_{\text{cr}} < 1$), $M_{A,0} \lesssim (m_e/m_i)^{1/5}(d_i/L_0)$, a rather stringent condition that is difficult to satisfy when $\beta_0 \gg 1$ and $\rho_i/L_0 \ll 1$. That being said, given the uncertainties in the nonlinear evolution of both FKR- and Coppi-like collisionless tearing modes in a high-$\beta$, magnetized plasma – in particular, regarding the production of pressure anisotropy during X-point collapse – we focus primarily on the critical time (when $\gamma_t \tau_{\text{cs}} \gtrsim 1$) rather than the disruption time (when $w \sim a$).

4. Reconnection onset when $\Delta_p \neq 0$

We now consider the effects of mirrors on an evolving CS subject to tearing modes. Because different portions of the CS have different $\rho_i$ and $\tau_{\text{pa}}$, there will be a range of mirror wavenumbers, $k_{y,m}(x)$, along the CS (see figure 2).

The smallest $k_{y,m}$ will be located the nearest to $x = 0$ where mirrors can form, since these regions have the largest values of $\rho_i$ and $\tau_{\text{pa}}$. We argue that, since tearing modes with wavenumbers $k_t$ much smaller than this $k_{y,m}^{\text{min}}$ will see a rapidly $y$-varying magnetic field that averages to its unperturbed value, these modes are likely unaffected by the mirrors (or at least less affected than other modes). The largest $k_{y,m}$ will be located near $|x| \sim a$, where $\rho_i$ and $\tau_{\text{pa}}$ are at their smallest values. All tearing modes with $k_t \gg k_{y,m}^{\text{max}}$ will see an approximately uniform-in-$y$ magnetic field, but will have their $\Delta'(k_t)$ enhanced by the mirrors’ effect on the $x$-variation of the CS profile. If the CS is able to stretch to the point where $k_{y,m}^{\text{max}} \lesssim k_{t,\text{max}}^{\text{Coppi}}$ before the onset of tearing, then all of the modes that are unaffected by the mirrors will have smaller growth rates and thus be unimportant.

---

Another reason for prudence is Drake & Lee’s (1977b) argument that single-mode tearing with a guide field saturates via trapped-electron effects with an amplitude comparable to the inner-layer thickness, $w \sim \delta_{in}$. This argument was confirmed, and refined by incorporating finite-Larmor-radius effects, by Karimabadi et al. (2005).
for CS reconnection. The condition \( k_{y,m}^{\text{max}} \lesssim k_{t,\text{max}}^{\text{Coppi}} \) is thus a sufficient (but not necessary) condition for mirrors to matter.

We now follow the evolution of \( k_{y,m}^{\text{max}} \) as the CS evolves, and then investigate the evolution of tearing modes with \( k_t \gg k_{y,m}^{\text{max}} \). We treat two cases, depending upon the size of the guide field and thus the component of the mirrors’ wavevector along the CS at \( |x| \sim a \),

\[
k_{y,m} \sim k_{||,m} B_t/B + k_{\perp,m} B_g/B = k_{||,m} B_t/B \left( 1 + \theta \frac{k_{\perp,m}}{k_{||,m}} \right), \tag{4.1}
\]

With \( k_{\perp,m}/k_{||,m} \sim \Lambda_{m,\text{max}}^{-1/2} \) for the fastest-growing mirror mode, we have \( k_{y,m} \sim k_{||,m} \) for \( \theta \ll \Lambda_{m,\text{max}}^{1/2} \) and \( k_{y,m} \sim \theta k_{\perp,m} \) for \( \Lambda_{m,\text{max}}^{1/2} \ll \theta \lesssim 1 \). (In both cases, \( \Lambda_{m,\text{max}} \sim (d_i/a_0)^{1/2} M_{\Lambda,0}^{1/2} \).

### 4.1. When mirrors affect tearing if \( \theta \ll \Lambda_{m,\text{max}}^{1/2} \)

At \( x \sim a \), the local reconnecting field is near its asymptotic value and \( \tau_{\text{pa}} \sim \tau_{\text{cs}} \). Starting at time \( t_m \sim t_{\text{cs}}/\beta_0 \ll \tau_{\text{cs}} \), unstable mirror modes grow rapidly at this location (\( a \) and \( \tau_{\Lambda,r} \) hardly change from their initial values in a time \( t_m \).) Unless tearing modes disrupt the CS within \( t_{\text{disrupt}} \lesssim \tau_{\text{cs}} \) — which is extremely unlikely, requiring \( (3.2) \) to be satisfied within \( \tau_{\text{cs}} \) — these mirrors will saturate with \( \delta B \sim B_t \) and

\[
k_{y,m}^{\text{max}}(t) \rho_i \sim \frac{L_0}{L(t)} (\Omega t \tau_{\text{cs}})^{-1/2} \sim \frac{a(t)}{a_0} \left( \frac{d_i}{a_0} \right)^{1/2} M_{\Lambda,0}^{1/2}, \tag{4.2}
\]

where we have accounted for the Lagrangian stretching of the perturbations during CS formation.

To determine the effect of these mirrors on tearing, it is useful to first establish when \( k_{y,m}^{\text{max}}(t) \) enters the large-\( \Delta' \) regime in which \( \gamma_t \propto k \) (the leftmost portion of figure 1), i.e., when the mirrors influence the fastest-growing tearing modes. Combining \( (2.8b) \) and \( (4.2) \), we find that \( a(t) \) must satisfy

\[
\frac{a(t)}{d_i} \lesssim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{1/10} \left( \frac{d_i}{a_0} \right)^{-1/2} \beta_0^{1/6} M_{\Lambda,0}^{-1/6} \tag{4.3}
\]

for \( k_{y,m}^{\text{max}}(t) \lesssim k_{t,\text{max}}^{\text{Coppi}}(t) \). Equation \( (4.3) \) happens before the sheet would be disrupted in the absence of mirrors (see \( (3.2) \)) if

\[
\frac{a_0}{d_i} \gtrsim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{2/5} \beta_0^{-1} M_{\Lambda,0}^{-1}, \tag{4.4}
\]

which is easily satisfied under the conditions of interest. Thus, there will be a time at which all tearing modes with \( k_t \gtrsim k_{t,\text{max}}^{\text{Coppi}} \) are affected by mirrors. How the tearing progresses after \( (4.3) \) is satisfied will be discussed once the corresponding conditions for the other \( \theta \)-regime are derived.

### 4.2. When mirrors affect tearing if \( \Lambda_{m,\text{max}}^{1/2} \ll \theta \lesssim 1 \)

As \( B_g \) is increased, things will continue in much the same way as in §4.1 except that the initial \( k_{y,m}^{\text{max}} \sim \theta k_{\perp,m} \). That is, equation \( (4.2) \) is replaced by

\[
k_{y,m}^{\text{max}}(t) \rho_i \sim \frac{L_0}{L(t)} \theta (\Omega t \tau_{\text{cs}})^{-1/4} \sim \frac{a(t)}{a_0} \left( \frac{d_i}{a_0} \right)^{1/4} \theta M_{\Lambda,0}^{1/4}, \tag{4.5}
\]
This means that the condition on \( a(t) \) that \( k_{y,m}^{\text{max}}(t) \gtrsim k_{t,\text{max}}^{\text{Coppi}}(t) \) (cf. (4.3)) becomes

\[
a(t) \gtrsim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{1/10} \left( \frac{d_i}{a_0} \right)^{-5/12} \theta^{-1/3} \beta_0^{1/6} M_A^{-1/12}. \tag{4.6}
\]

If the initial state satisfies

\[
a_0 \gtrsim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{4/5} \theta \beta_0^{-2} M_A^{-3}, \tag{4.7}
\]

then (4.6) occurs before (3.2), when the sheet would be disrupted without the mirrors (cf. (4.4)).

4.3. Mirror-stimulated onset of reconnection

If either (4.4) or (4.7) is satisfied, then mirrors influence all tearing modes before they could otherwise disrupt the CS in the absence of mirrors. We now quantify that influence, focusing on those tearing modes with \( k_t \gg k_{y,m}^{\text{max}} \) (see (4.2) and (4.5)). As argued previously, these modes see a magnetic field that is roughly uniform in \( y \) but is rapidly varying in \( x \) due to the mirrors, with an initial \( k_{x,m} \sim k_{t,\text{max}} \) that is then compressed by the CS formation with \( k_{x,m}(t) a(t) \sim \text{const} \). This rapid variation enhances \( \gamma_t(k_t) \) for these modes due to the smaller effective sheet thickness (estimated below), which affects both \( \Delta'(k_t) \) and the Alfvén-crossing time \( \tau_{A,r} \) (see (2.6) and (2.7)).

4.3.1. Model for a mirror-infested CS

We argue that \( \tau_{A,r} \) changes by a small amount, since mirrors modify \( dB_y/dx|_{x=0} \) by only a factor of order unity. To determine how \( \Delta'(k) \) is modified, we adopt the following simple model for the magnetic-field profile of a mirror-infested Harris CS:

\[
B_y(x) = B_r \tanh \left( \frac{x}{a} \right) \left[ 1 + \varepsilon \sin \left( 2k_{x,m} a \text{sech} \left( \frac{x}{a} \right) \right) \right], \tag{4.8}
\]

where \( k_{x,m} \gg a^{-1} \) is a parameter characterizing the peak \( k_{x,m} \) occurring at the edge of the CS. This is a WKB approximation describing saturated mirrors with amplitude \( \varepsilon \sim O(1) \) times the local reconnecting field and wavenumber in the \( x \)-direction given by

\[
k_x(x) = 2k_{x,m} \text{sech}(x/a) \tanh(x/a).
\]

This model was chosen because \( k_x(x = 0) = 0 \), \( k_x(x \to \infty) \to 0 \), and \( k_x(x) \) is maximal near the edge of the CS, as anticipated. (What follows is not particularly sensitive to this choice of \( k_x(x) \).)

The resulting \( \Delta'(k_t) \) is obtained by numerically integrating the outer differential equation for the flux function, \( \psi \) (Furth et al. 1963):

\[
\frac{d^2\psi}{dx^2} - \left( k^2 + \frac{B_y''}{B_y} \right) \psi = 0, \tag{4.9}
\]

with \( B_y(x) \) given by (4.8). Then \( \Delta' = d \ln \psi/dx|_{x=0} \) for the solution that obeys reasonable boundary conditions; an example result is shown in figure 3(a). (Its shape does not change significantly as \( \varepsilon \) and \( k_{x,m} \) vary.) Generally, \( \Delta' > 0 \) for \( k_t \) smaller than the inverse of the effective sheet thickness, \( a_{\text{eff}} \), which we identify with the location \( x_m \) of the peak in \( B_y(x) \) closest to \( x = 0 \) (i.e. the location of the innermost mirror). As \( k_t \) decreases from this value, \( \Delta'(k_t) \) rises sharply to saturate at \( k_t = k_{\text{sat}} \) with value \( \Delta'_{\text{sat}} \sim 1/a_{\text{eff}} \sim 1/x_m \), at which it is approximately constant until it nears the Harris-sheet \( \Delta'(k_t) \sim 1/k_t a^2 \), which it then follows.

The corresponding \( \gamma_t(k_t) \) shown in figure 3(b) depends on whether or not \( \Delta'_{\text{sat}} d_e \ll 1 \). However, the maximum growth rate always occurs at \( k_{\text{sat}} \sim 1/x_m \), because of the \( k_t \)-
Figure 3. (a) $\Delta'(k_t)$ and (b) $\gamma_t(k_t)$ for a Harris CS (red dashed line) and its mirror-infested counterpart (blue solid line), using $k_{\text{max}}a = 200\pi$ and $\varepsilon = 1/2$ in Eq. (4.8). $\Delta'$ rises rapidly at $k_t x_m \lesssim 1$ and plateaus for $k_{\text{sat}} \gtrsim k_t \gtrsim 1/(\Delta'_{\text{sat}}d_e)$. Mirror-stimulated tearing thus peaks at $k_t \sim k_{\text{sat}}$, regardless of whether $\Delta'_{\text{sat}}d_e \ll 1$ (blue solid line) or $\Delta'_{\text{sat}}d_e \gtrsim 1$ (orange dotted line).

dependence of (2.6) and (2.7). Thus, to determine the new $t_{\text{cr}}$, we must calculate $x_m$. This yields two cases based on the size of $\theta$.

4.3.2. Mirror-stimulated tearing for $\theta \ll x_m/a$

When the reconnecting field is the dominant field on the scale of the innermost mirrors, the total ion-cyclotron frequency is $\Omega_i \sim (x_m/a)\Omega_{i,r}$ and $\tau_{pa} \sim \tau_{cs}$. The $x$-wavenumber of the mirrors at that location is then

$$k_{x,m}(t, x_m(t))\rho_{i,r} \sim \left(\frac{x_m}{a(t)}\right)^{3/4} \left(\frac{d_i}{a_0}\right)^{1/4} \frac{a_0}{a(t)} M_{A,0}^{1/4}, \quad (4.10)$$

where we have accounted for the Lagrangian compression due to CS formation. The innermost mirror is located at $x_m \sim k_{x,m}^{-1}$, an $x$-wavelength away from the center. Substituting this into (4.10) yields

$$\frac{x_m}{a(t)} \sim \left(\frac{d_i}{a_0}\right)^{3/7} \beta_t^{2/7} M_{A,0}^{-1/7}. \quad (4.11)$$

For this estimate to be self-consistent, we require $\theta \ll x_m/a$ or, using (4.11),

$$\theta \ll \left(\frac{d_i}{a_0}\right)^{3/7} \beta_t^{2/7} M_{A,0}^{-1/7}. \quad (4.12)$$

Provided this is satisfied, the fastest-growing tearing mode, having $\gamma_t(k_{\text{sat}})$, is either FKR-like, if $d_e/x_m \ll 1$, or Coppi-like, if $d_e/x_m \gtrsim 1$.

In the former case, the maximum tearing growth rate is (using (2.6) with $k_t \sim 1/x_m$...
and $\Delta' \sim 1/x_m$)

$$\gamma_{t_{\text{m}} \text{FKR}} \tau_{A,r} \sim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{d_i}{\theta a_0} \right)^2 \beta_r^{-4/7} M_{A,0}^{2/7}. \tag{4.13}$$

The critical time $t_{\text{cr}}^{\text{FKR}}$ occurs when $\gamma_{t_{\text{m}} \text{FKR}} \tau_{cs} \sim 1$, or

$$\frac{a(t_{\text{cr}}^{\text{FKR}})}{a_0} \lesssim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{1/6} \left( \frac{d_i}{a_0} \right)^{8/21} \beta_r^{-4/7} M_{A,0}^{-5/21}. \tag{4.14}$$

In the latter (Coppi-like) case, which happens when

$$\frac{a(t_{\text{cr}}^{\text{Coppi}})}{a_0} \lesssim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{1/5} \beta_r^{-2/7} M_{A,0}^{1/7}, \tag{4.15}$$

the maximum growth rate is

$$\gamma_{t_{\text{m}} \text{Coppi}} \tau_{A,r} \sim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{1/5} \beta_r^{-2/7} M_{A,0}^{1/7} \left( \frac{d_i}{a_0} \right)^{3/7} a_0, \tag{4.16}$$

and so the critical time $t_{\text{cr}}^{\text{Coppi}}$ occurs when $\gamma_{t_{\text{m}} \text{Coppi}} \tau_{cs} \sim 1$, or

$$\frac{a(t_{\text{cr}}^{\text{Coppi}})}{a_0} \lesssim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{1/10} \left( \frac{d_i}{a_0} \right)^{2/7} \beta_r^{-1/7} M_{A,0}^{-3/7}. \tag{4.17}$$

Since we are considering situations where the smallest parameter in the problem is likely $d_i/a_0$ (though this is by no means necessary), the CS will go unstable to mirror-stimulated FKR-like modes before the fastest-growing mode enters the large-$\Delta'$ regime. In this case, the critical CS thickness, $a_{\text{cr}}$, is given by (4.14). Comparing this to the expression for $a_{\text{cr}}$ when pressure anisotropy is not considered, equation (3.2), we see that mirrors increase $a_{\text{cr}}$ by a factor of $\sim (d_i/a_0)^{-2/7} \beta_r^{-4/7} M_{A,0}^{2/21}$.

### 4.3.3. Mirror-stimulated tearing for $\theta \sim x_m/a$

If (4.12) is not satisfied, then the innermost mirror does not reach the center of the CS (i.e. $k_{x_m x_m} \gg 1$). Instead, the mirrors closest to the center with growth rate comparable to $\tau_{cs}^{-1}$ are most important, i.e. those located at $x_m \sim \theta a$ (see (2.2)). Then the scaling laws in the previous section are modified; equations (4.13)–(4.17) become, respectively,

$$\gamma_{t_{\text{m}} \text{FKR}} \tau_{A,r} \sim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{d_i}{\theta a_0} \right)^2, \tag{4.18}$$

$$\frac{a(t_{\text{cr}}^{\text{FKR}})}{a_0} \lesssim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{1/6} \left( \frac{d_i}{\theta a_0} \right)^{2/3} M_{A,0}^{-1/3}, \tag{4.19}$$

$$\frac{a(t_{\text{cr}})}{a_0} \lesssim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{d_i}{\theta a_0} \right), \tag{4.20}$$

$$\gamma_{t_{\text{m}} \text{Coppi}} \tau_{A,r} \sim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{1/5} \left( \frac{d_i}{\theta a_0} \right), \tag{4.21}$$

$$\frac{a(t_{\text{cr}}^{\text{Coppi}})}{a_0} \lesssim \left( \frac{m_e}{m_i} \right)^{1/10} \left( \frac{d_i}{\theta a_0} \right)^{1/2}. \tag{4.22}$$

Comparing (4.19) and (4.20), we see that, if $d_i/(\theta a_0) \ll 1$, tearing will onset before the fastest-growing mode can enter the large-$\Delta'$ regime; therefore, $a_{\text{cr}}$ is given by (4.19). In
this case, $\alpha_{cr}$ is increased by a factor of $\theta^{-2/3}$ over the value derived without consideration of the mirrors, (3.2). Therefore, tearing will onset much sooner if $\theta \ll 1$, whereas $t_{cr}$ is largely unaffected if $\theta \sim 1$.

5. Discussion

While the specific quantitative model of CS evolution and mirror-stimulated tearing formulated herein is perhaps debatable, it nevertheless demonstrates an important, qualitative point: a gradually forming CS in a high-$\beta$, collisionless plasma easily produces enough pressure anisotropy to trigger the mirror instability, and the effect of this instability on the magnetic-field-line topology, and thus the tearing modes that instigate CS disruption via reconnection, ought to be considered. For reasonable parameters, our theory predicts that the onset of reconnection in an evolving CS, driven by mirror-stimulated tearing modes, likely occurs earlier and at smaller scales than it would have without the mirrors, thereby placing a tighter upper limit on the aspect ratio of any forming CS (e.g. compare (4.14) and (4.19) for the critical CS thickness at which mirror-stimulated tearing onsets to their $\Delta_p = 0$ counterpart, equation (3.2)). Whether or not these mirror-stimulated tearing modes ultimately grow to amplitudes $w \sim a_{\text{eff}}$, and perhaps beyond to $\sim a$ via island coalescence, awaits further work.

An immediate practical implication of this result is that numerical simulations of collisionless reconnection in high-$\beta$ plasmas should not initialize with a Maxwellian plasma embedded in an equilibrium CS. Instead, the CS should be allowed to evolve, and the particle distribution function self-consistently with it. A natural testing ground for this theory is the kinetic magnetorotational instability (MRI) (Quataert et al. 2002; Heinemann & Quataert 2014), thought to be the main driver of turbulence and enhanced transport in collisionless accretion flows, such as that onto the supermassive black hole at the Galactic center (Sharma et al. 2006). Historically, the linear MRI, at least in its MHD guise (Balbus & Hawley 1991), was quickly shown to be a nonlinear “channel” solution in a differentially rotating disk (Goodman & Xu 1994), and various studies followed that employed Kelvin-Helmholtz and tearing “parasitic” modes to disrupt the otherwise resilient channels. In some theories, this disruption is credited for setting the steady-state level of magnetorotational turbulence as a function of the dissipative properties of the underlying magnetized fluid (e.g. Pessah & Goodman 2009). Given that the kinetic MRI both linearly and nonlinearly drives pressure anisotropy (Squire et al. 2017), it is worthwhile to contemplate a similar sequence of events, in which the kinetic MRI breaks down due to tearing modes stimulated by ion-Larmor-scale mirrors. Kinetic simulations of the MRI (e.g. Riquelme et al. 2012; Hoshino 2013, 2015; Kunz et al. 2016; Inchingolo et al. 2018) may already be capable of testing this idea.
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