Fast collisional electron heating and relaxation in thin foils driven by a circularly polarized ultraintense short-pulse laser
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We investigate collisionally induced energy absorption of an ultraintense and ultrashort laser pulse in a solid copper target using particle-in-cell simulations. We find that, upon irradiation by a $2 \times 10^{20}$ W cm$^{-2}$ intensity, 60 fs duration, circularly polarized laser pulse, the electrons in the collisional simulation rapidly reach a well-thermalized distribution with $\approx 3.5$ keV temperature, while in the collisionless simulation the absorption is several orders of magnitude weaker. Circular polarization inhibits the generation of suprathermal electrons, while ensuring efficient bulk heating through inverse Bremsstrahlung, a mechanism usually overlooked at relativistic laser intensity. An additional simulation, taking account of both collisional and field ionization, yields similar results: the bulk electrons are heated to $\approx 2.5$ keV, but with a somewhat lower degree of thermalization than in the pre-set, fixed-ionization case. The collisional absorption mechanism is found to be robust against variations in the laser parameters. At fixed laser pulse energy, increasing the pulse duration rather than the intensity leads to a higher electron temperature. The creation of well-thermalized, hot and dense plasmas is attractive for warm dense matter studies.

1. Introduction

The creation of warm dense matter (WDM) or hot dense matter (HDM) in a laboratory setting is of high interest for a broad field of research disciplines such as laboratory astrophysics (Remington 2005; Bailey et al. 2007; Fujioka et al. 2009), studies of planetary interiors (Ross 1981; Knudson et al. 2008), inertial confinement fusion (Le Pape et al. 2018; Drake 2018), understanding the equations of state under such extreme conditions (Renaudin et al. 2003; Nettelmann et al. 2008) and experimental verification of high energy density (HED) atomic physics models (Hoarty et al. 2013b; Faussurier & Blancard 2019). However, in order to benchmark atomic physics models against spectroscopic data, these must be obtained under well-controlled conditions. Since most such models assume Maxwellian plasma populations, this means that, when diagnosed, the heated samples should be as close to thermal equilibrium as possible.

The generation of WDM/HDM at uniform near-solid density requires that the sample be heated rapidly, i.e. before any significant hydrodynamic expansion. Such isochoric heating can be achieved using ultrahigh-intensity, short-pulse lasers, as has been done at various high-power systems (Evans et al. 2005; Gregori et al. 2005; Martinolli et al. 2006;
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Chen et al. 2007; Nilson et al. 2009; Pérez et al. 2010; Brown et al. 2011; Hoarty et al. 2013a). These experiments were conducted using laser pulses with 0.3–10 ps duration and pulse energies in the range of 10–500 J, but there is a need for a wider access at lower-energy table-top facilities, typically delivering joule-level, femtosecond laser pulses. Promising results in this direction have recently been obtained by Purvis et al. (2013) and Bargsten et al. (2017) making use of nano-wire arrays to strongly enhance the laser-to-plasma coupling efficiency, thus creating keV-temperature, sub-solid plasmas. Yet, such structured targets are nontrivial to manufacture and are extremely sensitive to parasitic laser prepulses, which can destroy the nano-structures before the main pulse arrives.

Most laser-based isochoric heating experiments conducted so far have exploited the fast electrons driven by a linearly polarized laser pulse (Nilson et al. 2010; Santos et al. 2017; Sawada et al. 2019). Their energy dissipation through the plasma bulk enables heating to high temperatures (0.1–1 keV) at solid-range plasma densities, but usually at the expense of poor spatial uniformity (Dervieux et al. 2015) and relatively slow thermalization. Plasma heating in this case is caused by the interaction of the fast electrons with the bulk plasma via a combination of direct collisions (Robinson et al. 2014), Ohmic dissipation of the slower return current (Lovelace & Sudan 1971; Guillory & Benford 1972; Bell & Kingham 2003; Robinson et al. 2014) or plasma waves driven by the fast electrons (Sherlock et al. 2014; Kemp & Divol 2016). Some experiments have been done with laser-accelerated ions to heat a secondary target (Patel et al. 2003; Dyer et al. 2008; Mančić et al. 2010). Yet, while this heating method can provide better spatial uniformity, it leads to much lower (∼10 eV) temperatures.

At normal laser incidence and linear polarization (LP), and for sharp-gradient, highly overdense plasmas, the most commonly invoked mechanisms of laser energy conversion into fast electrons are j×B heating (Krue & Estabrook 1985) and vacuum heating (Bauer & Mulser 2007; May et al. 2011). Both mechanisms hinge on the temporal modulation of the laser ponderomotive force around the target surface, and thus lead to periodic injection of MeV-range electrons bunches into the target at twice the laser frequency. Such suprathermal electrons thermalize relatively slowly (∼ps), which may hinder those applications requiring a closely Maxwellian dense plasma.

By contrast, laser pulses with circular polarization (CP), for which the ponderomotive force does not show high-frequency oscillations, the j×B and vacuum heating mechanisms are essentially suppressed in overdense targets, and so is the fast electron bunch production. Still, some fast electrons can be produced with CP if the variation time scale of the laser envelope is not large compared to the laser cycle (Siminos et al. 2012, 2017).

In this paper, we study the effects that collisions have on the energy absorption capability of the electrons in a thin, solid foil of a high-atomic-number element. Due to the high atomic number, it is not clear a priori what degree of ionization ($Z^*$) the ions have throughout the process and what influence the ionization history has on heating. While a high $Z^*$ is desirable for the collisional heating process, the initially cold target will not be highly ionized in the beginning. Therefore, we have studied both different degrees of fixed ionization as well as the self-consistent ionization process including both field and impact ionization.

We demonstrate that electron heating via inverse bremsstrahlung in the surface layer of the plasma is the dominant laser-energy absorption mechanism. The front-layer electrons are collisionally scattered into the target body where they heat the plasma bulk. The scattered electrons have energies low enough that they primarily heat the bulk via direct collisional thermalization. Comparison of the collisional mean free path and the electromagnetic skin depth and the recorded absorption scalings indicate that the heating mechanism in our simulations cannot be explained by normal or anomalous skin effects as
Fast electron heating and thermalization with CP laser described by Rozmus & Tikhonchuk (1990). Since this mechanism relies on the scattering of the electrons accelerated by the laser field against the heavy ions, it is operative regardless the polarization. Inside the plasma, where the laser field is negligible, collisions cause fast relaxation of the electron distribution to a Maxwellian.

2. Simulation design

We have performed one-dimensional (1-D) particle-in-cell (PIC) simulations of laser–solid interactions with and without collisions enabled. We have used the Smilei PIC code (Derouillat et al. 2018), which has a relativistic binary collision module (Pérez et al. 2012) based on the collisional algorithm by Nanbu (1997) and Nanbu & Yonemura (1998). In the case of a collisional plasma, we have considered either a fixed degree of ionization or self-consistent modelling of the ionization process – through field ionization and collisional impact ionization.

We performed 1-D simulations in a box of size $20 \mu m$ with a resolution of $\Delta x = 0.39 \text{ nm}$ (51200 cells). We considered both LP and CP laser pulses with wavelength 800 nm, dimensionless amplitude $a_0 = 10$ (intensity $I = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_0 (m_e c \omega a_0 / e)^2 \approx 2 \times 10^{20} \text{ W cm}^{-2}$, where $\varepsilon_0$ is the vacuum permittivity, $m_e$ the electron mass, $e$ elementary charge and $\omega$ the laser frequency), and a Gaussian temporal profile with $t_{\text{FWHM}} = 60 \text{ fs}$ full-width-at-half-maximum (FWHM) duration in the intensity. The plasma is 2.5 $\mu m$ thick, starting at $x = 7.5 \mu m$ with a linear density ramp over a distance of 20 nm. The plasma consists of electrons and copper ions at solid density, $n_{\text{Cu},0} = 48.4 n_c \approx 8.4 \times 10^{22} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, with 400 macro-particles per cell for each species. Here, $n_c = \varepsilon_0 m_e \omega^2 / e^2$ is the critical density associated with the laser frequency $\omega$. The particles are initialized from Maxwellian distributions with temperatures $T_{e,0} = 1 \text{ eV}$ for the electrons and $T_{i,0} = 0.1 \text{ eV}$ for the ions.

In order to assess the influence of the plasma collisionality alone, we have first carried out simulations with fixed ionization degrees $Z^* = 11, 19, 24$ and 27. Then, to ascertain the physical accuracy of these results, we have performed simulations describing both collisional and field ionization. The collisionless skin depth $l_s = c / [\omega (n_e/n_c)^{1/2}]$ is resolved, even for the highest ionization where $l_s(Z^* = 27) \approx 3.5 \text{ nm}$. The values of $Z^* = 11, 19$ and 27 correspond to full depletion of different electronic shells, $Z^* = 27$ being the reference ionization used in other scans. An additional data point, $Z^* = 24$ was chosen as an arbitrary value between 19 and 27. When modelling the ionization process self-consistently, the ions were initialized with $Z_{0}^* = 5$, in accordance with the widely used Thomas-Fermi model (More 1983). Both field-tunnelling and electron–ion impact ionization were enabled. The self-consistent ionization simulation was performed using CP only.

3. Results and discussion

Figure 1 compares the electron energy spectra as obtained at CP and LP ($Z^* = 27$), with or without collisions enabled, and at CP with self-consistent ionization. The spectra are recorded at two successive times ($t = 150 \text{ fs}$ and $t = 500 \text{ fs}$) – for reference, the peak laser intensity hits the target at $t \approx 110 \text{ fs}$ and the pulse FWHM duration is 60 fs. For both polarizations, much higher electron energies are achieved when allowing for collisions. The collisionally enhanced absorption results in a bulk electron temperature of $T_e \approx 3.5 \text{ keV}$ for both LP and CP, determined by fitting a Maxwellian curve to the bulk spectra (ignoring the tails). Meanwhile, the collisionless simulations only reach an electron temperature of $\sim 10\text{--}100 \text{ eV}$; these electrons are, however, far from being thermalized and...
only their energetic tails are visible in the figure. The fact that both CP and LP reach very similar bulk electron temperatures when collisions are enabled indicates that the laser absorption mechanism is the same in both cases.

When activating self-consistent ionization, the bulk electron temperature is slightly reduced (∼2.5 keV) compared to the fixed-ionization case. The front plasma is rapidly ionized, mostly through field ionization, so that collisional absorption quickly reaches an efficiency similar to that obtained with fixed \( Z^* = 27 \) (see figure 2b showing that the average ionization \( \langle Z^* \rangle \approx 24 \) at the plasma front already at \( t = 100 \) fs). The lower \( T_e \) is mostly due to the energy spent on ionization – the average ionization energy from \( Z^* = 5 \) to 27 is 0.9 keV.

Moreover, figure 1b shows that, for both CP and LP, collisions cause efficient bulk electron thermalization as early as \( t = 500 \) fs. High-energy tails are found to emerge above \( \sim 50 \) keV for the fixed ionization and \( \sim 30 \) keV for the self-consistent ionization. Note the large range of the logarithmic \( f_E \) scale, meaning that the tails are three to five orders of magnitude lower than the bulk spectra. The nonthermal tail is heavier in LP than in CP, due to the operative \( j \times B \) and vacuum heating.

Also, the simulation with self-consistent ionization displays a larger tail, compared to the bulk spectrum, than its counterpart with fixed \( Z^* \). The larger tail as well as an electron population at \( \sim 3 \) MeV can be explained by field-ionization events in the charge separation layer, which is exposed to stronger laser fields. As the target front electrons are being pushed back by the ponderomotive force, the ions remaining in the charge-separation layer experience the less shielded laser field which quickly ionizes them further. Since these newly freed electrons are injected into regions of stronger laser fields, they are energized similarly to vacuum heating in LP, thus resulting in a larger population of nonthermal electrons which, like in LP, thermalize relatively slowly. Furthermore, the average ionization level is lower inside the target with self-consistent ionization, as seen
in figure 2, thus reducing the efficacy of collisional thermalization. Both these effects act to give a larger high-energy tail.

The ionization level profiles ($\bar{Z}^*$) of the self-consistent ionization simulation shown in figure 2a represent the local ionization levels averaged over all macro-particles in each spatial cell. Comparing the $t = 150$ fs (dashed-dotted line) and the $t = 500$ fs (dashed line) average ionization curves, we see that the target front quickly reaches a high ionization degree while the bulk is ionized more gradually. Since there are no strong electric fields inside the plasma, the ionization of the bulk must be driven by impact ionization. The $\bar{Z}^*$ curve at $t = 500$ fs (dashed line) in figure 2a displays plateaus at $\bar{Z}^* = 27, 19$ and to some extent 11. These ionization plateaus correspond to the full ionization of an electronic shell, which can also be seen as the larger jumps in ionization energies to reach $\bar{Z}^* = 12$ and 20 shown in figure 2a (upper horizontal axis); the energy to reach $Z^* = 28$ is $\sim 11$ keV.

Figure 2b shows $\bar{Z}^*$ at the target front surface ($x = 7.5 \mu m$). At time $t = 85$ fs (solid line), the ionization level has saturated at $\bar{Z}^* = 19$ due to the jump in ionization energy after $Z^* = 19$. Later, at $t = 100$ fs (dotted line) the laser field has become strong enough to sustain field ionization beyond $Z^* = 19$, which we see as the peak in $\bar{Z}^*$ near $x = 7.5 \mu m$. Apart from the laser field, the electrostatic field ($E_x$) induced by the laser ponderomotive force at the target front causes additional ionization. This results in the $\bar{Z}^*$ peak seen around $x = 7.55 \mu m$, which moves into the plasma as the charge-separation layer is pushed forward by the laser ponderomotive force.

The difference between the simulations is made clearer when studying the electron phase spaces shown in figure 3†. The figure displays time sequences of the collisional distributions with LP in the top row and CP in the second row; the third row shows the self-consistent ionization CP simulation and the bottom row shows the collisionless CP distribution. In the LP simulation, high-energy electron bunches are produced at twice the laser frequency, as seen in the $t = 150$ fs panel (top row), while CP with fixed

† The normalization $f/f_{\text{max}}$ of the distribution functions in figure 3 and 5 are with respect to the initial maximum value of the distribution function in their respective planes of phase space $f_{\text{max}}$. The colour values of the plotted distributions can therefore be directly compared.
ionization (second row) produces a more even distribution of hot electrons since \( j \times B \) and vacuum heating mechanisms are inhibited. At \( t = 500 \text{ fs} \), most of the fast electrons have thermalized in the fixed-ionization case, while there still remains a significant population of high-energy electrons “swarming” around the back of the target with self-consistent ionization.

With self-consistent ionization, two populations of relatively high energy electrons are created during the rising phase of the laser pulse. These populations originate from two successive field-ionization phases. The first one occurs early in the interaction, when the ionization of the surface plasma momentarily saturates at \( Z^* = 19 \). In the \( t = 150 \text{ fs} \) panel of figure 3, this population accounts for the broad momentum distribution in the target bulk, and also for the beam (with momenta \( p_x/(m_e c) \sim -1 \)) being reflected in the vacuum (\( x > 10 \mu\text{m} \)) and refluxing into the target. The second phase starts at \( t \approx 90 \text{ fs} \), when the laser pulse gets intense enough to ionize the surface plasma beyond \( Z^* = 19 \) (compare the 85 fs and 100 fs curves in figure 2b). This yields fast electrons (visible in the upper right corner of the \( t = 150 \text{ fs} \) phase space) more energetic than those generated earlier, which correspond to the bump around \( \sim 3 \text{ MeV} \) in the energy spectra of figure 1.

We now turn our attention to the energy density achieved in these scenarios. Since the time scale is short compared to the hydrodynamical timescales, the plasma has not had time to expand hydrodynamically, hence the bulk electrons and ions remain at solid-range density. At the same time, the electrons reach keV temperatures, resulting in high energy densities in the order of \( \sim 10 \text{ Gbar} = 10^9 \text{ J/cm}^3 \). In figure 4, the electron kinetic energy density \( P_e \) is displayed throughout the target at times \( t = 150 \text{ fs} \) (top panel) and

![Figure 3. Electron phase-space distributions for collisional LP with fixed ionization (top row); collisional CP with fixed ionization (second row) and self-consistent ionization (third row) as well as for collisionless CP (bottom row), at times \( t = 150 \text{ fs} \) (left column), \( 250 \text{ fs} \) (middle column) and \( 500 \text{ fs} \) (right column). Note the different momentum scale for the collisionless CP.](image-url)
Figure 4. Electron kinetic energy density $P_e$ for collisional LP (dotted line) and CP (black solid line) and CP with self-consistent ionization (blue solid line), at times $t = 150$ fs (top panel) and $t = 500$ fs (bottom panel). The peak laser intensity hits the target at $t \approx 110$ fs.

At $t = 500$ fs (bottom panel). At the earlier time, the kinetic energy density is concentrated to the front of the target, while at the later stage the energy has spread out throughout most of the plasma. The energy density in the fixed ionization simulations reaches around $\sim 10$ Gbar and is mostly homogeneous in the region $x = 8-9$ µm.

The high-energy electrons created with LP facilitate a better spatial homogenization of the energy density than with CP. Their slow thermalization results in a more spatially homogeneous target heating, since they can recirculate several times through the plasma. In a potential application, one would therefore have to make a compromise between good thermalization and homogenization. Another parameter that can be used to control homogenization is target thickness; decreasing it helps for a faster homogenization of the plasma heating. However, a thinner target will also explode faster hydrodynamically, which would give a HED application a shorter time frame to operate in.

Meanwhile, the energy density in the self-consistent ionization simulation still has a distinct gradient throughout the length of the target at $t = 500$ fs indicating that thermalization is taking longer. The lower temperature and electron density reached with self-consistent ionization result in around an order of magnitude lower energy density compared to the fixed ionization results. However, there is still a significant region with $P_e > 1$ Gbar in the self-consistent ionization simulation at $t = 500$ fs. The energy density does not homogenize as efficiently in the self-consistent ionization case, partly due to a decreased ability of the target to thermalize fast electrons (stemming from lower $\bar{Z}^*$), and partly due to the inhomogeneity of the ionization profile which affects the bulk electron density profile.

As a consequence of the strong gradients in $P_e$ around the target front side, a shock wave is launched. The shock wave presents itself as a sharp jump in electron pressure, most clearly seen close to $x = 8.0$ µm in the $t = 500$ fs panel in figure 4. The details of shock formation are sensitive to the laser and target parameters, and are more clearly seen from the ion phase space, as will be addressed by a paper in preparation (Sundström
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Figure 5. Electron transverse momentum distribution at \( x = 7 \) nm behind the ion front in the simplified simulations with fixed ions. The left and right panels correspond to collisional and collisionless simulations, respectively. A quasi-steady state has been reached, where \( E_\perp \) and \( P_\perp \) rotates (clock-wise) in the transverse plane.

et al. 2019). However, no ion reflection occurs at the shock front, which means that the shock is hydrodynamic-like in its nature.

3.1. Collisional absorption mechanism

To illustrate the collisional absorption mechanism, we have performed a simplified set of simulations. These simulations are designed in order to generate a quasi-steady-state: the laser intensity is constant after a linear ramp-up over 10 laser cycles; the ions are stationary; the plasma is 2.5 \( \mu m \) long and it terminates at a thermal boundary, meaning that particles which exit the boundary are reflected with momenta chosen randomly from a Maxwellian distribution at \( T_{e,0} = 10 eV \) for the electrons – the same at the initial temperatures. The other simulation parameters are: CP at \( a_0 = 10 \), \( Z^* = 27 \) with and without collisions; resolution and other numerical parameters are as stated in \( \S \) 2. The long ramp-up time has been chosen to reduce electron energization due to the laser amplitude envelope modulation (Siminos et al. 2012).

We will now take a look at the interaction between the electrons and the laser electric field. The density of power \( S \) exerted on an electron population can be expressed as

\[
S(x, t) = -e \int d^3 v \ E_\perp \cdot v f_e(v) = -e n_e E_\perp \cdot V_\perp , \tag{3.1}
\]

where \( E_\perp = E_\perp(x, t) \) is the laser electric field – which only lies in the transverse plane – and \( V_\perp = V_\perp(x, t) = [1/n_e(x, t)] \int d^3 v v f_e(x, v; t) \) is the projection of electron velocity moment onto the transverse plane.

In a 1-D model, disregarding collisional effects, the transverse canonical momentum \( \tilde{P}_\perp = P_\perp - e A_\perp \) is conserved, and \( \tilde{P}_\perp = 0 \). Hence \( P_\perp = e A_\perp \), where \( A_\perp \) and \( P_\perp \) are the transverse component of the magnetic vector potential and the electron momentum moment, defined analogously to \( V_\perp \). In quasi-steady state, \( A_\perp \) is just rotating in the transverse plane, so the electric field is \( E_\perp \equiv - \partial A_\perp / \partial t = \omega A_\perp \) \( [\cos(\omega t)\hat{y} - \sin(\omega t)\hat{z}] / \sqrt{2} \), where \( A_\perp = A_\perp(x) \) is the magnitude of the vector potential (necessarily transverse in 1-D). Importantly, the electric field vector is perpendicular to the vector potential and the magnitude of the electric field is \( E_\perp = \omega A_\perp \). We therefore expect \( P_\perp \) and \( E_\perp \) to be perpendicular and their magnitudes – in normalized units – to be equal, \( P_\perp = E_\perp \).

Figure 5 shows slices of the collisional (left) and collisionless (right) electron distributions in the transverse momentum plane, at a time when a quasi–steady state has been reached and at a location 7 nm behind the immobile ion front edge of the plasma. If we were to evolve this picture in time, we would see the (negative) electric field \(-E_\perp\)
rotate clockwise, along the marked-out circular path in figure 5; the mean momentum $P_\perp$ would follow synchronously in this rotation. The most apparent difference between the collisional and collisionless distributions is the much larger momentum spread of the former, caused by collisional scattering of the electrons. In contrast to the collisionless case, $-E_\perp$ and $P_\perp$ are not equal in magnitude nor are they perfectly perpendicular. The missing transverse canonical momentum has been collisionally transferred to the ions, where it disappears from the simulation due to the ions being static. Note that if $-E_\perp$ and $P_\perp$ are not perfectly perpendicular in (3.1), then the absorbed power density $S$ is non-vanishing†. We can express (3.1) as

$$S = -neE_\perp \cdot V_\perp = neE_\perp V_\perp \sin(\alpha),$$

where the phase angle between $-E_\perp$ and $V_\perp$ is $\pi/2 - \alpha$.

Figure 6 displays configuration space profiles of $E_\perp$, $V_\perp$ and $S$ – in dimensionless units – as well as $\sin(\alpha)$; the curves are produced from a time average over 21 time frames spanning 20 fs. In the collisionless case, we have $P_\perp(x) = E_\perp(x)$ and the phase shift angle $\alpha \simeq 0$ throughout the first $\approx 25$ nm $\approx 8\ell_s$. Due to a finite spread in the electron transverse velocities, there will be a continuous exchange of electrons in the longitudinal direction not accounted for in the fluid description above, which induces a small deviation from $\alpha = 0$ and hence $S \neq 0$. However, $S$ changes sign at $x \approx 15$ nm, beyond which the absorbed power is negative. In the collisional case, $P_\perp(x)$ is consistently smaller than $E_\perp(x)$. Furthermore, the phase shift $\sin(\alpha)$ is much larger, which is reflected in the about two orders of magnitude larger absorbed power $S$ than in the collisionless case.

A final note on the collisional case in figure 6 (left) is the numerical artefact that causes both $E_\perp(x)$ and $P_\perp(x)$ to level off near $x = 20$ nm. As the Monte Carlo collisional algorithm used in Smilei (Pérez et al. 2012) only conserves momentum statistically, a $P_\perp$ noise floor is generated which drives noise in $E_\perp$, i.e. the base level in figure 6 (left). This effect could be alleviated by increasing the number of macro-particles. However, the absolute majority of the collisionally induced laser-energy absorption occurs in the region $x = 5 - 15$ nm and is therefore not significantly affected by the collisional noise floor.

† For simplicity, we are ignoring relativistic effects in this discussion, which would otherwise complicate the relationship between $P_\perp$ and $V_\perp$.
3.2. Parameter scans

We have also performed parameter scans in order to investigate the dependencies of the collisional heating mechanism. One such scan has been in ionization, with fixed ionization levels of $Z^* = 11, 19, 24$ and $27$, as well as a self consistent field and impact ionization. We have also conducted scans in laser intensity with $a_0 = 2, 5, 7, 10$ and $14$, as well as pulse durations of $t_{\text{FWHM}} = 15$ fs, $30$ fs, $60$ fs and $120$ fs. The remaining parameters are as in § 2.

Let us first look at the absorbed energy from the laser. Figure 7 shows the kinetic energy gain $\Delta U$ of ions and electrons after the end of the laser pulse (CP) compared to the initial kinetic energy for the different combinations of $a_0$ (colour coded) and pulse duration (shape coded). The value displayed on the horizontal axis is the laser pulse energy $J = I t_{\text{FWHM}} [\pi/\log(4)]^{1/2} \propto a_0^2 t_{\text{FWHM}}$, where $I$ is the laser intensity. In the case of a constant pulse duration, $t_{\text{FWHM}} = 60$ fs (triangles), the trend scales like a power law with $\Delta U \propto J^{0.73}$ (dashed line) or $\Delta U \propto a_0^{1.46}$, since $J \propto a_0^2$. In other words, the absorption efficiency scales as $\Delta U/J \propto J^{-0.27} \propto a_0^{-0.54}$. This scaling is similar to the $I^{-1/4}$ scaling of the normal skin effect, as described by Rozmus & Tikhonchuk (1990). However, the condition for the normal skin effect, that the collisional mean free path $\lambda_{\text{mfp}} \approx 50–100$ nm is small compared to the skin depth $l_s \approx 6$ nm, is clearly not fulfilled. The heating mechanism observed here is therefore not simply the normal skin effect, nor does it conform with the $I^{-2/25}$ scaling for the absorption efficiency of the anomalous skin effect (Rozmus & Tikhonchuk 1990).

The other scaling trend displayed in figure 7 is at constant $a_0 = 10$ (magenta). Here, the power law fit (dotted line) gives $\Delta U \propto J^{1.18} \propto t_{\text{FWHM}}^{1.18}$. In this case the absorption efficiency still has a weak positive scaling of $\Delta U/J \propto t_{\text{FWHM}}^{0.18}$. This observed scaling also does not conform with the absorption efficiency scalings of the normal and anomalous skin effects in Rozmus & Tikhonchuk (1990).

These scalings are only observed trends with no other quantitative theoretical backing. Heuristically, however, it seems reasonable that the collisional absorption efficiency should decrease when $a_0$ is increased. Collisional effects in general decrease at higher particle energies and the absorption happens through collisional scattering of the laser-driven electrons in the skin layer. Therefore, if the laser field ($a_0$) is increased, so that the absorption becomes less efficient.

The skin depth adjusted for collisions has been inferred from figure 6 (left).
Fast electron heating and thermalization with CP laser

We also have a scan in (fixed) ionization degree $Z^*$. This parameter differs from the other scans in that the ionization degree cannot be controlled independently in reality. The $Z^*$ scan can nonetheless provide insight into the target collisionality, which scales as $(Z^*)^2$ – ignoring other effects, e.g. individual particle energy. However, by varying $Z^*$ while keeping the ion density $n_{\text{Cu},0}$ fixed, we inevitably also change the electron density $n_{e,0} = Z^*n_{\text{Cu},0}$, which may introduce other effects due to density. Nevertheless, the electron density stays highly over-critical – the lowest electron density in this scan is $n_{e,0} = 532.4n_c$ for $Z^* = 11$. Figure 8 displays the energy absorbed by both electrons and ions $\Delta U$ (filled circles, left axis) and only by electrons $\Delta U_e$ (open circles, left axis) for the different ionization degrees. The absorbed energy increases with $Z^*$, while a smaller fraction of the absorbed energy goes into the ions at higher $Z^*$.

Due to the accompanying changes in electron density, the average absorbed energy per electron $\Delta E$, also shown in figure 8 (black triangles, right axis), happens by about 15% from $Z^* = 11$ to 27. The decrease in $\Delta E$ with $Z^*$ may seem surprising if the dominant heating mechanism is collisional. However, this might be due to other density effects, such as the increased skin depth at lower electron density which allows a deeper laser penetration and thus a stronger laser-to-electron coupling efficiency. When we examine the electron energy spectra (not shown) in this scan, the Maxwellian-fitted bulk electron temperatures are all $T_e = 3.5 \pm 0.1$ keV.

Besides just the pure amount of energy absorbed from the laser, we are also interested in how well thermalized the plasma is. As a measure of that, the fraction of electron kinetic energy in the nonthermal electrons is plotted in figure 9 for scans in fixed ionization degree $Z^*$ (a), laser amplitude $a_0$ (b), and pulse duration $t_{\text{FWHM}}$ (c). The displayed values are taken 200 fs after the end of the laser pulse. Due to a varying heat transport speed, the fraction of nonthermal electron energy is only taken in the region in which the bulk electron temperature is no longer increasing. This should still give a representative estimate of the nonthermal fraction, since the fast electrons have already recirculated by the chosen time, c.f. the $t = 250$ fs panels of figure 3. The precise values in figure 9 are sensitive to the choice of time and region to include, thus these results are only qualitative. Nevertheless, the general trends shown here are still representative of the observed situation – importantly, the relation between LP and CP is robust.

Figure 9a shows that there is a trend toward lower nonthermal fraction at higher ionization levels, which is consistent with the faster thermalization expected at high
Figure 9. Fraction of the electron energy in nonthermal electrons 200 fs after the end of the laser pulse, for scans in $Z^*$ (a), $a_0$ (b) and $t_{\text{FWHM}}$ (c) with CP, marked by crosses. The value marked with a dot is from LP, and self-consistent ionization is shown as a star.

$Z^*$. This trend also suggests that the higher absorbed energy per electron at lower $Z^*$ (figure 8) is linked to a relative increase in the nonthermal population.

Regarding the scans in the laser amplitude and duration in figure 9b & c, respectively, no clear trend appears to emerge among the CP laser pulses (marked by $\times$). Then there are the self-consistent ionization (star) and LP (downward triangle) simulations: both have about one order of magnitude higher fraction of energy in nonthermal electrons than the equivalent (fixed-ionization, CP) counterpart. The higher fraction of nonthermal energy with LP stems from the $j\times B$ and vacuum heating mechanism. The higher nonthermal energy fraction with a self-consistent ionization process is discussed in conjunction with its phase-space distribution in figure 3.

Even a very small fraction of nonthermals may affect the interpretation of X-ray diagnostics (Rosmej 1997; Renner & Rosmej 2019), meaning that LP can be more intrusive than CP in WDM/HDM studies. We have also conducted simulations with a larger pre-expanded plasma (exponentially decaying density profile with a scale length of 80 nm). While not presented here, those simulations show that LP can result in up to $\sim$10% of the electron kinetic energy in nonthermal electrons, which would of course be even more intrusive and significantly affect the X-ray diagnostics. With CP, the pre-plasma weakens the energy absorption by about a factor of two, but the fraction of energy in fast electrons stays $\lesssim 1%$.

4. Conclusions

We have performed collisional and collisionless 1-D PIC simulations and shown that a collisional, inverse Bremsstrahlung, absorption dominates the electron heating process in a solid-density, high-$Z^*$ material, such as copper, with ultrahigh intensity, short-pulse lasers. Using CP, the electron population quickly thermalizes to well-formed Maxwellian distributions suitable for experimental verification of HED physics models. The collisional simulations show that the target electrons are quickly heated to $T_e \approx 3.5$ keV bulk temperature on a $\sim$200 fs time scale. The target energy density reaches $\sim$10 Gbar, which is within the realm of ultrahigh energy density. The use of CP provides faster collisional thermalization of the electron population compared to LP, something which is valuable for experimental tests of HED atomic physics models. The collisional energy absorption mechanism (in CP) is explained by a collisionally induced phase shift between the laser electric field and the electron transverse momentum.
We have carried out scans over laser parameters and ionization. The scans over laser settings show that the mechanism is robust to changes in the laser, with lower intensity and longer pulses at the same laser pulse energy yielding better energy absorption. Also, the higher collisionality incurred from a higher ionization level improves energy absorption and electron thermalization. A more realistic simulation run with self-consistent ionization, including both collisional impact and field ionization, reached $T_e = 2.5$ keV, confirming that the collisional heating is still operational in a self-consistently ionized plasma. The self-consistent ionization simulation was not as well-thermalized as its CP, fixed-ionization counterpart due to high-energy electrons generated through ionization events in strong-field regions.

This work has been based on 1-D simulations, which means that higher-dimensional effects not captured here, e.g. filamentation and transverse heat transport, would also affect the electron heating in reality. One such type of filamentation is the Weibel filamentation, mediated by momentum anisotropy, but collisions can decrease or even suppress the Weibel growth rate (Wallace et al. 1987). Simulations in two or three dimensions would therefore be a valuable continuation of the present work, even though numerical constraints would unfortunately prevent us from achieving the same physical accuracy.
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