Retrieving transient magnetic fields of ultrarelativistic laser plasma via ejected electron polarization
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Interaction of an ultrastrong short laser pulse with non-prepolarized near-critical density plasma is investigated in an ultrarelativistic regime, with an emphasis on the radiative spin polarization of ejected electrons. Our particle-in-cell simulations show explicit correlations between the angle resolved electron polarization and the structure and properties of the transient quasistatic plasma magnetic field. While the magnitude of the spin signal is the indicator of the magnetic field strength created by the longitudinal electron current, the asymmetry of electron polarization is found to gauge the island-like magnetic distribution which emerges due to the transverse current induced by the laser wave front. Our studies demonstrate that the spin degree of freedom of ejected electrons could potentially serve as an efficient tool to retrieve the features of strong plasma fields.

Magnetic fields play a crucial role in various plasma collective phenomena and nonlinear quantum electrodynamical processes in extreme environments of laboratory and universe [1–3]. The astrophysical magnetic fields can govern the internal structure of interstellar shocks [4], mediate the radio wave emission nearby neutron stars [5], induce baryon inhomogeneities [6], and catalyse the dark matter formation [7]. Self-generated fields with strength ∼10^7 Tesla have been produced in high-intensity plasma experiments [8–12], and the guidance of jet flows by laboratory magnetic fields helps interpret the evolution of young stellar objects [13–15]. With recent advancement of ultrastrong laser techniques [16–22] more extreme conditions and larger fields are expected in ultrarelativistic laser plasma interaction [23–29].

Generally, detection of plasma magnetic fields requires an external probe beam, where the field information is imprinted in the velocity space of charged particles [30–35] or the rotated polarization vector of the optical beam [36–39]. However, these conventional methods are inapplicable for scenarios with unprecedented field strength, ultrashort time scale (∼fs), and overcritical plasma density [40]. Furthermore, the spin, an intrinsic property of particles, offers a new degree of freedom of information, which is widely utilized in exploring magnetization of solids [41], nucleon structure [42], and phenomena beyond the standard model [43]. In extreme laser fields there is a strong coupling of the electron spin to the laser magnetic field [44–48], which may yield radiative spin polarization (SP) [49–52], i.e., polarization of electrons due to spin-flip during photon emissions. Even though in the oscillating field the electron net SP is suppressed, fast polarization of a lepton beam with laser pulses becomes possible when the symmetry of the monochromatic field is broken, such as in an elliptically polarized, or in two-color laser pulses [53–57]. Because of collective effects, more complex spin dynamics occurs in strong laser field interaction with plasma. Consequently, the question arises if it is possible to employ the spin signal of spontaneously ejected particles from plasma to retrieve information on transient plasma fields.

In this Letter, based on particle-in-cell (PIC) simulations, we investigate the ultrarelativistic dynamics of a short strong pulse interacting with a non-prepolarized near-critical density plasma, see Fig. 1. Special attention is devoted to describing the spin dynamics of plasma electrons, being strongly disturbed by the radiative spin-flips modulated by the quasistatic plasma magnetic field (QPMF). The latter is commonly transient with a time scale as short as the driving pulse duration while being quasistatic with respect to the fast oscillating laser field. We show that the angle dependent SP of ejected electrons carries signatures of the inhomogeneous QPMF. The signal of SP of ejected electrons can be used to predict the strength of the leading order antisymmetric QPMF created by the longitudinal current. A more detailed analysis reveals that the asymmetry of SP of two outgoing divergent electron bunches characterizes the secondary QPMF, which is induced by a transverse transient current and generally neglected in previous studies [58–62]. The sum of these two part QPMFs gives rise to a nonlinear island-like magnetic structure [see Fig. 2(a)(b)]. Our results demonstrate that the spin degree of freedom of ejected electrons from ultrarelativistic plasmas can be employed in principle as a tool to retrieve information on the QPMF structure and properties.

In 2D PIC simulations, a near-critical density target is irradiated by a linearly polarized pulse (with the transverse electric field along y). Our main example adopts a peak intensity of 1.7 × 10^{23}W/cm^2, equivalent to the normalized field amplitude a_0 = 350 given the laser wavelength \( \lambda_0 = 1 \mu m \). The pulse has a 2.6 \( \mu m \) focal spot size and 18 fs duration (FWHM intensity measure). The target has thickness \( l_0 = 10 \mu m \) and electron (carbon) density \( n_e = 5n_c \), \( n_c = n_c/6 \), where \( n_c = m_e c \omega^2 / 4\pi e^2 \) is the plasma critical density for a laser frequency \( \omega_0 = c k_0 \); \( m_e \) (\( e \)) the electron mass (charge); \( c \) the speed of light. The dynamics of spin precession is governed by the Thomas-Bargmann-Michel-Telegdi equation and spin-dependent photon emissions have been implemented in the EPOCH
FIG. 1. (a) The interaction scheme: the laser pulse impinges on unpolarized plasma (the electron density is shown in gray shades); accelerated and radiatively polarized electrons due to spin-flips form outgoing polarized bunches. The red (blue) dots represent the electrons with spin \( s_z = 1 \) (−1) and the lines show their movement tendency. The green line shows a typical electron trajectory with a spin-flip marked by a pentagram. (b) and (c) show snapshots of the electron SP distribution in spatial \((x, y)\) coordinates and transverse \((y, \theta)\) phase space, respectively. The green lines in (b) profile the laser field \( \mathbf{E}_y \) at slice \( y = 0 \). (d) Angular distribution of electron number \( dN/d\theta_f \) and SP \( \langle s_z \rangle \). (e) \( \delta \langle s_z \rangle \) and \( dN/d\varepsilon_e \) vs electron energy \( \varepsilon_e \). All parameters are indicated in the text.

When the pulse impinges on the target, a fraction of bulk electrons is expelled outwards by the laser ponderomotive force to form a plasma channel [65]. Meanwhile, the peripheral electrons are prone to be injected [66] and subsequently polarized inside the channel due to spin-flips during photon emissions, see Fig. 1(b). Since the ion reaction partially compensates the transverse charge separation [67], the quasistatic electric field \( \mathbf{E}_y \) is negligible in this scenario. Thus the deflection of the accelerated electrons in transverse direction is predominantly governed by the azimuthal QPMF \( \mathbf{B}_{z,2} \), which is presumably sustained by the longitudinally forward moving electron current \( j_x \). The simulation results in Fig. 1(a) show that the electrons with a positive (negative) final angle \( \theta_f \) mainly originate from the plasma region of \( y < 0 \) \((y > 0)\). As the magnetic field \( \mathbf{B}_{z,2} \sim -\mu_0 j_y y \) is antisymmetric, created by the nearly uniform current \( j_x \sim -|j_0| \), the electrons exiting the plasma area with a final angle \( \theta_f > 0 \) mostly experience a positive \( \mathbf{B}_{z,2} \) [see Fig. 1(a)] and vice versa. This leads to oppositely SP ejected electron bunches: \( \langle s_z \rangle < 0 \) \((\langle s_z \rangle > 0)\) for the electron bunch of \( \theta_f > 0 \) \((\theta_f < 0)\). The spatial evolution of SP in Fig. 1(b) manifests that two groups of electrons are firstly polarized and confined inside the channel, and then intersect with each other towards the opposite transverse direction. This procedure is also unveiled by the evolution of SP \( \langle s_z \rangle \) in the transverse phase space \((y, \theta)\) in Fig. 1(c), where \( \theta = \arctan(p_y/p_x) \) denotes the direction of electron momentum. The clockwise rotation of \( \langle s_z \rangle \) indicates that the QPMF not only generates spatial dependent SP but also deflects the electrons to form an angle dependent polarization distribution of ejected electrons. In Fig. 1(d), asymmetry exists for both electron SP and number angular distributions. Specifically, the averaged SP (final angle) with a positive \( \theta_f \) is \( \langle s_z \rangle \approx -3.3\% \((\theta_+ \approx 11.4\%\)\), whereas \( \langle s_- \rangle \approx 4.0\% \((\theta_- \approx -16.5\%\)\) for \( \theta_f < 0 \). The magnitude of the SP signal is characterized by the parameter \( \delta \langle s_z \rangle \equiv \langle s_+ \rangle - \langle s_- \rangle \). According to Fig. 1(e), SP is insignificant for low-energy electrons because of damped radiative spin-flips. Therefore, the criterion of \( \varepsilon_e > 4\gamma_0 m_e c^2 \) is adopted here to filter out the low-energy noise. To reveal more subtle features of QPMF \( \mathbf{B}_{z,2} \), we introduce also the spin (angle) asymmetry characteristics via the absolute difference: \( \Delta \langle s_z \rangle \equiv |\langle s_+ \rangle | - |\langle s_- \rangle | \) and \( \Delta (\theta) \equiv |\langle \theta_+ \rangle | - |\langle \theta_- \rangle | \), which will be discussed below.

The QPMF \( \mathbf{B}_{z,2} \) is determined by electric currents via \( \partial \mathbf{B}_{z,2}/\partial y = \mu_0 j_x \) and \( \partial \mathbf{B}_{z,2}/\partial x = -\mu_0 j_y \) (with the vacuum permeability \( \mu_0 \)). In general, inside a laser-driven plasma channel, the current is dominated by the longitudinal one \( j_x \) and the transverse current \( j_y \) is neglected [58][62]. However, the magnetic field in our simulation shows an irregular structure, with multiple islands associated with the current kinks and vortices, see Fig. 2(b). The latter indicates that the transverse current \( j_y \) is important in characterizing the exact form of \( \mathbf{B}_{z,2} \). Let us divide QPMF into two parts \( \mathbf{B}_{z,2} = \mathbf{B}_{z,2,1} + \mathbf{B}_{z,2,2} \), where the leading part \( \mathbf{B}_{z,2,1} \) is induced by \( j_x \), while the secondary \( \mathbf{B}_{z,2,2} \) by \( j_y \): \( \partial \mathbf{B}_{z,2,1}/\partial y = \mu_0 j_x \) and \( \partial \mathbf{B}_{z,2,2}/\partial x = -\mu_0 j_y \). The leading part \( \mathbf{B}_{z,2,1} \sim -\mu_0 e n_c y \) with antisymmetric feature \( \mathbf{B}_{z,2,1}(-y) = -\mathbf{B}_{z,2,1}(y) \) is ubiquitously utilized in previous studies [58][62]. Now, we focus on the secondary \( \mathbf{B}_{z,2,2} \). Considering the electron velocity \( v_y = p_y/(\gamma m_e c) \) and momentum \( p_y \sim A_y = a_0 c(\varepsilon + \phi_0) \) where \( \xi = \omega_0 t - k_0 x \) and \( \phi_0 \) the carrier envelop phase (CEP), we obtain \( j_y \approx -|e| \int n_2 \delta(x/v_y - t)v_y dt \approx |e| n_2 c \cos[\omega(x/v_y - x/v_{ph}) + \phi_0] \). The \( \delta(t-x/v_y) \) function indicates that the transverse current is predominantly contributed by the electron density \( n_2 \delta(t-x/v_y) \) piled up at the front edge of the plasma channel nearby the region \( x \sim v_y t \), where the electron’s transverse velocity is significant. Here, \( v_{ph} (v_{ph}) \) is the laser group (phase) velocity in plasma, and the Lorentz-factor \( \gamma \sim a_0 \) is assumed. With \( \partial \mathbf{B}_{z,2,2}/\partial x = -\mu_0 j_y \), the secondary magnetic field can be estimated:

\[
\mathbf{B}_{z,2,2} \sim -\frac{\mu_0 e n_2}{k_2} \sin(k_2 x + \phi_0),
\]

where \( k_2 = k_0(v_{ph} - v_y)/v_y \). The analytically predicted...
when the electron spin-flip is dominated by the plasma emission to higher spin-flip process is shifted with respect to the photon emission probability $d^3N_{ph}/d\chi_{ph}dt$ with a bandwidth accounting for the influence of electron spin. (d) The number distribution of all emitted photons $N_{ph}$ (grey) and emission associated with spin-flips $N_s$ (yellow). (e) The spatial dependent SP differentiate $ds_z/dz$ contributed by the cases of $\kappa \leq 1$ for electrons with final angle $\theta_f > 0$ and $\theta_f < 0$, respectively. (f) The angular dependence of spin-flip occurrence, where the result of condition $\kappa > 1$ is multiplied by 10 for better visibility.

$B_z = B_{z,1} + B_{z,2}$ is shown in Fig. 2(a), which agrees qualitatively with the simulated $B_z$ in Fig. 2(b). The asymmetric periodic island-like structure of QPMF $B_z$ stems from the nontrivial current vortex $(\nabla \times \mathbf{j})_{x,y} \neq 0$ generated by the transverse current of electrons plough away by the laser beam front.

As we are interested in the relation of the electron SP to the magnetic field structure, and considering the polarization attributable to the spin-flip during a photon emission, we analyze the probability of this process $P(\chi_{ph})$ in Fig. 2(c) for typical parameters of our PIC simulations. Here, the electron with an initial $\gamma_0 = 2000$ normally crosses the uniform magnetic field $B_0 = 10^4 T$, and the electron quantum invariant parameter is $\chi_e \sim 0.1$, with $\chi_{e,ph} = (e\hbar/m^2c^2)|F_{\mu\nu}p^\nu|$ and the momentum $p^\nu$ of the electron or photon, respectively. As Fig. 2(c) illustrates, the electron spin-flips exclusively take place when emitting an energetic photon with $\chi_{ph}$ close to $\chi_e$, while the photon emission probability is peaked at $\hbar\omega_e \sim \chi_e\gamma_0 m c^2$ (at $\chi_e < 1$), i.e., the peak of the spin-flip process is shifted with respect to the photon emission to higher $\chi_e$’s, see Fig. 2(d). Both the laser magnetic field $B_0$ and QPMF $B_z$ can cause the electron spin-flip as $\chi_e \approx \gamma_0 [(1 - \cos \theta)B_0 + |B_z|]/B_0$, with the Schwinger limit $B_0 \approx 4 \times 10^7 T$. We introduce the parameter $\kappa = |B_z|/(1 - \cos \theta)B_0|$, defining two regimes, when the electron spin-flip is dominated by the plasma ($\kappa > 1$) or by the laser field ($\kappa < 1$). The evolution of SP in Fig. 2(c) demonstrates that the laser field dominated regime ($\kappa < 1$) mostly contributes to the final electron SP. A distinguishable feature between the $\kappa \lesssim 1$ regimes is the angle $\theta$ of the electron’s instantaneous momentum when the spin-flip occurs. As the angular dependent spin-flip shows in Fig. 2(f), the $\kappa < 1$ regime applies at backward emissions, while $\kappa > 1$ for forward ones.
The detailed particle tracking further confirms these conclusions. In the \( \kappa > 1 \) regime Figs. 3(a),(b), the position of spin-flip with \( \kappa > 1 \) is closely correlated with the spatial distribution of QPMF \( B_2 \). The time evolution of \( p_x \) illustrates that the spin-flip happens after the electron starts an efficient acceleration and its velocity aligns longitudinally \( \theta \ll 1 \), resulting in \( (1 - \cos \theta)B_l < B_2 \). For the laser dominant regime \( \kappa < 1 \), the electron trajectory and momentum evolution [in Fig. 3(c),(d)] demonstrate that the typical spin-flip occurs at the electron’s temporarily backward motion, when \( (1 - \cos \theta) \approx 1 \) and \( B_l > B_2 \).

It should be noted that even in the laser dominant regime, the QPMF \( B_2 \) is still the key factor for the SP. The reason is that the laser field has oscillating character. Although it can cause spin-flips, its net contribution to the final SP is negligible. The laser magnetic field \( B_l \) acts as a catalyst to enhance the electron spin-flips by increasing \( \chi_e \) and net spin-flips contributing to the final SP are still determined by \( B_2 \). We may estimate \( s_z \approx -\int B_z/[|B_l|A(\chi_e)]dt \) (at \( B_l \gg B_2 \)), with \( A(\chi_e) \approx (\sqrt{3}\text{af}_{m_e}c^2\chi_e)/(\hbar\gamma_e)A^*(\chi_e) \), and \( A^*(\chi_e) \approx 0.18\chi_e \) (at \( 0.01 < \chi_e < 0.4 \) \[64\]). The electrons with final angle \( \theta_f > 0 \) (\( \theta_f < 0 \)) are mainly exposed to the QPMF \( B_2 > 0 \) \( \langle B_z \rangle < 0 \) at the region \( y < 0 \) (\( y > 0 \)), and the overall SP with \( \theta_f > 0 \) (\( \theta_f < 0 \)) would be \( s_z < 0 \) (\( s_z > 0 \)) which are illustrated as the solid black lines in Fig. 3(e,f).

Thus, we calculate the electron’s SP magnitude \( \delta \langle s_z \rangle \) being correlated with the leading order QPMF \( B_{z,1} \):

\[
\delta \langle s_z \rangle \sim -\frac{\eta |e| B_{z,1}}{m_e\omega_0} a_0^2 \tag{2}
\]

where \( \gamma_e \sim a_0 \) is used, and \( \eta \approx 4 \times 10^{-8} \) accounts for the deviations from the radiative spin evolution. With \( B_{z,1} \approx \sqrt{(a_0/4\pi)(n_e/n_c)(m_e\omega_0/|e|)} \), we find the SP scaling \( \delta \langle s_z \rangle \propto a_0^{-5/2} \), as well as the relation \( B_{z,1} \approx -[\delta \langle s_z \rangle/|\eta|](n_e/4\pi n_c)^{2/5} \). In Fig. 4(a),(b),(c), the analytically predicted scalings of \( \delta \langle s_z \rangle \) and \( B_{z,1} \) are in good accordance with the 2D simulation results.

Finally, we show how with the help of the SP asymmetry signal \( \Delta \langle s_z \rangle \) defined above, the secondary QPMF can be retrieved. In the \( \Delta \langle s_z \rangle \) signal the contribution of the \( B_{z,1} \) is cancelled, and \( \Delta \langle s_z \rangle \approx 2 \int \langle B_{z,2}/|B_l| \rangle A(\chi_e)dt \). Since \( B_{z,2} \approx b_2 \sin(k_{2z}x + \phi_0) \) is oscillating along the longitudinal position (along the laser CEP), the overall effect of \( B_{z,2} \) imprinted on the signal of \( \Delta \langle s_z \rangle \) is oscillating as well. Taking into account the results for \( \delta \langle s_z \rangle \) and \( B_{z,2} \), we find for the asymmetry signal

\[
\Delta \langle s_z \rangle \sim \delta \langle s_z \rangle \left( \frac{b_2}{|B_{z,1}|} \frac{k_0}{k_2} \cos(k_2 l_0 + \phi_0) \right) \tag{3}
\]

where \( b_2 \) is the amplitude of \( B_{z,2} \). The oscillating dependence of \( \Delta \langle s_z \rangle \) on the laser CEP \( \phi_0 \) is reproduced by the simulation results in Fig. 4(d). We see that the amplitude of the SP asymmetry signal \( \Delta \langle s_z \rangle \) is directly related to the secondary QPMF \( b_2 \):

\[
\Delta \langle s_z \rangle \approx \delta \langle s_z \rangle \left( \frac{b_2}{|B_{z,1}|} \frac{k_0}{k_2} \cos(k_2 l_0 + \phi_0) \right)
\]

\[
\langle B_{z,1} \rangle \approx B_{z,1} \approx -\frac{\eta |e| B_{z,1}}{m_e\omega_0} a_0^2
\]

\[
\Delta \langle s_z \rangle \approx \delta \langle s_z \rangle \left( \frac{b_2}{|B_{z,1}|} \frac{k_0}{k_2} \cos(k_2 l_0 + \phi_0) \right)
\]

\[
\Delta \langle s_z \rangle \approx \delta \langle s_z \rangle \left( \frac{b_2}{|B_{z,1}|} \frac{k_0}{k_2} \cos(k_2 l_0 + \phi_0) \right)
\]

\[
\Delta \langle s_z \rangle \approx \delta \langle s_z \rangle \left( \frac{b_2}{|B_{z,1}|} \frac{k_0}{k_2} \cos(k_2 l_0 + \phi_0) \right)
\]
tigated the role of experimental imperfections and uncertainties, in particular, the asymmetry in the driving laser pulse, and the ramp-up and -down of the plasma density profile. The simulation results indicate that the presented scheme is robust to moderate imperfections of such practical issues. It should be noted that distinguishing more complex field structures, e.g., the three-island structure like that in Fig. 3(d), could be achievable with modifications of the retrieval method, see an example in [64], which however needs further exploration.

In conclusion, the ejected electron spin provides a new degree of freedom to extract information on the structure and magnitude of different components of the transient plasma fields. Our results open a new avenue for the electron spin-based plasma diagnostics in extreme conditions, which are prevalent in astrophysical environments and are expected in near future laser facilities.

The original version of code EPOCH adapted here is funded by the UK EPSRC grants EP/G054950/1, EP/G056803/1, EP/G055165/1 and EP/M022463/1. Z. Gong would like to thank A. V. Arefiev, X.-Q. Yan and J.-X. Li for useful discussions. The Supplemental Material includes Refs. [70][78].


[56] Y.-Y. Chen, P.-L. He, R. Shaisultanov, K. Z. Hatsagort- syan, and C. H. Keitel, Polarized positron beams via in-


[64] See the Supplemental Materials for the details.


