

Ponderomotive force due to the intrinsic spin for electrostatic waves in a magnetized plasma

Haidar Al-Naseri^{1,*} and Gert Brodin^{1,†}

¹*Department of Physics, Umeå University, SE-901 87 Umeå, Sweden*

We study the contribution from the electron spin to the ponderomotive force, using a quantum kinetic model including the spin-orbit correction. Specifically, we derive an analytical expression for the ponderomotive force, applicable for electrostatic waves propagating parallel to an external magnetic field. To evaluate the expression, we focus on the case of Langmuir waves and on the case of the spin-resonance wave mode, where the classical and spin contributions to the ponderomotive force are compared. Somewhat surprisingly, dependent on the parameter regime, we find that the spin contribution to the ponderomotive force may dominate for the Langmuir wave, whereas the classical contribution can dominate for the spin resonance mode. Naturally, this does not prevent the opposite case from being the more common one.

I. INTRODUCTION

During the last decades, there has been an increasing number of works, see e.g. the reviews [1–5] and references therein, studying quantum plasma physics. The motivation behind the works includes various applications, for example, quantum wells [6], plasmonics [7] and spintronics [8], as well as astrophysics [9, 10], strong field dynamics, and general theoretical interest. As a first rule of thumb, a quantum description of plasmas is needed in the low-temperature high-density regime, as displayed in temperature density plots made e.g. in Refs. [1, 2]. However, it should be noted that quantum plasma behavior also can be introduced by a strong magnetic field such as in astrophysics (e.g. causing Landau quantization), and by strong laser fields inducing spin-polarization [11, 12].

The ponderomotive force is the main source behind broad classes of nonlinear plasma phenomena. Concrete examples include e.g. wake-field generation [13, 14], soliton formation [15], self-focusing [16], and the subsequent nonlinear wave collapse [17]. Pioneering work regarding the classical expression for the ponderomotive force in a magnetized plasma was made by Karpman and Washimi [18] based on fluid theory, which was later generalized to include kinetic effects. The generalization of the ponderomotive force in magnetized plasma to include quantum effects, in particular, due to spin, has been done in Refs. [19, 20]. However, these works considered the effects due to non-relativistic spin dynamics. Moreover, in Ref. [21], the ponderomotive force due to semi-relativistic spin dynamics in unmagnetized plasma was calculated.

In this work, we calculate the ponderomotive force due to semi-relativistic spin dynamic in magnetized plasmas. To be more specific, we consider electrostatic waves using the kinetic equation derived by Asenjo et al. [22]. Firstly, we study the linear electrostatic wave propagation in a magnetized plasma. This results in deriving the dispersion relation for the electrostatic waves. In addition to the

common Langmuir mode, even for the case of immobile ions, it should be noted that in a magnetized plasma linearized theory allows for a new spin-dependent wave mode referred to as the spin resonance mode. In section II C, we use perturbation theory based on linear calculations in order to calculate the ponderomotive force. Next, in section III, the general result is evaluated, comparing the magnitude of the classical and of spin-dependent contributions. This comparison is split into two parts, depending on whether the linear wave mode is a Langmuir wave or a spin resonance mode. Finally, in section IV, the results are summarized and the conclusions are drawn.

II. BASIC EQUATIONS AND DERIVATIONS

In this section, we first present the basic quantum kinetic theory to be used throughout the manuscript. The theory is then used to investigate the linearized eigenmodes in a magnetized plasma in an electrostatic field geometry with the wave vector parallel to the external magnetic field. In the next sub-section, we perform nonlinear perturbation theory based on previous results, in order to deduce the ponderomotive force for electrostatic waves.

A. Basic equations

Different quantum kinetic theories have been put forward in the literature, see e.g. the reviews given in [5]. In particular, two models that have been proven to be equivalent, based on the weakly relativistic limit of the Dirac Hamiltonian, have been derived in Ref. [22] and in Ref. [23]. We will make use of the former formulation, based on a scalar distribution function, where the usual phase space is extended by a dependence on the independent spin-variable [22]. Specifically, we will use the governing

* haidar.al-naseri@umu.se

† gert.brodin@umu.se

equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \left[\frac{\mathbf{p}}{m} + \frac{\mu}{2mc} \mathbf{E} \times (\mathbf{s} + \nabla_s) \right] \cdot \nabla_x f \\ + q \left(\mathbf{E} + \frac{1}{c} \left[\frac{\mathbf{p}}{m} + \frac{\mu}{2mc} \mathbf{E} \times (\mathbf{s} + \nabla_s) \right] \times \mathbf{B} \right) \cdot \nabla_p f \\ + \frac{2\mu}{\hbar} \mathbf{s} \times \left(\mathbf{B} - \frac{\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{E}}{2mc} \right) \cdot \nabla_s f \\ + \mu \nabla_x \left[(\mathbf{s} + \nabla_s) \cdot \left(\mathbf{B} - \frac{\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{E}}{2mc} \right) \right] \cdot \nabla_p f = 0, \quad (1) \end{aligned}$$

where $f(x, p, s, t)$ is the quasi-distribution function in phase-space, extended by the independent spin-variable \mathbf{s} , defined to have unit length, m is the electron mass, $\mu = \hbar q / 2mc$ is the electron magnetic moment and $q = -e$ is the electron charge. This equation describes the dynamics of an ensemble of spin-1/2 particles in the Hartree approximation, i.e. the derivation applies mean-field theory neglecting correlations and exchange effects.

While this model contains most dynamical effects related to the electron spin, such as the magnetic dipole force, spin precession, and the spin-orbit interaction, the evolution equation still neglects particle dispersive effects. This is a valid approximation in the regime of relatively long scale-lengths, fulfilling $\hbar^2 \nabla_x^2 \nabla_p^2 \ll 1$. Note that we have also omitted the Darwin-term in the original kinetic equation derived by [22] since it is smaller than the other terms in the regime of consideration, with $\hbar^2 \nabla_x^2 \ll m^2 c^2$. Furthermore, since the model is semi-relativistic, the relation between \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{p} is non-trivial, reading

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{\mathbf{p}}{m} + \frac{3\mu}{2mc} \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{s} \quad (2)$$

This relation is important when the sources in Maxwell's equation is computed. The relations needed to close the system are as follows

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = 4\pi\rho \quad (3)$$

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t} + \frac{4\pi}{c} \mathbf{J}, \quad (4)$$

where ρ and \mathbf{J} are the charge and current density

$$\rho = \rho_f + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{P} \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{J}_f + \nabla \times \mathbf{M} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{P}}{\partial t}, \quad (6)$$

where

$$\rho_f = q \int d\Omega f \quad (7)$$

$$\mathbf{P} = -3\mu \int d\Omega \frac{\mathbf{s} \times \mathbf{p}}{2mc} f \quad (8)$$

$$\mathbf{J}_f = q \int d\Omega \left[\frac{\mathbf{p}}{m} + \frac{3\mu}{2mc} \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{s} \right] f \quad (9)$$

$$\mathbf{M} = 3\mu \int d\Omega \mathbf{s} f \quad (10)$$

are where the expressions represent the free charge density, the polarization, the free current density, and the magnetization, respectively. Here, we have used $d\Omega = d^3 p d^3 x d^2 s$. In this work, we express the momentum \mathbf{p} in cylindrical coordinates (p_\perp, ϕ_p, p_z) while for spin \mathbf{s} , we use spherical coordinates (ϕ_s, θ_s) .

Before we proceed with the analysis, let us point out that the closely related model derived by [23] does not use spin as an independent variable, but instead has a classical type of (scalar) distribution function for the charge density, and a vector-valued distribution function for the magnetization. The relation between these two models has been described in some detail in Refs. [1, 5]. We stress that although the models are technically different, they have been shown to be formally equivalent.

B. Linear theory

As a prerequisite to computing the ponderomotive force, we first study the linearized theory. Specifically, we concentrate on electrostatic waves propagating parallel to an external magnetic field. Thus we first divide the distribution function into $f(x, p, s, t) = f_0(p^2, \theta_s) + f_1(x, p, s, t)$, where f_0 is the background distribution function which is homogeneous (see e.g. Ref. [5, 24] for a discussion of possible background functions) and f_1 is the perturbed distribution function. The dependence $f_0(p^2)$ assures that the momentum dependence of the background is isotropic. For our case of electrostatic waves propagating parallel to an external magnetic fields we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} &= E \hat{\mathbf{z}} \\ \mathbf{B} &= B_0 \hat{\mathbf{z}} \\ \mathbf{k} &= k \hat{\mathbf{z}}. \end{aligned}$$

To proceed, we use spherical coordinates in spin space ϕ_s, θ_s , with the length $|\mathbf{s}| = 1$. Thus the Cartesian components are written $\mathbf{s} = (\cos \phi_s \sin \theta_s, \sin \phi_s \sin \theta_s, \cos \theta_s)$. Next, we linearize Eq. (1) and expand f_1 using the following ansatz

$$f_1 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{n, n'=-\infty}^{\infty} g_{n, n'} e^{in\varphi_p} e^{in'\varphi_s} e^{i(kz - \omega t)} \quad (11)$$

Applying this ansatz to the linearized version of Eq. (1), after some algebra we find an explicit expression of f_1 in terms of the unperturbed function f_0 of the form

$$f_1 = A + B_+ e^{i(\varphi_p - \varphi_s)} + B_- e^{-i(\varphi_p - \varphi_s)} \quad (12)$$

where

$$A = -\frac{iqE}{\omega - kp_z/m} \frac{\partial f_0}{\partial p_z} \quad (13)$$

$$B_{\pm} = -i \frac{q\mu B_0 E/4mc}{\omega - kp_z/m \mp \Delta\omega_{ce}} \left(\sin\theta_s + \cos\theta_s \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_s} \right) \frac{\partial f_0}{\partial p_{\perp}} \\ \pm i \frac{k\mu E p_{\perp}/4mc}{\omega - kp_z/m \mp \Delta\omega_{ce}} \left(\sin\theta_s + \cos\theta_s \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_s} \right) \frac{\partial f_0}{\partial p_z} \\ + i \frac{\mu E p_{\perp}/2\hbar mc}{\omega - kp_z/m \mp \Delta\omega_{ce}} \frac{\partial f_0}{\partial\theta_s}. \quad (14)$$

Here, $\Delta\omega_{ce} = \omega_{cg} - \omega_{ce}$, $\omega_{ce} = qB/m$ is the cyclotron frequency and $\omega_{cg} = (g/2)\omega_{ce}$ is the spin precession frequency and $g \approx 2.002318$ is the electron g -factor. Note that in the classical ($\hbar \rightarrow 0$) limit, we get $B_{\pm} = 0$ and we have the standard classical expression for electrostatic Langmuir waves.

Next we calculate the dispersion relation by using Ampère's law Eq. (4), where the total current \mathbf{J} is given by Eq. (6). In the integration process when calculating the currents, we expand the denominators in Eq. (12) to the first non-vanishing order of p_z , as is appropriate for a low or modest temperature. This condition is also necessary

to avoid strong wave-particle interaction leading to appreciable wave-damping. Moreover, we use the following expression of the background distribution f_0

$$f_0(p^2, \theta_s) = \sum_{\pm} (1 \pm \cos\theta_s) f_{0\pm}(p^2), \quad (15)$$

where $f_{0\pm}(p^2)$ is the unperturbed distribution function for the particles in spin up/down state. Thus we have $\int d\Omega f_{0\pm}(p^2) = n_{0\pm}$, where $n_{0\pm}$ is the number density for spin up/down state. To carry the momentum integration, we need to specify the background distribution function $f_{0\pm}$. For a non-degenerate plasma, where the Fermi temperature is well below the thermodynamic temperature, the appropriate distribution function is the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution function with a spin-dependent part [24]

$$f_{0\pm} = \frac{1}{N_m} e^{-p^2/m^2 v_{th}^2} e^{\pm\mu B_0/K_B T}, \quad (16)$$

where K_B is the Boltzmann constant, T is the temperature, the thermal velocity v_{th} fulfills $mv_{th}^2/2 = k_B T$, and $N_m = 8m^3 v_{th}^3 \pi^{5/2} \cosh(\mu B_0/K_B T)$ is the normalization factor. After carrying out the spin- and momentum-integration, we obtain the dispersion relation

$$\omega^2 \left(1 + \frac{\hbar^2 \omega_p^2 \Delta\omega_{ce}}{8m^2 c^4} \left[\frac{\omega_{ce}}{\omega^2 - \Delta\omega_{ce}^2} + \frac{k^2 v_{th}^2/2(3\omega^2 \omega_{ce} + \Delta\omega_{ce}^2 \omega_{ce})}{(\omega + \Delta\omega_{ce})^3 (\omega - \Delta\omega_{ce})^3} \right] + \frac{\omega m v_{th}^2}{\hbar \Delta\omega_{ce} (\omega^2 - \Delta\omega_{ce}^2)} \tanh \frac{\mu B_0}{K_B T} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{k^2 v_{th}^2 \omega}{(\omega + \Delta\omega_{ce})^2 (\omega - \Delta\omega_{ce})^2} \right) = \omega_p^2 \left(1 + \frac{3}{2} \frac{k^2 v_{th}^2}{\omega^2} \right) \quad (17)$$

where we have used

$$\omega_p^2 = \frac{q^2}{m} \sum_{\nu} \int d\Omega f_{0\nu}, \quad (18)$$

as the definition of the plasma frequency. Taking the classical limit by letting $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ in Eq. (17), most terms disappear and we get the classical Langmuir dispersion relation. While the coefficients in front of the spin-dependent terms are usually small (unless we have very high densities and/or magnetic field strengths), nevertheless the quantum terms can be important for wave-frequencies close to $\Delta\omega_{ce}$. The effects of spin-resonances, i.e. frequencies fulfilling $\omega \approx \Delta\omega_{ce}$ will be explored below.

C. The ponderomotive Force

The aim of this sub-section is to generalize the linearized treatment to the weakly nonlinear regime, in order to deduce the ponderomotive force for electrostatic waves.

For this purpose, we use the following ansatz

$$f(x, p, s, t) = f_0(p^2, \theta_s) + f_{lf}(z, t, p, \theta_s) \\ + \frac{1}{2} \left[\tilde{f}_1(z, t, p, s) e^{ikz - i\omega t} + \tilde{f}_1^*(z, t, p, s) e^{-ikz - i\omega t} \right]. \quad (19)$$

to calculate the weakly nonlinear low-frequency response to electrostatic waves. Here f_{lf} is the low-frequency response due to quadratic nonlinearities, \tilde{f}_1 represents the slowly varying high-frequency wave and the star denotes the complex conjugate. As usual, "slowly varying" means that the amplitude derivatives are small compared to the rapidly oscillating scale at (ω, k) . Using this ansatz in Eq. (1), keeping up to quadratically nonlinear terms, and averaging to isolate the low-frequency scale, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[\partial_t + \frac{p_z}{m} \partial_z\right] f_{lf} = & -qE_{lf} \frac{\partial f_0}{\partial p_z} - \frac{\mu}{2mc} \left[\tilde{\mathbf{E}} \times (\mathbf{s} + \nabla_s)\right] \cdot \nabla_x \tilde{f}_1^* \\
& - \frac{q\tilde{E}}{4} \frac{\partial \tilde{f}_1^*}{\partial p_z} - \frac{q\mu}{8mc} \left([\tilde{\mathbf{E}} \times (\mathbf{s} + \nabla_s)] \times \mathbf{B}_0\right) \cdot \nabla_p \tilde{f}_1^* \\
& + \frac{\mu}{4\hbar mc} \left[\mathbf{s} \times (\mathbf{p} \times \tilde{\mathbf{E}})\right] \nabla_s \tilde{f}_1^* + \frac{\mu}{8mc} \nabla \left[(\mathbf{s} + \nabla_s) \cdot (\mathbf{p} \times \tilde{\mathbf{E}})\right] \cdot \nabla_p \tilde{f}_1^* \\
& + c.c. \quad (20)
\end{aligned}$$

The high frequency response \tilde{f}_1 is obtained by making the substitution

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega & \rightarrow \omega + i\partial_t \\
k & \rightarrow k - i\partial_z
\end{aligned}$$

in the linear solution of f_1 in Eq. (12), where $i\partial_t$ and $i\partial_z$ can be treated as small perturbations due to the slowly varying amplitudes. Now having an implicit expression for f_{lf} , we will calculate the total low-frequency current

$$J_{lf} = J_{lf}^f + J_{lf}^p, \quad (21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{lf}^p &= -3\mu\partial_t \int d\Omega \frac{p_\perp}{2mc} \sin\theta_s \left(\cos\varphi_s \sin\varphi_p \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sin\varphi_s \cos\varphi_p \right) f_{lf} \\
J_{lf}^f &= q \int d\Omega \frac{p_z}{m} f_{lf} \quad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

are the free and polarization low-frequency current respectively. Note that the low frequency free current looks simpler than the expression in Eq. (9) since the current is directed along \hat{z} . Now we want to use the expression of f_{lf} in Eq. (20) to calculate the current Eq. (22). But since Eq. (20) does not provide an explicit expression of f_{lf} , we need to make some further calculations. We note that for low-frequency free current in Eq. (22), we have the following relation

$$\partial_t J_{lf}^f + q \int d\Omega \frac{p_z^2}{m^2} \frac{\partial f_{lf}}{\partial z} = q \int d\Omega \frac{p_z}{m} \left[\partial_t + \frac{p_z}{m} \partial_z\right] f_{lf}. \quad (23)$$

The term in the square brackets in Eq. (23) is the same as in the right hand side of Eq. (20). However we have the integral in the left hand side of Eq. (23) that we need to deal with. Due to the proportionality of p_z^2 , this term is small in the low temperature limit and we will use this for a perturbative calculation in the next step. Taking the time-derivative of Eq. (23), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t^2 J_{lf}^f &\approx q\partial_t \int d\Omega \frac{p_z}{m} \left[\partial_t + \frac{p_z}{m} \partial_z\right] f_{lf} \\
&\quad - q\partial_z \int d\Omega \frac{p_z^2}{m^2} \left[\partial_t + \frac{p_z}{m} \partial_z\right] f_{lf} \quad (24)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we added $p_z^3/m^3 \partial_z^2 f_{lf}$ in the last term. This term turns to be a higher order thermal correction to the rest of the terms, but we added it in order to use the implicit expression of f_{lf} in Eq. (20). Doing the same procedure for the polarization current, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t^2 J_{lf}^p &\approx -\frac{3\mu}{2mc} \partial_t^2 \int d\Omega p_\perp \sin\theta_s (\cos\varphi_s \sin\varphi_p - \sin\varphi_s \cos\varphi_p) \left[\partial_t + \frac{p_z}{m} \partial_z\right] f_{lf} \\
&\quad + \frac{3\mu}{2mc} \partial_t \int d\Omega p_\perp \sin\theta_s (\cos\varphi_s \sin\varphi_p - \sin\varphi_s \cos\varphi_p) \frac{p_z}{m} \partial_z \left[\partial_t + \frac{p_z}{m} \partial_z\right] f_{lf} \quad (25)
\end{aligned}$$

Now we can calculate the integrals in Eq. (24) and Eq. (25).

In doing that, we use the Eq. (15) for f_0 . Calculating the ϕ_s , ϕ_p and θ_s -integrals, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t^2 J_{lf}^f = & -2(2\pi)^2 q^2 \sum_{\nu} \int p_{\perp} dp_{\perp} dp_z \left[\frac{p_z}{m} \partial_t - \frac{p_z^2}{m^2} \partial_z \right] \left[E_{lf} \frac{\partial f_{0\nu}}{\partial p_z} \right. \\
& + i |E|^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial p_z} \left(\frac{1}{\omega - k \frac{p_z}{m} - i(\partial_t + \frac{p_z}{m} \partial_z)} - \frac{1}{\omega - k \frac{p_z}{m} + i(\partial_t + \frac{p_z}{m} \partial_z)} \right) \frac{\partial f_{0\nu}}{\partial p_z} \\
& + i |E|^2 \frac{\mu B_0}{32mc} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_{\perp}} \sum_{\pm} \left(\frac{q\mu B_0 \partial_{p_{\perp}} f_{0\nu} \mp (k - i\partial_z) \mu p_{\perp} \partial_{p_z} f_{0\nu} + 2\nu \mu p_{\perp} / \hbar f_{0\nu}}{\omega - k \frac{p_z}{m} - i(\partial_t + \frac{p_z}{m} \partial_z) \mp \Delta\omega_{ce}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \frac{q\mu B_0 \partial_{p_{\perp}} f_{0\nu} \mp (k + i\partial_z) \mu p_{\perp} \partial_{p_z} f_{0\nu} + 2\nu \mu p_{\perp} / \hbar f_{0\nu}}{\omega - k \frac{p_z}{m} + i(\partial_t + \frac{p_z}{m} \partial_z) \mp \Delta\omega_{ce}} \right) \right] \quad (26)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t^2 J_{lf}^p = & \frac{(2\pi)^2 q^2 \mu^2 |E|^2 \partial_t}{4m^2 c^2} \sum_{\nu, \pm} \int p_{\perp}^2 dp_{\perp} dp_z \left[\partial_t - \frac{p_z}{m} \partial_z \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial p_z} \\
& \left[\frac{\pm B_0 \partial_{p_{\perp}} f_{0\nu} - (k - i\partial_z) p_{\perp} / q \partial_{p_z} f_{0\nu} \pm 2\nu p_{\perp} / \hbar q f_{0\nu}}{\omega - k \frac{p_z}{m} - i(\partial_t + \frac{p_z}{m} \partial_z) \mp \Delta\omega_{ce}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{\pm B_0 \partial_{p_{\perp}} f_{0\nu} - (k + i\partial_z) p_{\perp} / q \partial_{p_z} f_{0\nu} \pm 2\nu p_{\perp} / \hbar q f_{0\nu}}{\omega - k \frac{p_z}{m} + i(\partial_t + \frac{p_z}{m} \partial_z) \mp \Delta\omega_{ce}} \right] \quad (27)
\end{aligned}$$

Expanding the denominators in Eq. (26) and Eq. (27) to lowest non-vanishing order of p_z , this is consistent with the approximation made in Eq. (24) and Eq. (25). Then, we integrate over p_z and p_{\perp} and use Ampere's law

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial_t^2} + \omega_p^2 \right) E_{lf} = & -\frac{2q\omega_p^2}{m\omega^2} \left[1 - \frac{7\mu B_0 \hbar \omega^2 \Delta\omega_{ce}}{64m^2 c^3 (\omega^2 - \Delta\omega_{ce}^2)} \right] \frac{\partial |E|^2}{\partial z} \\
& + \frac{\mu B_0 \hbar k q}{16m^3 c^3} \frac{\omega \Delta\omega_{ce} \omega_p^2}{(\omega + \Delta\omega_{ce})^2 (\omega - \Delta\omega_{ce})^2} \frac{\partial |E|^2}{\partial t}, \quad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the classical limit $\hbar \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial_t^2} + \omega_p^2 \right) E_{lf} = -\frac{2q\omega_p^2}{m\omega^2} \frac{\partial |E|^2}{\partial z} \equiv \frac{qn_0}{\epsilon_0} f_p \quad (29)$$

where f_p is defined by the second equality, such that f_p gives us the classical ponderomotive force. Due to the velocity perturbation being parallel to the external magnetic field, the unperturbed magnetic field does not influence the result in the classical case. However, quantum mechanically, due to the spin-orbit interaction, there is a contribution that modifies the classical ponderomotive force rather significantly, as seen by Eq. (28). In particular, in addition to a term proportional to the spatial intensity gradient, we get a term proportional to the temporal intensity gradient. Even more importantly, the quantum mechanical terms contain spin-resonances, that will be investigated in the next section.

III. COMPARISON OF CLASSICAL AND NON-CLASSICAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PONDEROMOTIVE FORCE

The purpose of this section is to illustrate the importance of the spin contributions in Eq. (28) by comparing the new terms to the classical contribution. However, the relative magnitude of the spin terms depend to a considerable degree on the linear wave properties of the electrostatic pulse, as described by the dispersion relation Eq. (17). To simplify the expression of the ponderomotive force in Eq. (28), we use that, to the lowest order approximation, the pulse is stationary in a frame moving with the group velocity $v_g = \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial k}$, such that the approximation

$$\frac{\partial |E|^2}{\partial t} \simeq -v_g \frac{\partial |E|^2}{\partial z} \quad (30)$$

can be applied to compare the magnitude of the terms in Eq. (28). Thus, as a prerequisite to studying the ponderomotive force, we need to analyze the linear dispersion relation to deduce the group velocity. While the general behavior of Eq. (17) can be complicated, our analysis is simplified by the fact that for most naturally occurring plasmas, we can treat $\hbar \omega_p / mc^2$ and $\hbar \omega_c / mc^2$ as small parameters. For this case, that we focus on below, the solutions of Eq. (17) separates into two modes. One mode resembling the classical Langmuir mode to a good approximation, and another mode with a frequency close to the spin resonance, approximately given by $\omega \simeq \Delta\omega_{ce}$. We will simply refer to these modes as the Langmuir mode and the spin resonance mode, respectively. Below we compare the relative contribution of the classical and

non-classical terms in Eq. (28) for the Langmuir mode and for the spin resonance mode.

A. The Langmuir mode

For a case where the linear dispersion is approximately classical, the frequency ω cannot be too close to the spin resonance. If the spin resonance is avoided, however, the magnitude of the quantum terms in Eq. (28) will also be somewhat limited. One would expect, perhaps, that the condition for neglecting the spin contribution to Eq. (28) would be the same as for dropping the spin contribution in Eq. (17). As it turns out, however, this is not quite true. To the contrary, it is possible to have a situation where the linear dispersion relation is approximately classical, although the spin terms dominate the expression for the ponderomotive force. This requires an intermediate regime, where the wave frequency is fairly close to the spin resonance, in order for the spin contributions of Eq. (28) to be magnified. Still, the wave frequency must be sufficiently far from the spin resonance, in order not to invalidate the classical approximation of Eq. (17). Firstly, we analyze the linear dispersion relation Eq. (17), comparing the classical terms with the dominant spin term. For the classical Langmuir dispersion relation to hold approximately, we must have the strong inequality

$$\frac{\hbar^2 \omega_p^2}{8m^2 c^4} \frac{\omega_{ce}}{\tilde{\omega}} \ll 1 \quad (31)$$

fulfilled, where $\tilde{\omega} \equiv \omega - \Delta\omega_{ce}$. Assuming this to hold, we can neglect all of the spin-terms in the dispersion relation Eq. (17).

However, although we cannot be too close to the spin resonance (as implied by Eq. (31)), we cannot be too far from the resonance, as otherwise the spin terms will not be significant in Eq. (28). In practice, for the Langmuir wave mode (and with $\hbar\omega_p/mc^2 \ll 1$ and $\hbar\omega_c/mc^2 \ll 1$), spin terms are significant only for a rather small wave number spectrum narrowly centered around $k \simeq k_c$, where k_c is the critical wave number where the classical Langmuir dispersion coincides with the spin resonance frequency. Thus, we will here be concerned with wave numbers $k \simeq k_c$, where k_c fulfills:

$$\omega^2 = \omega_p^2 + \frac{3}{2} k_c^2 v_{th}^2 \approx \Delta\omega_{ce}^2. \quad (32)$$

Evaluating the ponderomotive expression Eq. (28) in a narrow wave number spectrum centered around $k = k_c$ (such that ω , approximately given by the classical Langmuir dispersion relation is centered around $\Delta\omega_{ce}$), we evaluate temporal derivatives according to Eq. (30). More specifically, in Fig. 1, we plot the ratio of the total ponderomotive force and its classical contribution only, for a narrow frequency spectrum surrounding the spin resonance. We assume Eq. (31) to be fulfilled, such that the classical Langmuir dispersion relation can be used to




Figure 1. The fraction of the total and classical ponderomotive force α is plotted versus the normalized frequency difference $\omega_n = (\omega^2 - \Delta\omega_{ce}^2)/\Delta\omega_{ce}^2$ for $K_B T/mc^2 = 0.1$, $\omega_p/\Delta\omega_{ce} = 0.7$ and $\mu B_0/mc^2 = (0.1, 0.01)$ for the upper and lower panels respectively.




Figure 2. The fraction of the total and classical ponderomotive force α is plotted versus the normalized frequency difference $\omega_n = (\omega^2 - \Delta\omega_{ce}^2)/\Delta\omega_{ce}^2$ for different values of $R = \omega_p/\Delta\omega_{ce}$.

evaluate the group velocity. Moreover, the small deviation




Figure 3. The fraction of the spin and classical ponderomotive force α is plotted versus the normalized wavelength $k_n = kv_{th}\Delta\omega_{ce}$. The solid curve is the first spin-term, the star-curve is the second spin term and the dashed curve is the total spin-force. In the first panel we have $B_n = 0.1, R = 2$, in the second we have $B_n = 0.1, R = 0.9$ and in the third $B_n = 0.1, R = 0.1$.




Figure 4. The fraction of the spin and classical ponderomotive force α is plotted versus the normalized wavelength $k_n = kv_{th}\Delta\omega_{ce}$. The solid curve is the first spin-term, the star-curve is the second spin term and the dashed curve is the total spin-force. In the first panel we have $B_n = 0.1, R = 0.9$ and in the second we have $B_n = 0.1, R = 0.7$.

of k from k_c has been neglected in the plot. While the region where Eq. (31) is violated from the plot must be discarded (the region inside the two dashed vertical lines shown in the first panel of Fig. 1), we note that the spin terms of Eq. (28) magnifies the ponderomotive force in a wider region frequency region than the one that must be excluded. In other words, there is a narrow frequency band where the linear wave properties are classical to a good approximation, but where the nonlinear properties need to be evaluated with the spin terms included. In the second panel of Fig. 1, we see a similar plot, but for a somewhat weaker magnetic field (normalized magnetic field $B_n = \mu B_0/mc^2 = 0.01$), in which case the resonance region becomes slightly more narrow. The narrowing applies in a much higher degree to the validity condition. Thus, in the second panel of Fig. 1, the region violating the inequality Eq. (31) is too narrow to be displayed. To be concrete, if the two vertical lines were given as in Fig. 1, but for the new parameter values, the vertical lines would be centered too close to the precise resonance at $\omega_n = 0$ to be separable in the given resolution. Finally, to show the role of a varying density, three curves for different values of $R \equiv \omega_p/\Delta\omega_{ce}$ are shown in Fig. 2. We can see that the curve with the higher value of R has the most narrow resonance.

Finally, before we turn our attention to the spin resonance mode, we note that for the Langmuir mode, the second spin term (proportional to $\partial|E|^2/\partial t$) in Eq. (28) always dominate over the first (proportional to $\partial|E|^2/\partial z$), since the resonance is of a higher order for the second

term.

B. The Spin resonance mode

Next, we will consider the complimentary frequency regime close to the spin resonance where Eq. (31) is violated. Specifically, we focus on the long wavelength regime $|kv_{th}/(\omega - \Delta\omega_{ce})| \ll 1$, in order to avoid strong Landau damping of the mode. Since we are focusing on the spin resonance mode, we can let $\omega = \Delta\omega_{ce}$ when evaluating the ponderomotive force terms Eq. (28), except in the denominators, where, obviously, a more accurate expression must be used. As a prerequisite for further analysis, we calculate the frequency for the mode at $k = 0$, which will deviate slightly from $\Delta\omega_{ce}$. Approximating the denominators of $1/(\omega^2 - \Delta\omega_{ce}^2)$ of Eq. (17) as $1/[2(\omega - \Delta\omega_{ce})\Delta\omega_{ce}]$, we compute the frequency for $k = 0$ for the spin resonance mode as

$$\omega = \Delta\omega_{ce}(1 + \delta) \quad (33)$$

where

$$\delta = \frac{\hbar^2 \omega_p^2 \omega_{ce} \Delta\omega_{ce}}{16m^2 c^4 (\omega_p^2 - \Delta\omega_{ce}^2)} \left[1 + \frac{mv_{th}^2}{\hbar \omega_{ce}} \tanh\left(\frac{\mu B_0}{k_B T}\right) \right] \quad (34)$$

We note that $\delta \ll 1$ holds to a very good approximation for most parameters of physical interest.

Next, we consider the spin-resonance mode in the long wavelength regime $|kv_{th}/(\omega - \Delta\omega_{ce})| \ll 1$, where the terms proportional to k^2 of Eq. (17) are small corrections. The dispersion relation can then be approximated by

$$\omega = \Delta\omega_{ce} \left[(1 + \delta) + \frac{\hbar^2 \omega_p^2}{128m^2 c^4} \frac{\omega_{ce} \Delta\omega_{ce}}{(\omega_p^2 - \Delta\omega_{ce}^2)} \frac{k^2 v_t^2}{(\omega - \Delta\omega_{ce})^2} \right] \quad (35)$$

Apparently, since $\delta \ll 1$, and the dispersive term proportional to k^2 in Eq. (35) is small in the long wavelength regime, $\omega \approx \Delta\omega_{ce}$ applies for the spin resonance-mode. Using Eq. (35), we can compute the group velocity for the spin resonance mode, and compare the magnitude of the classical and the spin terms in Eq. (28). The first spin term of Eq. (28) (proportional to $\partial|E|^2/\partial z$) and the second spin term (proportional to $\partial|E|^2/\partial t$) as well as the sum of both are plotted in Fig. 3 as a function of normalized wave-number $k_n = kv_{th}/(\omega - \Delta\omega_{ce})$, where the validity condition of the plot require $k_n \ll 1$. All contributions are normalized against the classical ponderomotive force, i.e. a contribution equal to -1 is equal in magnitude to the classical ponderomotive force but has the opposite sign. The classical ponderomotive force for electrostatic fields is always directed from higher intensity to lower intensity, but, as seen in Fig. 3, this does not always hold for the spin contributions. Specifically, the first spin term, which dominate for the longest wavelength, can have the opposite sign as the classical term. However, while this term can be significant, it cannot be negative

enough to revert the direction of the total ponderomotive force. Thus, independently of wave-number and parameter values, the total ponderomotive force for electrostatic fields is always directed from higher to lower intensities.

One might expect that the spin terms are always important for the spin resonance mode. However, as shown in the first and second panels of Fig. 3, the classical ponderomotive force can be dominant for the longest wavelengths (both spin terms and the sum of them are well below unity). A thing to note when comparing the first and second panels of Fig. 3 is the change of sign of the first spin term. As it turns out, the first spin term has the same sign as $1 - R$.

Next, as seen in the third panel of Fig. 3, we note that the relative importance of the ponderomotive force terms are rather sensitive to the plasma density. Decreasing the density, as captured by the R -parameter, we see that the first spin term becomes larger than the classical term, and will dominate in the long wavelength regime.

In Fig. 3 we have only shown the results for really long wavelengths up to $k_n < 10^{-3}$. As the calculations of this section apply up to $k_n < 0.1$, the shorter wavelength regime is also of interest. Using the same parameters as in the second panel of Fig. 3, but extending the wave-number regime, we see in the first panel of Fig. 4 that the spin part of the ponderomotive force (due to the second term) will dominate for the shorter wavelengths. Decreasing the density further (as in the second panel of Fig. 4), the effects are even more pronounced, as the spin term can be more than a factor 50 larger than the classical term. Due to the scale, it is hard to read of the first spin-term that is small compared to the other terms in both panels of Fig. 4. This term varies little with wave-numbers and is close to 0.1 in the upper panel and 0.45 in the lower panel, for the whole spectrum.

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the present paper, we have calculated the ponderomotive force for electrostatic waves propagating in a plasma parallel to an external magnetic field. The calculation has been performed using a quantum kinetic model, including the electron spin dynamics, covering effects such as spin-orbit interaction and Thomas precession. The model is of particular interest for strongly magnetized environments, as can be found in astrophysics. The ponderomotive force is of crucial importance for a large number of nonlinear phenomena, such as e.g. soliton formation, self-focusing, wake field generation, and particle acceleration.

In section IV we have studied the relative magnitude of classical and quantum mechanical contributions to the ponderomotive force. An interesting finding is that many of the preliminary conclusions from linear theory does not translate into the nonlinear regime. Thus, even if the inequality Eq. (31) is fulfilled, such that the linear dispersion relation agrees to a good approximation with the classical Langmuir dispersion relation, in the vicinity

of the spin resonance the quantum terms may still dominate the expression for the ponderomotive force. Similarly, even when the linear mode is a spin resonance mode (given by expression Eq. (35), which is quantum mechanical in nature, it may happen that the ponderomotive force is given by the classical expression. However, depending on the plasma parameters and the wave-number, it is also possible that the quantum contribution is larger than the classical one by orders of magnitude.

Understanding the nonlinear spin dynamics in the simpler case of electrostatic fields is a first step towards understanding more complex nonlinear phenomena, such as e.g. spin polarization by intense laser pulses [11, 12]. Moreover, the findings of our paper are a necessary prerequisite for a more detailed analysis of nonlinear phenomena of astrophysical plasmas, in particular accretion discs surrounding objects such as pulsars and magnetars.

-
- [1] G. Manfredi, P.-A. Hervieux, and J. Hurst, Phase-space modeling of solid-state plasmas: A journey from classical to quantum, *Reviews of Modern Plasma Physics* **3**, 13 (2019).
 - [2] P. Shukla and B. Eliasson, Colloquium: Nonlinear collective interactions in quantum plasmas with degenerate electron fluids, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **83**, 885 (2011).
 - [3] D. Melrose, Quantum kinetic theory for unmagnetized and magnetized plasmas: A tutorial review of quantum plasma theory, *Reviews of Modern Plasma Physics* **4**, 8 (2020).
 - [4] S. V. Vladimirov and Y. O. Tyshetskiy, On description of a collisionless quantum plasma, *Physics-Uspekhi* **54**, 1243 (2011).
 - [5] G. Brodin and J. Zamanian, Quantum kinetic theory of plasmas, *Reviews of Modern Plasma Physics* **6**, 1 (2022).
 - [6] G. Manfredi and P.-A. Hervieux, Autoresonant control of the many-electron dynamics in nonparabolic quantum wells, *Applied Physics Letters* **91**, 061108 (2007).
 - [7] H. A. Atwater, The promise of plasmonics, *Scientific American* **296**, 56 (2007).
 - [8] S. Wolf, D. Awschalom, R. Buhrman, J. Daughton, v. S. von Molnár, M. Roukes, A. Y. Chtchelkanova, and D. Treger, Spintronics: a spin-based electronics vision for the future, *science* **294**, 1488 (2001).
 - [9] G. Chabrier, F. Douchin, and A. Potekhin, Dense astrophysical plasmas, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **14**, 9133 (2002).
 - [10] D. A. Uzdensky and S. Rightley, Plasma physics of extreme astrophysical environments, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **77**, 036902 (2014).
 - [11] Y.-F. Li, R. Shaisultanov, K. Z. Hatsagortsyan, F. Wan, C. H. Keitel, and J.-X. Li, Ultrarelativistic electron-beam polarization in single-shot interaction with an ultraintense laser pulse, *Physical review letters* **122**, 154801 (2019).
 - [12] D. Del Sorbo, D. Seipt, T. Blackburn, A. Thomas, C. Murphy, J. Kirk, and C. Ridgers, Spin polarization of electrons by ultraintense lasers, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A Phys Rev A* **96**, 043407 (2017).
 - [13] L. Gorbunov and V. Kirsanov, Excitation of plasma waves by an electromagnetic wave packet, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz* **93**, 509 (1987).
 - [14] R. Bingham, On the crest of a wake, *Nature* **445**, 721 (2007).
 - [15] G. Thejappa and R. MacDowall, Langmuir solitons in solar type iii radio bursts: Stereo observations, *The Astrophysical Journal* **864**, 122 (2018).
 - [16] P. Shukla, N. Rao, M. Yu, and N. Tsintsadze, Relativistic nonlinear effects in plasmas, *Physics Reports* **138**, 1 (1986).
 - [17] P. Kaw, Nonlinear laser-plasma interactions, *Reviews of Modern Plasma Physics* **1**, 1 (2017).
 - [18] H. Washimi and V. Karpman, The ponderomotive force of a high-frequency electromagnetic field in a dispersive medium, *Soviet Physics-JETP* **44**, 528 (1976).
 - [19] G. Brodin, A. Misra, and M. Marklund, Spin contribution to the ponderomotive force in a plasma, *Physical Review Letters* **105**, 105004 (2010).
 - [20] M. Stefan, J. Zamanian, G. Brodin, A. P. Misra, and M. Marklund, Ponderomotive force due to the intrinsic spin in extended fluid and kinetic models, *Physical Review E* **83**, 036410 (2011).
 - [21] M. Stefan and G. Brodin, Linear and nonlinear wave propagation in weakly relativistic quantum plasmas, *Physics of Plasmas* **20**, 012114 (2013).
 - [22] F. A. Asenjo, J. Zamanian, M. Marklund, G. Brodin, and P. Johansson, Semi-relativistic effects in spin-1/2 quantum plasmas, *New Journal of Physics* **14**, 073042 (2012).
 - [23] J. Hurst, P.-A. Hervieux, and G. Manfredi, Phase-space methods for the spin dynamics in condensed matter systems, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **375**, 20160199 (2017).
 - [24] J. Zamanian, M. Marklund, and G. Brodin, Scalar quantum kinetic theory for spin-1/2 particles: mean field theory, *New Journal of Physics* **12**, 043019 (2010).