# Stochastic Ferm i A cceleration of sub-R elativistic E lectrons and Its R ole in Im pulsive Solar F lares

Robert Selkow itz and Eric G.Blackman

Dept. of Physics and A stronom y, and Laboratory for Laser Energetics, University of Rochester, Rochester NY, 14627

#### ABSTRACT

We reexam ine stochastic Ferm iacceleration (STFA) in the low energy (New tonian) regime in the context of solar ares. The particle energization rate depends a dispersive term and a coherent gain term. The energy dependence of pitch angle scattering is in portant for determ ining the electron energy spectrum. For scattering by whistler wave turbulence, STFA produces a quasi-therm al spectrum. A second well-constrained scattering mechanism is needed for STFA to match the observed 10 100keV non-therm al spectrum. We suggest that STFA most plausibly acts as phase one of a two phase particle acceleration engine in in pulsive ares: STFA can match the therm al spectrum below 10kev, and possibly the power law spectrum between 10 and 100keV, given the proper pitch angle scattering. However, a second phase, such as shock acceleration at loop tops, is likely required to match the spectrum above the observed knee at 100keV. Understanding this knee, if it survives further observations, is tricky.

Subject headings: acceleration of particles, Sun: ares, Sun: X-R ays, gam m a-rays

#### 1. Introduction

Ferm iacceleration was rst proposed as a mechanism for cosm ic ray acceleration (Ferm i 1949, 1954). In the original model, compressive perturbations in the G alactic magnetic eld, associated with molecular clouds, reject charged particles. If these clouds converge, the particles gain energy over time. If they diverge, the particles lose energy. Later, it was realized (Bell 1978; Axford, Leer, & Skadron 1978; K rym skii 1977; B landford & Eichler 1987), that shock fronts are another site of Ferm i Acceleration. In the shock acceleration model, charged particles stream into magnetic perturbations in the post-shock region, reject, and are scattered back across the shock by pre-shock A liven waves. Repeated rejections

steadily accelerate particles to a power law distribution. This has been studied extensively (e.g. Jones & Ellison 1991). If the shock thickness is determ ined by the ion gyroradius then ions are picked up out of the therm all population but electrons must be injected at energies at or above the therm all energy by a factor of the ratio of proton to electron mass, ( $m_p=m_e$ ), to incur power law acceleration. The injection process is a critical outstanding problem for many applications of shock acceleration. Shock Ferm i acceleration is commonly referred to as rst order Ferm i Acceleration because the sign of the energy gain after each cycle is positive and dE =dt /  $v_c=v$ , where E and v are the electron energy and speed, and  $v_c$  the velocity of the magnetic compression.

Fem i acceleration can also take place in a fully turbulent plasma. There, the mirroring sites are turbulent perturbations, typically fast mode magnetohydrodynamic waves, random ly distributed throughout the plasma (e.g. A chterberg (1984)). Electrons encounter these perturbations such that there is a stochastic distribution of energy gaining and energy losing relectrons. As is demonstrated below, there is a net dissipation of turbulent energy into high energy electrons. Because the energy gaining and energy losing relectrons are equal to rst order, STFA is often referred to as second order Ferm i acceleration and proceedsmore slow ly than the rst order process. For STFA, dE =dt /  $(v_c=v)^2$ .

STFA has been considered extensively as the acceleration mechanism in impulsive solar ares, (e.g. LaRosa et al. (1996)). Observations of these ares show hard X-ray emission with a downward breaking power law spectrum extending from 10keV to at least 0.5M eV with the break energy narrow ly distributed around  $E_{br} = 100$  keV and a therm ald istribution at energies below 10keV (Dulk et al. 1992; Krucker, & Lin 2002). The time structure of the em ission shows distinct spikes of duration 1s and typical energy 10<sup>26</sup> erg (A schwanden, et al. 1995). Non-therm alem ission occurs principally at the footpoints of the soft X -ray loop, and to a lesser extent at a loop-top hard X -ray source (T suneta 1996; M asuda, et al. 1996). B rown (1971) has shown that the emission at a dense target is consistent with B rem sstrahlung radiation by electrons accelerated to a power law energy distribution at some height above the target; in impulsive ares the acceleration site can be associated with the loop-top region, while the thick target is associated with the footpoints. We dem onstrate that STFA is possibly responsible for the acceleration of electrons below 10keV, while st order Fermi processes at the loop-top fast shock m ay produce the highest energy electrons. In this picture STFA also provides power law distributed electrons in the range 10 keV < E < 100 keV, thus satisfying the shock in jection criterion and producing the observed spectral break at 100keV. It is shown that in order to produce this spectrum the pitch angle scattering must obey the restriction that the scattering distance,  $_{\rm P}$  , is inversely proportional to the energy of the 100keV range. M atching the knee is di cult, requiring either scattered electron in the 10 a cuto in the secondary pitch scattering at 100keV, or the sudden onset of yet another

pitch scattering agent with a much shorter wavelength. While both are possible, these requirements provide a serious challenge to STFA models of electron acceleration.

It is in portant to note that the downward break is not observed in all in pulsive solar ares. Indeed, Dulk et al. (1992) observed a spread in break energies and spectral indexes. Some of their ares exhibited no discernible break, or even some upward breaks (ankles). In this paper we address the fundam ental process of STFA, and show how it can accomm odate the downward breaking spectra observed in a subset of impulsive ares. The general form of the electron spectra we model is illustrated in gure 1. We assume a thick target B rem m - strahlung emission model where the electron spectral index and the photon spectral index are related by = +1 (B rown 1971; Tandberg-Hanssen & Em slie 1988). The data show n are mean values taken from the ares studied by Dulk et al. (1992): E br = 100keV, = 4 below E br, and = 525 above E<sub>b</sub>r.

Furtherm ore, not all ares are observed to be dominated by electron acceleration. A recent are observed by Hurford et al. (2003) clearly shows regions of emission which are dom inated by X-ray emission from electrons as well as regions which are dom inated by gyrosynchrotron emission from MeV/nucleon ions. Proton and ion emission appears to be associated primarily associated with larger are loops. Miller and Roberts (1995); Miller, Em slie, and Brown (2004) propose that this can be explained by a two stage process for ion acceleration. First, ions are accelerated via gyroresonance to speeds of roughly  $v_A$  by A liven waves, and subsequently are accelerated preferentially over electrons by m agnetosonic waves. They argue convincingly for the gyroresonant acceleration by A liven waves on the basis of relative ion abundances. However, it is unclear that the second stage acceleration by m agnetosonic m odes m ust be resonant. It appears that the second stage is consistent with STFA. In any event, proton acceleration in long are loops presents an interesting problem for acceleration m odels, in that suepr-A livenic protons m ust be preferentially accelerated over electrons, but electron acceleration still must be dominant in shorter loops. In this work, we presume that the bops are su ciently short that protons remain sub-Alfvenic. Longer bops, and the e ects of proton acceleration on the shaping of the observed B rem sstrahlung X-ray spectra from high energy electrons, require further study.

STFA is found to depend on two competing e ects which we refer to as the steady and di usive acceleration rates. The steady rate represents the net acceleration of electrons due to the slight advantage of head-on or energy gaining relections over catch-up or energy losing relections. The di usive term represents the spreading of the electron distribution function as a result of the stochastic nature of the relections. Longair (1994) treats the two elects together using the Fokker-Planck equation. Likewise, Park and Petrosian (1995) discuss general solutions of a simpli ed Fokker-Planck equation for STFA. In a follow-up work, Park, Petrosian, and Schwartz (1997) apply their solution to solar ares. W hile they produce spectra consistent with observations, they do not discuss the physics of electron escape. Furtherm ore, they focus mainly on the regime above 100keV. Som e past treatments of STFA in impulsive area focused exclusively on the di usive term . LaR osa et al. (1996) derives the di usive acceleration rate using simple physical arguments. Chandran (2003) derives the di usive term using both phenom enological argum ents and quasi-linear theory. The latter also includes C obum b losses as a sm all correction; this is of note since the C obum b loss term is mathematically similar to a negative steady acceleration term. Herein we derive the steady term and compare it to the di usive term, nding the steady acceleration to be dom inant in the non-relativistic regime for impulsive ares. As will be seen, our steady term di ers slightly from that of som e previous calculations such as that in Longair (1994) in its dependence on the turbulent magnetic uctuation strength. This arises because we average only over the pitch angle phase space for which STFA operates in m agnetic m irroring, whereas Longair (1994) averaged over all pitch angles in considering a more generic form of Ferm i acceleration. A similar averaging over all pitch angles is performed in Skilling (1975); Webb (1983).

We rst review the basic Ferm i process using a test particle approach. We then derive an expression for the mean acceleration of electrons in a turbulent plasm a via STFA, and compare this to the di usive STFA derived by LaRosa et al. (1996). Finally, we discuss the trapping of electrons in the turbulent accelerating region and show that at non-relativistic energies, the electron spectrum depends strongly on the energy dependence of pitch angle scattering. For scattering by whistler wave turbulence, the emerging spectrum is quasitherm al. In order to produce the 10 100keV power law in solar area, we show that there must be an additional source of pitch angle scattering which has a length scale inversely dependent on electron energy; this mechanism is tightly constrained. The existence of such a pitch angle scattering mechanism is yet to be determ ined. This brings to the fore the most pressing di culty with STFA models of electron acceleration; the pitch angle scattering requirem ents are stringent and m ight not be possible to meet.

#### 2. The Ferm iA cceleration Process

Consider a particle of charge q traveling with gyroradius  $r_G$  in a magnetic eld of strength B (Ferm i1949, 1954; Spitzer 1956). The charge follows a helical path, orbiting the eld line while also moving parallel (or anti-parallel) to the eld line. Taking the condition for circular motion and the Lorentz force

$$F = qv_{2} B = \frac{m v_{2}^{2}}{r_{G}};$$
 (1)

where q is the electron charge, and applying conservation laws for angular momentum and kinetic energy ( $r_{G} v_{?}$  and  $v^{2}$  constant) yields

$$\frac{qL}{mE} = \frac{\sin^2}{B}; \qquad (2)$$

where L is the angular momentum of the charge, E the kinetic energy, and  $v \sin = v_{2}$  relates the total velocity to the component perpendicular to the eld line. The pitch angle, , is the angle between the eld line and the velocity vector. A s the charge enters a region of increasing B, such as a magnetic compression, the pitch angle evolves according to

$$\frac{\sin^2_{1}}{B + B} = \frac{\sin^2_{1}}{B}$$
(3)

where B is the increase in eld strength and  $_1$  is the pitch angle at eld strength B + B. W hen sin  $_1 = 1$ , the charge cannot penetrate further into the compression, and re ects. This process, known as magnetic m informing, is commonly used to con ne laboratory plasm as (D endy 1990). It follows immediately that m informing will not occur at a given compression unless the initial pitch angle satis es

$$\sin^2 \qquad \frac{B}{B + B}: \tag{4}$$

Fem i (1949, 1954) showed that moving magnetic mirrors, in particular molecular clouds, can accelerate charges. In the cloud's frame of reference (primed), mirroring results in only a change in the sign of  $v_k^0$ , the component of the initial velocity of the charge parallel to the eld line in the compression's rest frame. Let us work for the moment in the limit where the compression speed and the particle speed are both c. Transforming to the lab frame,  $v_k = 2v_k$ , where  $v_c$  is the drift velocity of the cloud. The positive (negative) sign is for head-on (catch-up) rejections between the charge and cloud. Catch-up rejections are dened as those where the components of the compression and charge velocities parallel to the eld line have the same sign. Head on rejections are those where the parallel components have opposite signs. The net change in energy from a rejection is given by

$$E = \frac{m}{2} (v_{f}^{2} - v_{0}^{2}) = \frac{m}{2} (2 - v_{k} v_{0} \cos(0) + (-v_{k})^{2}) = (2m) (-v_{k} v_{k} + v_{c}^{2});$$
(5)

where  $v_f$  and  $v_0$  are the speeds after and before relection, m is the mass of the charge, and  $v_k = v_0 \cos($ ). Head-on relections result in a positive energy change, while catch-up re ections can result in a negative energy change when  $v_k > v_c$ . In both types of re ection, there is the positive term proportional to  $v_c^2$ .

O ne can repeat this derivation using Lorentz transform ations in place of the G alilean transform ations to generalize this result to particles of any energy scattered by com pressions which are still restricted to non-relativistic velocities. For a derivation see Longair (1994); we simply cite the result:

$$E_{R} = 2E \qquad \frac{V_{c}V_{k}}{c^{2}} + \frac{V_{c}^{2}}{c^{2}}$$
; (6)

where c is the speed of light in vacuum. Over time, charges trapped between converging magnetic compressions are subject to only head-on relections, and are accelerated to higher energies.

Notice that the change in momentum of a Ferm i accelerated electron is solely in the component parallel to the mean eld. This corresponds to an increase in the electron's pitch angle. As an extreme example, consider an electron of initial energy  $E_0$  with pitch angle in the mean eld B approaching =2. Upon doubling the electron's energy via Ferm i acceleration, the pitch angle in the mean eld is reduced to =4. C learly, acceleration to high energy must be accompanied by some additional scattering agent which isotropizes electron pitch angles on a short time scale, otherwise Ferm i acceleration shuts o after sm all accelerations as pitch angles evolve out of the range given by (4). The well known problem of pitch angle scattering remains largely unsolved (e.g. A chterberg (1981); M elrose (1974); LaR osa et al. (1996)).

Ferm i acceleration is distinct from the transit time damping (TTD) treated, for example, in M iller, Larosa, & M oore (1996). TTD is the magnetic analog of Landau D amping. In TTD, electrons (or ions) which are near gyroresonance with waves of wavenum bwerk are pushed towards the resonance by eld gradients in the wave which alter the parallel component of the velocity. G radients in the electron velocity spectrum result in a net damping or enhancement of the waves. In the presence of a spectrum of waves, an electron can drift from resonance at k to k k and so forth, eventually reaching high energies. Ferm i A coeleration, however, is a non-resonant interaction. Electrons will mirror at a compression regardless of energy provided that the pitch angle is su ciently large. TTD is often referred to as resonant Ferm i A coeleration because the two processes rely on sim ilar physics. Table 1 lists the relevent length and time scales for STFA in impulsive ares.

Length scale	D escription	Time scale	D escription
L <sub>T</sub>	Turbulent outer scale	S	Steady STFA acceleration time
Т	Turbulent eddy scale	D	Diusive STFA acceleration time
k	Parallel eddy scale	ΕD	Turbulent eddy tim e
?	Perpendicular eddy scale	р	Pitch angle scattering time
SF	E ective STFA scale		
р	MFP for pitch angle scattering		
wh	$_{ m p}$ for scattering by whistlers		
С	Constrained <sub>p</sub> for 10 100keV		

Table 1: Table of length and time scales relevant to STFA in in pulsive ares.

## 3. Stochastic Ferm i A cceleration

We now consider the behavior of charges in a turbulent magnetic plasm a where magnetosonic modes provide the sites of magnetic mirroring. This scenario di ers from rst order Ferm i acceleration by shocks in two ways. 1) Consecutive mirroring events are not coherent, but rather stochastically distributed between head-on and catch-up. 2) The turbulent cascade governs the acceleration e ciency; the system picks out a scale where acceleration competes with the cascade. In the solar corona plasma,  $v_c$ , the velocity of the magnetic compressions, is the phase speed of the magnetosonic modes, which is roughly the A lfven speed for the fast mode and the sound speed ( $c_s$ ) for the slow mode. Typically, therm al electrons in the corona are super-A lfvenic and non-relativistic,  $v_A = v_0$  c, and v 0:05; we will solve the STFA problem in this regime.

#### 3.1. Determ ination of the Steady A cceleration R ate

Recall that the energy gain from a typical relection is given in Eq.(5) to be E = 2m (  $v_k v_c + v_c^2$ ). We dere three parameters: R, the total rate of relections; R<sub>+</sub>, the rate of head-on relections; and R, the rate of catch-up relections. The relation R = R<sub>+</sub> + R is autom atically satisfied by this denition as all relections must be of either the head-on or catch-up type. This allows us to write the approximate acceleration rate as the sum of a coherent term and an incoherent term :

$$\frac{dE}{dt}_{s} = 2m [(R_{+} R_{+})v_{k}v_{c} + (R_{+} + R_{-})v_{c}^{2}];$$
(7)

where the subscript S is used to distinguish our derived acceleration rate from that of LaR osa et al. (1996). The set term, proportional to  $(R_+ R_-)$  represents the mean acceleration due to the o set in the rates of the two types of relection. The second term, proportional to  $(R_+ + R_-) = R$ , the total relection rate, represents the coherent term. This expression gives a full description of the mean acceleration of charges by the non-relativistic STFA process. To evaluate it in a particular plasm a requires the determ ination of the head-on and catch-up relection rates  $R_+$  and  $R_-$ .

In order to obtain  $R_+$  and  $R_-$ , consider the path a charge takes to encounter a m irror. Note that there is a distinction between an encounter and a m irroring because of the pitch angle condition for rejection. We take the fraction of encounters which reject to be F and assume that this fraction is the same for both head-on and catch-up encounters:  $F = F_+ = F_-$ . This assumption is often taken in the regime where  $v_-v_c$  (LaR osa et al. 1996). While this assumption is not strictly true, the elects of relaxing it are negligible. In Appendix B we repeat this calculation without assuming  $F_+ = F_-$ . There is a well defined mean distance between encounters,  $T_-$  as well as a relative velocity between the particle and the compression  $v_- = v_k$ . We the set in rates. For each type of encounter, the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing of any sort is specified by the general relation  $R_- = F_- v_{rel}$ , with  $v_{rel}$  the relative velocity between the particle and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separation is 2  $T_-$  and the rate of relaxing the mean separati

$$R_{+} = F \frac{V_{k} + V_{c}}{2_{T}}$$

$$R_{-} = F \frac{V_{k} - V_{c}}{2_{T}}$$

$$R_{-} = F \frac{V_{k} - V_{c}}{2_{T}}$$

$$R_{-} = F \frac{V_{k}}{T}$$
(8)

The oset in rates is thus

$$R_{+} \qquad R = F \frac{V_{c}}{T}; \qquad (9)$$

and we can rewrite the average acceleration rate as

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = 2m F \frac{v_k v_c^2}{T} + 2m F \frac{v_k v_c^2}{T} = 4m F \frac{v_k v_c^2}{T}; \qquad (10)$$

with the associated acceleration time scale  $_{s} = E = \frac{dE}{dt}_{s}$ . We thus see that the acceleration due to the o set in head-on and catch-up rejection rates and the acceleration from the coherent term in  $v_{c}$  are equal.

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = 4m v_c^2 R = \frac{dE}{dM} \frac{dM}{dt}; \qquad (11)$$

where we used (8) and de neM as the total number of relections experienced by an electron, dM = dt = R, and

$$dE = dM = 4m v_c^2 :$$
 (12)

The quantity dE = dM, the mean acceleration of an electron per relection, will be of particular use when examining electron escape in section 4.

#### 3.2. C om parison to the D i usive A cceleration R ate

A di erent approach was taken by LaRosa et al. (1996). They set  $R_{+} = R_{-}$  in the  $v_{c}$  regime and studied the di usion of particles through energy space via random walk. The starting point in their calculation of the electron acceleration was the timescale for the e-folding of a charged particle's energy in the turbulent plasm a

$$\frac{1}{D} = \frac{1}{E} \quad \frac{dE}{dt} \quad = \frac{F}{N \quad t};$$
(13)

where N is the number of mirrorings required to double the particle's energy and t is the time between encounters. They set  $R_+$   $R_-=0$ , and also dropped the last term in  $v_c^2$  in Eq.6. From (7) and (10) it is clear that if one of their two assumptions is valid the other must also apply, and  $(dE = dt)_s = 0$  in that limit. Under these assumptions  $E_+$  and E are equal in magnitude, and from the standard solution of an evenly weighted random walk  $N = (E = E)^2$ . The acceleration rate is then

$$\frac{dE}{dt}_{D} = \frac{E}{D} = F \frac{E^{2}}{E} \frac{v_{k}}{T} = \frac{8F}{T} \frac{m v_{c}^{2} v_{k}^{3}}{v_{0}^{2}}; \qquad (14)$$

where  $v_0$  is the total initial speed and the subscript D is used to denote LaRosa et al's di usive acceleration rate.

To complete the calculation of the acceleration rates, we must obtain F and average over pitch angles. The minimum accessible pitch angle for rejection is related to F by

$$F = \cos(m_{in}) = \frac{B}{B}^{1=2};$$
 (15)

where we have applied the rejection condition from (4). In the regime where the compression ratio B = B < < 1, which will apply to the plasm a of interest, and taking the assumption that pitch angles are isotropic gives hoos() i =  $\cos(m_{in})=2$  and hoos<sup>3</sup>() i =  $\cos^3(m_{in})=4$ . We now write the averaged acceleration rates as

$$\frac{dE}{dt}_{S} = 4m F \frac{v_{k} v_{c}^{2}}{T} = \frac{2m}{T} (v_{c}^{2}v) \frac{B}{B} ; \qquad (16)$$

$$\frac{dE}{dt}_{D} = \frac{8F}{T} \frac{m v_{c}^{2} v_{k}^{3}}{v_{0}^{2}} = \frac{2m}{T} (v_{c}^{2}v) \frac{B}{B}^{2} :$$
(17)

W hat do these two acceleration rates represent?  $(dE = dt)_S$  is the steady growth of the mean kinetic energy due to the drain of turbulence by the combined e ects the slightly non-zero (R<sub>+</sub> R) and the coherent  $v_A^2$  term : a shift of the mean electron energy to higher energy. On the other hand,  $(dE = dt)_D$  represents the di usion of energies away from the mean via random walk: a spreading of the distribution. The relative in portance of the two is xed by their ratio

$$= \frac{\frac{dE}{dt s}}{\frac{dE}{dt p}} = \frac{B}{B}$$
(18)

The combined result of the action of both processes on an initially narrow G aussian energy distribution is shown in Fig2 where we have chosen = 65. and assume that electrons do not escape. Thus we can exam ine the evolution of electron energy spectra solely due to the in uence of the two acceleration rates. As is increased, the steady (m ean growth) term becomes increasingly dominant over the di usive (distribution widening) term. To understand STFA in a particular plasma, both acceleration rates must be calculated. In the event that the di usive rate is very small compared to the steady growth rate, it can be ignored. The steady growth rate is always faster than the di usive growth rate for a > 1. As will be shown later, v 100 in are plasmas, and the di usive term is negligible.

It is very in portant to note that our result di ers from the standard for Ferm iA coeleration, in which both the di usive and steady terms depend on the same power of  $_{\rm B}$  =B. This di erence arises as a result of the averaging over pitch angles. To correctly obtain h E i, one must only average over those encounters which result in a rejection. For traditional STFA, the range of pitch angles which reject is ultimately determined by the turbulent magnetic eld strength. One factor of cos() in the expression to be averaged results in one factor of (B = B)<sup>1=2</sup> in the acceleration rate. In other treatments, such as that of Longain (1994); W ebb (1983); Skilling (1975), the acceleration mechanism is assumed to act at all pitch angles. In this case, the averaging over cos() while maintaining the asumption of pitch angle isotropy, yields a numerical value with no B dependence. In this regime, the di usive and steady acceleration terms have the same relative strength at all levels of turbulence.

#### 3.3. Speci cation of the Turbulent Cascade

This leaves B = B as the remaining parameter to be determined. It is related to the turbulent length scale  $_{\rm T}$  through the cascade law. M agnetohydrodynamic (MHD) turbulence proceeds by the shredding of like sized eddies and subsequent formation of smaller eddies; energy input into eddies on a large (outer) length scale,  $L_{\rm T}$ , cascades rapidly to smaller length scales on the eddy turnover time,  $_{\rm ed}$ , and nally dissipates at  $_{\rm r}$ , the dissipation scale. If the cascade obeys K om olgorov's steady state assumption then the energy ow through all length scales is constant, and independent of the scale. This results in an inertial range between the scales  $L_{\rm T}$  and  $_{\rm r}$  where the turbulence at eddy size  $_{\rm r}$  is usually determined by a micro-physical process, such as resistivity. When STFA is active, the turbulence can instead be drained by pumping energy into electrons. This sets another condition for STFA to proceed in a plasm a: there must be some  $_{\rm SF}$  which is greater than the resistive length scale at which the STFA timescale is shorter than the cascade time, otherwise the turbulence will drain at the resistive scale before STFA can produce an appreciable electron acceleration.

There are three major MHD wavem odes: A liven waves, and the fast and slow magnetosonic waves. A liven waves are purely transverse, and thus do not compress the magnetic eld; they cannot participate in STFA. Both the fast and slow modes are compressive, and are in principle capable of Fermi acceleration. It has been argued that in low plasm as such as the solar corona, the slow mode is rapidly dissipated via Landau damping (Achterberg 1981). However, more recent studies of MHD turbulence indicate that the cascade time for GS turbulence is signi cantly shorter than the electron damping time, and slow mode damping by electrons can be ignored in turbulent are plasm as (Lithwick and Goldreich 2001). A key di erence in the two analyses is that Lithwick and Goldreich (2001) treats MHD turbulence as inherently anisotropic, whereas A chterberg (1981) assumes isotropy. Furtherm ore, M aron (private communication) has shown in simulations which neglect damping that the slow mode may be driven with much higher total energy content than the fast mode at low . A de nitive resolution of the issue is beyond the scope of this paper. However, we should point out that up to this point, the calculation is independent of the choice of wave mode. There is one signicant di erence between the two, however: slow modes propagate

at roughly the sound speed ( $v_c v c_s$ ) while fast modes propagate at roughly the A lfven speed ( $v_c v v_A$ ). It will be shown that due to the in uence of pitch angle scattering, STFA is likely dom inated by the fast mode.

M HD turbulence is in general anisotropic; the direction of any large scale mean magnetic eld de nes a preferred axis. A lso, even if the turbulence is isotropic on large scales, smaller scales may see the larger scale turbulent structures as an elective mean eld. Goldreich and Sridhar (1997) (hereafter, GS) modi ed the the K om olgorov assumption for the cascade of slow and A lyfen modes of M HD turbulence under the condition that the turbulence is anisotropic with scale  $_k$  along the eld line and  $_2$  perpendicular to the eld line. The two directions are found to obey di erent cascade laws, with  $_k$  cascading more weakly than  $_2$ . The parallel direction is ofm ore in portance to STFA, as it represents the distance along the eld line between rejection sites. The GS power law for the parallel scale is (Goldreich and Sridhar 1997; Lithwick and Goldreich 2001)

$$\frac{B}{B} = \frac{T}{L_T} \stackrel{1=2}{;}$$
(19)

where B is the mean magnetic eld strength, and B is the turbulent eld strength at parallel length scale  $_{\rm T}$ .

The exact power law of MHD turbulence remains the subject of some debate, so for now we assume a general power law of form

$$\frac{B}{B} = \frac{T}{L_T} \stackrel{1=a}{;}$$
(20)

where a > 1 is an arbitrary index. Using the turbulent power spectrum and substituting for F from (15) we can rewrite the acceleration rates as

$$\frac{dE}{dt}_{S} = \frac{2m}{T} v_{A}^{2} v \frac{T}{L_{T}}^{T} = \frac{2}{L} m v_{A}^{2} v \frac{T}{L_{T}}^{T} \qquad (21)$$

$$so that_{S} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{vL_{T}}{v_{A}^{2}} \frac{T}{L_{T}}^{T} \qquad (21)$$

$$\frac{dE}{dt}_{D} = \frac{2m}{T} v_{A}^{2} v \frac{T}{L_{T}}^{2=a} = \frac{m}{L} v_{A}^{2} v \frac{T}{L_{T}}^{2=a-1}$$

$$so that_{D} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{vL_{T}}{v_{A}^{2}} \frac{T}{L_{T}}^{T} \qquad (21)$$

For a typical turbulent cascade, where  $_{\rm T}$  <  $\rm L_{T}$  and a > 0,  $_{\rm S}$  <  $_{\rm D}$  .

#### 3.4. <sub>SF</sub> and the Role of P itch Angle Scattering

There remains the nalstep of determining the particular dissipation scale  $_{\rm SF}$  at which the energy drain takes place. In order for STFA to overcome the cascade of MHD turbulence, it must drain energy at a rate equal to the input rate at the outer scale. If turbulent compressions are shredded and cascade faster than electrons can draw out energy via rejections, then the cascade continues to smaller length scales. At smaller scales, STFA is more rapid. STFA becomes competitive with the cascade at a scale determined by  $(dE = dt)_S = dE_T = dt$ .  $(dE = dt)_S$  is acceleration rate of electrons and  $dE_T = dt$  is the cascade rate of turbulent energy, nm  $_p v_A^3 = L_T$ . The STFA scale  $_{\rm SF}$  is different for acceleration by the two compressive MHD modes.

For slow mode turbulence,  $v_c = c_s$ , and the balance is

$$\frac{2nm_{e}}{L_{T}}c_{s}^{2}v \frac{T}{L_{T}} = \frac{nm_{p}}{L_{T}}v_{A}^{3}:$$
(22)

Solving for  $_{T}$  =L $_{T}$  and associating this particular  $_{T}$  with  $_{SF}$  gives

$$\frac{s_{\rm F}}{L_{\rm T}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{m_{\rm p}}{m_{\rm e}} \frac{v_{\rm A}^3}{c_{\rm S}^2 v} \stackrel{\frac{\alpha}{1 \, a}}{:}$$
(23)

In solar area and a GS turbulent cascade (a = 2),  $v_0 = 12$  10° cm/s,  $c_s = 3$  10° cm/s and  $v_A = 1$  10° cm/s (LaR osa et al. 1996), this gives  ${}_{SF} = L_T v 10^{-6}$ . We have taken the initial electron velocity to be the mean velocity of the therm alloadkground plasma. The cascade w ill proceed down the inertial range to this length scale where STFA then acts as the micro-physical damping agent, rapidly draining the energy from turbulence into particles.

In the case of the fast m ode, where  $v_{\rm c}$  =  $\,v_{\rm A}$  , the rate balance is

$$\frac{2nm_{e}}{L_{T}}v_{A}^{2}v \frac{T}{L_{T}} = \frac{nm_{p}}{L_{T}}v_{A}^{3}; \qquad (24)$$

and the STFA length scale is then given by

$$\frac{s_F}{L_T} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{m_p}{m_e} \frac{v_A}{v} \stackrel{a}{\xrightarrow{1-a}} :$$
(25)

For solar are conditions, and a GS cascade (a = 2),  $_{SF}=L_T = 10^4$ . We have tacitly assumed that the length scale for pitch angle isotropization is roughly equal to  $_T$ . If it is

not, the accelration rate is retarded signi cantly, and STFA can be shut o . To understand this we must further explore the role of pitch angle scattering.

A s discussed above, pitch angle scattering is necessary during acceleration to maintain a population of electrons which satisfy the pitch angle condition for relection. The strength of the pitch angle scattering strongly regulates the rate of acceleration. We consider three cases:  $_{\rm SF}$  , and  $_{\rm p}$  v  $_{\rm SF}$  where eddy  $_{\rm p}$  is the typical distance over which pitch SF/ p р angles are isotropized. In the rst case, p SF, electrons relect a few times and quickly leave the pitch angle range in which they can re ect. They then must stream a distance of order p before they can scatter again. Thus the rate of relections and the acceleration rate are both decreased by a factor of  $_{SF} = _{p}$ . Since the acceleration rate and cascade rate are not in balance, the cascade continues down to smaller scales T < SF. The nom inal acceleration rate (eq 22) is proportional to  $T^{1=2}$ , while the retardation factor is proportional to  $_{\rm T}$ . The combined e ect is a net acceleration rate which is proportional to  $_{\rm T}^{1=2}$ ; sm aller scale turbulence is actually less e cient as an accelerator. As a result, STFA never turns on in this regime. In the second case, p  $_{\rm SF}$  , the pitch angle scattering is far m ore rapid than acceleration. Since pitch scattering can take an electron through = 0, very strongly pitch scattered electrons traverse the plasm a by random walking in steps of length p, again reducing the rate of rejection, this time by a factor of  $(p_{p} = s_{F})^{2}$ . Unlike the previous case, this is not a problem for STFA; the retarding factor tends towards unity as the cascade continues to scales  $_{T}$  <  $_{SF}$ . The net acceleration rate is proportional to  $_{T}$  <sup>5=2</sup>, and STFA turns on as the cascade proceeds to a su ciently small scale. In case three, where  $v_{\rm s}$ , pitch angle scattering and re ections proceed at the same rate. Thus, electrons are capable of stream ing freely from compression to compression, while they maintain a nearly isotropic pitch angle distribution. This is the sim plest pitch angle scattering regime for STFA.

The identity of the accelerating wavem ode is now easy to determ ine. In section 4.1 we show that whistler wave turbulence is a plausible source of pitch angle scattering, at least for the lower energy quasi-therm aloom ponent of the spectrum. At 3keV,  $_{\rm wh}$ =L<sub>T</sub> is roughly 10<sup>4</sup>. This places slow mode turbulence ( $_{\rm SF}$ =L<sub>T</sub> v 10<sup>6</sup>) well in the rst regime. Slow modes do not participate in STFA in these areas. Fast modes, however, have  $_{\rm SF}$ =L<sub>T</sub> v 10<sup>4</sup> and therefore are in the nearly ideal range for acceleration. Furtherm ore, both  $_{\rm SF}$  and  $_{\rm p}$  grow linearly with electron energy, so as electrons undergo STFA by fast modes in the presence of whistler wave turbulence, they remain in the same pitch angle scattering regime throughout.

#### 4. The post-acceleration spectrum

The simplest case of STFA is the steady state, where we assume that electrons are injected into a turbulent region at energy  $E_0$  at a rate equal to that at which accelerated electrons escape. The turbulent energy supply is continuously replenished at a large scale. We are concerned with the energy spectrum, N (E), of electrons escaping the region. Note that this is in general dierent from the spectrum of the electrons within the turbulent region. We de ne N<sub>t</sub>(E) to be the total number of electrons reaching energy at least E before escaping, such that

$$N (E) / dN_t (E) = dE :$$
 (26)

Initially, we consider the case of strongly relativistic electrons; a full derivation of this regime is presented in the Appendix.

To appreciate the calculational di erences between the non-relativistic regime of interest to solar area and the more commonly studied relativistic regime, we begin with the latter. Following the approach used by Bell (1978) for Shock Ferm i acceleration, and writing  $dN_t=dM = p_{esc}N_t$ , where  $p_{esc}$  is the mean probability of an electron escaping from the acceleration region, gives

$$\frac{dN_{t}}{dE} = \frac{dN_{t}}{dM}\frac{dM}{dE} = p_{sc}N_{t}\frac{dM}{dE} = p_{sc}N_{t}\frac{1}{E}; \qquad (27)$$

where on the right hand side we have for the moment taken the strongly relativistic limit: dE = dM = E and assumed  $p_{esc}$  to be constant. This treatment of the highly relativistic limit follows Ferm i (1949). One can solve for N<sub>t</sub> (E) by separating variables, integrating both sides and inverting the logarithms, resulting in the familiar power law (see e.g. Ferm i (1949); Longair (1994); Jones (1994))

$$N_{t}(E) = N \quad \frac{E}{E_{0}} \qquad ; \qquad (28)$$

where N is the total number of electrons. From Eq. (26), one obtains

N (E) = N<sub>0</sub> 
$$\frac{E}{E_0}$$
 (1+  $\frac{Pesc}{Pesc}$ ); (29)

where  $N_0 dE$  is the number density of escaped electrons with  $E = E_0$ . Notice that the logarithm ic integrals in both  $N_t$  and E are vital to producing the power law.

For STFA by fast mode waves, the computation is more complicated because  $p_{esc}$  is energy dependent. We solve for a general  $p_{esc}$  in the non-relativistic regime, leaving the

speci cation of the trapping for later discussion. In the non-relativistic regime, the acceleration rate is not proportional to the kinetic energy as it is in the strongly relativistic regime. Instead, one has  $dE = dM = 4m v_A^2$ . We thus write, using (11),

$$\frac{dN_{t}}{dE} = \frac{N_{t}p_{esc}}{4m v_{A}^{2}};$$
(30)

which can be rewritten as

$$\frac{\mathrm{dN}_{\mathrm{t}}}{\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{t}}} = \frac{\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{esc}}}{4\mathrm{m}\,\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{A}}^{2}}\mathrm{dE}:$$
(31)

We have assumed that  $dN_T = dM = p_{esc}N_t$ . This is reasonable as long as the electrons can be treated as statistically independent and collisionless. In this case, it is reasonable to assume that  $p_{esc}$  carries no inherent dependence on  $N_t$  and the escape rate is sim ly given by the product of the number of electrons in the volume and the mean escape probability. Taking  $p_{esc} = p_0 (E = E_0)^{-1}$  allow sus to solve for a particularly interesting N (E). We see in mediately that

$$\frac{dN_{t}}{N_{t}} = \frac{E_{0}}{E} \frac{p_{0}}{4m v_{A}^{2}} dE ; \qquad (32)$$

and N (E) is again a power law energy distribution:

N (E) = N<sub>0</sub> 
$$\frac{E}{E_0}$$
 (1+); (33)

where  $= p_0 E_0 = 4m v_A^2$ . However, in any other case, STFA does not produce a simple power law. The importance of the trapping mechanism is now clear; the combined energy dependence of the acceleration and escape must be E<sup>-1</sup> to produce a power law spectrum. Such a spectrum relies on the coincidental logarithm ic integrals over both N and E.

# 4.1. Calculation of $p_{esc}$

Let us now calculate  $p_{esc}$  for non-relativistic electrons within the turbulent volum e, and consequently the energy spectrum of electrons. For simplicity, let us take the turbulent region to be rectangular, with the long axis, z, parallel to the direction of the bulk ow, with z = 0 and  $z = L_F$  xed to the downstream and upstream boundaries of the region respectively.  $L_F$  is taken to be the extent of the region of turbulent ow, which is presumed to be the entire distance between the reconnection sheet and the top of the soft X-ray loop.

This distance is typically of size 10<sup>10</sup> cm for solar ares (T suneta 1996). The largest eddy size in the turbulence,  $L_T$  is set by the width of the out ow, typically  $10^8$  cm. Thus the turbulent volume consists of a number of cells, each of which ows downward from the reconnection point towards the bop-top. An electron escapes the acceleration region only when it reaches the X-ray loop at the base of the turbulent region. These individual cells m ay be associated with single bursts or fragments of X-ray emission, and thus are responsible for the temporal structure of in pulsive ares. In order to escape the region with energy E (M), an electron must stream from its location in the region at some height z to the boundary at z = 0after the M th relection without further relection. W e will assume that the electrons are contained in the region in the x y plane by gyration around large scale eld lines. To further sim plify the problem, we shall assume that the electron density remains uniform throughout the turbulent region. We also neglect the bulk ow speed,  $v_f = 8$  10 cm s<sup>1</sup> (T suneta 1996) since the legth of the down ow region is roughly 10<sup>10</sup> cm. This gives a ow time from the reconnection region to the bop-top of 100s. The acceleration process is xed to the much shorter 1s time scale by the tem poral size of the observed energy release fragm ents and the MHD eddy turnover time. Thus, bulk ow into the are bop is not likely to be a dom inant process in cutting o the acceleration.

Take the mean z-component of the distance stream ed between rejections to be  $_z$ ;  $_z$  carries an energy dependence inherited from the energy dependence of the pitch scattering. The probability of escaping at z = 0 after the M th rejection from a point at height z is given by

$$p_{esc}(z) = \frac{1}{2} e^{z - z};$$
 (34)

and the mean escape probability of electrons distributed uniform ly across the length of the region is

$$p_{esc} = \frac{1}{L_{F}} \sum_{0}^{Z_{L_{F}}} p_{esc}(z) dz = \frac{p}{L_{F}} (1 - e^{2L_{F} - p});$$
(35)

where we have taken z = p=2 from the isotropy in pitch angles, with p the pitch angle scattering length scale. To obtain the spectrum of solar are electrons requires speci cation of the pitch angle scattering.

Both M iller, Larosa, & M oore (1996) and LaR osa et al. (1996) assume strong scattering, and suggest that the scattering agent above 1keV is resonant interaction with lower hybrid (LH) turbulence, or circularly polarized electrom agnetic waves, such as whistler waves. Below 1keV, C oulom b interactions are thought to be su ciently strong to isotropize the electrons. It should be noted that M elrose (1974) sets the threshold for the whistler m ode resonance at 25 keV for are plasmas, while M iller & Steinacker (1992) argue that the resonances extend down to 1keV.W e assume the latter. In a recent study, Luo, et.al. (2003) considered whether LH wave turbulence is the primary mode of electron acceleration in solar ares. They concluded that the pitch angle scattering is too ine cient to maintain isotropy. Thus, we assume that LH wave turbulence cannot supply su cient pitch angle scattering to sustain STFA either. W histler waves are more promising.

M elrose (1974) associates the frequency of pitch angle scattering with the pitch angle di usion coe cient in the quasi-linear equation. Thus, 1= is the chracteristic time scale for e ective pitch angle isotropization of the electron distribution. It should be noted that, in general, som e sm allanisotropy is likely to remain in the distribution, and that this anisotropy could be responsible for the generation of the whistler waves. However, the source of these waves is still uncertain. From M elrose (1974), we have that

$$= \frac{!_{p}^{2} (!_{R})}{e_{e} e^{n_{e}m}c^{2}};$$
(36)

where  $_{e} v 1$  is the Lorentz factor of the electron,  $_{e}$  is the electron gyrofrequency,  $!_{p}$  is the plasm a oscillation frequency, and

$$(!_{\rm R}) = \frac{m_{\rm p}}{2} n_{\rm p} v_{\rm A}^2 \frac{B}{B};$$
(37)

is the energy density of the turbulence at the resonant wavelength. This allows us to rewrite (36) as

$$= 5 \quad 1\vec{0}B_{100}n_{10}^{1=2} \quad \frac{T}{L_{T}} \quad ; \qquad (38)$$

where we have used  $v_A^2 = B^2 = 4 n_p$ ,  $e = 1.8 \quad 10^9 B_{100}$ ,  $!_p = 5.7 \quad 10^9 n_{10}^{1=2}$ , and the dimensionless parameters  $B_{100} = B = 100G$  and  $n_{10} = n_e = 10^{10}$  cm<sup>-3</sup>.

W emust compare to the growth time for pitch angle an isotropy due to STFA.Bearing in m ind that for STFA,  $dv_2 = dt = 0$ ,

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = m v_k \frac{dv_k}{dt};$$
(39)

and the pitch angle evolves according to

$$\frac{d(\cos)}{dt} = \frac{1}{m} \frac{\sin^2}{v^2 \cos} \frac{dE}{dt}$$
(40)

Substituting in from equation (21) for dE = dt and assuming a GS cascade (a = 2), gives

$$_{\rm SF} = \frac{d(\cos)}{dt} = \frac{2}{L_{\rm T}} \frac{T}{L_{\rm T}} \frac{(1-2)}{v_{\rm A}^2} \frac{v_{\rm A}^2}{v\cos}$$
(41)

For impulsive ares, E  $_0$  = 0:3keV, B  $_{100}$  = 2, and  $n_{10}$  = 1. Taking  $_{\rm T}$  =  $_{\rm SF}$  results in = 1  $\,$  10 s  $^1$  and

$$_{SF} = 2 \qquad 10^{2} \quad \frac{E_{0}}{E} \qquad s^{1=2} \qquad (42)$$

where  $_{\rm SF}$  is evaluated at the threshold pitch angle for rejection. To maintain pitch angle isotropy, scattering by whistler waves must occur on a time scale shorter than pitch angle evolution by STFA. Thus, as long as  $_{\rm SF}$  < , isotropy can be maintained. This condition is met for all E > E<sub>0</sub>. W histler modes, if present, are capable of providing su cient pitch angle scattering to maintain isotropy.

In addition to maintaining pitch angle isotropy, the scattering mechanism must also operate at a length scale which traps electrons in the volume;  $_{\rm wh}$   $L_{\rm T} = 10^8$  cm must be satis ed, or else electrons rapidly leave the acceleration region and STFA shuts o . We obtain the pitch scattering length scale for whistler waves,  $_{\rm wh}$ ,

$$_{wh} = \frac{v}{-} = 2 \qquad 10^3 \quad \frac{E}{E_0} \qquad \text{am}:$$
 (43)

The required condition is satis ed for energies below 100kev.

# 4.2. The Electron Spectrum and Constraints on the Secondary Pitch Angle Scattering

In order to obtain the spectrum of the escaped electrons, we can now substitute the functional form for  $p_{esc}$  from (35) into (31)

$$\frac{dN_{t}}{N_{t}} = \frac{p_{esc}}{4m v_{A}^{2}} dE = \frac{p}{L_{F}} (1 - e^{L_{F} - p}) \frac{1}{4m v_{A}^{2}} dE :$$
(44)

Next, by choosing p = wh, we use  $p=L_F = AE^{1=2}$ , with E in units of keV, and rearranging, obtain

N (E) = 
$$\frac{dN_{t}}{dE}$$
 = AE<sup>1=2</sup> (1 e<sup>1=AE<sup>1=2</sup></sup>) $\frac{1}{4m v_{A}^{2}}$ N<sub>t</sub>: (45)

The resulting spectrum, N (E), is plotted in gure 4. This is consistent with the therm al component to the are spectrum observed using RHESSI (Krucker, & Lin 2002).

In addition to the therm alcom ponent, RHESSI observations show a clear power law region extending from roughly 10keV up to at least 50keV, above which the data are uncertain, but consistent with a continuing power law. Previous observations using the ISEE 3/ICE instrum ent also show a power law throughout the range of the instrum ent, 25 300keV; the spectrum typically breaks downward at 100keV (Dulk et al. 1992). More recent observations with RHESSI could push the low energy threshold for the power law as high as 35keV (Holm an et. al. 2003). The spectral index below the break is v 3, while above the break it is v 4. Elsewhere (Blackman (1997); Selkowitz and Blackman (2004) in preparation), we discuss rst order acceleration at the loop-top fast shock. Fast shocks are well known to accelerate super-therm al particles to power law energy spectra, even in the non-relativistic lim it (Bell1978). However, in order to be accelerated, electrons must satisfy the requirem ent  $(m_p=m_e)v_s^2 = 10$  keV in solar are plasmas, where  $v_s = 10^8$  cm s<sup>-1</sup> is the in ow that E speed of the plasm a at the shock (Blackm an & Field 1994). This places the injection energy at roughy 100keV. The correspondence of the shock in jection energy and the observed break energy is noteworthy. A possible mechanism to reproduce the observations is for STFA to produce a power law spectrum in the 10 100keV regime which then satis es the injection criterion for bop-top fast shocks. Since STFA by magnetosonic turbulence in the presence of whistler wave turbulence pitch scattering is insu cient to produce the power law component. However, it is possible that a second pitch scattering agent exists which produces the power 100keV range. W e exam ine the constraints in posed on this scattering. law in the 10

To produce a power law spectrum, non-relativistic STFA requires  $p_{esc} / E^{-1}$ . From (35), we see that this is true only if  $_p=L_F = =E$ , where 2E = -1 and the exponential term is small. Here is a constant parameter which we sthe strength of the pitch scattering. W hile the physics of the pitch angle scattering is not well understood, this constrains the scattering mechanisms available to STFA. We de ne  $_C = L_T = E = 2 - 10^7 (E_0=E)$  cm to be the pitch scattering length scale of the constrained mechanism, and the electron spectum is given by

N (E) = N<sub>0</sub> 
$$\frac{E}{E_0}$$
 (1+ = (4m v<sub>A</sub><sup>2</sup>)) : (46)

is constrained by the observed X -ray spectral index of = 3. It is a standard prediction of are models (B rown 1971; Stepanov and T sap 2002; K iplinger, et al. 1984) that the spectrum

of electrons accelerated above the loop-top is steeper than the spectrum of the thick target B rem strahlung X -rays em itted at the footpoints in solar ares. We assume that to match the RHESSIX -ray data requires an index v 4 for the electrons, or

$$= 12m v_{a}^{2} = 0.072 \text{keV} = 0.17 \text{E}_{0}$$
(47)

The exponential term in  $p_{esc}$  is indeed sm allas 2E = 270 at E = 10 keV. The electron spectral index could conceivably be as high as 6, in which case  $= 0.28E_0$ , and the exponential can still be safely neglected.

It is insu cient to merely produce the proper power law. The scattering agent must also be able to reproduce the transition from therm alto power law spectrum at the correct energy,  $E_c$ . We recall wh to be the length scale of pitch angle scattering associated with whistler wave turbulence. In impulsive area, p = wh below  $E_c$ . Above  $E_c$ , p = c. To obtain  $E_c$  one sets wh = c.  $E_c = 23$ keV, which is consistent with the observed threshold of v 10keV.

There is one more important constraint imposed by the observations: the knee at 100keV.Dulk et al. (1992) demonstrate a distinct downward break in the power law spectrum at roughly  $E_{br} = 100$  keV. The break energy varies som ew hat from are to are, but is consistently observed in all of the impulsive ares in their sam ple. Unlike dow nw ard breaks, upward breaks are easily explained by the meshing of two acceleration mechanisms, as the shallow component which dominates above the break emerges naturally from beneath the steeper power law which dom inates below. For upward breaks, E br is the naturally occurring crossover point. The matching problem is much more di cult for knees in the absence of signi cant cooling on timescales of interest. Since the steep component is above the break energy and the shallow component below it, both must be truncated at the break energy. If either one extended beyond the break, then that one would overrun the other, and there would be no break at all. The most natural solution for a knee is a single acceleration mechanism which undergoes some transition at the break energy. One such example is the knee found by Bell (1978b) in the spectra of shock accelerated electrons at roughly 1G eV. This knee results from the transition from the non-relativistic to the relativistic regime. There is no apparent natural transition for STFA of electrons at 100keV. However, there is a well de ned low energy cuto for a power law spectrum at 100keV, the shock in jection energy. The shock injection threshold is not only at the right energy, but is also a variable cuto, depending on the ion temperature and local magnetic eld strength, consistent with the variability in the observed  $E_{br}$ .

Bell (1978b) has shown that shock acceleration does not change the spectrum of electrons if the pre-shock spectrum is shallower than the post-shock spectrum which obtains from a

steep pre-shock spectrum. Shock Ferm i acceleration cannot steepen a power law spectrum; it can only make it shallower. This is another di culty for knee matching. The STFA spectrum must have a sharp cuto at  $E_{\rm br}$  in order to match the knee. This may not be an in possible condition to meet, especially as  $E_{\rm br}$  may be greater that the injection energy, not precisely equal to it.

One natural cuto occurs when  $_{\rm C}$  =  $_{\rm r}$ ; acceleration will shut o when the cascade reaches the resistive scale. For slow modes in inpulsive ares,  $_{\rm r} = 10^3$  cm (LaR osa et al. 1996; Chandran 2003; Lithwick and Goldreich 2001), which for = 0:073keV gives a cuto energy of 7  $10^5$  keV, which is both too high and far outside of the non-relativistic regim e. A possible solution is that the constrained pitch scattering has a maximum resonant threshold at  $E_{\rm br}$ . Another possible solution is that yet another very strong pitch scattering mechanism has a threshold energy of  $E_{\rm br}$  and a length scale <  $_{\rm r}$ . Both of these solutions are presently ad hoc. This underscores the need for a more thorough understanding of pitch angle scattering in astrophysical plasm as. It also illustrates the limitations of STFA as an acceleration mechanism in solar ares; if STFA alone were to account for the spectrum from 10 100 keV, the tight constraints on the pitch angle scattering mechanism that we have identi ed are required.

#### 5. Sum m ary and D iscussion

STFA in the non-relativistic limit behaves di erently from highly relativistic STFA. At the core of these di erences is the energy dependence of the electron velocity at low energies. Thus, unlike the relativistic case, both the rate of relections and the probability of escaping the acceleration region at an energy E vary. U sing a test particle approach, we have examined this behavior and derived the spectrum of post-acceleration electrons in a plasm a under impulsive solar are conditions.

Fortraditional STFA, where there is a m inim um pitch angle constraint which determ ines whether an individual encounter results in rejection, it is seen that the steady acceleration rate can dom inate over the dijusive acceleration rate. This arises from the averaging over pitch angles to evaluate h E i. Some previous treatments of the generalized Ferm i acceleration problem do not have such rejection conditions, and thus do not retain factors of the turbulent eld strength, B=B, when averaging. In those treatments, such as Longair (1994); Skilling (1975); W ebb (1983), the steady and dijusive terms typically are seen to be of the same order. For some processes this is appropriate, how ever non-resonant STFA is not one of them. Thus, the phase space conditions for scattering by the acceleration m echanism can play a very signi cant role, even in cases where pitch angle isotropy is maintained. The nature of the pitch angle scattering turns out to be the dom inant factor in determining electron escape, and therefore the shape of the spectrum . We indicate which is well studied in solar ares (Melrose 1974; Miller & Steinacker 1992), is an excellent source of pitch angle scattering which allows STFA to produce a quasi-therm allelectron distribution that peaks at E 5keV. This matches the lowest energy portion of the observed X-ray emission very well. However, to produce the power law spectrum observed in the range v 10 100keV by STFA requires at least a second scattering mechanism. Matching the spectral index and the transition energy from quasi-therm all to power law spectrum requires an undetermined scattering mechanism which satis es  $_{\rm C}$  =L<sub>F</sub> = =E with = 0.073keV, and naturally becomes the dom inant pitch angle scatterer at roughly 20keV.

If the constrained pitch angle scattering mechanism is discovered, it im plies that the acceleration of electrons in solar area is at least a two stage process. The rst stage, STFA in the down ow region, produces both the quasi-them all spectrum below v 10keV and the lower half of the power law spectrum up to 100keV. To produce the highest energy electrons, as well as the spectral break at E = 100keV requires a second acceleration mechanism at the top of the soft X-ray bop. We are further exploring the possibility that rst order acceleration at a weak fast shock, form ed as the down ow in pacts the top of the closed are loop, is responsible for electron acceleration to the highest observed energies. A cceleration at fast shocks is known to have an injection energy of roughly 100keV, and varies with temperature. This coincides with the break in the power law spectrum at 100keV, and is consistent with the variability observed by Dulk et al. (1992) in  $E_{\rm br}$ .

Recently, Chandran (2003) concluded, using quasi-linear theory, that STFA for slow modes is not viable in the 10-100keV regime. While we also not slow modes to be ine ective, di erences between our paper and Chandran (2003) must be kept in mind. Chandran (2003) assumed that dp=dt / p for STFA. While this is true in the strongly relativistic limit for STFA, we do not assume that this is true in the lower energy regime (see eq. 22). Second, unlike Chandran (2003) we do not assume herein that  $P_{\rm esc}$  has to be energy independent. These two assumptions play a signi cant role in shaping electron spectra.

A nother concern which can be raised about the electroness of STFA as the electron acceleration engine in in pulsive area is the total energetics of the process. Since STFA, as developed above, only is electron in a short length scale regime where one also has B = B = 1 it m ight seem that only a small fraction of the released are energy is available for electron acceleration. This is not the case. The total energy contained in single turbulent cell is given by  $(1=2)m_{\rm p}v_{\rm A}^2$  nL<sup>3</sup> v  $10^{26}$  erg, where n =  $10^{10}$  cm<sup>-3</sup> is the electron number density in the are plasma. The energy in a single turbulent cell is similar to the energy contained in one X-ray

em ission fragm ent. A lihough only a fraction of the energy in one turbulent cell is ever at  $_{p}$  at one tim e, it does all cascade down to  $_{p}$  over an eddy turnover tim e. Thus, while B = B is always sm all, the energy throughput can still be high enough to accelerate the electrons. The sim ilarity in total energy between a single turbulent cell and an individual in pulsive X-ray fragm ent strongly suggests that the two are related.

M iller, et al. (1997) estimates that as much as '94% of the magnetic energy in a are is available in the turbulence, which is su cient to produce the high energy electrons inferred from the observed X-rays, but raises concerns about the e ciency of STFA, particularly in com petition with other sources of dissipation. W hile we have not fully studied other dissipation mechanism s which might compete with STFA for this energy, three signi cant ones can be ruled out: proton acceleration by STFA, Landau dam ping, and resistive dissipation of the turbulence. The latter two have already been discussed. P roton acceleration is a signi cant concern since Ferm i acceleration of protons and heavy ions was in fact the very problem Ferm intended to solve. Therm alprotons in coronal are plasm as are sub-Alfvenic and thus cannot meet the condition for mirroring (LaRosa et al. 1996; Blackman 1999). However, M iller and Roberts (1995) argues convincingly that gyroresont interaction of protons and heavy ions with A lfven waves can accelerate them to velocities above  $v_A$  on a relatively short time scale. W ithin their model, the ions then are accelerated by compressive magnetosonic waves at the expense of electron acceleration. Recent RHESSI observations (Hurford et al. 2003) indicate that the emission signatures of ions and electrons are spatially separated, with the ion emission associated with longer loops. Miller, Emslie, and Brown (2004) concluded that these observations are consistent with the gyroresonance model of ion acceleration; as the bops grow longer, protons are more likely to reach super-A livenic speeds, and thus can be accelerated by the magnetosonic waves. This second phase of acceleration need not be gyroresonant. W hile it appears prom ising, further study is required to determ ine if STFA m odels can accom odate these results.

The strong dependence of the post-acceleration electron spectrum on the pitch angle scattering agent is both a positive and negative feature. It leaves STFA considerable exibility in m atching various characteristics of solar are X-rays which fall outside of the sim ple scenario studied in this paper. For exam ple, Lin et al. (1981) rst observed a superhot com – ponent in a solar are, which has since been supported by RHESSI observations K rucker, et al. (2003). This therm al, or nearly therm al, spectral com ponent is seen at energies of up to 35keV.W ithin our STFA fram ework, the superhot em ission can easily be explained by an enhancem ent of pitch angle scattering at low er energies, either by increased whistler wave turbulence, or some other scattering agent. W hile this exibility naturally allows for the wide range of are characteristics observed, it does not yet de nitively solve the are acceleration problem. Instead, it shifts the focus exclusively to a well constrained, but largely

unspecied, array of pitch angle scattering mechanisms. This is the single greatest obstacle to STFA models of acceleration.

In short, STFA can naturally account for the therm all spectrum below 10keV, and som ewhat less naturally for the non-therm all spectrum between 10keV and 100keV. There we have shown that  $_{\rm p}$  must depend inversely on particle energy, in contrast to that of pitch angle scattering by whistler waves below v 10kev, which is proportional to the particle energy. Above 100keV, shock acceleration is a natural possibility; the needed injection of supertherm all electrons may be provided by STFA operating at energies below E <sub>br</sub>. The knee at 100keV remains the most di cult spectral feature to accommodate, and we have explained the di cult requirements to pitch angle scattering that this dem ands.

E B. thanks B. Chandran for discussions. We thank J. M aron for sharing the results of his simulations and adknow ledge support from DOE grant DE-FG 02-00ER 54600 and the Laboratory for Laser Energetics at the University of Rochester. RS adknow ledges support from the DOE Horton Fellow ship. We also adknow ledge the insightful critique and comments of the reviewer.

## Appendix A: The Power Law Spectrum of Relativistic STFA

Notice that the spectrum we obtain for STFA is di erent from the power law result of Jones (1994). This is a matter of regime; we discussed in the text the acceleration of non-relativistic particles in a region of non-relativistic turbulence, here we show that when the particles are relativistic, a power law spectrum emerges.

Recall that (5) for fully relativistic electrons in a region of non-relativistic turbulence is given by (6)

$$E_{R} = 2E \qquad \frac{V_{A}V_{k}}{C^{2}} + \frac{V_{A}^{2}}{C^{2}}$$
;

where E is the total energy, kinetic plus rest, of the electron before rejection. Notice that if we the low velocity limit, v = c where  $E = m c^2$ , the expression reduces to (5). The relative velocity between the compression and electron for head-on and catch-up type interactions are still given by (8) so the steady acceleration rate is given by

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = 2E (R_{+} R_{-})\frac{v_{A}v_{k}}{c^{2}} + R\frac{v_{A}^{2}}{c^{2}} = 4\frac{E}{c^{2}}\frac{v_{A}^{2}}{c^{2}}v_{k}E:$$
(48)

A lternatively, we can  $\;$  nd the mean acceleration per rejection by multiplying equation 48 by R  $^{1}$ 

$$\frac{dE}{dl} = 4 \frac{v_A^2}{c^2} E :$$
(49)

In the highly relativistic limit, E is just the kinetic energy, and we recover the familiar result (Jones 1994) that dE = dt / E. This proportionality is expected to produce a power law. We derive the power law spectrum for STFA of highly relativistic electrons by following the approach of Bell (1978) and assume that  $p_{esc}$  is a constant in are plasmas, independent of electron energy. We start by integrating dE = dl to obtain E (1)

$$l = \frac{1}{A} \ln (E = E_{0});$$

$$A = \frac{4v_{A}^{2}}{c^{2}};$$
(50)

The probability of an electron remaining in the acceleration region for at least 1 re ections is given by

$$P(l+) = (1 \ p_{sc})^{l}$$
 (51)

Taking the logarithm and substituting in for 1 from equation 51, gives

$$\ln P (E +) = \ln (1 \quad p_{esc}) = \frac{1}{A} \ln \frac{E}{E_0} \quad \ln (1 \quad p_{esc}) = \ln \frac{E}{E_0} \quad (p_{esc} = A)^{-1} : \quad (52)$$

where we used the approximation  $\ln (1 \ p_{sc}) = p_{sc}$  for  $p_{esc}$  1 in obtaining the expression to the right of the nalequals sign. D i erentiating with respect to E, results in

$$P(E) = E_{0} \frac{E}{E_{0}} + \frac{(p_{esc}=A)^{-1}}{F_{0}};$$
(53)

where P (E) dE is the unnormalized probability of a post-acceleration electron having the energy E. In the limit, where  $p_{esc}$  is extremely small, the relativistic STFA spectrum has power law index 1. In a plasm a where  $p_{esc}$  A, the power law index can grow larger, and the index is very sensitive to  $p_{esc}$ . In the third regime, where  $p_{esc}$  A, electrons stream out of the turbulent volume quickly, do not experience much acceleration, and have a very steep power law energy distribution with virtually no very high energy electrons (E  $E_0$ ).

A ppendix B:D erivation of Steady A cceleration R ate with  $F_+ \in F$ 

In section 3.1 we derived the steady acceleration rate for electrons in a low turbulent magnetic plasma. This derivation was contingent on the assumption that  $F_+ = F_- = F_+$ , which is not strictly valid. B lackman (1999) calculates F for Ferm iacceleration. By resetting the limits of the integral in his eq (12), and renormalizing for the smaller phase space, one arrives at

F = 
$$\cos_{m} \frac{v_{A}}{v} + 1 \frac{v_{A}}{v}^{2} (1 \cos_{m}^{2})^{1=2}$$
 (54)

where  $\cos_m$  is the minimum pitch angle at which an electron will reject and  $v_A = v$  is the ratio of the A liven speed to the electron speed. We rename these quantities A and B respectively; both are small quantities. By taking a series expansion of eq (54) and truncating it at second order in B, it can be simplied to

$$F = A \ 1 \ B \ \frac{1}{2}B^2$$
 : (55)

Recall that from (8),

$$R = F \frac{V_k \ Y_k}{2} = A \ 1 \ B \frac{1}{2}B^2 \ (A \ B)\frac{V}{2}$$
: (56)

From this one easily obtains

$$R = (R_{+} + R_{-}) = \frac{v}{-} A^{2} 1 \frac{1}{2}B^{2} + AB^{2} ; \qquad (57)$$

and

$$(\mathbf{R}_{+} \quad \mathbf{R}_{-}) = \frac{\mathbf{v}}{-} \mathbf{A}^{2}\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}_{-} \mathbf{1}_{-} \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{B}^{2}$$
 : (58)

This gives us all of the ingredients for calculating the steady acceleration from (7)

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = 2m [(R_{+} R_{-})v_{k}v_{A} + (R_{+} + R_{-})v_{A}^{2}]:$$

The resulting acceleration rate is

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \frac{2m v^3}{AB^2} AB^2 2A + A^2 \frac{1}{2}B \frac{1}{2}AB^2 + B^2 ; \qquad (59)$$

where we have added the additional subscript b to indicate the distinction from the previously calculated rate. The steady acceleration rate found in (10) from the assumption  $F_+ = F_- = F_-$  is

$$\frac{\mathrm{dE}}{\mathrm{dt}} = \frac{4\mathrm{m}\,\mathrm{v}^3}{\mathrm{A}^2\mathrm{B}^2}$$
(60)

Note that provided A > 4B this is the largest term in (59). Indeed, for coronal are plasma, B v 0:1 at electron energy  $E_0$  and decreases with increasing energy while A v 0:1 as well at  $E_0$ , but is largely insensitive to eletron energy. At the onset of the power law regime,  $E = 10 \text{keV} = 30E_0$ , and B v 0:01; all term s of order B<sup>3</sup> or higher can be neglected, as can the term in A<sup>3</sup>. Thus we can safely use the assumption  $F_+ = F_- = F_-$  in this regime, and (11) is reasonable.

#### REFERENCES

A chterberg A . 1981, A & A , 98, 161

- A chterberg A. 1984, A dvances in Space Research, 4, 193
- A schwanden M J., Schwartz R A , A L D M , 1995, ApJ, 447, 923
- Axford W. I., Leer E., Skadron G. 1978, International Cosm ic Ray Conference, 15th, Plovdiv, Bulgaria, August 13-26, 1977, Conference Papers. Volum e 11. (A 79-44583 19-93)
  So a, B'lgarska A kadem iia na Naukite, 1978, p. 132-137., 11, 132

Blackm an E.G., Field G.B., Phys. Rev. Lett., 73, 3097

- Blackm an E.G., 1997, ApJ, 484, L79
- B lackm an E G , 1999, M N R A S302, 723
- BellA R., 1978, MNRAS, 182, 147
- BellA R., 1978, MNRAS, 182, 443
- Blandford, R. & Eichler D. 1987, Phys. Rep., 154, 1

Brown J.C., 1971, Sol. Phys., 18, 489B

- { 29 {
- Chandran B D G , 2003, ApJ, 599, 1426
- Dendy R.O., 1990, Plasm a Dynam ics. Oxford University Press, New York
- Dulk G A., Kiplinger A L., Winglee R M., 1992, , ApJ, 389, 756
- Ferm iE. 1949, Physical Review, 75, 1169
- Ferm iE., 1954, ApJ, 119, 1F
- Goldreich P., Sridhar S., 1997, ApJ, 485, 680
- Holm an G D , SuiL, Schwartz R A , Em slie A G , 2003, ApJ, 595, 97
- Hurford G.J., Schwartz R.A., Krucker S., Lin R.P., Smith D.H., Vilmer N. 2003, ApJ, 595, L77
- Jones F.C. 1994, ApJS, 90, 561
- Jones F.C. & Ellison D.C. 1991, Space Science Reviews, 58, 259
- Kiplinger, A L., Dennis, B R., Frost, K J., O rwig, L E. 1984, ApJ, 287, L105
- K nucker S., Hurford G.J., Lin R.P., 2003, ApJ, 595, L103
- K rucker S., Lin R. P., 2002 Sol. Phys., 210, 229
- Krymskii G.F. 1977, Akadem iia Nauk SSSR Doklady, 234, 1306 (tranlsation in Soviet Physics Doklady, vol. 22, June 1977, p. 327, 328.)
- LaRosa T N ., M oore R J., M iller JA ., Shore S N ., 1996, ApJ, 467, 454
- Lin R P., Schwartz R A., Pelling R M., Hurley K C., 1981, ApJ, 251, L109
- Lithwick Y., Goldreich P., 2001, ApJ, 562, 279L
- Longair M. S., 1994, High Energy Astrophysics vol2, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Luo Q Y , W eiF S, Feng X S, 2003, ApJ, 584, 497
- Masuda S., Kosugi T., Tsuneta S, Hara H., 1996, Adv. Space Res., 17, 63
- Melrose D. B., 1974, Sol. Phys., 37, 353
- M iller JA., et al., 1997, J.G eophys. Res., 102, 14631

- Miller JA., Em slie A.G., Brown JC., 2004, ApJ, 602, L69
- Miller J.A., Larosa T.N., Moore R.L. 1996, ApJ, 461, 445
- Miller J.A., Roberts D.A., 1995, ApJ, 452, 912
- M iller J.A., Steinacker J., 1992, ApJ, 399, 284
- Park B.T., Petrosian V., 1996, ApJ, 446, 699
- Park, B.T., Petrosian V., Schwartz R.A., 1997, ApJ, 489, 358
- Skilling J.,1975, MNRAS, 172, 557
- Spitzer L., 1956, Physics of Fully Ionized Gases. Interscience, New York
- Stepanov, A.V., Tsap, Y.T., 2002, Sol. Phys., 211, 135
- Tandberg-Hanssen E., Em slie A.G., 1988, The Physics of Solar Flares. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- T suneta S., 1996, ApJ, 456, 840
- WebbGM., 1983, ApJ, 270, 319



Fig. 1. The typical downward broken power law of an impulsive are, as observed by Dulk et.al. (1992). The left panel shows the hard X-ray spectrum, with  $E_{\rm br} = 100$  keV, and spectral indices above and below  $E_{\rm br}$  of 4:25 and 3 respectively. The right hand panel shows the electron spectrum in the emission region inferred from the given photon spectrum using a thick target B rem strahlung m odel for the emission (B rown 1971; Tandberg-H ansæn & Em slie 1988). A gain,  $E_{\rm br} = 100$  keV and the spectral indices above and below  $E_{\rm br}$  are 4 and 5:25.



Fig. 2. The evolution of a sample electron energy distribution with an initially G aussian velocity distribution. The peak of the distribution is evolved from the are thermal energy, 0.2 keV to the post-STFA mean energy at 16 keV. A) The initial distribution function. B) The sam e distribution after being evolved only by the steady process. C) The distribution evolved through both the steady and di usive processes. Note that the relative width of the electron energy distribution,  $E = E_m$  dereases with increasing mean energy  $E_m$ .



Fig. 3. From (B lackm an 1997). Sketch of a typical in pulsive solar are. Note that the x-point reconnection occurs in the led region at the top of the diagram. Only the downward half of the out ow is shown. Reproduced by permission of the AAS.



Fig. 4. The spectrum of non-relativistic STFA under impulsive are conditions with whistler wave turbulence as the only pitch angle scatterer.  $E_0 = 0.3$  keV.

{ 33 {



Fig. 5. The spectrum of non-relativistic STFA under in pulsive are conditions with whistler wave turbulence and a second source of pitch angle scattering. The second pitch angle scattering source obeys the constraints required to produce a power law.  $E_0 = 0.3$  keV.