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An ideal magnetic evolution can cause the development of an exponentially large variation between the distance of closest approach and greatest separation between neighboring pairs of magnetic field lines. When this occurs, a fast magnetic reconnection naturally arises on the evolution time scale of magnetic field multiplied by a factor that depends only logarithmically on the strength of the non-ideal effects. An obvious example arises when the magnetic evolution is driven by footpoint motion, as in the solar corona. A similar effect can be responsible for the sudden loss of magnetic surfaces during a tokamak disruption. In almost all magnetic surfaces in a tokamak, a magnetic field line never closes on itself as its trajectory $\vec{x}(\phi)$ is followed in the toroidal angle $\phi$, and the line comes arbitrarily close to every point in the surface. A single field-line trajectory $\vec{x}(\phi)$ is shown to give $\gamma_c \equiv \ln(\Delta_{\text{max}}/\Delta_{\text{min}})$, where $\Delta_{\text{max}}/\Delta_{\text{min}}$ is the ratio of the maximum to the minimum separation of neighboring magnetic surfaces. The exponentiation, $\gamma_c$, increases the more an ideal perturbation displaces the magnetic surfaces. When this displacement exceeds the distance between low-order rational magnetic surfaces, the surface contortion becomes so great that $\Delta_{\text{max}}/\Delta_{\text{min}}$ can exceed the ratio consistent with magnetic surface preservation. That ratio is the distance between the rational surfaces and the minimum distance over which two neighboring field lines can remain distinguishable, $\Delta_d$, in the presence of plasma resistivity and electron inertia.

I. INTRODUCTION

The rapid destruction of magnetic surfaces during a tokamak disruption is a magnetic reconnection. Magnetic reconnections were defined in 1956 by Parker and Krook [1] as the “severing and reconnection of lines of force.”

Magnetic field lines, the lines of force of Parker and Krook, are determined at fixed points in time. In a non-reconnecting, or ideal, magnetic evolution the magnetic field lines at one point in time can be mapped into the lines at another. Non-ideality and magnetic reconnection are produced to the extent that the one-to-one mapping is broken. The breaking during a time period is quantified by the spatial scale $\Delta_d$ below which neighboring magnetic field lines are indistinguishable. In a rigorously ideal evolution, the distinguishability distance vanishes, $\Delta_d = 0$, over all time scales.

Studies of magnetic field line behavior in nature and in the laboratory often involve plasmas that are nearly ideal. This is best understood as an extremely large $a/\Delta_d$ ratio, where $a$ is the distance across the magnetic field lines that would be required for the breaking of field line connections to change the speed or nature of the magnetic evolution.

When $a/\Delta_d \gg 1$, one would naively expect the evolution to be essentially ideal. That is not what is observed with examples from the solar corona [2] to tokamak disruptions [3]. Magnetic field lines do not change connections freely. Nevertheless, even when $a$ is many orders of magnitude greater than $\Delta_d$, the time required for reconnection to fundamentally change the evolution is often only an order of magnitude longer than the time scale of the ideal magnetic evolution itself.

As discussed in [4] and Section II, Faraday’s law, mathematics, and three-dimensionality together imply that the timescale required for reconnection to affect magnetic evolution in the solar corona is the evolution time multiplied by a term that increases only logarithmically with $a/\Delta_d$. For this to be true, an ideal evolution must generically have a property that makes the actual evolution exponentially sensitive to non-ideal effects. This property is chaos in the magnetic-field-line velocity that is associated with the ideal evolution. A flow is chaotic when the streamlines of the flow separate exponentially in time throughout a non-zero volume of space.

A logarithmic dependence of magnetic reconnection on non-ideal effects is associated with Petschek [5]. Nonetheless, the actual mathematics and physics have little in common with his theory.

This paper relates the rapid breaking of magnetic surfaces in tokamaks to the rapid development of magnetic reconnection in the corona. In both, an ideal magnetic evolution generically makes the actual evolution increasingly sensitive to non-ideal effects when the system depends non-trivially on all three spatial coordinates. In a tokamak, a non-axisymmetric magnetic perturbation is required. Non-axisymmetric perturbations may be ex-
ternally applied. They may also be the result of a growing tearing-mode magnetic island, often at the $q = 2$ surface, which deeper within the plasma can appear as essentially ideal. An ideally-evolving perturbation cannot directly break magnetic surfaces, Section [I] but can make the breaking of surfaces arbitrarily sensitive to small non-ideal effects.

Why are the methods developed in this paper important? First, they provide a method for assessing the adequacy of codes used to study disruptions, not only in operating tokamaks, but also in ITER and in tokamak power plants. The temporal and spatial resolution of existing simulations are often too low to realistically follow disruption physics in operating tokamaks. Future tokamaks will have a larger size and generally operate at a higher electron temperature, which will make obtaining an adequate resolution even more difficult.

Second, much can be learned from simulations with an inadequate resolution, but a deep understanding of the phenomena being simulated is required to avoid mistakes that could endanger the machine.

Third, traditional theories of magnetic reconnection posit current sheets in which the current density along the magnetic field reaches a value inversely proportional to the non-ideal effects, $j_{||} \propto a/\Delta_d$. The electric field parallel to the magnetic field associated with these current sheets could greatly exacerbate the already difficult problem of the plasma current being transferred from near-thermal to relativistic electrons through the runaway phenomenon. As explained in [I] and in Section [I] when the timescale to reconnection depends only logarithmically on non-ideal effects, the current density is only enhanced logarithmically, $j_{||} \propto \ln(a/\Delta_d)$, not inversely with the strength of those effects.

The electron acceleration question could be subtle because particle acceleration can occur even in an ideal evolution [I]. Non-ideality can be represented in Faraday’s law, Equation (3), by $\mathcal{E}$, Equation (2). $\mathcal{E}$ is equivalent to a loop voltage, the energy gained by an electron from $\mathcal{E}$ per toroidal circuit. The large number of toroidal circuits required in ITER to change the energy of an electron by 0.5 Mev, of order a thousand, tends to average the terms in the acceleration to zero, other than the loop voltage, when magnetic surfaces exist.

Section [III] defines magnetic coordinates, which are used throughout the study of toroidal plasmas, such as tokamaks. Wherever magnetic surfaces exist, magnetic coordinates are well behaved even when the magnetic surfaces become arbitrarily contorted. As will be explained, the magnetic surfaces become ever more contorted when an ideal perturbation causes a surface displacement that exceeds the distance between low order rational magnetic surfaces. On rational surfaces magnetic field lines close on themselves after $M$ toroidal and $N$ poloidal circuits of the torus. Using magnetic coordinates, it will be shown that when the magnetic field is known in $(R, \varphi, Z)$ cylindrical coordinates that a single field line integration, $d\vec{x}/d\varphi = \vec{B}(\vec{x})/\vec{B} \cdot \nabla \varphi$, on an irrational surface determines the ratio between the maximum and the minimum separation between neighboring magnetic surfaces by monitoring the separation $\delta(\varphi) \equiv |\vec{x}(\varphi + 2\pi k_0) - \vec{x}(\varphi)|$. The integer $k_0$ is chosen so the distance $\delta(0)$ is sufficiently small, and the integration distance $\varphi_{\text{max}}$ is chosen to be sufficiently large that the ratio of the maximum to the minimum separation, $\delta_{\text{max}}/\delta_{\text{min}}$, is independent of $k_0$ and $\varphi_{\text{max}}$.

Section explains what is known about ideal magnetic perturbations. This section is based on a review of the literature in Appendix A.

Section [V] discusses the implications of ideal perturbations on the rapid breakup of magnetic surfaces. In particular, it is discussed how the adequacy of codes can be assessed that are used to study disruptions in future tokamak experiments such as ITER.

A simulation code that is adequate for understanding disruption effects in ITER and tokamak power plants must be able to follow the evolution of an ideally-evolving non-axisymmetric magnetic perturbation. The ideal evolution must be followed sufficiently deep into the nonlinear regime that the perturbation has a strong resonant interaction with a number of rational surfaces. It is the resolution of the extremely contorted the magnetic surfaces in the nonlinear regime that makes numerical calculation so difficult and magnetic reconnection inevitable, no matter how small $\Delta_d$ may be. It is not the maximum amplitude of the parallel current, $j_{||}$ near the rational surfaces that is responsible for reconnection as in traditional reconnection theory.

II. REQUIRED CONCEPTS

The rapid destruction of magnetic surfaces across tokamak plasmas, which generally accompanies a major disruption, is more subtle in its cause than fast magnetic reconnections in the solar corona [4]. The primary purpose of this section is to ensure readers understand why reconnection in the solar corona can occur on the ideal evolution time scale
multiplied by a term that depends only logarithmically on non-ideal effects. Several concepts are required; some are from mathematics and others from Maxwell’s equations. These concepts have been explained in an hour-long colloquium that the Journal of Plasma Physics has posted [7].

The first of the required concepts is a chaotic flow, \( \vec{u}(x,t) \), which comes from a branch of mathematics, chaos theory. In a chaotic flow, pairs of neighboring streamlines are separated exponentially over time with such pairs existing through a non-zero volume. The remarkable fact is that such flows are essentially universal even for divergence-free flows in two spatial dimensions, \( dx/dt = -\partial h/\partial y \) and \( dy/dt = \partial h/\partial x \) when the stream function, or Hamiltonian, \( h(x,y,t) \) depends on time \( t \) as well as \( x \) and \( y \). Chaos in Hamiltonian systems was considered sufficiently remarkable in 1986 to justify a review [8], but chaotic flows are universally recognized to be the cause of enhanced mixing in near-ideal fluids after the 1984 paper of Aref [9,10]. For example, the equilibration of temperature in a room requires of order ten minutes instead of the two weeks expected from diffusion alone. Thermal equilibration and magnetic reconnection are related examples of chaotic flows causing non-ideal relaxations that depend only logarithmically on non-ideal effects [11].

A second required mathematical concept is the representation of an arbitrary vector \( \vec{E}(x) \) in three-space in terms of another vector \( \vec{B}(x) \) that has no zeros in the region of interest,

\[
\vec{E} = -\vec{u} \times \vec{B} - \nabla \Phi + \varepsilon \nabla \ell. \tag{1}
\]

\( \Phi \) is a single valued potential, and \( \ell \) is the distance along the vector \( \vec{B} \). This means the field lines of \( \vec{B} \) are given by \( d\vec{x}/dt = \vec{B}/B \equiv \vec{b} \) at a given point in time; the vector \( d\ell \equiv bdt \). The proof of Equation (1) is simple. The component of \( \vec{E} \) along \( \vec{B} \) gives \( b \cdot \vec{E} = -\partial \Phi/\partial \ell + \varepsilon \), where \( \varepsilon \) is a constant along \( \vec{B} \), which must be chosen to make \( \Phi \) single-valued. It is essentially the concept of an electromotive force in electrodynamics. When \( \vec{B} \) lies on toroidal surfaces,

\[
\varepsilon = \lim_{L \to \infty} \int_0^L \frac{\vec{E} \cdot d\vec{\ell}}{L}, \tag{2}
\]

and \( 2\pi R_0 \varepsilon \) is the loop voltage with \( R_0 \) a suitably averaged major radius of the surface. The components of \( \vec{E} \) perpendicular to \( \vec{B} \) determine \( \vec{u}_\perp \), which are the two components of \( \vec{u} \) that are perpendicular to \( \vec{B} \).

The most important concept from physics is Faraday’s Law, \( \partial \vec{B}/\partial t = -\nabla \times \vec{E} \), which gives the evolution of the magnetic field in terms of the electric field. Using Equation (1) to represent the electric field, Faraday’s law becomes

\[
\frac{\partial \vec{B}}{\partial t} = \nabla \times \left( \vec{u}_\perp \times \vec{B} - \varepsilon \nabla \ell \right). \tag{3}
\]

since \( \nabla \times (\nabla \Phi) = 0 \).

In 1958 Newcomb proved [13] that when \( \varepsilon = 0 \), magnetic field lines move with the velocity \( \vec{u}_\perp \). The proof is simple. Write the magnetic field in the well known Clebsch form \( 2\pi \vec{B} = \nabla \psi \times \nabla \Theta \) and show the evolution of field-line labels \( \psi \) and \( \Theta \) can be written as convective derivatives, \( \partial \psi / \partial t + \vec{u}_\perp \cdot \nabla \psi = 0 \) and \( \partial \Theta / \partial t + \vec{u}_\perp \cdot \nabla \Theta = 0 \). When \( \varepsilon \neq 0 \), one can show \( \Delta u \) is non-zero and reconnection occurs [11].

When applied to toroidal plasmas, Newcomb’s ideal-evolution proof for \( \varepsilon = 0 \) was always understood to imply a perfect preservation of magnetic surfaces including the toroidal magnetic flux enclosed by each surface and the twist of the field lines in each surface, the rotational transform \( \ell \). An explicit proof for toroidal surfaces is given in Section 6 of [14].

Enhanced magnetic reconnection is caused by magnetic field lines, which are defined at fixed points in time by \( d\vec{x}/d\ell = \vec{b}(x) \), exponentially separating. At a particular point in time, two neighboring magnetic field lines have a minimum \( \Delta \min \) and a maximum \( \Delta \max \) separation, where neighboring implies that the limit \( \Delta \max \to 0 \). For a field line integration of length \( L \), the field-line exponentiation \( \gamma_L \) is defined by

\[
e^{\gamma_L} \equiv \frac{\Delta_{\max}}{\Delta_{\min}}. \tag{4}
\]

The magnetic field is chaotic when its Lyapunov exponent

\[
\gamma_L \equiv \lim_{L \to \infty} \frac{\gamma_L}{L}. \tag{5}
\]

is non-zero, but a non-zero \( \gamma_L \) is not a critical condition for magnetic field line exponentiation to lead to rapid reconnection. In some systems, as in the solar-corona model [14], the length \( L \) is finite, so the field-line Lyapunov exponent \( \gamma_L \) is not properly defined. When the magnetic field lines lie on magnetic surfaces in a torus, the field-line Lyapunov exponent is well defined but zero.

The field-line exponentiation \( \gamma_L \) is a function of time in a magnetic field that is evolving ideally. Reconnection is certain to occur when \( \gamma_L(t) \) is an unbounded function of time, \( \gamma_L(t \to \infty) \to \infty \); any
non-ideal effect no matter how small will cause reconnection. When the ideal field-line flow \( \vec{u}_\perp \) is chaotic, the exponentiation of the lines grows in time as the exponentiation in the separation of the magnetic field lines does. In the simple reconnection example \([3]\), in which a region is bounded by a perfectly conducting cylinder in which the top of the cylinder is flowing, the quantity \( \gamma_L(t)/t \) is the Lyapunov exponent of the flow in the top plane as \( t \to \infty \). Reconnection becomes essentially inevitable for \( \gamma_L \gtrsim a_u/\Delta_d \) where \( a_u \) is the cross-field-line scale of \( \vec{u}_\perp \) and \( \Delta_d \) is the minimum distance over which evolving field lines remain distinguishable.

Two concepts should be clarified: the first is from mathematics and the second from physics.

Although chaotic flows are defined by an exponentially increasing separation of infinitesimally separated streamlines, the exponentiation characterizes the behavior of pairs of streamlines as long as their separation is small compared to the spatial scale of the flow \( \vec{u}(x,t) \). In the limit of larger separations, the separation tends to increase only diffusively; in simple cases this means as \( \sqrt{t} \). Although \( \gamma_L \) is defined for particular pairs of neighboring field lines, it represents the distance field lines can exponentially separate when \( \Delta_{max} \lesssim a_u \), where \( a_u \) is the characteristic spatial scale across \( \vec{B} \) on which the flow \( \vec{u}_\perp \) varies. This is illustrated in Figure 3c of \([4]\). At any point in time, \( \gamma_L \) is an extremely complicated function of which pair of field lines is chosen; the spatial gradient of \( \gamma_L \) increases exponentially.

The second concept, the distinguishability distance \( \Delta_d \) of magnetic field lines, is a physics concept. Nonetheless, the concept arises most obviously in simulations using ideal evolution equations in a code in which the spatial grid has a scale \( \Delta_d \). Then, as expected magnetic reconnection occurs \([12]\). When at any point in time, two magnetic field lines come closer to each other than \( \Delta_d \) at any place along their trajectories, then the two lines are indistinguishable. As discussed in the Introduction, distinguishability is a requirement for two magnetic field lines not to interchange their connections.

The distinguishability distance is defined by an inequality, and expressions for \( \Delta_d \) are valid if they satisfy this inequality. When it is small and enters logarithmically, the precise numerical value for \( \Delta_d \) makes little difference in the predicted time for magnetic reconnection to ensue.

Electron inertia gives a distinguishability distance equal to the electron skin depth, \( c/\omega_{pe} \), which is similar in effect to that of a finite spatial grid. A detailed derivation is given in Appendix C of \([15]\).

Plasma resistivity \( \eta \) diffuses magnetic field lines with a diffusion coefficient \( \eta/\mu_0 \). The expected distinguishability distance from this effect is \( \Delta_d^2 = (\eta/\mu_0) t \). The shortest time that can characterize lines not interdiffusing is \( \Delta_d/\vec{u}_\perp \). Consequently, if two magnetic field lines come closer than \( \Delta_d = \eta/\mu_0 a_u \) at any point on their trajectories, the two lines must be indistinguishable.

When combined with the references \([3, 11]\). Equation \( (3) \) for the evolution of a magnetic field gives a different way to estimate for the resistive distinguishability distance, \( \Delta_d = \eta/\mu_0 a_u \). This argument is simple when terms that are logarithmic in \( \ln(a_u/\Delta_d) \) are taken to be of order unity. The ideal evolution contributes to \( \partial \vec{B}/\partial t \) as \( \vec{\nabla} \times (\vec{u}_\perp \times \vec{B}) \sim \vec{u}_\perp B/a_u \). The resistivity contributes to \( \mathcal{E} \) as \( \mathcal{E} \sim j \eta \mathcal{B}^2 j \), with \( j \eta \mathcal{B}^2 j \) the average of the parallel current density along the line, and contributes to \( \partial \vec{B}/\partial t \) as \( \eta \vec{\nabla} \times j \mathcal{B} \mathcal{B} j / \Delta_d \). The current flows in ribbons along the magnetic field lines that become exponentially narrower in one direction across the magnetic field lines \([4, 11]\), until the ribbon becomes so thin that the effect of resistivity on the evolution is as fast as that of the ideal evolution. The current ribbons are exponentially broader in the other direction across the lines with \( j \mathcal{B} j \sim B/\mu_0 a_u \) evolving only logarithmically, by an amount proportional to \( \sim \ln(a_u/\Delta_d) \).

The distinguishability distance \( \Delta_d \) is combination of the electron inertia and resistive effects. Since the electron skin depth is \( c/\omega_{pe} = 5.31 \times 10^{-4} \sqrt{10^{20} \text{ m}^{-3}/n \text{ m}} \), and the magnetic diffusivity \( \eta/\mu_0 = 6.6 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2/\text{s} (10 \text{ keV}/T)^{3/2} \), the qualitative form of the distinguishability distance is

\[
\Delta_d \approx \frac{c}{\omega_{pe}} \left( 1 + \frac{u_c}{u_\perp} \right) \quad \text{with} \quad (6)
\]

\[
u_c \equiv \frac{\eta/\mu_0}{c/\omega_{pe}} \quad (7)
\]

\[
= 1.2 \text{ m/s} \sqrt{\frac{n}{10^{20} \text{ m}^{-3}}} \left( \frac{10 \text{ keV}}{T} \right)^{3/2} . \quad (8)
\]

When the ideal evolution velocity of the magnetic field lines \( u_\perp \) is greater than \( u_c \), which appears to be the case of primary interest in ITER, the electron skin depth is the distinguishability distance. Since the spatial scale of the distance between low order rational surfaces will be approximately a half meter in ITER, the ratio \( \Delta_{max}/\Delta_{min} \) must be of order \( 10^6 \approx e^7 \).

The electron skin depth appears to determine \( \Delta_d \) in the solar corona as well as in large tokamaks. In the corona, the density is of order \( n \sim 10^{15} \text{ m}^{-3} \).
and the temperature is of order 100 eV, so \( u_e \sim 3 \text{ m/s} \). Flows of order 100 m/s tangential to the solar photosphere are observed [16]. The ratio of the a typical distance scale of a thousand kilometers to the electron skin depth is of order \( 10^9 \approx e^{21} \).

The mathematics of partial differential equations shows that appropriate boundary conditions are essential for the solution of Equation (3) for a magnetic evolution. The simplest well-posed boundary condition is to surround the entire reconnecting region by a perfect conductor, which can be assumed to move or deform in time in order to drive the evolution. In principle, one can have outgoing boundary conditions on an enclosing surface, but such boundary conditions are subtle. What differences are produced by field lines that preserve their connections even after they have crossed the enclosing surface versus those that do not?

An important physics concept is the ideal evolution equation for the magnetic energy density, which is [11]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \frac{B^2}{2\mu_0} \right) + \nabla \cdot \left( \frac{B^2}{2\mu_0} \mathbf{u}_\perp \right) = - \left( \frac{B^2}{2\mu_0} \right) \left( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_\perp + 2\mathbf{u}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{\kappa} \right),
\]

where \( \mathbf{\kappa} \equiv \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b} \) is the curvature of the magnetic field lines. When Equation (9) is integrated over the volume enclosed by a moving perfect conductor, the left-hand side gives the energy input due to the motion of that perfect conductor. The right-hand side implies that only a field-line velocity that satisfies \( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_\perp + 2\mathbf{u}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{\kappa} = 0 \) can flow without large energy exchanges with the plasma in which the field is embedded. Three spatial coordinates are required to satisfy this condition during the evolution toward a rapid reconnection. Two coordinates perpendicular to \( \mathbf{B} \) are required to satisfy \( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_\perp + 2\mathbf{u}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{\kappa} = 0 \) and a third coordinate giving the variation along \( \mathbf{B} \) is required for a non-trivial magnetic reconnection problem.

When the magnetic evolution is in a two-dimensional space, an exponential increase in the separation of magnetic field lines cannot be responsible of fast magnetic reconnection in standard problems, for that would require an exponential increase in the magnetic energy. Schindler, Hesse, and Birn [17] proved that in two-dimensional space reconnection that competes with evolution requires a thin reconnection layer in which the current density reaches \( j \approx B_{\text{rec}}/\mu_0 \Delta_d \), where \( B_{\text{rec}} \) is the reconnecting magnetic field and \( \Delta_d = \eta/\mu_0 u_\perp \) is the resistive distinguishability distance. The ratio of the cross magnetic-field scale \( a_B \) to the resistive distinguishability scale is the magnetic Reynolds number \( R_m = \mu_0 u_\perp a_B/\eta \).

Two-dimensional reconnection theory has focused on methods of moving the plasma sufficiently rapidly out of the way in order to maintain a near-singular current density. The timely formation of a near-singular current [2] is not commonly considered and, as will be discussed, is limited by the propagation of shear Alfvén waves along the magnetic field lines. With field line exponentiation, the current density needs to reach only a far smaller magnitude, a magnitude that scales as \( \ln(a_B/\Delta_d) \), and the current flows in many ribbons along the magnetic field with each ribbon exponentially thin, \( \propto \exp(-\gamma_L) \), in one direction and exponentially wide, \( \propto \exp(\gamma_L) \), in the other direction across the field lines. Exponentiation, which requires three dimensions, gives a current density that is smaller by a factor of \( (\ln(R_m)/R_m) \) than two-dimensional reconnection. For a three-dimensional example, see [4].

Section III suggests a study that would clarify whether a current singularity can arise in two-dimensional reconnection when \( c/\omega_p \) determines the distinguishability distance. As discussed after Equation (6), \( c/\omega_p \) generally dominates \( \Delta_d \) in large tokamaks as well as in the solar corona.

Once reconnection has occurred over a sufficiently broad region \( a \), static force balance is generally lost and the evolution velocity switches from being determined by the explicit drive to the Alfvén speed, \( V_A \). The relevant measure of the importance of ideal to non-ideal effects for reconnection switches from the driven value of the Reynolds number to the Lundquist number, \( S = \mu_0 V_A a_B/\eta \). Field-line exponentiation provides a simple explanation for Parker’s 1973 observation [18] that reconnection generally occurs at a speed of order \( \approx 0.1V_A \). The natural logarithm of the Lundquist number is within a factor of three of ten in essentially any near-ideal magnetic evolution.

III. MAGNETIC COORDINATES AND SURFACE SEPARATION

A. Representation of \( \mathbf{B} \)

Wherever magnetic field lines lie on nested surfaces that are spatially bounded, these surfaces must be toroidal and can be denoted by the toroidal magnetic flux \( \psi \) that each surface encloses. The magnetic
field can then be represented as [19]

\[
2\pi \vec{B} = \vec{\nabla}\psi \times \vec{\nabla}\theta + \epsilon(\psi) \hat{\varphi} \times \vec{\nabla}\psi. \tag{10}
\]

The poloidal angle, the short way around the torus, is \(\theta\). The toroidal angle \(\varphi\) can be taken to be the polar angle of \((R, \varphi, Z)\) coordinates. The equation for a magnetic field line that was at \((\psi_0, \theta_0)\) at \(\varphi = 0\) is \(\psi = \psi_0\) and \(\theta = \theta_0 + \epsilon(\psi_0)\varphi\). The rotational transform \(\epsilon\) is the inverse of the safety factor, \(q = 1/\epsilon\).

The position in space associated with a given point in magnetic coordinates, \(\vec{x}(\psi, \theta, \varphi)\), can be given using cylindrical coordinates \((R, \theta, Z)\) with

\[
\vec{x}(\psi, \theta, \varphi) = R(\psi, \theta, \varphi) \hat{R}(\varphi) + Z(\psi, \theta, \varphi) \hat{Z}. \tag{11}
\]

The three tangent vectors of magnetic coordinates are

\[
\frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial \psi} = \frac{\partial R}{\partial \psi} \hat{R} + \frac{\partial Z}{\partial \psi} \hat{Z}, \tag{12}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\partial R}{\partial \theta} \hat{R} + \frac{\partial Z}{\partial \theta} \hat{Z}, \tag{13}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial \varphi} = \frac{\partial R}{\partial \varphi} \hat{R} + \frac{\partial Z}{\partial \varphi} \hat{Z} + R \hat{\varphi}, \tag{14}
\]

where the three orthonormal unit vectors of cylindrical coordinates satisfy \(\hat{Z} \times \hat{R} = \hat{\varphi}\) and \(dR/d\varphi = \hat{\varphi}\).

### B. Separation between magnetic surfaces

This section will derive relations, which are required to prove Equation [24]. Equation [24] relates the separation of neighboring magnetic surfaces in constant-\(\varphi\) planes to the distance between a pair of neighboring field lines that lie on the same magnetic surface. The variation in the separation of a pair of lines in a magnetic surface is more easily ascertained than the variation in the separation between neighboring magnetic surfaces.

Calculating the separation of neighboring magnetic surfaces in constant-\(\varphi\) planes is a major simplification to the calculation of the actual separation of neighboring surfaces. Nevertheless, it is an excellent approximation because the strength of the toroidal field \(B_\varphi\) in tokamaks, \(|\vec{B} - B_\varphi \hat{\varphi}|/B_\varphi \lesssim 0.1\), makes it difficult to produce sharp toroidal bends in the surfaces.

Equation (10), which gives the magnetic field in magnetic coordinates, and the expressions for tangent vectors imply

\[
2\pi \vec{B} \cdot \frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial \psi} \times \frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial \theta} = 1. \tag{15}
\]

The derivation uses the orthogonality relations of general coordinates, which are derived in the Appendix of [19]: \(\vec{\nabla}\psi \cdot \partial \vec{x}/\partial \psi = 1, \vec{\nabla}\theta \cdot \partial \vec{x}/\partial \theta = 0\), etc. Equation (11), which gives the positions associated with points in magnetic coordinates, and Equation (15) imply

\[
\frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial \psi} \times \frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\hat{\varphi}}{2\pi B_\varphi}, \text{ or} \tag{16}
\]

\[
\left|\frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial \psi}\right| \left|\frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial \theta}\right| \sin \alpha = \frac{1}{2\pi B_\varphi}. \tag{17}
\]

where \(B_\varphi \equiv \vec{B} \cdot \hat{\varphi}\) is the toroidal magnetic field and \(\alpha\) is the angle between the tangent vectors \(\partial \vec{x}/\partial \psi\) and \(\partial \vec{x}/\partial \theta\). This angle is defined by \(\cos \alpha = (\partial \vec{x}/\partial \psi) \cdot (\partial \vec{x}/\partial \theta)/\left|\partial \vec{x}/\partial \psi\right|\left|\partial \vec{x}/\partial \theta\right|\).

The separation \(\Delta \psi, \delta \psi\) between a pair of neighboring magnetic surfaces, one at \(\psi\) and the other at \(\psi + \delta \psi\) in a constant-\(\varphi\) plane is calculated using

\[
\Delta \psi, \delta \psi = \frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial \psi} \delta \psi + \frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial \theta} \delta \theta \tag{18}
\]

with \(\delta \theta, \delta \psi\) chosen to minimize the separation \(\Delta \psi = \sqrt{\Delta \psi \cdot \Delta \psi}\). One finds \(\Delta \psi = |(\partial \vec{x}/\partial \psi) \sin \alpha|\) and

\[
\Delta \psi \left|\frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial \theta}\right| = \frac{1}{2\pi B_\varphi}. \tag{19}
\]

The term “neighboring surfaces” implies the limit \(\delta \psi \to 0\). Although the separation between neighboring surfaces \(\Delta \psi\) is of primary interest for magnetic reconnection, the spatial separation between a pair of magnetic field lines that are both in the same magnetic surface is far easier to determine given a magnetic field \(\vec{B}(\vec{x})\).

### C. Field-line separation

A single field-line integration, \(d\vec{x}/d\varphi = \vec{B}(\vec{x})/\vec{B} \cdot \vec{\nabla}\varphi\), where \(\vec{\nabla}\varphi = \hat{\varphi}/R\), allows one to determine the separation between a pair of lines in a magnetic surface that have an initial separation \(\delta(0)\). \(\vec{B}(\vec{x})\) is assumed to be given in \((R, \varphi, Z)\) cylindrical coordinates. First, integrate the field line equation starting at \(\varphi = 0\) and determine \(\vec{x}(\varphi)\). Since almost all surfaces are irrational, \(\vec{x}(\varphi = 2\pi k)\), with \(k\) an integer, will come arbitrarily close to \(\vec{x}(\varphi = 0)\) for some value \(k = k_0\). Let

\[
\delta(\varphi) \equiv |\vec{x}(\varphi + 2\pi k_0) - \vec{x}(\varphi)|. \tag{20}
\]
with \( \delta(0) \equiv \delta(\varphi = 0) \) sufficiently small that the ratio \( \delta(\varphi) / \delta(0) \) achieves its asymptotic limit. Define

\[
\Delta_\theta(\varphi) / \Delta_\theta(0) = B_\varphi(\varphi) \delta(\varphi) / B_\varphi(0) \delta(0) .
\] (21)

Although there is only one field-line integration, a pair of neighboring field lines are being followed: one at \( \theta_1 = \theta_0 + \epsilon \varphi \) and the other at \( \theta_2 = \theta_0 + \delta \theta_0 + \epsilon \varphi \). The separation \( \delta(0) \) is proportional difference in the poloidal angle \( \delta \theta_0 \) at \( \varphi = 0 \):

\[
\delta(0) = \left| \frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial \theta} \right| \delta \theta_0 .
\] (22)

The difference \( \delta \theta_0 \) is unknown, but that is irrelevant when \( \delta \theta_0 \) sufficiently small compared to the \( \theta \) range through which a significant change in \( \vec{x}(\psi, \theta, \varphi) \) occurs.

Since \( e(\psi) \) is irrational on almost all magnetic surfaces, a single field line \( \theta = \theta_0 + \epsilon \varphi \), will come arbitrarily close to every point on the surface, and the ratio of Equation (21), \( \delta(\varphi) / \delta(0) \), becomes independent of \( \delta \theta_0 \) for \( \delta(0) \) sufficiently small.

Equation (21) is equivalent to

\[
\Delta_\theta(\varphi) / \Delta_\theta(0) = B_\varphi(\varphi) \left| \frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial \theta} \right| \theta = \theta_0 / B_\varphi(0) \left| \frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial \theta} \right| \theta = \theta_0 .
\] (23)

Equation (19) implies

\[
\frac{\Delta_\psi(\varphi)}{\Delta_\psi(0)} = \frac{\Delta_\theta(0)}{\Delta_\theta(\varphi)} .
\] (24)

where \( \Delta_\theta(\varphi) \) can be determined from a single magnetic-field line, \( \vec{x}(\varphi) \) using Equations (20) and (21).

Where two neighboring magnetic field lines are close to each other on a magnetic surface, which means \( \Delta_\theta \) small, the magnetic surfaces are far part, which means \( \Delta_\psi \) is large, and vice versa. This phenomenon is well known as the separatrix that defines a tokamak divertor is approached from the plasma side.

D. Variation in the separation of surfaces

When the ratio of the maximum to the minimum separation of neighboring magnetic surfaces, \( \Delta_{max}/\Delta_{min} \) becomes sufficiently large, reconnection becomes inevitable.

To determine \( \Delta_{max}/\Delta_{min} \), let

\[
\tilde{\gamma}(\varphi) \equiv \ln \left( \frac{\Delta_\theta(\varphi)}{\Delta_\theta(0)} \right) , \text{ or equivalently (25)}
\]

\[
= - \ln \left( \frac{\Delta_\psi(\varphi)}{\Delta_\psi(0)} \right) (26)
\]

using Equation (24).

The variation in the separation is given by

\[
\gamma_\psi \equiv \tilde{\gamma}_{max} - \tilde{\gamma}_{min} ,
\] (27)

where \( \tilde{\gamma}_{max} \) and \( \tilde{\gamma}_{min} \) are the maximum and the minimum value of \( \gamma_\psi \) on a magnetic surface, and

\[
\frac{\Delta_{max}}{\Delta_{min}} = e^{\gamma_\psi} .
\] (28)

The calculation of \( \gamma_\psi \) requires following an arbitrarily chosen magnetic field line on a \( \psi \)-surface for a sufficient number of toroidal transits for the line to come close to every point on that surface—in particular, it must close to the points where \( \tilde{\gamma}_{max} \) and \( \tilde{\gamma}_{min} \) are located.

Reconnection only requires non-ideal effects destroy the distinguishability of magnetic field lines where they are closer together than \( \Delta_\theta \). Consequently, the distinguishability of neighboring magnetic surfaces is also destroyed if they come closer to each other than \( \Delta_\theta \) at any point in space. Any pair of neighboring lines in a magnetic surface have their maximum separation at the point at which its neighboring magnetic surfaces have their closest approach.

IV. IDEAL PERTURBATIONS

Appendix A reviews the present understanding of the behavior of magnetic perturbations that evolve ideally. The strength of an ideal perturbation can be measured by \( \xi(\psi, \theta, \varphi) \), the distance the magnetic surfaces are displaced. The magnetic surfaces become more contorted the larger \( \xi \) is compared to the distance between rational surfaces that resonate with the \( M \) and \( N \) Fourier terms in \( \xi \). The integer \( M \) is the multiplier of the poloidal \( \theta \) and \( N \) of the toroidal \( \varphi \) angle.

Remarkably little is known about ideal perturbations to tokoidal plasmas for four reasons.

1. Ideal perturbations have only been carefully studied in perturbed systems that have perfect helical symmetry. The helical symmetry implies only one magnetic surface is resonant,
the one with $i(\psi_r) = N_0/M_0$, where $M_0$ and $N_0$ are mutually prime integers that define the helicity. Even then, the shape of the magnetic surfaces closer to the resonant surface, $\psi = \psi_r$, than the displacement $\xi$ become extremely contorted. This drives many harmonics $M_j N_0$, where $j_h$ is an integer—even when the external drive for the ideal perturbation has only the $M_0, N_0$ Fourier term.

2. Despite the strong non-linearity that arises closer to the rational surface than the local surface-displacement $\xi$, the temporal dependence has only been studied only for the short time scale before this non-linearity develops. Non-linear studies have only been carried out for static helically-symmetric ideal perturbations.

In the static limit, the parallel current density $j_{||}$ becomes singular at the resonant rational surface, but the short-time linear studies and force-balance considerations imply the current density is finite for finite time, apparently increasing linearly with time, Appendix A. A magnetic surface that had an initial spatial separation $x_0$ from the rational surface will have separations that vary from $\Delta_{\text{max}}$ to $\Delta_{\text{min}}$ with ratio of separations becoming infinite as the rational surface is approached, $\Delta_{\text{max}}/\Delta_{\text{min}} \propto 1/x_0^{4/3}$.

3. Even static non-linear studies have not been carried out in toroidal tokamaks. For a good reason, the toroidicity and the axisymmetric shaping drive poloidal or $M$-number harmonics. The production of the $j_h$ harmonics by the interaction with a single rational surface and the spread in the $M$ harmonics by toroidicity imply that even an external perturbation that is a pure Fourier mode, which resonates with a single magnetic surface, produces a broad spectrum of helicities once it interacts with the plasma. Calculations that includes many helicities and consequently many resonant rational surfaces are far more difficult than single helicity calculations.

4. The stronger the externally driven displacement and the longer the time after that displacement was initiated, the larger the number of rational surfaces that are non-linearly coupled into determination surface displacement $\xi(\psi, \theta, \varphi)$.

Although knowledge is limited, what is clear is that an externally driven displacement $\xi_d$ that has an increasing amplitude and a resonate interaction with at least one rational surface will over time involve an even greater number of rational surfaces in the plasma response. The ratio between the maximum and minimum separation between neighboring surfaces becomes large as $\xi$ increases. This effect becomes extreme when the displacement $\xi$ is comparable to the distance between low order rational surfaces, which gives a heuristic condition for a fast magnetic reconnection to occur. The implication is that a fast reconnection in a tokamak is similar to a fast reconnection sparked by the motion of magnetic footpoints [4]. An ideal evolution can not break magnetic field lines but can make their large-scale breaking result from arbitrarily small non-ideal effects.

V. IMPLICATIONS

Non-axisymmetric magnetohydrodynamics codes, such as NIMROD, M3D-C1, and JOREK [20-22], are used to study tokamak disruptions. As noted in the Introduction, an important application of this paper is the definition of studies that clarify the reliability of these simulations for disruption studies for ITER and tokamak power plants.

The simplest relevant study is the time development of ideal perturbations in helical symmetry. Only the linear limit, which fails after a sufficient number of Alfvén transit times, and the non-linear steady-state limit have been studied. The helically symmetric calculation is not only simplified by having only two non-trivial coordinates but also because the location of the resonant rational surface is known so the spatial grid can be packed in that region. In addition to the ideal evolution, it is also important to study of the effect of the electron skin depth, $c/\omega_{\text{pe}}$, when it is significantly larger than the spatial grid and with resistivity kept at a sufficiently low level to be negligible. An important question is whether a non-zero value for $c/\omega_{\text{pe}}$ prevents the development of a singular current density even when the plasma resistivity vanishes.

The inclusion of toroidicity makes the numerical study of an ideal evolution of a perturbation with an increasing amplitude extremely challenging. As the amplitude of the perturbation is increased the number of rational surfaces that must be carefully resolved increases without limit. Except in cylindrical symmetry, the ratio of separations between neighboring magnetic surfaces $\Delta_{\text{max}}/\Delta_{\text{min}}$.
is greater than unity, and the ratio increases the more contorted the magnetic surfaces become. The surface contortion becomes extreme when the amplitude of the surface displacement becomes comparable to the distance between low-order rational surfaces. An important question is how large can $\Delta_{\text{max}}/\Delta_{\text{min}}$ be while preserving the constraints of an ideal evolution—in particular the preservation of magnetic surfaces. For rapid magnetic surface breaking in the core of ITER, $\Delta_{\text{max}}/\Delta_{\text{min}} \gtrsim 10^3$ is required to make $\Delta_{\text{max}} = a$, the reconnection scale that causes static equilibrium to be lost, while $\Delta_{\text{min}} = \Delta_0$, the spatial scale over which magnetic distinguishability is lost.

As shown in Section III, a single magnetic field line trajectory $\vec{x}(\phi)$ at a given point in time determines (1) the $\Delta_{\text{max}}/\Delta_{\text{min}}$ ratio for the separation of the neighboring magnetic surfaces, (2) both the location and the localization on the magnetic surface of the place where $\Delta_{\text{min}}$ is located, and (3) whether the magnetic surface continues to exist. When a magnetic surface exists, the curve formed by $\vec{x}(2\pi k)$ with $k$ an integer gives the cross section of the magnetic surface in the $\phi = 0$ plane. When a magnetic surface does not exist, the points $\vec{x}(2\pi k)$ with $k$ an integer will fill an area and do not form a well defined curve.

The breaking of magnetic field lines and surfaces occurs at specific locations, the places where $\Delta_{\text{min}}$ is smallest. This may have important implications for the mixing of cold impurity ions, which move extremely slowly both along and across field lines. That is, the impurity mixing is closely related to the mixing of field line segments produced by reconnection. $\Delta_{\text{min}}$ presumably becomes extremely localized on the surfaces as $\Delta_{\text{max}}/\Delta_{\text{min}} \to \infty$. The extent to which existing simulation capabilities can determine this localization is unclear.

Since magnetic field lines are defined at points in time, the trajectory of a magnetic field line that passes through a particular point in space can undergo an arbitrarily large trajectory change between time $t$ and $t + \delta t$ due to a reconnection event, even as $\delta t \to 0$. This may seem to be physical nonsense until a distinction is made between the reconnections themselves, which means topology changes, and reconnection effects, which are physical effects that result from the changes in field-line topology. In hot, multi-kilovolt tokamak plasmas, the fastest observational effect of reconnection [23] is generally the spreading of energetic electrons along the reconnected magnetic field lines by collisionless streaming. This has been observed on DIII-D to occur on a 50 $\mu$s time scale, [24]. The relaxation of the parallel current density, or more precisely $j||/B$, occurs [23] on the time scale for a shear Alfvén wave to propagate along the reconnected field lines. Both empirical and theoretical evidence [23] imply that of order a hundred toroidal transits are required for a single magnetic field line to go from the central region to the plasma edge after a large scale breaking of magnetic surfaces has occurred in a tokamak disruption. Effects that involve the loss of static force balance across the magnetic field lines occur on a much faster time scale, the time scale for a compressional Alfvén wave to propagate across the magnetic field lines. This propagation is far faster than the most obvious causes of loss of force balance across the lines, which are adjustments in the plasma pressure and the relaxation of $j||/B$ to a constant in spatial regions covered by a single field line. Consequently, the plasma generally remains in force balance across the magnetic field as the electron energy and $j||/B$ relax along the magnetic field.

Using techniques developed in this paper, much can be learned about the physics of magnetic surface breakup and the capability of existing codes to represent it. Such studies are required to assess the reliability of these codes when applied to disruptions in ITER or in tokamak power plants.
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Appendix A: Effect of two-dimensional magnetic perturbations

The most important perturbations to nested toroidal magnetic surfaces are resonant. A resonant
perturbation has a normal magnetic field to the unperturbed surfaces which has a least one Fourier coefficient with a poloidal mode number $M$ and toroidal mode number $N$ that is resonant with the rotational transform $\iota(\psi_r) = N/M$ on a magnetic surface $\psi = \psi_r$ within the region of nested toroidal surfaces.

When a toroidal plasma is perturbed—even a plasma that was axisymmetric—there are no symmetry directions. An implication is that there are no single-term $(M,N)$ Fourier decompositions of the perturbing normal field within the plasma volume and multiple rational surfaces are generally affected. The interactions associated with the various Fourier terms is required to obtain an exponential variation in the separation of neighboring magnetic field lines throughout a volume and not just on a surface. It is a volumetric exponentiation that leads to large scale magnetic reconnection.

Unfortunately, detailed studies of this problem have only been carried out with the assumption the system has perfect helical symmetry in a limit in which the curvature of the magnetic surfaces can be ignored so that Cartesian coordinates can be employed. It is also assumed that the plasma pressure is zero. Steady-state studies have been carried out in [25–28] and are based on a method developed by Rosenbluth, Dagazian, and Rutherford [29] to study the $M = 1$ $N = 1$ kink in tokamaks.

1. Cartesian coordinate approximation

In helical symmetry, any perturbation is a periodic function of $M\theta - N\varphi$ in $(r, \theta, z)$ cylindrical coordinates, where $\varphi \equiv z/R_0$ with $2\pi R_0$ the wavelength of the perturbation in the $z$ direction. The helical angle $\theta_h$ and the helical symmetry vector $\vec{h}$ are

$$\theta_h \equiv M\theta - N\varphi \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{h} \equiv \frac{M^2 \hat{z} + \frac{\dot{\varphi}}{R_0}MN \hat{\theta}}{M^2 + N^2 \frac{\dot{\varphi}^2}{R_0^2}}, \quad \text{where} \quad (A1)$$

$$\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{h} = 0; \quad \text{and} \quad (A2)$$

$$\vec{h} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \theta_h = 0; \quad \text{and} \quad (A3)$$

$$\vec{\nabla} \times \vec{h} = \frac{2}{R_0} \frac{MN}{M^2 + N^2 \frac{\dot{\varphi}^2}{R_0^2}} \vec{h}. \quad \text{and} \quad (A4)$$

The magnetic field has helical symmetry when

$$\vec{B} = B_0 \vec{h} + \vec{\nabla} \times (A(r, \theta_h) \vec{h}); \quad (A6)$$

$$\vec{B} \cdot \vec{\nabla} A = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (A7)$$

The magnetic field lines lie in surfaces of constant $A$, where $A\vec{h}$ is the vector potential in the direction of helical symmetry.

To simplify the problem further, it is assumed that $R_0 \to \infty$. In this limit, $\vec{h} \approx \hat{z}$. The current density is $\mu_0 \vec{j} = \vec{\nabla} \times (\vec{\nabla} \times A\vec{h})$ with $\vec{h} \approx \hat{z}$, so

$$\mu_0 j_z = -\vec{\nabla}^2 A. \quad (A8)$$

The operator $\vec{B} \cdot \vec{\nabla} f$ is of particular importance. When the function $f(x)$ is helically symmetric, $\vec{h} \cdot \vec{\nabla} f = 0$, and

$$\vec{B} \cdot \vec{\nabla} f = -\vec{h} \cdot (\vec{\nabla} A \times \vec{\nabla} f); \quad (A9)$$

$$= \vec{B} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \theta_h \frac{\partial f(A, \theta_h)}{\partial \theta_h}. \quad (A10)$$

In the unperturbed state, $\theta_h = M\theta - N\varphi$, so $\vec{B} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \theta_h = (\iota(A)M - N)\vec{B} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \varphi$, where $\vec{B} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \varphi = B_0/R_0$, which is a constant as $R_0 \to \infty$. Consequently, the operator

$$\frac{\vec{B} \cdot \vec{\nabla} f}{B_0} = \iota(A)M - N \frac{\partial f(A, \theta_h)}{\partial \theta_h} \quad (A11)$$

in the limit as the perturbation goes to zero.

The unperturbed vector potential near the rational surface $\iota(r_s) = N/M$ is

$$A_0 = -\frac{\mu_0 \bar{J}_0}{2} r_s^2 \left( \ln(r/r_s) - \frac{r - r_s}{r_s} \right) \quad (A12)$$

$$\approx \frac{\mu_0 \bar{J}_0}{4} x_0^2 + \cdots, \quad \text{where} \quad (A13)$$

$$x_0 \equiv r - r_s \quad (A14)$$

and $\bar{J}_0$ is the average current density in the region enclosed by the rational surface. For both simplicity and to be definite, the current density in the unperturbed plasma is assumed to be zero at the rational surface. The term involving $(r - r_s)/r_s$ in Equation (A12) comes from the unperturbed field on the rational surface being equal to $B(r_s) = B_0 \vec{h} \approx B_0 (\vec{z} + (N r_s / M R_0) \hat{\theta})$. The radial derivative of the rotational transform at the rational surface is

$$\iota' \equiv -\frac{\mu_0 \bar{J}_0 R_0}{2 B_0 r_s} \quad (A15)$$

The rotational transform is order unity, so the ratio $B_0 / R_0$ must remain constant as the limit $R_0 \to \infty$ is taken.

An ideal perturbation can move the magnetic surfaces, which remain surfaces of constant $A$. The implication is that if a magnetic surface is perturbed
from being independent to being dependent on $\theta_h$, then its position is

$$x = x_0 + \xi(x_0, \theta_h)$$ \hspace{1cm} \text{(A16)}$$

and $\xi(x_0, \theta_h)$ is the displacement of the surface. That is, the vector potential in the presence of the perturbation is

$$A = A_0(x - \xi)$$ \hspace{1cm} \text{(A18)}$$

$$A_0(x_0) = \frac{\mu_0 J_0}{4} x_0^2$$ \hspace{1cm} \text{(A17)}$$

As $x \to \infty$, the vector potential in the presence of the perturbation goes to

$$A \to \frac{\mu_0 J_0 x^2}{4} \left(1 - 2\frac{\xi}{x}\right).$$ \hspace{1cm} \text{(A20)}$$

A cosinusoidal perturbation is assumed to be driven at a large distance $x$ from the resonant surface in the sense $|x/\xi| >> 1$, but close to the rational surface, which has a radius $r_s$, in the sense $|x/r_s| << 1$.

The approximations that have been made reduce the problem to $(x, y, z)$ Cartesian coordinates, where

$$x(x_0, \theta_h) = x_0 + \xi(x_0, \theta_h),$$ \hspace{1cm} \text{(A21)}$$

$$y(\theta_h) = r_s \theta_h,$$ \hspace{1cm} \text{(A22)}$$

and $z$ is the direction of symmetry. Using Equation (A17), the unperturbed coordinate $x_0$ also specifies a particular value of the vector potential, which is unchanged by the perturbation. The radius $r_s$ is the radius of the resonant magnetic surface.

2. Force-free solution

When the plasma pressure is zero, the only long term solution for force balance is for the current to be force free, which means $\vec{j} = (\vec{j}||/B)\hat{B}$, and divergence free, which implies $\vec{B} \cdot \nabla (\vec{j}||/B) = 0$. Using Equation (A8), the infinite-time solution for the magnetic field subjected to perturbation that is time-independent is a solution of the equation

$$\nabla^2 A = -\mu_0 j_z(A),$$ \hspace{1cm} \text{(A23)}$$

with the displacement of $\xi$ satisfying $A(x, y) = A_0(x - \xi)$. The boundary condition is on a surface $r = b$. On the $r = b$ surface, the displacement is $\xi_b = -\xi_a \cos \theta_h$, or $\xi_b = -\xi_a \cos(y/r_s)$. The solution gives not only the displacement $\xi(x, y)$ but also the self-consistent force-free current $j_z(A)$. For simplicity, it is usually assumed the perturbation is applied on both sides of the rational surface in a balanced way, so the rational surface itself remains at its unperturbed position.

The most important results [9] are that a magnetic surface, which was separated from the rational surface by a distance $x_0$, has a closest approach $x \asymp x_0^2$ and a furthest separation $x \asymp x_0^{2/3}$ in the region in which $x_0$ is small compared to the imposed displacement. The width of the region of furthest separation scales as $x_0^{1/3}$, so the cross-sectional area of this region scales as $x_0$. The magnetic field $B_y$, which is zero at the rational surface becomes a non-zero constant as the rational surface is approached.

Figure 10 in [28] demonstrates these scalings except that of the closest approach. As discussed in Appendix A3, the time that it would take $j_z$ to become a function of $A$ alone on a surface is the time it would take a shear Alfvén wave to cover the surface. This is determined by how long the Alfvén wave takes to propagate through the region of furthest separation, which is proportional to $1/x_0$ just as in the unperturbed system.

3. Time development

a. Evolution equations in helical symmetry

The infinite-time solution has a singular current density at the rational surface, but this current grows only algebraically in time.

Two additional equations are required to describe the evolution of a magnetic field embedded in an ideal but pressureless plasma.

One additional equation describes the evolution of the vector potential, $\partial A/\partial t = -\vec{E}$. The ideal electric field has the form $\vec{E} = \vec{v} \times \vec{B} - \nabla \Phi$, so the evolution of the component of the vector potential parallel to the magnetic field is

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial t} = \frac{\vec{B} \cdot \nabla \Phi}{B_0}.$$ \hspace{1cm} \text{(A24)}$$

The time independence of the vector potential associated with the magnetic field $B_0 \hat{z}$ implies $\vec{B} \times \vec{E} = 0$, which requires the velocity

$$\vec{v} = -\dot{\hat{z}} \times \frac{\nabla \Phi}{B_0},$$ \hspace{1cm} \text{(A25)}$$
\[ \nabla \times \vec{v} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\nabla^2 \Phi}{B_0}. \quad (A26) \]

The other additional equation is for the evolution of the velocity, which is the force-balance equation, \( \rho_0 \partial \vec{v}/\partial t = j \times \vec{B} \). The curl of this equation implies

\[ \rho_0 \frac{\partial \nabla \times \vec{v}}{\partial t} = \vec{B} \cdot \nabla j_z, \quad \text{so} \quad (A27) \]

\[ \frac{\partial \nabla^2 \Phi}{\partial t} = V_A^2 \frac{\vec{B} \cdot \nabla}{B_0} \nabla^2 A, \quad \text{where} \quad (A28) \]

\[ V_A^2 = \frac{B_0^2}{\mu_0 \rho}, \quad (A29) \]

is the Alfvén speed. Equations (A24) and (A28) together with \( \nabla^2 A = -\mu_0 j_z \) imply the current relaxes to being force-free, \( j_z(A) \), on the time scale of shear Alfvén wave propagation. The operator that gives parallel wavenumber of the Alfvén waves, \( k_\parallel = (\vec{B}/B_0) \cdot \nabla \), is inversely proportional to the distance from the rational surface.

### b. Hahm and Kulsrud linear solution

In 1985 Hahm and Kulsrud [31] solved Equations (A24) and (A28) in the limit in which the quadratic \( \xi \) term can be ignored in \( A = (\mu_0 J_0/4)(x^2 - 2x\xi + \xi^2) \), Equation (A19), and elsewhere in the analysis. In particular, the small perturbation limit of the operator \( (\vec{B}/B_0) \cdot \nabla \), Equation (A11), was used. Although it was assumed that the distance \( x \) from the rational surface was larger than \( \xi \), the distance \( x \) is assumed to be much smaller than the radius \( r_\ast \) of the rational surface, so \( \nabla^2 \rightarrow \partial^2 / \partial x^2 \). This assumption makes the exponential increase, \( \sim \exp(Mx/r_\ast) \) that occurs as the source of the perturbation is approached in a curl-free magnetic field unimportant.

Equations (A24) and (A28) become

\[ \frac{\partial A}{\partial t} = \frac{M' x}{R_0} \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial h}, \quad (A30) \]

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial x^2} = V_A^2 \frac{M' x}{R_0} \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \frac{\partial^2 A}{\partial x^2}, \quad \text{so} \quad (A31) \]

\[ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \frac{\partial^2 A}{\partial x^2} = \left( V_A^2 \frac{M' x}{R_0} \right)^2 x \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial h^2} A. \quad (A32) \]

The part of \( A \) that depends on time and \( \theta_h \) is proportional to \( x\xi \), so Equation (A32) can be written

\[ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \frac{\partial^2 \xi}{\partial x^2} = \left( V_A^2 \frac{M' x}{R_0} \right)^2 x \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \frac{\partial^2 x\xi}{\partial h^2}, \quad \text{or} \quad (A33) \]

\[ = -\frac{1}{a^2 \tau_A^2} \frac{\partial^2 x\xi}{\partial x^2}, \quad \text{when} \quad (A34) \]

\[ \xi = \xi \cos \theta_h \quad \text{and} \quad (A35) \]

\[ \tau_A = \frac{R_0}{M' \tau_s V_A} \quad (A36) \]

is the characteristic time for the propagation of a shear Alfvén wave, typically of order a micro-second in a large tokamak.

Hahm and Kulsrud gave the solution for the displacement, Equation (A34), using the sine function, \( \text{Si}(\zeta) \):

\[ \xi = \frac{2\xi_d}{\pi} \text{Si} \left( \frac{x}{\Delta} \right), \quad \text{where} \quad (A37) \]

\[ \Delta(t) = r_\ast \tau_A / t; \quad (A38) \]

\[ \text{Si}(\zeta) = \int_0^\zeta \frac{\sin(u)}{u} \, du; \quad (A39) \]

\[ \text{Si}(\infty) = \frac{\pi}{2}; \quad (A40) \]

\[ \text{Si}(\zeta) = \zeta - \frac{\zeta^3}{18} + \frac{\zeta^5}{600} + \cdots; \quad (A41) \]

\[ \text{Si}(\zeta) \leq \text{Si}(\pi) = 1.851937 \cdots. \quad (A42) \]

The properties of the sine function, \( \text{Si}(\zeta) \), can be found on a number of web sites.

The distance \( \Delta(t) \) is the distance scale of the shielding current at the time \( t \) after the perturbation is initiated.

Let \( \tilde{A} \) be the part of \( A \) that depends on time and \( \theta_h \), then in the Hahm-Kruskal approximation

\[ \tilde{A} = -\frac{\mu_0 J_0}{2} x\xi \quad (A44) \]

\[ = -\xi_d \frac{\mu_0 J_0}{\pi} x^2 t \frac{\text{Si}(\zeta)}{\Delta(t)} \quad (A45) \]

When \( x < \Delta(t) \), which means within the region in which a shielding current arises, \( \zeta = x/\Delta < 1 \) and \( \text{Si}(\zeta)/\zeta \approx 1 \). Consequently,

\[ \xi \approx \frac{2\xi_d}{\pi \Delta(t)} x; \quad (A46) \]

\[ \frac{\tilde{A}}{A_0} \approx -\frac{4}{\pi} \frac{\xi_d}{\Delta(t)}; \quad (A47) \]

\[ \theta_z \equiv -\frac{1}{\mu_0} \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{A}}{\partial \theta_h^2} \approx \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\xi_d}{\Delta(t)}. \quad (A49) \]
Within the spatial region of validity of the Hahm-Kulsrud approximation, the shielding current is a spatial constant when $x << \Delta(t)$. Their solution is invalid unless $\xi/2x = \chi_d/(\pi \Delta) << 1$, which means when $\Delta(t) \lesssim \xi_d$. The displacement $\xi_d$ is defined by the asymptotic value of $\xi$ when $x >> \Delta(t)$, which means outside of the region in which shielding currents flow. The displacement is independent of $x$ in the region $r_s >> x >> \Delta(t)$ and equal to $\xi_d$, where $r_s$ is the radius of the rational surface.


