

1974

# Comments on 'Fluctuations in Guiding Center Plasma in Two Dimensions'

George Vahala

Linda L. Vahala

*Old Dominion University*, lvahala@odu.edu

David Montgomery

Glenn Joyce

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/ece\\_fac\\_pubs](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/ece_fac_pubs)

 Part of the [Plasma and Beam Physics Commons](#)

## Repository Citation

Vahala, George; Vahala, Linda L.; Montgomery, David; and Joyce, Glenn, "Comments on 'Fluctuations in Guiding Center Plasma in Two Dimensions'" (1974). *Electrical & Computer Engineering Faculty Publications*. 36.

[https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/ece\\_fac\\_pubs/36](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/ece_fac_pubs/36)

## Original Publication Citation

Vahala, G., Vahala, L., Montgomery, D., & Joyce, G. (1974). Comments on 'Fluctuations in guiding center plasma in two dimensions'. *Physics of Fluids*, 17(12), 2298. doi: 10.1063/1.1694709

## COMMENTS

Comments refer to papers published in *The Physics of Fluids* and are subject to the same length limitation as *Research Notes*. The Board of Editors will not hold itself responsible for the opinions expressed in the Comments.

# Comments on "Fluctuations in guiding center plasma in two dimensions"

George Vahala\*

*Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, New York, New York 10012*

Linda Vahala

*4 Washington Square Village, New York, New York*

David Montgomery and Glenn Joyce

*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52240*

(Received 14 March 1973; final manuscript received 18 September 1974)

In a recent paper<sup>1</sup> Taylor and Thompson calculated auto-correlations in density for the electrostatic guiding center plasma in two dimensions by means of a variant of the random phase approximation. In their notation, they find, for the ensemble average  $S_k(\tau) \equiv \langle \rho_{-k}(t)\rho_k(t-\tau) \rangle$ , the expression [their Eq. (23)]  $S_k(\tau) = q_k \cos \Omega_k \tau$ , where [their Eq. (13)]  $q_k \equiv n\lambda^2 k^2 / (1 + \lambda^2 k^2)$ , and [their Eq. (24)]

$$\Omega_k^2 = -\frac{\alpha^2}{(2\pi)^2} \int d^2l \frac{(\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \mathbf{l} \times \mathbf{k})^2}{l^2} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{k^2} - \frac{1}{l^2} \right) q_1 - \left( \frac{1}{k^2} - \frac{1}{(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{l})^2} \right) q_{|\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{l}|} \right].$$

It is claimed that [their Eq. (27)] for small  $k$ ,  $\Omega_k^2 \rightarrow (KTc^2/6LB^2)k^4$ .

The purpose of this comment is to remark that an error in evaluating the integral (24) has occurred, and that the correct small  $k$  limit of  $\Omega_k^2$  should be  $\Omega_k^2 \rightarrow \alpha^2 n k^2 / 16$ . Because the major "volume divergent" contribution to the integral, which is later assumed to represent the diffusion coefficient, comes from the region of small  $k$ , this "divergence" no longer results (e.g., in their last equation). This invalidates the principal result of the paper and leaves the diffusion coefficient in flat disagreement with that previously published by Taylor and McNamara.<sup>2</sup>

The error has occurred in ignoring the transformation of the domain of integration, when the second half of the integral in Eq. (24) is transformed to get Eq. (25). Moreover, the assumption which motivates the authors Reply (that there can be a meaningful distinction between an

"interaction cutoff" and a "fluctuation cutoff") is incorrect. [It should also be noted that Eq. (1) of their Reply is incorrect. It results from an inconsistent use of the fluctuation cutoff in determining the integration limits.] For any thermal equilibrium Coulomb system (guiding center, finite gyroradius, or unmagnetized), a straightforward proportionality exists between the spectral density of the fluctuations and the Fourier transform of the two-body interaction. All that is required is a small plasma parameter expansion of the equilibrium BBGKY hierarchy derived from the Gibbs distribution.<sup>3</sup> This result is independent of the details of the force law between particles and is independent of dimensionality.<sup>4</sup> There is thus no ambiguity to the statement that in wave number space, the fluctuation spectrum vanishes at exactly those places where the interaction potential vanishes, and nowhere else.

During the course of this work one of us (GV) was supported by Air Force Office of Scientific Research Grant AF-AFOSR-73-2499, one of us (DM) was supported by National Aeronautics and Space Administration Grant NGL-16-001-043, and one of us (GJ) was supported by United States Atomic Energy Commission Grant AT(11-1)-2059.

\* Present address: Department of Physics, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va. 23185.

<sup>1</sup> J. B. Taylor and W. B. Thompson, *Phys. Fluids* **16**, 111 (1973). (We use their notation.)

<sup>2</sup> J. B. Taylor and B. McNamara, *Phys. Fluids* **14**, 1492 (1971).

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., D. Montgomery in *Kinetic Theory*, edited by W. Brittin, A. O. Barut, and M. Guenin (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1967), p. 35.

<sup>4</sup> G. Vahala and D. Montgomery, *J. Plasma Phys.* **4**, 425 (1971).