

Sensitivity of synchrotron radiation to the superthermal electron population in mildly relativistic plasma

Cite as: Phys. Plasmas **30**, 043301 (2023); doi: 10.1063/5.0140508

Submitted: 28 December 2022 · Accepted: 18 March 2023 ·

Published Online: 4 April 2023



M. E. Mlodik,^{a)}  V. R. Munirov,  T. Rubin,  and N. J. Fisch 

AFFILIATIONS

Department of Astrophysical Sciences, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08540, USA

^{a)}Author to whom correspondence should be addressed: mmlodik@princeton.edu

ABSTRACT

Synchrotron radiation has markedly different behavior in ~ 10 keV and in ~ 100 keV plasma. We show that high-energy electrons that occupy the tail of velocity distribution function have disproportionate impact on power loss of ~ 100 keV plasma. If electrons with energy more than cutoff energy are redistributed while keeping the Maxwellian distribution function below cutoff energy intact, both emission and absorption of synchrotron radiation act to decrease the lost power. These novel radiation transport effects in non-equilibrium plasma suggest large utility in the deconfinement of high-energy electrons to reduce synchrotron radiation in applications where the radiation is deleterious.

Published under an exclusive license by AIP Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0140508>

I. INTRODUCTION

Synchrotron radiation occurs whenever a charged particle moves in a magnetic field. Synchrotron emission and absorption in plasmas are of great importance both in fusion and astrophysical settings and thus have been studied extensively.^{1–30} The basic theory of synchrotron radiation can be found in Refs. 1–5. In particular, it was observed in the pioneering work of Trubnikov¹ that self-absorption of synchrotron radiation by plasma is a crucial effect, resulting in more power radiated into higher harmonics. In fusion plasmas, electron cyclotron emission is used both to heat plasma^{31–37} and to diagnose it.^{38–42} The synchrotron emission has also been proposed to maintain toroidal currents in tokamaks upon asymmetric reflection of the emission back into the tokamak,⁴³ which then drives an rf current upon reabsorption in the plasma.⁴⁴ In astrophysical plasmas, synchrotron radiation is widespread^{28–30} and usually comes from nonthermal power-law energy distributions;⁴⁵ it plays a crucial role in the physics of pulsar magnetospheres,^{20,21} active galactic nuclei,^{46–48} and supernova remnants^{49,50} and dominates the radio emission from normal galaxies.^{51,52} Note, however, that the synchrotron radiation spectrum behavior changes significantly once plasma is mildly relativistic.

In this paper, we show that the removal of superthermal electrons, accompanied by redistribution of these electrons as thermal electrons, has a large effect on the radiation transport. It is not the objective of this paper to inquire into how these superthermal electrons are selectively removed from the plasma; we assume that various

devices may be employed to render these electrons less well confined. It is our objective to explore the sensitivity on the net emission from the plasma in the absence of these electrons, given that these electrons play an outsized role on both emission and absorption.

The superthermal electrons both emit more radiation and emit disproportionately more radiation into higher harmonics. As many plasmas are optically thick for lower harmonics of synchrotron radiation and optically thin for higher harmonics, the redistribution of superthermal electrons dramatically decreases synchrotron power losses from plasma. Moreover, if we keep the total number of electrons constant, self-absorption of synchrotron radiation also changes once superthermal electrons are redistributed to lower energy. Note that this change of absorption enhances the effect of distribution function manipulation even more. This analysis is of potential importance for any device that aims to have magnetically confined high-temperature plasma where synchrotron losses are to be avoided or mitigated.

The paper is organized as follows: Formulation of the problem and the governing equations are described in Sec. II. The main results of the paper are shown in Sec. III. Conclusions and limitations of the analysis are presented in Sec. IV.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

In order to isolate the effect of superthermal electrons on power losses of plasma via synchrotron radiation, we consider the following model. Suppose that there is a uniform plasma slab immersed in

uniform magnetic field B parallel to the boundary of the slab. Suppose that the electron distribution function in this slab is the same everywhere and that it is given. For the most part, unless said otherwise, we consider perpendicular propagation of synchrotron radiation as most losses are concentrated around that direction of propagation. We also consider the plasma slab to be tenuous to synchrotron radiation. (This assumption is discussed in more detail in Sec. IV.)

More specifically, we consider a relativistic Maxwellian distribution with and without cutoff energy. We will use the Maxwell–Jüttner distribution with a cutoff at γ_{\max}

$$f(\mathbf{u}) = \begin{cases} N_{\text{const}} \frac{e^{-\frac{\gamma}{\theta_{T_e}}}}{4\pi\theta_{T_e}K_2(1/\theta_{T_e})}, & \gamma \leq \gamma_{\max}, \\ 0, & \gamma > \gamma_{\max}, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where N_{const} is the normalization constant, K_2 is the modified Bessel function of the second kind, $\theta_{T_e} = T_e/m_e c^2$ is the dimensionless temperature, and γ is the Lorentz factor. Throughout this paper, we will use the dimensionless momentum $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{p}/m_e c$, so that $\gamma = \sqrt{1 + u^2}$; the normalization will always be such that $\int f(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} = \int f(\mathbf{u}) \times 2\pi u_{\perp} du_{\perp} du_{\parallel} = 1$, and by subscripts \perp and \parallel , we will denote the components perpendicular and parallel to the magnetic field. When γ_{\max} is equal to infinity and $N_{\text{const}} = 1$, Eq. (1) yields the Maxwell–Jüttner distribution without cutoff. This family of model distributions is chosen to show with the most clarity the impact of superthermal electrons on synchrotron radiation.

Synchrotron radiation in tenuous plasma can be described as follows: If the spontaneous emissivity from one electron with momentum \mathbf{u} is given by $\eta_{\omega}(\mathbf{u})$, then the total emission coefficient from a collection of electrons of density n_e with distribution function $f(\mathbf{u})$ is given by Bekefi³

$$j_{\omega} = n_e \int \eta_{\omega}(\mathbf{u}) f(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} = n_e \int \eta_{\omega}(u_{\perp}, u_{\parallel}) f(u_{\perp}, u_{\parallel}) 2\pi u_{\perp} du_{\perp} du_{\parallel}. \quad (2)$$

The absorption coefficient is given by Bekefi³

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{\omega} &= -n_e \frac{8\pi^3 c^2}{n_r^2 \omega^2} \int \eta_{\omega}(u_{\perp}, u_{\parallel}) \\ &\times \left[\frac{\varepsilon}{m_e^2 c^4} \frac{\partial f}{\partial u_{\perp}} - \frac{n(\theta) \cos \theta}{m_e c^2} \left(u_{\parallel} \frac{\partial f}{\partial u_{\perp}} - u_{\perp} \frac{\partial f}{\partial u_{\parallel}} \right) \right] 2\pi du_{\perp} du_{\parallel} \\ &= -n_e \frac{8\pi^3 c^2}{n_r^2 \omega^2} \int \eta_{\omega}(\mathbf{u}) \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{u})}{\partial \varepsilon} d\mathbf{u}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Here, θ is the angle between the wave propagation and the magnetic field, n_r is the ray-refractive index [see Eq. (1.121) of Ref. 3], while n is the usual wave refractive index. We will use the assumption of tenuous plasma and set $n_r = n = 1$.

The emissivity of a single electron from tenuous plasma is given by Trubnikov²

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\omega} &= \frac{e^2 \omega^2}{2\pi c \omega_c \sin^2 \theta \gamma} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \left[(\gamma \cos \theta - u_{\parallel})^2 J_s^2 \left(\frac{\omega \sin \theta}{\omega_c} u_{\perp} \right) \right. \\ &\left. + u_{\perp}^2 \sin^2 \theta J_s^2 \left(\frac{\omega \sin \theta}{\omega_c} u_{\perp} \right) \right] \delta \left[s - \frac{\omega}{\omega_c} (\gamma - u_{\parallel} \cos \theta) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here, $\omega_c = |e|B/(m_e c)$ is the electron cyclotron frequency in the non-relativistic limit. This formula is separated into two parts (the first is proportional to J_s^2 , and the second is proportional to $J_s'^2$) that correspond to two separate polarizations. The corresponding total plasma emission and absorption determined by Eqs. (2) and (3) with η_{ω} given by Eq. (4) are also separated into two polarizations, which we will denote with superscripts (1) and (2). Separation above might not be possible for absorption, as can be seen, for example, by looking at the $|\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{V}_n^*|^2$ term in Refs. 5 and 6. However, this separation is legitimate for near perpendicular propagation ($\theta \approx \pi/2$), which dominates radiation losses for such temperatures. Moreover, the polarization should affect the distribution functions with cutoff and without cutoff in a similar manner (since both of them are symmetric). In the case of perpendicular propagation, superscripts (1) and (2) correspond to ordinary and extraordinary wave, respectively.

For the radiation intensity leaving a slab of plasma per $d\omega$ and per solid angle, the equation of radiative transfer yields the following expression [see, for example, Eq. (10) of Ref. 1]:

$$I_{\omega} = \sin \theta \left[\frac{j_{\omega}^{(1)}}{\alpha_{\omega}^{(1)}} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\alpha_{\omega}^{(1)} L}{\sin \theta}} \right) + \frac{j_{\omega}^{(2)}}{\alpha_{\omega}^{(2)}} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\alpha_{\omega}^{(2)} L}{\sin \theta}} \right) \right], \quad (5)$$

where superscripts (1) and (2) correspond to two polarizations discussed above. Note that the crucial parameters that determine whether plasma is opaque for a given frequency is $\alpha_{\omega}^{(1,2)} L$. Following Ref. 3, in plasma with a symmetric distribution function that depends on only energy, $\alpha_{\omega}^{(1,2)} L$ have the following dependence:

$$\alpha_{\omega}^{(1,2)} L = \frac{\omega_p^2 L}{\omega_c c} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \Phi^{(1,2)}(s; \omega/\omega_c; \theta_{T_e}), \quad (6)$$

where $\Phi^{(1,2)}$ are dimensionless functions. As $\Phi^{(1,2)}$ do not depend on plasma size or density, plasma absorption is determined to a large extent by absorption parameter Λ ,

$$\Lambda = \frac{\omega_p^2 L}{\omega_c c}. \quad (7)$$

Here, ω_p is the plasma frequency, and L is the plasma size in the direction perpendicular to the magnetic field. Note that the redistribution of superthermal electrons that is studied in this paper does not change Λ .

For the Maxwell–Jüttner distribution with cutoff energy, we still have a symmetric distribution function that depends on only energy, so that $\partial f(\mathbf{u})/\partial \varepsilon = -f(\mathbf{u})/\theta_{T_e} m_e c^2$, and the source function is the same for the blackbody radiation,

$$\frac{j_{\omega}}{\alpha_{\omega}} = \frac{j_{\omega}^{(1)}}{\alpha_{\omega}^{(1)}} = \frac{j_{\omega}^{(2)}}{\alpha_{\omega}^{(2)}} = \frac{\omega^2 T_e}{8\pi^3 c^2} = \frac{m_e \omega^2 \theta_{T_e}}{8\pi^3}. \quad (8)$$

Using source functions from Eq. (8), we can rewrite Eq. (5) and obtain (see also Sec. 11.9 of Ref. 18)

$$I_{\omega} = \sin \theta \frac{m_e \omega^2 \theta_{T_e}}{8\pi^3} \left(2 - e^{-\frac{\alpha_{\omega}^{(1)} L}{\sin \theta}} - e^{-\frac{\alpha_{\omega}^{(2)} L}{\sin \theta}} \right). \quad (9)$$

The limiting case $\alpha_{\omega}^{(1,2)} L/\sin \theta \ll 1$ of Eq. (5) corresponds to the optically thin regime,

$$I_{\omega} = (j_{\omega}^{(1)} + j_{\omega}^{(2)}) L = j_{\omega} L. \quad (10)$$

The opposite case $\alpha_{\omega}^{(1,2)}L/\sin\theta \gg 1$ corresponds to the optically thick regime, where radiation intensity becomes

$$I_{\omega} = \sin\theta \frac{m_e \omega^2 \theta T_e}{4\pi^3}, \quad (11)$$

i.e., blackbody spectrum. Note that $\alpha_{\omega}^{(1,2)}$ vary across the spectrum. Thus, the plasma can be optically thick for some frequencies and optically thin for other frequencies.

III. MAIN RESULT

Both emission and absorption change significantly in a plasma with cutoff energy. An example of the emission spectrum determined in Eq. (2) for near perpendicular propagation angle $\theta = 0.45\pi$ is shown in Fig. 1. Once electrons with energy higher than the cutoff energy are redistributed into the low-energy part of the electron distribution function, emission into the low-frequency part of the spectrum increases, while emission into the high-frequency part of the spectrum decreases. This can be seen from the comparison of the total plasma emission coefficient of the Maxwell–Jüttner distribution without cutoff (black solid line) and the Maxwell–Jüttner distribution with cutoff at $\gamma_{\max} = 1.5$ (black dashed line). Note that many (300) harmonics were used in order to calculate total emission coefficient because of line broadening, which is a large effect in mildly relativistic plasma due to both relativistic change of mass and Doppler broadening. As line broadening is less pronounced in plasma with cutoff energy, the larger part of the total emission coefficient spectrum retains oscillatory nature in such a plasma. Everywhere in this paper, a sufficient number of harmonics is used in calculations in order to properly capture all the relevant details of the spectrum.

The absorption spectrum (more specifically, spectrum of $\alpha_{\omega}^{(2)}L/\Lambda$) is shown in Fig. 2. This particular combination of parameters is chosen in order to make the plot independent of plasma density and size. Color lines show absorption of plasma with temperature 150 keV and cutoff energy at $\gamma = \gamma_{\max}$ for different values of γ_{\max} . Similar to




FIG. 1. The total plasma emission coefficient j_{ω} for $\theta = 0.45\pi$ calculated for 300 harmonics as a function of ω/ω_c for $\gamma_{\max} = 1.5$ (black dashed line) and without cutoff (black solid line) together with their first 10 harmonics (color solid and dashed lines).




FIG. 2. Synchrotron radiation absorption as a function of harmonic number ω/ω_c for 10 keV plasma (black line) and 150 keV plasma for different values of the energy cutoff γ_{\max} (color lines).

the emission spectrum, the absorption spectrum of plasma with cutoff energy features an increase at low frequencies and a dramatic decrease at high frequencies. Moreover, oscillations become more pronounced with decreasing cutoff energy. If all electrons with $\gamma > 1.2$ in 150 keV plasma are redistributed into the lower-energy part of the distribution function, the absorption spectrum becomes similar in magnitude to the spectrum of Maxwellian plasma at temperature 10 keV (black line in Fig. 2). Absorption spectrum shows a decrease with frequency up to oscillations regardless of the cutoff energy. As such, plasma remains more opaque to the low-frequency part of synchrotron radiation spectrum than to the high-frequency part.

When combined, the changes in emission and absorption lead to the main observation described in this paper: superthermal electrons provide disproportionately large contribution to synchrotron energy losses in mildly relativistic plasma. One reason for this is that superthermal electrons radiate more energy than do bulk electrons and have worse single-particle energy confinement time. Another even more important reason why superthermal electrons disproportionately affect synchrotron radiation is that they radiate more into higher harmonics. The nature of synchrotron radiation in hot plasma is such that low harmonics are primarily absorbed by the plasma itself (as long as $\Lambda \gg 1$), while high harmonics are radiated away. Let us write $\Lambda = 602 n_{e,14} L_{1m} / B_{10T}$, where $n_{e,14}$ is the electron density normalized to 10^{14} cm^{-3} , L_{1m} is the size of plasma in the direction perpendicular to the magnetic field normalized to 1 m, and B_{10T} is the magnetic field normalized to 10 T. Thus, if the plasma under consideration has perpendicular size $L = 1$ m, magnetic field $B = 10$ T, density $n_e = 10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, and temperature $T_e = 150 \text{ keV}$, then $\Lambda = 602$. Therefore, if superthermal electrons are redistributed into the lower-energy part of the distribution function, then electrons radiate more into low-frequency part of the spectrum, which is mostly absorbed by the plasma itself, and they radiate less into high-frequency part of the spectrum, to which plasma is mostly transparent. An example that corroborates this observation is shown in Fig. 3. In Fig. 3, red line shows power loss spectrum, which includes both emission and self-absorption of




FIG. 3. Synchrotron radiation spectrum in 10 keV plasma (black line), 150 keV plasma (red line), and 150 keV plasma with electron energy cutoff at $\gamma_{\max} = 1.8$ (blue line) and $\gamma_{\max} = 1.2$ (green line). Here, opacity parameter $\Lambda = 600$ is assumed.

150 keV plasma; blue line shows power loss spectrum of 150 keV plasma with cutoff $\gamma_{\max} = 1.8$; green line shows power loss spectrum of 150 keV plasma with cutoff $\gamma_{\max} = 1.2$; and black line shows power loss spectrum of 10 keV Maxwellian plasma. In all cases in Fig. 3, $\Lambda = 600$ is assumed. As the cutoff energy is decreased, spectrum peak moves to lower frequency, oscillations become more pronounced, and overall power loss, determined by area under the curve, decreases dramatically.

Given all of the changes described above, the redistribution of superthermal electrons into the lower-energy part of distribution function makes a disproportionate impact on power loss via synchrotron radiation. Figure 4 shows the dependence of the ratio of synchrotron radiation power loss for electron distribution function with and without a cutoff on absorption parameter Λ . Note that the electron density is kept the same in Fig. 4, so the figure shows the power loss per particle. Limit $\Lambda \ll 1$ shows the effect of decrease in emission due to redistribution of superthermal electrons, as plasma is transparent to all harmonics in this limit. Power loss per particle decreases dramatically as the cutoff energy decreases. Even more striking feature is that for $\Lambda < 10^5$, power loss decrease per electron becomes larger as absorption parameter Λ decreases. In other words, redistribution of superthermal electrons is more effective for mitigation of power loss via synchrotron radiation in opaque plasma than in transparent plasma. For example, synchrotron power loss mitigation in plasma with cutoff at $\gamma_{\max} = 1.5$ and $\Lambda \ll 1$ is as effective as mitigation in plasma with cutoff at $\gamma_{\max} = 1.8$ and $\Lambda = 800$. Note that in order to decrease synchrotron power loss per electron by a factor of 2, cutoff at $\gamma_{\max} = 1.8$ is required in $\Lambda \ll 1$ plasma, cutoff at $\gamma_{\max} = 2$ is sufficient in $\Lambda = 60$ plasma, and cutoff at $\gamma_{\max} = 2.5$ is enough in $\Lambda = 4 \times 10^4$ plasma if plasma temperature is 150 keV. Another feature of note in Fig. 4 is that power loss due to synchrotron radiation is a relatively larger issue in 150 keV plasma than in 10 keV plasma if opacity parameter is large, as shown by black curve. Therefore, even though the redistribution of superthermal electrons is more effective as opacity is increased, a larger




FIG. 4. Synchrotron radiation mitigation via redistribution of superthermal electrons. Color lines show the ratio of total power loss via synchrotron radiation per electron as a function of opacity parameter Λ for different values of cutoff parameter γ_{\max} in 150 keV plasma. Black line shows the ratio of synchrotron power loss per electron in 10 keV plasma to the same quantity in 150 keV, also as a function of opacity.

redistribution (provided by smaller cutoff parameter γ_{\max}) is required for 150 keV plasma in order to match power loss of a 10 keV plasma. As the cutoff energy goes to infinity, the redistribution of superthermal electrons becomes less and less effective as a method to decrease power loss due to synchrotron radiation, as fewer electrons get redistributed.

Another way to interpret power loss mitigation is to look at synchrotron energy confinement time, which can be defined as the ratio of kinetic energy stored in electrons to power loss via synchrotron radiation. Given that surface density of kinetic energy stored in electrons in a plasma slab is $n_e T_e L$, energy confinement time is proportional to $\Lambda / \int I_\omega d\omega$. The total improvement in synchrotron energy confinement time due to dependence on absorption coefficient and energy cutoff is shown in Fig. 5. The synchrotron energy confinement time increases both with an increase in opacity parameter Λ and with a decrease in cutoff γ_{\max} .

IV. DISCUSSION AND CAVEATS

Superthermal electrons have disproportional impact on all aspects of synchrotron radiation in plasma: emission and absorption spectra, power loss, and energy confinement time. The analysis presented in this paper is focused on a Maxwell–Jüttner distribution with energy cutoff and the losses in the direction perpendicular to slab boundaries (which is the primary direction of power losses); it is chosen to isolate and cleanly demonstrate the effect. Similar effects can be expected for other electron distribution functions and other angles of propagation. The size of power loss reduction can be significant; for example, the power loss is halved in 150 keV plasma with opacity parameter $\Lambda = 60$ and cutoff at $\gamma_{\max} = 2$.

Reducing the power loss by synchrotron radiation in plasma with a 150 keV electron temperature may be relevant for pB11 fusion concepts. For pB11 fusion to be viable, the plasma must be kept at a high temperature, where Bremsstrahlung losses could be overwhelming. It




FIG. 5. Synchrotron energy confinement time as a function of absorption coefficient Λ and cutoff energy γ_{\max} in 150 keV plasma (color lines) and energy confinement time in 10 keV plasma (black line). Units are arbitrary.

was recently shown that, neglecting synchrotron radiation and other conductive losses, the pB11 reaction could in principle achieve ignition by overcoming the Bremsstrahlung losses, even if barely, at electron temperatures in the range of 100–200 keV.⁵³ If some form of alpha channeling⁵⁴ were employed, this margin could be significantly widened.^{55,56} With alpha channeling, the margin is most wide at electron temperatures of about 150 keV. These calculations do not assume any particular means of plasma confinement; rather the focus is just to see to what extent the Bremsstrahlung losses could be overcome. However, if the plasma were confined magnetically, where synchrotron losses could also be large, then the means provided here to reduce those losses in the 150 keV electron temperature range could be relevant.

The results here show that deconfining superthermal electrons by any means significantly reduces synchrotron emission. It should be noted that the removal of these electrons in of itself is a significant energy loss. These losses occur on a continuing basis, since thermal electrons are constantly promoted via collisions to superthermal electrons. Thus, the plasma energy losses are not stemmed by the deconfinement of superthermal electrons, only that the energy loss through synchrotron radiation is now lost instead through energetic particles. However, in cases in which the radiation itself is damaging, or the energy lost in particles is more easily recovered than the energy lost in radiation, this effect can be beneficial.

These results are of particular importance for plasma devices with open-field-line geometry. In open-field-line plasma devices, there are several mechanisms to deplete the superthermal tail of the electron distribution function, for example, scattering by imperfections of the magnetic field, or by magnetic turbulence.⁵⁷ This paper shows the utility of depletion of electron tail should it be realized, thereby providing an argument for particular design choices. Note that superthermal electrons are less collisional than bulk electrons, which, depending on the details of mechanism of the redistribution of the superthermal electrons, could lead to anisotropy in the electron distribution function. However, given the outsized and synergistic role of superthermal

electrons in emission and absorption, it can be expected that the dramatic decrease in power loss via synchrotron radiation in the perpendicular direction found here will be retained. Although anisotropy in the electron distribution function could affect the off-perpendicular propagation of synchrotron radiation, those details are beyond the scope attempted here.

While Fig. 4 captures the basic effect, more precise calculations might refine the results presented here by perhaps $\sim 10\%$. For example, we assumed that plasma is tenuous, which is satisfied if $(\omega_p/\omega_c)^2 \ll \theta_{T_e}$. If this condition is not satisfied, the low harmonics might not be able to propagate in plasma. Note, however, that taking this effect properly into account is only going to strengthen the claim described here. The reason is that while propagation of lower harmonics might be affected if plasma is not tenuous, higher harmonics are going to propagate as is. Given that the redistribution of superthermal electrons is predominantly affecting higher harmonics, the relative ratio of power losses is going to increase if lower harmonics cannot propagate in plasma. We also assumed that the plasma is homogeneous, while plasmas in nature or in laboratory settings are often inhomogeneous. Spatial inhomogeneity of plasma may give rise to effects, such as formation of regions of plasma where electron tails are naturally formed,^{58,59} which can affect synchrotron losses from plasma. That could modify the magnitude of the effect reported on here but not the nature of the result.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank E. J. Kolmes, I. E. Ochs, and J.-M. Rax for useful conversations. This work was supported by ARPA-E Grant No. DE-AR0001554.

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflicts to disclose.

Author Contributions

Mikhail E. Mlodik: Conceptualization (lead); Formal analysis (equal); Investigation (lead); Methodology (equal); Writing – original draft (lead); Writing – review & editing (equal). **Vadim R. Munirov:** Formal analysis (equal); Investigation (equal); Methodology (equal); Software (lead); Validation (lead); Visualization (lead); Writing – original draft (supporting); Writing – review & editing (equal). **Tal Rubin:** Conceptualization (equal); Formal analysis (supporting); Investigation (supporting). **Nathaniel J. Fisch:** Conceptualization (equal); Formal analysis (equal); Funding acquisition (lead); Project administration (lead); Supervision (lead); Writing – review & editing (equal).

DATA AVAILABILITY

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

REFERENCES

- ¹B. A. Trubnikov, *Plasma Physics and the Problem of Controlled Thermonuclear Reactions*, edited by M. A. Leontovich (Pergamon, New York, 1959), Vol. 3, pp. 122–152.

- ²B. A. Trubnikov, *Phys. Fluids* **4**, 195 (1961).
- ³G. Bekefi, *Radiation Processes in Plasmas* (Wiley, New York, 1966).
- ⁴M. Bornatici, R. Cano, O. D. Barbieri, and F. Engelmann, *Nucl. Fusion* **23**, 1153 (1983).
- ⁵M. Bornatici and F. Engelmann, *Phys. Plasmas* **1**, 189 (1994).
- ⁶F. Albajar, N. Bertelli, M. Bornatici, and F. Engelmann, *Plasma Phys. Controlled Fusion* **49**, 15 (2007).
- ⁷F. Albajar, M. Bornatici, and F. Engelmann, *Nucl. Fusion* **47**, 1101 (2007).
- ⁸V. Arunasalam, *Phys. Fluids B* **4**, 1643 (1992).
- ⁹D. B. Beard and J. C. Baker, *Phys. Fluids* **4**, 611 (1961).
- ¹⁰D. B. Beard and J. C. Baker, *Phys. Fluids* **5**, 1113 (1962).
- ¹¹V. A. Bordovitsyn, *Synchrotron Radiation Theory and Its Development* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1999).
- ¹²S. Denk, R. Fischer, H. M. Smith, P. Helander, O. Maj, E. Poli, J. Stober, U. Stroth, W. Suttrop, E. Westerhof, M. Willensdorfer, and ASDEX Upgrade Team, *Plasma Phys. Controlled Fusion* **60**, 105010 (2018).
- ¹³S. Denk, R. Fischer, E. Poli, O. Maj, S. Nielsen, J. Rasmussen, M. Stejner, and M. Willensdorfer, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **253**, 107175 (2020).
- ¹⁴W. E. Drummond and M. N. Rosenbluth, *Phys. Fluids* **3**, 45 (1960).
- ¹⁵W. E. Drummond and M. N. Rosenbluth, *Phys. Fluids* **6**, 276 (1963).
- ¹⁶V. Fidone, G. Giruzzi, and G. Chiozzi, *Plasma Phys. Controlled Fusion* **31**, 2003 (1989).
- ¹⁷J. L. Hirshfield, D. E. Baldwin, and S. C. Brown, *Phys. Fluids* **4**, 198 (1961).
- ¹⁸N. A. Krall and A. W. Trivelpiece, *Principles of Plasma Physics* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1973).
- ¹⁹S.-Y. Lee, P. H. Yoon, E. Lee, and W. Tu, *Astrophys. J.* **924**, 36 (2022).
- ²⁰Y. E. Lyubarskii and S. A. Petrova, *Astron. Astrophys.* **337**, 433 (1998).
- ²¹P. O'Connor, A. Golden, and A. Shearer, *Astrophys. J.* **631**, 471 (2005).
- ²²A. Marcowith and J. Malzac, *Astron. Astrophys.* **409**, 9 (2003).
- ²³V. R. Munirov and N. J. Fisch, *Phys. Rev. E* **95**, 013205 (2017).
- ²⁴A. Nassri and M. Heindler, *Phys. Fluids* **29**, 3275 (1986).
- ²⁵A. Nassri and M. Heindler, *Phys. Fluids* **31**, 95 (1988).
- ²⁶A. Peratt, *Physics of the Plasma Universe*, 2nd ed. (Springer, New York, 2015).
- ²⁷P. A. Robinson, *Plasma Phys. Controlled Fusion* **27**, 1037 (1985).
- ²⁸V. L. Ginzburg and S. I. Syrovatskii, *Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **3**, 297 (1965).
- ²⁹V. L. Ginzburg and S. I. Syrovatskii, *Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **7**, 375 (1969).
- ³⁰V. V. Zheleznyakov, *Radiation in Astrophysical Plasmas, Astrophysics and Space Science Library* (Springer, Dordrecht, 1996).
- ³¹F. Jaeger, A. J. Lichtenberg, and M. A. Lieberman, *Plasma Phys.* **14**, 1073 (1972).
- ³²M. A. Lieberman and A. J. Lichtenberg, *Plasma Phys.* **15**, 125 (1973).
- ³³E. Ott, B. Hui, and K. R. Chu, *Phys. Fluids* **23**, 1031 (1980).
- ³⁴I. B. Bernstein and D. C. Baxter, *Phys. Fluids* **24**, 108 (1981).
- ³⁵V. Erckmann and U. Gasparino, *Plasma Phys. Controlled Fusion* **36**, 1869 (1994).
- ³⁶B. Lloyd, *Plasma Phys. Controlled Fusion* **40**, A119 (1998).
- ³⁷R. C. Wolf, S. Bozhenkov, A. Dinklage, G. Fuchert, Y. O. Kazakov, H. P. Laqua, S. Marsen, N. B. Marushchenko, T. Stange, M. Zanini, I. Abramovic, A. Alonso, J. Balduhn, M. Beurskens, C. D. Beidler, H. Braune, K. J. Brunner, N. Chaudhary, H. Damm, P. Drewelow, G. Gantenbein, Y. Gao, J. Geiger, M. Hirsch, U. Höfel, M. Jakubowski, J. Jelonnek, T. Jensen, W. Kasperek, J. Knauer, S. B. Korsholm, A. Langenberg, C. Lechte, F. Leipold, H. T. Mora, U. Neuner, S. K. Nielsen, D. Moseev, H. Oosterbeek, N. Pablant, E. Pasch, B. Plaum, T. S. Pedersen, A. P. Sitjes, K. Rahbarnia, J. Rasmussen, M. Salewski, J. Schilling, E. Scott, M. Stejner, H. Thomsen, M. Thumm, Y. Turkin, F. Wilde, and Wendelstein 7-X Team, *Plasma Phys. Controlled Fusion* **61**, 014037 (2018).
- ³⁸E. Fredrickson, J. Callen, K. McGuire, J. Bell, R. Colchin, P. Efthimion, K. Hill, R. Izzo, D. Mikkelsen, D. Monticello, V. Paré, G. Taylor, and M. Zarnstorff, *Nucl. Fusion* **26**, 849 (1986).
- ³⁹N. J. Fisch and A. H. Kritz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 2393 (1989).
- ⁴⁰C. Janicki, *Nucl. Fusion* **33**, 513 (1993).
- ⁴¹L. Barrera, E. de la Luna, L. Figini, M. N. A. Beurskens, M. Brix, F. Castejón, P. C. de Vries, D. Farina, M. Kempenaars, P. Lomas, J. Mailloux, I. Nunes, E. R. Solano, and J.-E Contributors, *Plasma Phys. Controlled Fusion* **52**, 085010 (2010).
- ⁴²Y. Liu, V. Udintsev, S. Danani, G. Paraiso, G. Taylor, M. Austin, A. Basile, J. Beno, B. Bunkowski, R. Feder, T. Giacomin, J. Guirao, S. Houshmandyar, H. Huang, A. Hubbard, S. Hughes, S. Jha, A. Khodak, R. Kumar, S. Kumar, V. Kumar, P. Maquet, C. Nazare, H. Neilson, A. Ouroua, S. Pak, H. Pandya, C. Penney, P. Phillips, S. Pish, J. Poissy, W. Rowan, A. Saxena, M. Schneider, S. Strank, S. Thomas, G. Vayakis, F. Waelbroeck, M. Walsh, and L. Worth, *J. Instrum.* **17**, C04019 (2022).
- ⁴³J. M. Dawson and P. K. Kaw, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 1730 (1982).
- ⁴⁴N. J. Fisch, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **59**, 175 (1987).
- ⁴⁵J. J. Condon and S. M. Ransom, *Essential Radio Astronomy, Princeton Series in Modern Observational Astronomy* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2016).
- ⁴⁶P. L. Biermann and P. A. Strittmatter, *Astrophys. J.* **322**, 643 (1987).
- ⁴⁷C. D. Dermer, S. J. Sturmer, and R. Schlickeiser, *Astrophys. J., Suppl. Ser.* **109**, 103 (1997).
- ⁴⁸Z. Osmanov and G. Machabeli, *Astron. Astrophys.* **516**, A12 (2010).
- ⁴⁹E. G. Berezhko and H. J. Völk, *Astrophys. J.* **427**, 525 (2004).
- ⁵⁰J. Ballet, *Adv. Space Res.* **37**, 1902 (2006).
- ⁵¹K. R. Lang and Y. Terzian, *Astrophys. Lett.* **3**, 29 (1969).
- ⁵²J. J. Condon, *Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **30**, 575 (1992).
- ⁵³S. Putvinski, D. Ryutov, and P. Yushmanov, *Nucl. Fusion* **59**, 076018 (2019).
- ⁵⁴N. J. Fisch and J.-M. Rax, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 612 (1992).
- ⁵⁵E. J. Kolmes, I. E. Ochs, and N. J. Fisch, *Phys. Plasmas* **29**, 110701 (2022).
- ⁵⁶I. E. Ochs, E. J. Kolmes, M. E. Mlodik, T. Rubin, and N. J. Fisch, *Phys. Rev. E* **106**, 055215 (2022).
- ⁵⁷A. B. Rechester and M. N. Rosenbluth, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 38 (1978).
- ⁵⁸R. W. Harvey, M. G. McCoy, J. Y. Hsu, and A. A. Mirin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47**, 102 (1981).
- ⁵⁹G. Giruzzi, I. Fidone, and X. Garbet, *Nucl. Fusion* **32**, 1011 (1992).