

An efficient kinetic modeling in plasmas by using the AWBS transport equation

Authors*

*Centre Lasers Intenses et Applications,
Universite de Bordeaux-CNRS-CEA,
UMR 5107, F-33405 Talence, France.
(Dated: June 26, 2018)*

Text of abstract.

I. INTRODUCTION

The first attempts of modern kinetic modeling of plasma can be tracked back to the fifties, when Cohen, Spitzer, and Routly (CSR) [1] in detail demonstrated the fact, that in the ionized gas the effect of Coulomb collisions between electrons and ions predominantly results from frequently occurring events of cumulative small deflections rather than occasional close encounters. This effect was originally described in [2] and Chandrasekhar [3] proposed to use the diffusion equation model of the Fokker-Planck type (FP) [4].

As a result, a classical paper by Spitzer and Harm (SH) [5] provides the computed electron distribution function spanning from low to high Z plasmas, and more importantly, the current and heat flux formulas, which are widely used in almost every plasma hydrodynamic code nowadays. The distribution function is of the form $f^0 + \mu f^1$, where f^0 and f^1 are isotropic and μ , is the direction cosine between the particle trajectory and some preferred direction in space. It should be emphasized that the SH solution expresses a small perturbation of equilibrium, i.e. that f^0 is the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution and μf^1 represents a very small deviation.

The actual cornerstone of the modern FP simulations was set in place by Rosenbluth [6], when he derived a simplified form of the FP equation for a finite expansion of the distribution function, where all the terms are computed according to plasma conditions, including f^0 , which of course needs to tend to the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution.

In the purpose of this paper to present an efficient alternative to FP model based on the Albritton-Williams-Bernstein-Swartz collision operator (AWBS) [7]. In Section II we propose a modified form of the AWBS collision operator, where its important properties are further presented in Section III with the emphasis on its comparison to the full FP solution in local diffusive regime. Section IV focuses on the performance of the AWBS transport equation model compared to modern kinetic codes including FP codes Aladin and Impact, and PIC code Calder, where the cases related to real laser generated plasma conditions are studied. Finally, the most important outcomes of our research are concluded in Section V.

II. THE AWBS KINETIC MODEL

The electrons in plasma can be modeled by the deterministic model of charged particles

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f + \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} f = C_{ee}(f) + C_{ei}(f), \quad (1)$$

where $f(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})$ represents the density function of electrons at time t , spatial point \mathbf{x} , and velocity \mathbf{v} , and $\tilde{\mathbf{E}} = \frac{q_e}{m_e} \mathbf{E}$ is the existing electric field in plasma.

The generally accepted form of the electron-electron collision operator C_{ee} is the Fokker-Planck form published by Landau [8]

$$C_{FP}(f) = \Gamma \int \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \nabla_{\mathbf{v}'} (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}') \cdot (f \nabla_{\mathbf{v}'} f - f' \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} f) d\mathbf{v}', \quad (2)$$

where $\Gamma = \frac{q_e^4 \ln \Lambda}{4\pi e^2 m_e^2}$ and $\ln \Lambda$ is the Coulomb logarithm. In principal, the electron-ion collision operator C_{ei} could be expressed in the form similar to (2), but since ions are considered to be motionless compared to electrons, the scattering operator, i.e. no change in the velocity magnitude, expressed in spherical coordinates is widely accepted

$$C_{ei}(f) = \frac{\nu_{ei}}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \left((1 - \mu^2) \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mu} \right) + \frac{1}{\sin^2(\phi)} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \theta^2} \right), \quad (3)$$

where $\mu = \cos(\phi)$, ϕ and θ are the polar and azimuthal angles, and $\nu_{ei} = \frac{Z n_e \Gamma}{v^3}$ is the electron-ion collision frequency.

Fish introduced an alternative form of C_{ee} in [9] referred to as high-velocity limit electron collision operator

$$C_H(f) = \nu_e \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \left(f + \frac{v_{th}^2}{v} \frac{\partial f}{\partial v} \right) + \frac{\nu_e}{2} \left(1 - \frac{v_{th}^2}{v^2} \right) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \left((1 - \mu^2) \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mu} \right) + \frac{1}{\sin^2(\phi)} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \theta^2} \right), \quad (4)$$

where $\nu_e = \frac{n_e \Gamma}{v^3}$ is the electron-electron collision frequency and $v_{th} = \sqrt{\frac{k_B T_e}{m_e}}$ is the electron thermal velocity. The linear form of C_H arises from an assumption that the fast electrons predominantly interact with the thermal (slow) electrons, which simplifies importantly the nonlinear form (2).

* milan.holec@u-bordeaux.fr

The aim of this work is to use a yet simpler form of the electron-electron collision operator, i.e. the AWBS formulation [7], where we propose the following form

$$C_{AWBS}(f) = v \frac{\nu_e}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial v} (f - f_M) + \frac{\nu_{ei} + \frac{\nu_e}{2}}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \left((1 - \mu^2) \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mu} \right) + \frac{1}{\sin^2(\phi)} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \theta^2} \right), \quad (5)$$

where f_M is the Maxwell-Boltzmann equilibrium distribution. C_{AWBS} represents the complete $C_{ee} + C_{ei}$ collision operator in (1).

The complete form of collision operator (5) was previously introduced in [10, 11], nevertheless, we intentionally use a half of the electron-electron collisional frequency modification $\frac{\nu_e}{2}$, because this formulation provides very promising results compared to the full FP operator as emphasized in Section III.

The Maxwell-Boltzmann averaged e-e scattering in (4) can be approximated as $\nu_e \int \left(1 - \frac{v_{th}^2}{2v^2} \right) f_M 4\pi v^2 dv = \frac{\nu_e}{2}$.

III. BGK, AWBS, AND FOKKER-PLANCK MODELS IN LOCAL DIFFUSIVE REGIME

In a broad analysis of the electron transport, any qualitative information about its properties are highly welcome. Even better, if one can extract some qualitative information, which provides comparative and reliable results in a clear way, the confidence of using a transport model, e.g. (5), can lead to efficient yet relatively cheap computation cost predictions of real physics.

In this paper, we can try to find an approximate solution to the so-called *local diffusive regime* of electron transport, where the *diffusive regime*, in general, refers to a low anisotropy in angle given by μ , and *local* means that the mean free path of electrons λ_{ei} is rather restricted compared to the plasma spatial scale. In the words of mathematics this corresponds to the first order expansion in λ_{ei} and μ of the distribution function as

$$\tilde{f}(z, v, \mu) = f^0(z, v) + f^1(z, v) \lambda_{ei} \mu, \quad (6)$$

where z is the spatial coordinate along the axis z , v the magnitude of transport velocity, and $\lambda_{ei} = \frac{v}{\nu_{ei}} = \frac{v^4}{Z n_e \Gamma}$. In other words, one can say that by evaluating numerically \tilde{f} in (6), we accept some error of the order $O(\lambda_{ei}^2) + O(\mu^2)$.

In order to start, we express the left hand side of (1) in 1D and insert the approximation (6), which leads to

$$\mu \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial z} + \frac{\tilde{E}_z}{v} \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial v} \right) + \frac{\tilde{E}_z (1 - \mu^2)}{v^2} \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial \mu} = \mu \left(\frac{\partial f^0}{\partial z} + \frac{\tilde{E}_z}{v} \frac{\partial f^0}{\partial v} \right) + \frac{\tilde{E}_z \lambda_{ei}}{v^2} f^1 + O(\mu^2), \quad (7)$$

and is truncated for low anisotropy, i.e. with error $O(\mu^2)$.

A. The BGK local diffusive electron transport

Even though the BGK plasma collisional operator [12]

$$\frac{1}{v} C_{BGK}(\tilde{f}) = \frac{\tilde{f} - f_M}{\lambda_e} + \frac{1}{2\lambda_{ei}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} (1 - \mu^2) \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial \mu}, \quad (8)$$

where $\lambda_e = Z\lambda_{ei}$, is not actually used in our nonlocal transport simulations, we consider it useful to include this simplest form of the Boltzmann transport collision operator, because of two reasons: a) it can be treated analytically in the local diffusive regime; and b) it represents the so-called phenomenological collision operator by explicitly using the Maxwell-Boltzmann equilibrium distribution f_M , which proves to be very useful in coupling of the nonlocal electron transport to hydrodynamics.

If one applies the action of the right hand side, i.e. of (8), on the approximation (6) and sets the result to be equal to the left hand side (7), the corresponding terms in μ are governed by the following equations

$$f^0 = f_M + \frac{\tilde{E}_z}{v^2} f^1 Z \lambda_{ei}^2, \quad (9)$$

$$f^1 = -\frac{Z}{Z+1} \left(\frac{\partial f^0}{\partial z} + \frac{\tilde{E}_z}{v} \frac{\partial f^0}{\partial v} \right), \quad (10)$$

i.e. $f^0 = f_M + O(\lambda_{ei}^2)$ and $f^1 = -\frac{Z}{Z+1} \left(\frac{\partial f_M}{\partial z} + \frac{\tilde{E}_z}{v} \frac{\partial f_M}{\partial v} \right)$. Now the electric current expressing the contribution of every electron naturally tends to zero, i.e. the *quasi-neutrality* constraint, which lead to an analytic formula of the self-consistent electric field

$$\mathbf{j} \equiv q_e \int \mathbf{v} f^1 d\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{E}} = v_{th}^2 \left(\frac{\nabla \rho}{\rho} + \frac{5}{2} \frac{\nabla T}{T} \right). \quad (11)$$

Consequently, based on (9), (10), and (11), the analytic formula (6) of the electron distribution function reads

$$\tilde{f} = f_M - \frac{Z}{Z+1} \left(\frac{v^2}{2v_{th}^2} - 4 \right) \frac{1}{T} \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} f_M \lambda_{ei} \mu, \quad (12)$$

which is nothing else than the famous Lorentz electron-ion collision gas model [13] scaled by a constant depending on Z , naturally arising from the BGK model (8).

B. The AWBS local diffusive electron transport

The main object of this work presented in Sec II simplifies in 1D to a relatively simple form of the Boltzmann transport collision operator (compared to (2))

$$\frac{1}{v} C_{AWBS}(f) = \frac{v}{2\lambda_e} \frac{\partial}{\partial v} (f - f_M) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_{ei}} + \frac{1}{2\lambda_e} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} (1 - \mu^2) \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mu}. \quad (13)$$

Similarly to the BGK model, AWBS 13 is also referred to as a phenomenological model, since it explicitly uses the Maxwell-Boltzmann equilibrium distribution f_M , and also, makes it a very attractive model of the non-local electron transport to be coupled to hydrodynamics via the plasma electron temperature and density.

A qualitative information about the AWBS model is obtained while repeating the action on (6) by the left hand side (7) and by the right hand side (13) and setting the equality. The corresponding terms in μ are then governed by the following equations

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial v} (f^0 - f_M) = \frac{\tilde{E}_z}{v^3} f^1 2Z \lambda_{ei}^2, \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{v}{2Z \lambda_{ei}} \frac{\partial(f^1 \lambda_{ei})}{\partial v} - \frac{2Z+1}{2Z} f^1 = \frac{\partial f^0}{\partial z} + \frac{\tilde{E}_z}{v} \frac{\partial f^0}{\partial v}, \quad (15)$$

i.e. $f^0 = f_M + O(\lambda_{ei}^2)$, however, the f^1 does not have a straightforward analytic formula. In reality, f^1 arises from the ordinary differential equation (by inserting f_M into (15))

$$\frac{\partial f^1}{\partial v} + \frac{1}{v}(3-2Z)f^1 = \frac{2Z}{v} \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z} + \left(\frac{v^2}{2v_{th}^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right) \frac{1}{T} \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} - \frac{\tilde{E}_z}{v_{th}^2} \right) f_M. \quad (16)$$

We will stick with a numerical solution of (16), where the details about the resulting distribution function can be found in Section III D.

C. The Fokker-Planck local diffusive electron transport

The Fokker-Planck (2) collision operator can be also written as [14]

$$\frac{1}{v} C_{FP}(f) = \frac{\Gamma}{v} \left(4\pi f^2 + \frac{\nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} f : \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} g}{2} \right), \quad (17)$$

where $g(\mathbf{v}) = \int |\mathbf{v} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}| f(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}) d\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ is the Rosenbluth potential [6]. Since we are interested in the approximate solution in the local diffusive regime, it is convenient to use a low-anisotropy approximation $\tilde{g} = g^0(f^0) + g^1(f^1) \lambda_{ei} \mu$, which arises based on Eq. 45 of [6].

For a better clarity we present the action of (17) in 1D

$$\begin{aligned} C_{FP}(\tilde{f}) = & \Gamma \left(4\pi f^{02} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 f^0}{\partial v^2} \frac{\partial^2 g^0}{\partial v^2} + \frac{1}{v^2} \frac{\partial f^0}{\partial v} \frac{\partial g^0}{\partial v} \right) \\ & + \frac{\mu}{Z n_e} \left[8\pi f^0 f^1 v^4 - v \left(\frac{\partial f^0}{\partial v} g^1 + \frac{\partial g^0}{\partial v} f^1 \right) \right. \\ & + \frac{1}{v^2} \left(\frac{\partial f^0}{\partial v} \frac{\partial(g^1 v^4)}{\partial v} + \frac{\partial g^0}{\partial v} \frac{\partial(f^1 v^4)}{\partial v} \right) \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 f^0}{\partial v^2} \frac{\partial^2(g^1 v^4)}{\partial v^2} + \frac{\partial^2 g^0}{\partial v^2} \frac{\partial^2(f^1 v^4)}{\partial v^2} \right) \right] + O(\lambda_{ei}^2, \mu^2), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

truncated by the quadratic terms in the angular anisotropy and the transport localization.

If once more repeated the action on (6) by the left hand side (7) and by the right hand side (17) and setting the equality, the equation governing f^0 corresponding to μ^0 takes the form

$$4\pi f^{02} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 f^0}{\partial v^2} \frac{\partial^2 g^0}{\partial v^2} + \frac{1}{v^2} \frac{\partial f^0}{\partial v} \frac{\partial g^0}{\partial v} = \frac{\tilde{E}_z}{v^5} f^1 Z n_e \lambda_{ei}^2 - \frac{2}{v^2} \left(\frac{\partial f^1 \lambda_{ei}}{\partial v} - \frac{f^1 \lambda_{ei}}{v} \right) \left(\frac{\partial g^1 \lambda_{ei}}{\partial v} - \frac{g^1 \lambda_{ei}}{v} \right), \quad (19)$$

where the fundamental property of the Fokker-Planck collision operator tending to the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution f_M [15], leads to $f^0 = f_M + O(\lambda_{ei}^2)$, where we write an explicit form of the quadratic term $O(\lambda_{ei}^2)$ obtained from the truncation (18). The equality corresponding to μ takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{Z n_e} \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 f_M}{\partial v^2} \frac{\partial^2(g^1 v^4)}{\partial v^2} + \frac{\partial^2 g_M}{\partial v^2} \frac{\partial^2(f^1 v^4)}{\partial v^2} \right) \right. \\ + \frac{1}{v^2} \left(\frac{\partial f_M}{\partial v} \frac{\partial(g^1 v^4)}{\partial v} + \frac{\partial g_M}{\partial v} \frac{\partial(f^1 v^4)}{\partial v} \right) \\ \left. - v \left(\frac{\partial f_M}{\partial v} g^1 + \frac{\partial g_M}{\partial v} f^1 \right) + 8\pi f_M f^1 v^4 \right] - v f^1 \\ = v \frac{\partial f_M}{\partial z} + \tilde{E}_z \frac{\partial f_M}{\partial v}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

which is the equation governing the unknown f^1 .

In principle, the solution to the equation (20) is very ambitious, as demonstrated in [1, 3, 6], fortunately, one can use the explicit evaluation of the electron distribution function published in [5], which takes the following form

$$f^1(z, v) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{ei}} \frac{m_e^2}{4\pi q_e^4 \ln \Lambda} \frac{v_{2th}^4}{Z} \left(2d_T(v/v_{2th}) + \frac{3}{2} \frac{\gamma_T}{\gamma_E} d_E(v/v_{2th}) \right) \frac{f_M}{n_e} \frac{1}{T} \frac{\partial T_e}{\partial z}, \quad (21)$$

where $d_T(x) = Z D_T(x)/B$, $d_E(x) = Z D_E(x)/A$, γ_T , and γ_E are represented by numerical values in TABLE I, TABLE II, and TABLE III in [5], and $v_{2th} = \sqrt{\frac{k_B T_e}{2m_e}}$.

D. Summary of the BGK, AWBS, and Fokker-Planck local diffusive transport

- Rescale BGK according to Lorentz to match SH heat flux.
- Emphasize the outstanding match between our modified $\frac{v_e}{2}$ AWBS model and the SH profiles of q_1 (define) in TABLE I.
- Stress the visual results of AWBS compared to FP presented in FIG. 1.




FIG. 1. The flux velocity moment of the anisotropic part of the electron distribution function in low $Z = 1$ and high $Z = 116$ plasmas in diffusive regime.

	$Z = 1$	$Z = 2$	$Z = 4$	$Z = 16$	$Z = 116$
$\bar{\Delta}q_{AWBS}$	0.057	0.004	0.038	0.049	0.004

TABLE I. Relative error $\bar{\Delta}q_{AWBS} = |q_{AWBS} - q_{SH}|/q_{SH}$ of the AWBS kinetic model equation (5) showing the discrepancy (maximum around 5%) with respect to the original solution of the heat flux given by numerical solution in Spitzer and Harm [5].

- Raise a discussion about the structure of f^1 equations (10), (16), and (20).

IV. BENCHMARKING THE AWBS NONLOCAL TRANSPORT MODEL

A. AP1 implementation

In order to eliminate the dimensions of the above transport problem the first-two-moment model based on approximation

$$\tilde{f} = \frac{f_0}{4\pi} + \frac{3}{4\pi} \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{f}_1,$$

can be adopted and reads

$$\begin{aligned} v \frac{\nu_e}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial v} (f_0 - 4\pi f_M) &= v \nabla \cdot \mathbf{f}_1 + \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_1}{\partial v} + \frac{2}{v} \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \cdot \mathbf{f}_1, \\ v \frac{\nu_e}{2} \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_1}{\partial v} - \nu_{scat} \mathbf{f}_1 &= \frac{v}{3} \nabla f_0 + \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{E}}}{3} \frac{\partial f_0}{\partial v}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\nu_{scat} = \nu_{ei} + \frac{\nu_e}{2}$.

Kn^e	10^{-4}	10^{-3}	10^{-2}	10^{-1}	1
v_{lim}/v_{th}	70.8	22.4	7.3	3.1	1.8

TABLE II. $\sqrt{3}v \frac{\nu_e}{2} > |\tilde{\mathbf{E}}|$.

1. Nonlocal electric field treatment

$$\int_v \left(\frac{\nu_e}{2} v^2 \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_1}{\partial v} - \frac{v^2}{3\nu_{scat}} \nabla f_0 - \frac{v}{3\nu_{scat}} \frac{\partial f_0}{\partial v} \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \right) v^2 dv = 0,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left(v \frac{\nu_e}{2} - \frac{2\tilde{E}_z^2}{3v\nu_e} \right) \frac{\partial f_{1z}}{\partial v} = \\ \frac{2\tilde{E}_z}{3\nu_e} \frac{\partial f_{1z}}{\partial z} + \frac{4\pi\tilde{E}_z}{3} \frac{\partial f_M}{\partial v} + \frac{v}{3} \frac{\partial f_0}{\partial z} + \left(\frac{4\tilde{E}_z^2}{3v^2\nu_e} + \left(\nu_{ei} + \frac{\nu_e}{2} \right) \right) f_{1z}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{red}| &= \sqrt{3}v \frac{\nu_e}{2}, \\ \nu_{scat}^E &= \frac{|\tilde{\mathbf{E}}| - |\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{red}|}{v}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\omega_{red} = |\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{red}|/|\tilde{\mathbf{E}}|$.

P1 approximation equivalent

$$\tilde{f} = \frac{4\pi f_M + \delta f_0}{4\pi} + \frac{3}{4\pi} \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{f}_1. \quad (22)$$

where the moment model reads

$$\begin{aligned} v \frac{\nu_e}{2} \frac{\partial \delta f_0}{\partial v} &= v \nabla \cdot \mathbf{f}_1 + \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \cdot \left(\omega_{red} \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_1}{\partial v} + \frac{2}{v} \mathbf{f}_1 \right), \\ v \frac{\nu_e}{2} \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_1}{\partial v} &= \tilde{\nu}_{scat} \mathbf{f}_1 + \frac{v}{3} \nabla (4\pi f_M + \delta f_0) \\ &\quad + \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{E}}}{3} \left(4\pi \frac{\partial f_M}{\partial v} + \omega_{red} \frac{\partial \delta f_0}{\partial v} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\nu}_{scat} = \nu_{ei} + \nu_{scat}^E + \frac{\nu_e}{2}$.

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}} = \frac{\int_v \left(\frac{\nu_e}{2\tilde{\nu}_{scat}} v^2 \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_1}{\partial v} - \frac{v^2}{3\tilde{\nu}_{scat}} \nabla (4\pi f_M + \delta f_0) \right) v^2 dv}{\int_v \frac{v}{3\tilde{\nu}_{scat}} \left(4\pi \frac{\partial f_M}{\partial v} + \omega_{red} \frac{\partial \delta f_0}{\partial v} \right) v^2 dv},$$

B. Aladin, Impact, and Calder kinetic codes

C. Simulation results

V. CONCLUSIONS




FIG. 2. Snapshot 20 ps. Left: correct steady solution of heat flux. Right: Aladins results are correct. Velocity limit $4.4 v_{th}$.

-
- [1] R. S. Cohen, L. Spitzer, Jr., P. M. Routly, The electrical conductivity of an ionized gas, *Phys. Rev.* 80 (1950) 230–238. 205 207
- [2] J. H. Jeans, *Astronomy and Cosmogony*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1929. 208 209
- [3] S. Chandrasekhar, Stochastic problems in physics and astronomy, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 15 (1943) 1. 210 211
- [4] M. Planck, Über einen Satz der statistischen Dynamik und seine Erweiterung in der Quantentheorie, *Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss.* 24 (1917) 324–341. 212 214
- [5] L. Spitzer, Jr. and R. Härm, Transport phenomena in a completely ionized gas, *Phys. Rev.* 89 (1953) 977. 215 216
- [6] M. N. Rosenbluth, W. M. MacDonald, D. L. Judd, Fokker-planck equation for an inverse-square force, *Phys. Rev.* 107 (1957) 1. 217 219
- [7] J. R. Albritton, E. A. Williams, I. B. Bernstein, K. P. Swartz, Nonlocal electron heat transport by not quite maxwell-boltzmann distributions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 57 (1986) 1887–1890. 220 222 223
- [8] L. Landau, Kinetic equation for the coulomb effect, *Phys. Z. Sowjetunion* 10 (1936) 154. 224 225
- [9] N. J. Fish, Theory of current drive in plasmas, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 59 (1987) 175. 226 227
- [10] D. D. Sorbo, J.-L. Feugeas, P. Nicolai, M. Olazabal-Loume, B. Dubroca, S. Guisset, M. Touati, V. Tikhonchuk, Reduced entropic model for studies of multidimensional nonlocal transport in high-energy-density plasmas, *Phys. Plasmas* 22 (2015) 082706. 205 206
- [11] D. D. Sorbo, J.-L. Feugeas, P. Nicolai, M. Olazabal-Loume, B. Dubroca, V. Tikhonchuk, Extension of a reduced entropic model of electron transport to magnetized nonlocal regimes of high-energy-density plasmas, *Laser Part. Beams* 34 (2016) 412–425. 207 208
- [12] P. Bhatnagar, E. Gross, M. Krook, A Model for Collision Processes in Gases. I. Small Amplitude Processes in Charged and Neutral One-Component Systems, *Phys. Rev.* 94 (1954) 511–525. 209 210
- [13] H. A. Lorentz, The motion of electrons in metallic bodies, in: *Proceedings of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Amsterdam, Vol. 7, 1905, pp. 438–453. 211 212
- [14] I. P. Shkarofsky, T. W. Johnston, M. P. Bachynskii, *The particle Kinetics of Plasmas*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1966. 213 214
- [15] C. L. Longmire, *Elementary Plasma Physics*, Intersci. Pub., 1963. 215 216





FIG. 3. Snapshot 20 ps. Left: correct steady solution of heat flux. Right: Aladins results are correct. Velocity limit $3.2 v_{th}$.





FIG. 4. Snapshot 12 ps. Left: correct steady solution of heat flux. Right: correct comparison to kinetic profiles at point $442 \mu\text{m}$ by Aladin. Velocity limit $3.4 v_{th}$.





FIG. 5. Snapshot 12 ps. Left: correct steady solution of heat flux. Right: correct comparison to kinetic profiles at point 437 μm by Impact. Velocity limit 4.0 v_{th} .





FIG. 6. Snapshot 11 ps. Left: correct steady solution of heat flux. Right: Kinetic profiles at point of maximum flux by AP1. Kinetics profiles by CALDER should be added. Velocity limit 3.8 v_{th} .




FIG. 7. Simulation results for the case $Z = 2$ computed by AP1/Aladin/Impact/Calder. Every point corresponds to the maximum heat flux in a "tanh" temperature simulation, which can be characterized by Kn . The range of $\log_{10}(Kn) \in (0, -4)$ can be expressed as equivalent to the electron density approximate range $n_e \in (1e19, 3.5e22)$ of the 50 μm slope tanh case. In the case of $Kn = 0.56$, $q_{Aladin}/q_{AP1} \approx 7.9$.




FIG. 8.