

# Particle Trapping in Axisymmetric Electron Holes

I H Hutchinson

Plasma Science and Fusion Center

and Department of Nuclear Science and Engineering,

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

## Key Points

The key points of this work are:

1. Electron holes of finite transverse extent are subject to trapped orbit losses arising from the violation of magnetic moment conservation.

2. Detrapping is calculated analytically and verified by numerical orbit integration, finding the phase space that can sustain the hole.

3. The results appear to offer a qualitative explanation for some trends concerning electron hole aspect-ratio observed in space plasmas.

---

I H Hutchinson Plasma Science and Fusion Center and Department of Nuclear Science and Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

**Abstract.** Electron orbits are calculated in solitary two-dimensional axisymmetric electrostatic potential structures, typical of plasma electron holes, in order to establish the conditions for the particles to remain trapped. Analytic calculations of the evolution of the parallel energy caused by the perturbing radial electric field are shown to agree well with full numerical orbit integration Poincaré plots. The predominant mechanism of detrapping is resonance between the gyro frequency in the parallel magnetic field and harmonics of the parallel bounce frequency. A region of phase-space adjacent to the trapped-passing boundary in parallel energy is generally stochastic because of island overlap of different harmonics, but except for very strong radial electric field perturbation, more deeply trapped orbits have well-defined islands and are permanently confined. A simple universal quantitative algorithm is given, and its results plotted as a function of magnetic field strength and hole radial scale-length, determining the phase space volume available to sustain the electron hole by depression of the permanently trapped distribution function.

## 1. Background

Electron holes are steady solitary electrostatic positive potential structures that sustain themselves by an electron density deficit arising from depressed phase-space density on trapped orbits [Turikov, 1984; Schamel, 1986; Eliasson and Shukla, 2006; Hutchinson, 2017]. They are frequently observed in one-dimensional non-linear simulations of plasma kinetic instabilities [Morse and Nielson, 1969; Berk *et al.*, 1970; Omura *et al.*, 1996; Miyake *et al.*, 1998; Hutchinson, 2017], and in observations of space plasmas [Matsumoto *et al.*, 1994; Ergun *et al.*, 1998; Bale *et al.*, 1998; Mangeney *et al.*, 1999; Pickett *et al.*, 2008; Andersson *et al.*, 2009; Wilson *et al.*, 2010; Malaspina *et al.*, 2013, 2014; Vasko *et al.*, 2015; Mozer *et al.*, 2016; Hutchinson and Malaspina, 2018; Mozer *et al.*, 2018]. The one-dimensional theory of these hole equilibria is well established, being a type of BGK mode [Bernstein *et al.*, 1957]. However, in multiple dimensions, both the equilibrium and stability of these self-sustaining structures is far less well understood. Satellite observations show that electron holes are generally three-dimensional [Franz *et al.*, 2000; Vasko *et al.*, 2017; Holmes *et al.*, 2018; Tong *et al.*, 2018], oblate structures, more extended in the direction perpendicular to the ambient magnetic field, than parallel, but by an amount that varies with plasma and hole parameters. Also, analysis and simulation have shown that initially-one-dimensional holes are subject to instabilities [Mottez *et al.*, 1997; Miyake *et al.*, 1998; Goldman *et al.*, 1999; Oppenheim *et al.*, 1999; Muschietti *et al.*, 2000; Oppenheim *et al.*, 2001; Singh *et al.*, 2001; Lu *et al.*, 2008; Hutchinson, 2018a, b, 2019a, b] that break them up in the transverse dimension, forming multidimensional remnants.

48 A significant magnetic field is known theoretically to be necessary for the existence of  
 49 multidimensional electron hole equilibria in non-pathological background electron distri-  
 50 butions [*Krasovsky et al.*, 2004; *Ng and Bhattacharjee*, 2005; *Ng et al.*, 2006]. When the  
 51 field is strong enough that the gyro-radius ( $\rho$ ) is very small, the equilibrium becomes  
 52 locally one-dimensional [*Chen and Parks*, 2002; *Jovanović et al.*, 2002], with minor cor-  
 53 rections to Poisson's equation to account for any transverse electric field divergence, but  
 54 eventually negligible influence on the particle orbits. At the other extreme, the magnetic  
 55 field cannot be so weak as to make the gyro-radius large compared with the hole's trans-  
 56 verse dimensions, otherwise it provides little transverse confinement. But there is a big  
 57 parameter range between these two limits, in which virtually no theory beyond order of  
 58 magnitude heuristics has been completed. A high proportion of observed electron holes  
 59 have equilibrium parameters lying in this unexplained region.

60 This article presents a first step to carry out rigorous analysis of multidimensional  
 61 electron hole equilibria. It adopts a model potential that is axisymmetric (independent of  
 62 the angle  $\theta$  in a cylindrical coordinate system) which is a representative subset of three-  
 63 dimensional holes. The electron orbits in this equilibrium are analysed and calculated  
 64 numerically, to discover which regions of phase space are permanently trapped; and,  
 65 in contrast, the regions that initially possess small enough parallel kinetic energy to be  
 66 trapped by the parallel electric field, but evolve soon to become untrapped, by the transfer  
 67 of energy from perpendicular gyration.

68 The present work does not solve the (still unsolved) full problem of finding a self-  
 69 consistent equilibrium in which only the velocity distribution function on the permanently  
 70 trapped orbits is allowed to differ from the background distribution. But it does give limits

on what fully self consistent solutions can exist, and indicates what their distribution functions might look like.

## 2. Orbits in axisymmetric electron holes

We consider the orbits of electrons in a potential  $\phi(r, z)$  that is axisymmetric about the coordinate  $z$ , i.e. independent of the angle  $\theta$ . This is a 2D problem, meaning there is just one ignorable coordinate  $\theta$ . A 2D cartesian geometry in which one cartesian coordinate is ignorable would give essentially the same result, and can be considered to be the limit in which the radius  $r$  is large. There is good reason to suppose that a fully 3D situation, possessing for example elliptical equipotentials in the transverse plane, will also approximately conform to our results if it is reasonably represented by a drift kinetic formulation, but no rigorous discussion of that case is given. Although the calculation will remain as general as possible, we shall have in mind equipotentials that are oblate: varying faster in the parallel ( $z$ ) direction than in the transverse ( $r$ ) direction. And where it is convenient we make the assumption that the potential is approximately separable, so that  $\phi \simeq \phi_r(r)\phi_z(z)$ . In any case the shapes  $\phi_r(r)$  and  $\phi_z(z)$  have single positive peaks where their arguments are zero, and  $\phi_z$  is a function only of  $|z|$  (i.e. it is reflectionally symmetric). The negatively charged electrons are therefore attracted to the origin, and some are trapped. A uniform magnetic field in the  $z$  direction is also present.

We work in units where time is measured in inverse plasma frequencies ( $\omega_p = \sqrt{n_e e^2 / m_e \epsilon_0}$ ), length in Debye lengths ( $\lambda_{De} = \sqrt{\epsilon_0 T_e / e^2 n_e}$ ), and energies (and potential) in electron temperatures ( $T_e$ ). Thus if primes denote dimensioned parameters, and unprimed the normalized quantities,  $t = \omega_p' t'$ ,  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}' / \lambda_{De}'$ , and energy  $W = W' / e T_e$ . The parameters  $T_e$  and  $n_e$  are the temperature and density of the unperturbed electron

93 distribution far from the hole. In these units the electron mass is eliminated from the  
 94 equations, and the electron charge is  $q_e = -1$ , so the total energy of an electron can be  
 95 written  $W = \frac{1}{2}v^2 - \phi$ , and we shall refer to the parallel energy as  $W_{\parallel} = \frac{1}{2}v_{\parallel}^2 - \phi$  and  
 96 perpendicular as  $W_{\perp} = \frac{1}{2}v_{\perp}^2 = \frac{1}{2}(v_r^2 + v_{\theta}^2)$ . The magnetic field strength is represented by  
 97 the (normalized) cyclotron frequency  $\Omega(= \Omega'/\omega_p')$ . The equation of an electron orbit is  
 98 then

$$\frac{d\mathbf{v}}{dt} = \nabla\phi - \mathbf{v} \times \Omega\hat{\mathbf{z}}. \quad (1)$$

99 In the 1D case where  $\phi$  depends only on  $z$ , there are two constants of the motion  $W$  and  
 100  $W_{\perp}$ . The perpendicular motion is then entirely decoupled from the parallel and can be  
 101 ignored. However, when  $\phi$  varies with  $r$ , and a transverse electric field  $E_r$  exists, the  $W_{\perp}$   
 102 (magnetic moment) invariance is broken, and the only strict invariant in addition to  $W$   
 103 is the canonical angular momentum about the  $z$ -axis:  $p_{\theta} = r(v_{\theta} - \Omega r/2)$ . The effect of  $p_{\theta}$   
 104 conservation is mostly to restrict the range of variation of the orbit's radius to what in the  
 105 probe literature are called "magnetic bottles". At radii greater than approximately the  
 106 gyro-radius  $\rho = v_{\perp}/\Omega$ , conservation of  $p_{\theta}$  contributes little to parallel particle dynamics,  
 107 serving mostly to localize the orbit in radial position, within approximately one gyro-  
 108 radius. Fig. 1 illustrates the kind of orbit that results.

109 For an electron hole to sustain itself, it requires a substantial fraction of the particle  
 110 orbits to be trapped. These orbits can then permanently possess a phase-space density ( $f$ )  
 111 less than those of untrapped orbits. Because in a collisionless plasma  $f$  is constant along  
 112 orbits, the *untrapped* orbits have phase-space density corresponding to their distribution  
 113 function at infinity; whereas the permanently *trapped* orbits have  $f$  determined by initial  
 114 conditions: the hole formation processes etc. The key question concerning the existence of

115 a steady solitary electron hole equilibrium is whether there are enough trapped orbits to  
 116 provide a negative electron density perturbation that can sustain the potential structure  
 117 self-consistently.

118 It is known that in the absence of a magnetic field, 2D and 3D electron hole equilibria do  
 119 not exist (for non-pathological external velocity distributions), because the trapped phase  
 120 space is then only orbits which have  $W < 0$ , and in multiple dimensions this is insufficient  
 121 [Krasovsky *et al.*, 2004; Ng and Bhattacharjee, 2005; Ng *et al.*, 2006]. It is also known  
 122 from particle in cell simulation and drift-orbit analysis that there exist axisymmetric 2D  
 123 equilibria when the magnetic field is strong enough that the gyro-radius ( $\rho$ ) is negligibly  
 124 small. Essentially this existence arises because of the orbit invariance of  $W_{\parallel}$  in the limit  
 125 of small  $\rho$  and consequently larger trapped phase-space volume requiring only  $W_{\parallel} < 0$ .  
 126 For the intermediate case, where  $\rho$  is finite, yet transverse  $\phi$ -variation exists, the challenge  
 127 is this. Given that energy can be exchanged during the orbit between  $W_{\parallel}$  and  $W_{\perp}$ , can  
 128 one quantify whether and to what extent the amount exchanged is limited, and an orbit  
 129 remains trapped in the  $z$ -direction ( $W_{\parallel} < 0$ ) even if it has so large a  $W_{\perp}$  that  $W > 0$ ?

130 An earlier attempt on this problem used a more complicated treatment based on an  
 131 “approximate invariant” [Krasovsky *et al.*, 2006] but was not carried through to a com-  
 132 prehensive result. Here, instead, we approach the solution quantitatively in a pertur-  
 133 bative manner, treating the changes to the magnetic moment as small and slow. This  
 134 is justified if the transverse electric field (arising from transverse non-uniformity of  $\phi$ )  
 135 is small in the sense that  $E_r/\phi \ll 1/\rho$ , which may also be written  $L_{\perp} \gg \rho$ , where  
 136  $L_{\perp} \equiv \phi/E_r = \phi/|\partial\phi/\partial r|$  is the transverse length scale of potential variation. It is this  
 137 electric field and its time dependence, arising from the orbit’s motion in the non-uniform

configuration, that is responsible for the transfer of energy between perpendicular and parallel. Starting from the drift limit (which is essentially  $\rho/L_\perp \rightarrow 0$ ), we recognize that the orbit's gyrocenter moves freely along  $z$  under the influence of the parallel electric field, and simultaneously rotates azimuthally in  $\theta$  under the (time-varying) influence of  $\mathbf{E}_r \times \mathbf{B}/B^2$ . Trapped orbits (our main focus) bounce in  $z$  and experience an effectively periodic  $E_r$  as a consequence. The mean value of  $E_r$  over a period determines the average azimuthal rotation. The varying component of  $E_r$  is the perturbation responsible for the transfer between perpendicular and parallel energy. To first order, the fractional transfer of energy in a bounce period is small. Then during a single period,  $z(t)$  can be approximated as being given by parallel motion with fixed  $W_\parallel$ , which is simply the 1D orbit problem. Moreover  $E_r(t) = E_r(r, z(t)) = -\partial\phi(r, z(t))/\partial r$  can be approximated as being at fixed radius  $r$  (again provided  $\rho$  is small enough relative to  $L_\perp$ ). The instantaneous energy transfer rate is simply the rate of doing work on the electron by  $E_r$ , namely

$$\frac{dW_\parallel}{dt} = -E_r(t)v_r(t). \quad (2)$$

The important velocity component in this equation arises from the gyro motion of the electron,  $v_r = v_\perp \cos(\Omega t)$ . When this equation is integrated over many bounces and gyro-periods, large excursions in  $W_\parallel$  will occur if there is a resonance between the gyro frequency and a harmonic of the bounce frequency  $\omega_b$ . These are the orbits that are liable to lead to detrapping, because the energy transfer is consistently unidirectional (between  $W_\perp$  and  $W_\parallel$ ) over many bounce periods. If resonant orbits do not lead *directly* to detrapping, by raising  $W_\parallel$  above zero, then they generally take the form of “islands” in the coordinate space  $W_\parallel$  versus relative phase angle (to be explained more fully in a moment). The result then is that the orbits remain trapped.



Since there are multiple resonances arising from the harmonics of  $\omega_b$ , the orbits can become stochastic and the islands broken up. Very generally, stochasticity begins in Hamiltonian systems approximately when there is overlap between the separatrices of adjacent islands [Chirikov, 1979; Meiss, 1992]. Indeed, this principle is often called the Chirikov criterion in recognition of its discoverer who studied resonances between gyro motion and bounces along the magnetic field in magnetic traps [Chirikov, 1960]: a close analog of our current concern. If an orbit is stochastic, it is generally *not* permanently trapped, and in principle cannot contribute to hole sustainment. The quantitative determination of the circumstances of trapped orbits therefore reduces, in this perturbative approach, to the determination of which islands (in which parts of  $W$  space) overlap, and which do not. We perform this calculation localized in  $r$ , and so obtain a measure of the trapped phase space volume which would eventually have to be integrated over the transverse domain.

### 3. Islands in energy

When discussing resonant perturbation islands in a Hamiltonian system, one generally requires an angle-like coordinate that amounts to the phase difference between the Hamiltonian orbit and the perturbation. In the magnetized electron hole with (presumed) uniform  $\Omega$ , the phase difference we require is between the gyro motion (of  $v_\perp$  and hence phase of  $v_r$ ) and a perturbing electric field which we will take as the Fourier component  $E_n$  at some harmonic  $n$  of the slowly varying bounce frequency:  $\omega_n = n\omega_b$ . The Fourier component has a fixed phase with respect to the  $z$  motion, which we will take as zero when  $z = 0$ . But because  $\omega_b$  is varying, the bounce phase has a variable rate of change with respect to the gyrophase, whose phase we have taken as zero when  $v_r = v_\perp$ . We shall

182 write the phase difference between bounce and gyromotion as  $\xi$ , so that

$$\frac{d\xi}{dt} = \omega_n - \Omega, \quad (3)$$

183 and seek the locus of orbit motion in the plane  $\xi, W_{\parallel}$ . Orbits will then have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dW_{\parallel}}{dt} &= -E_n v_{\perp} \cos(\omega_n t) \cos(\Omega t) \\ &= -E_n v_{\perp} \frac{1}{2} [\cos(\omega_n - \Omega)t + \cos(\omega_n + \Omega)t] \\ &\simeq -\frac{1}{2} E_n v_{\perp} \cos \xi, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

184 and we have dropped the term  $\cos(\omega_n + \Omega)t$ , because it is a fast oscillation, compared  
185 with the presumed slow evolution of  $\xi = (\omega - \Omega)t$ . We shall mention it later.

186 For an electron bouncing in a finite parallel potential energy well, the frequency  $\omega_b$  (and  
187 hence  $\omega_n$ ) varies with bounce amplitude, and hence with  $W_{\parallel}$ . Let us suppose for initial  
188 illustrative purposes that the variation can be approximated linearly as

$$\frac{d\xi}{dt} = \omega_n - \Omega = \frac{d\omega_n}{dW_{\parallel}} (W_{\parallel} - W_{\parallel R}) = \frac{d\omega_n}{dW_{\parallel}} \Delta W_{\parallel}, \quad (5)$$

189 where  $W_{\parallel R}$  is the value of  $W_{\parallel}$  at which exact resonance occurs ( $\omega_n = \Omega$ ), and that we can  
190 take  $E_n$  and  $\frac{d\omega_n}{dW_{\parallel}}$  to be independent of  $W_{\parallel}$ . Then eq. (2) becomes

$$\frac{d\omega_n}{dW_{\parallel}} \Delta W_{\parallel} \frac{dW_{\parallel}}{d\xi} = \frac{d\omega_n}{dW_{\parallel}} \frac{d\Delta W_{\parallel}^2}{2d\xi} = -E_n v_{\perp} \frac{1}{2} \cos \xi. \quad (6)$$

191 This expression can be integrated as

$$\frac{d\omega_n}{dW_{\parallel}} \Delta W_{\parallel}^2 = -E_n v_{\perp} \sin \xi + C. \quad (7)$$

192 This is the island locus, and different values of the integration constant,  $C$ , give rise to dif-  
193 ferent trajectories, effectively different starting  $W_{\parallel}$ s. The island's separatrix corresponds  
194 to  $C = E_n v_{\perp}$ . The x-point (if  $\frac{dW_{\parallel}}{d\omega_b}$  is negative) is at  $\xi = -\pi/2$  and the (maximum)

half-width of the separatrix (at  $\xi = \pi/2$ ) is then

$$|\Delta W_{\parallel}| = \sqrt{2E_n v_{\perp} \left| \frac{dW_{\parallel}}{d\omega_n} \right|}. \quad (8)$$

The island center is at  $\xi = \pi/2$ ,  $C = -E_n v_{\perp} \frac{dW_{\parallel}}{d\omega_n}$ . Fig. 2 illustrates two possible trajectory islands for different cyclotron frequencies and hence resonant energies. They are plotted as contours of the constant  $C$ . The perturbation  $E_n$ , and hence island separatrix width is small enough that the present approximations are good. (The islands are actually obtained by a more elaborate calculation that accounts for the variation of  $|d\omega_n/dW_{\parallel}|$  and  $|E_n|$  with  $W_{\parallel}$  and  $v_{\perp}$  with  $W_{\perp}$ , to be explained later, but are small enough that the present illustrative approximations are excellent.)

#### 4. The electric field harmonics

We must now obtain expressions for  $\omega_b$  and  $E_n$  as a function of  $W_{\parallel}$  for a model electron hole. These depend upon the  $z$ -profile of the potential, which will be taken as

$$\phi(r, z) = \psi(r) \text{sech}^4(z/4). \quad (9)$$

This  $z$ -dependence is what is obtained for 1-D shallow holes whose trapped distribution is a Maxwellian of negative temperature [Schamel, 1979]. More importantly, it falls off at large distances  $\propto \exp(-z)$ , which is *required* for essentially any 1-D Debye shielded potential (at small hole velocity) that does not have infinite velocity distribution derivative at  $W_{\parallel} = 0$  [Hutchinson, 2017]. Therefore the results we obtain from this model potential will apply to shallow trapped orbits for a wide range of acceptable potential profiles (which is not the case for Gaussian shaped potentials, often used.) We approximate the orbit, for the purpose of determining the  $z$ -motion, as occurring at fixed  $r$  (because of  $p_{\theta}$  conservation), so it is effectively a 1-D problem in space.

### 4.1. Bounce Frequency

It has been shown recently [Hutchinson, 2019b] that for shallow-trapping ( $-W_{\parallel} \ll \psi$ ) the (1D) bounce frequency is  $\omega_b \simeq \sqrt{-W_{\parallel}/2}$  in this potential. Deeply trapped orbits ( $W_{\parallel} + \psi \ll \psi$ ) have bounce frequency in the approximately parabolic bottom of the potential energy well  $\omega_b = \sqrt{\psi}/2$ . This expression is exact for the  $\text{sech}^4$  profile chosen, but the potential shape at the peak can (unlike the hole wings) be different, so this is a choice of a particular shape of hole. It has been found by numerical orbit integration as shown in Fig. 3 that an interpolation of the universal form

$$\omega_b/\sqrt{\psi} = [(-W_{\parallel}/\psi)^{-1/4} - 1 + 2^{1/4}]^{-2}/\sqrt{2}, \quad (10)$$

represents the dependence over the entire trapped energy range extremely well, within approximately the thickness of the line. The inverse of this expression is

$$-W_{\parallel}/\psi = [(2\omega_b^2/\psi)^{-1/4} + 1 - 2^{1/4}]^{-4}. \quad (11)$$

The shallow  $W_{\parallel} \rightarrow 0$  limit line  $\omega_b = \sqrt{-W_{\parallel}/2}$  is indicated by the dotted line. For approximate analytic purposes (to avoid the eventual necessity to evaluate hypergeometric functions) it is adequate to adopt a more approximate form

$$\omega_b/\sqrt{\psi} = (-W_{\parallel}/\psi)^{1/2}/2, \quad (12)$$

the dot-dash line with constant slope of 1/2 in Fig. 3.

Now we must relate the bounce motion to the time harmonics of  $E_r$ . First, observe that for a mirror symmetric potential such as eq. (9) the period of the variation of  $E_r = -\partial\phi/\partial r$  with  $z$  at constant  $r$  is actually  $\pi/\omega_b$ , and so only even harmonics  $n\omega_b$  are non-zero. The harmonics  $n > 2$  arise from the anharmonic motion and the resulting deviations of  $E_r(t)$  from a pure sinusoid.

Let us introduce convenient energy parameter notation involving positive values normalized to  $\psi$ , and (for future use) cyclotron frequency to  $\sqrt{\psi}$  as

$$w_{\parallel} \equiv -W_{\parallel}/\psi, \quad w \equiv W/\psi, \quad b \equiv \Omega/\sqrt{\psi}; \quad (13)$$

so trapped orbits have  $w_{\parallel}$  running from 0 to 1, and the orbits that can become untrapped have  $w > 0$ . For a given magnetic field value  $b$ , and harmonic number  $n$ , the resonance condition is  $n\omega_b = b$ , which gives a resonant parallel energy

$$w_{\parallel R} = [(2b^2/n^2)^{-1/4} + 1 - 2^{1/4}]^{-4} \quad (14)$$

corresponding to eq. (11).

## 4.2. Shallow trapped orbits

For shallowly-trapped orbits, the  $E_r(t)$  has the form of a train of relatively narrow impulses of width  $\sim \tau_t$  and period  $\pi/\omega_b$ , which peak briefly as the orbit passes rapidly through  $z \simeq 0$ . The orbit spends most of its time near the extrema of the  $z$ , where the parallel electric field is very small; and this dwell duration determines the period [Hutchinson, 2019b]. The total impulse in a single passage can be written  $A = \int E_r dt$ , and its duration is approximately the potential width divided by the peak speed [ $\tau_t \simeq 8/\sqrt{2(\psi + w_{\parallel})}$ ]. In the limit  $w_{\parallel} \rightarrow 0$  the integral  $\int E_r(z) dt = \int E_{r0} \text{sech}^4(z/4) dz/v_{\parallel}(z)$  can be performed exactly and yields  $A = 8E_{r0}/\sqrt{2\psi}$ . The Fourier decomposition of  $E_r(t)$  then gives the following Fourier mode amplitudes  $E_n$ , for even  $n$  when  $\tau_t \lesssim \pi/\omega_n$  (i.e.  $\sqrt{-W_{\parallel}/\psi} = \sqrt{w_{\parallel}} \lesssim \pi/4n$ ):

$$E_n = A \frac{2\omega_b}{\pi} \simeq E_{r0} \frac{8}{\pi} \sqrt{-W_{\parallel}/\psi} = E_{r0} \frac{8}{\pi} \sqrt{w_{\parallel}}. \quad (15)$$

We will refer to this as the impulse limit.

### 4.3. High Bounce Harmonics

249 An alternative perspective of the impulse limit is to note that each impulse gives an  
 250 energy change  $\delta w_{\parallel} = -Av_r = -Av_{\perp} \cos \xi$ , every  $\delta t = \pi/\omega_b$ . If  $\delta \xi$  and  $\delta w_{\parallel}$  during a single  
 251 passage through  $z = 0$  are small, we may approximate the effect as an average energy  
 252 rate of change

$$\frac{dw_{\parallel}}{dt} = \frac{\delta w_{\parallel}}{\delta t} = -\frac{Av_{\perp}\omega_b}{\pi} \cos \xi, \quad (16)$$

253 in agreement with eqs. (15), and (4).

254 However, if  $\Omega \gg \omega_b$ , so that only high harmonics of  $\omega_b$  are resonant, the continuum  
 255 limit is inappropriate. Moreover, it will always be the case that  $\Omega \gg \omega_b$  near the trapping  
 256 boundary,  $w_{\parallel} \rightarrow 0$ , because  $\omega_b \rightarrow 0$  there.

257 When there are many cyclotron periods during one bounce period, but the cyclotron  
 258 period is still long compared with the impulse duration,  $\tau_t$  (which does not itself become  
 259 significantly longer as  $w_{\parallel} \rightarrow 0$ ), the cyclotron phase ( $\xi$ ) at which each succeeding impulse  
 260 occurs becomes effectively random relative to the previous impulse. So, rather than a sys-  
 261 tematic continuous flight in the  $(\xi, w_{\parallel})$  space, the evolution consists of steps of virtually  
 262 random amplitude  $\delta w_{\parallel}$  cosine-distributed between  $\pm Av_{\perp}$ . This represents an effective *dif-*  
 263 *fusion* in  $w_{\parallel}$  with a diffusion coefficient  $\sim (Av_{\perp})^2 \omega_b / \pi$ . The diffusion connects the trapped  
 264 orbit region  $w_{\parallel} < 0$  with the untrapped region  $w_{\parallel} > 0$  across the nominal phase-space  
 265 separatrix  $w_{\parallel} = 0$ , with the result that the distribution function in this region has only  
 266 limited gradient  $|df/dw_{\parallel}|$ , and a value approximately equal to the external distribution  
 267  $f_{\infty}$  at  $v_{\parallel} = 0$  (in the frame of reference of the hole).

#### 4.4. Deeply trapped orbits

Orbits that are deeply trapped, having  $-W_{\parallel}/\psi$  a significant fraction of unity, are not accurately described by the impulse approximation of the previous section. Instead of being strongly anharmonic, the  $\phi(z)$  is approximately parabolic for them, and their orbit's  $z$ -position varies approximately sinusoidally in time. In the limit  $w_{\parallel} \rightarrow 1$ , only the lowest Fourier mode,  $n = 2$  is important and the higher harmonics become negligible. Moreover,  $E_r$  variation depends on the orbit excursion size; so even for the lowest relevant harmonic  $\omega_n = 2\omega_b$ , the electric field Fourier amplitude  $E_n = E_2$  can become small.

The Taylor expansion of the potential  $\phi(z) = \psi \operatorname{sech}^4(z/4)$  about  $z = 0$  is  $\phi(z) \simeq \psi[1 - z^2/8 + 7z^4/768 + O(z^6)]$ , which leads to the sinusoidal bounce frequency  $\omega_b = \sqrt{\psi}/2$  when  $z^4$  and higher terms are dropped. In the presumed separable radial electric field, similarly,  $E_r(z) \simeq E_{r0}(1 - z^2/8)$ , of which the time varying part is only the second term. For given parallel energy,  $w_{\parallel}$  the amplitude  $z_{\max}$  of the  $z$ -oscillation satisfies  $z_{\max}^2/8 = (1 - w_{\parallel})$ , and  $E_r(t) = E_{r0}[1 - z_{\max}^2 \sin^2(\omega_b t)/8] = E_{r0}[(1 - z_{\max}^2/16) + z_{\max}^2 \cos(2\omega_b t)/16]$  then yields

$$E_2 = z_{\max}^2 E_{r0}/16 = E_{r0}(1 - w_{\parallel})/2. \quad (17)$$

This dependence on  $(1 - w_{\parallel})$  replaces the  $\sqrt{-w_{\parallel}}$  dependence of eq. (15).

#### 4.5. Interpolated $E_n$ expression

It is helpful to have an approximate analytic interpolation for the Fourier harmonics  $E_n$  that spans the entire range  $0 < w_{\parallel} < 1$ . Observe that  $1 - w_{\parallel} = (1 - \sqrt{w_{\parallel}})(1 + \sqrt{w_{\parallel}})$ ; so an alternative expression to eq. (17), which is equally valid in the limit  $w_{\parallel} \rightarrow 1$ , is  $E_2 = E_{r0}(1 - \sqrt{w_{\parallel}})$ . Realize also that the higher harmonics,  $n = 4, 6, \dots$ , arise from correspondingly higher order terms in the Taylor expansion of  $\phi(z)$ , and that therefore,

as  $w_{\parallel} \rightarrow 1$ ,  $E_n$  will become proportional to correspondingly higher powers:  $(1 - \sqrt{w_{\parallel}})^{n/2}$ .

Consider then the following proposed interpolation between the two limits of  $w_{\parallel}$ :

$$E_n = E_{r0} \left[ \frac{n/2}{(1 - \sqrt{w_{\parallel}})^{n/2}} + \frac{\pi}{8} \frac{1}{\sqrt{w_{\parallel}}} \right]^{-1}. \quad (18)$$

The first term predominates as  $w_{\parallel} \rightarrow 1$ , and the second as  $w_{\parallel} \rightarrow 0$ . In their respective limits, these two terms give the correct values for  $E_2$ , in agreement with eqs. 15 and 17.

In the  $w_{\parallel} \rightarrow 1$  limit, the higher harmonics have appropriate scaling with  $1 - \sqrt{w_{\parallel}}$ . Their denominator  $n/2$  has not been derived; nor has the inverse form of the interpolation. Nevertheless, a comparison between this expression and numerical calculation of the Fourier harmonics, shows remarkably good agreement, as can be seen in Fig. 4. This is sufficient for the purposes of a representative potential profile calculation.

## 5. Solving the $w_{\parallel}$ trajectories

### 5.1. Analytic calculation

Using the approximate expression (12) for  $\omega_b$  giving  $\omega_n = (n/2)\sqrt{\psi w_{\parallel}}$ , the energy trajectory equation (4) ignoring the fast  $\omega_n + \Omega$  term becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dw_{\parallel}}{dt} &= (\omega_n - \Omega) \frac{dw_{\parallel}}{d\xi} = \frac{n\sqrt{\psi}}{2} (\sqrt{w_{\parallel}} - \sqrt{w_{\parallel R}}) \frac{dw_{\parallel}}{d\xi} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (E_n/\psi) v_{\perp} \cos \xi, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where  $w_{\parallel R} = 4\Omega^2/n^2\psi$  is the resonant parallel energy at which  $\omega_n = \Omega$ . Substituting the interpolation for  $E_n$  from eq. (18), and  $v_{\perp} = \sqrt{2(w + w_{\parallel})\psi}$ , it can be written

$$\begin{aligned} n \frac{\sqrt{w_{\parallel}} - \sqrt{w_{\parallel R}}}{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{w + w_{\parallel}}} \left[ \frac{n/2}{(1 - \sqrt{w_{\parallel}})^{n/2}} + \frac{\pi}{8} \frac{1}{\sqrt{w_{\parallel}}} \right] \frac{dw_{\parallel}}{d\xi} \\ = (E_{r0}/\psi) \cos \xi. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$



300 This equation can be integrated analytically in terms of elementary functions to obtain

$$F_n(w_{\parallel}, w, w_{\parallel R}) - (E_{r0}/\psi) \sin \xi = \text{const.}, \quad (21)$$

301 where for each  $n = 2, 4, 6, \dots$ ,  $F_n$  is a fairly complicated algebraic expression detailed  
 302 in the appendix. For chosen total energy, magnetic field strength, and perturbing field  
 303 (i.e.  $w$ ,  $w_{\parallel R}$ , and  $E_{r0}/\psi$ ) the trajectories can most easily be plotted as contours of the  
 304 left hand side expression,  $F_n - (E_{r0}/\psi) \sin \xi$ , in the plane  $(\xi, w_{\parallel})$ . In these calculations it  
 305 improves accuracy to use the more accurate equation (14) for  $w_{\parallel R}$  in terms of  $b$ , in  $F_n$ ;  
 306 and we adopt this practice forthwith, ignoring the minor inconsistency.

307 In Fig. 5 are shown examples of the energy trajectories for  $w = 1$ ,  $E_r/\psi = 0.01$   $\psi = 1$ ,  
 308 and three values of the magnetic field strength, and hence of the resonance energy  $w_{\parallel R}$  for  
 309 the lowest harmonic  $n = 2$ . Unlike the previous illustration in Fig. 2 the perturbing field is  
 310 stronger and we can see that the trajectories near the top or bottom of the potential energy  
 311 well (i.e. near to  $-w_{\parallel} = 0$  or  $-1$ ) are compressed asymmetrically at those limits because  
 312 of the form of  $F_n$ . For an energy away from those limits, the contours are approximately  
 313 symmetric about the resonant energy. If the magnetic field strength is big enough that  
 314  $\Omega^2/\psi > 1$ , then this  $n = 2$  resonance does not exist.

315 Fig. 6(a), instead shows trajectories for fixed magnetic field, and hence fixed  $n = 2$   
 316 resonance frequency, ( $b = \Omega/\sqrt{\psi} = \sqrt{0.8}$ ,  $E_{r0}/\psi = 0.005$ ), but for harmonic numbers  
 317  $n = 2, 4, 6, 8, \dots$ . The resonance energy is  $w_{\parallel R} = [(2b^2/n^2)^{-1/4} + 1 - 2^{1/4}]^{-4}$ . The higher  
 318 harmonics bunch together near the top of the potential energy well, corresponding to low  
 319 bounce frequency. And in fact the  $n = 6$  and  $n = 8$ , islands overlap: indicating that  
 320 this region of energy has stochastic orbits and so the orbits there are not permanently

trapped. Lower in the well, no overlap occurs with the  $n = 2$  island; so orbits there are permanently trapped.

## 5.2. Numerical orbits: Poincaré Plots

In order to verify the analytic calculation and to show what happens when its applicable parameter limits are exceeded, it is helpful to perform a numerical integration of the trapped orbits. The full (non-relativistic) equations of motion for the model potential have been implemented in cylindrical coordinates using a 4th order Runge-Kutta numerical scheme with timestep chosen short enough that the (known) conservation of  $W$  and  $p_\theta$  are reproduced for long orbits to no worse than 10 times machine precision. This is observed to require  $\Omega \cdot dt \lesssim 0.05$ . Fig. 1 is an example of an orbit so calculated.

Poincaré plots of the energy trajectories for such orbits are obtained by collecting values of  $W_\parallel$  and the phase of  $v_r$  (i.e.  $\text{atan2}(v_\theta, v_r)$ ) at successive instants when the orbit passes through  $z = 0$  (at which the orbit phase is zero or  $\pi$  and the phase of  $E_n$  is zero for all even  $n$ ). The phase difference,  $\xi$ , thus equals the phase of  $v_r$ . We place a point at each of the corresponding positions in  $\xi, W_\parallel$  space. We also, for convenience, start all orbits at  $z = 0$  and with  $v_\theta = 0$ ,  $v_r$  positive:  $\xi = 0$ . We abandon as escaped any orbits that acquire positive  $W_\parallel$  or pass beyond  $|z| = 20$ . A technical subtlety is that it is most appropriate to use for  $W_\parallel = v_z^2/2 - \phi$ , not the value of  $\phi$  at the orbit, but rather the value of  $\phi$  at the *gyrocenter*, which gives significantly smaller oscillatory excursions of  $W_\parallel$ . It therefore more effectively suppresses the  $\omega_n + \Omega$  term and expresses the approximate magnetic moment conservation.

Fig. 6(b) shows an example of a Poincaré plot, alongside its analytic energy trajectories 6(a). The agreement is excellent. Orbits are initialized at equally spaced  $W_\parallel$  values. Of

course, they cannot trace island contours well inside their separatrices where the island does not extend past  $\xi = 0$ . The position and  $W_{\parallel}$ -width of the  $n = 2$  island agree quantitatively very well between (a) and (b). And the  $n = 4$  and  $n = 6$  islands are also readily seen at their expected positions. Between the islands, the Poincaré points trace the open contours. Above the position of the  $n = 6$  island ( $W_{\parallel}/\psi \geq -0.05$ ) and near its x-point the plot shows rather incoherent scatter of the points. Orbits above this energy are stochastic, and terminate after some tens of bounces by leaving the domain. Again, this agrees well with the analytic observation of overlap between  $n = 6$  and 8, but not between  $n = 4$  and 6 islands.

Fig. 7, by comparison, shows what happens if the amplitude of the perturbing transverse field is increased by a factor of 8, other parameters unchanged. The  $n = 4$  and 6 islands now overlap strongly, and the entire region  $W_{\parallel}/\psi \gtrsim -0.3$  becomes stochastic. Below it, the Poincaré plots show orbits to be permanently trapped. Small island chains with higher mode numbers in phase  $\xi$  become visible. For example the chain of 3 islands at  $W_{\parallel}/\psi \simeq -0.45$ , or of two islands at  $W_{\parallel}/\psi \simeq -0.34$ . These additional chains arise from nonlinearity, and are not represented in the analytic linearized approximation. Still, the overall extent of the  $n = 2$  island is quite well captured by the analytics, which predict that it should remain intact, as it does. If the perturbing  $E_r/\psi$  is increased to 0.1, then overlap and stochasticization of even the  $n = 2$  island begins, as illustrated by Fig. 8. Soon beyond it, by  $E_r/\psi = 0.13$ , essentially the whole of the phase space becomes stochastic.

Fig. 9 shows what happens for a lower magnetic field,  $\Omega/\sqrt{\psi} = 0.6$ . In this case, a field  $E_r/\psi = 0.04$  is sufficient make the  $n = 2$  island stochastic, but when that happens, there

365 still remain some permanently trapped orbits at energies sufficiently below the resonance  
366 value ( $\sim 0.6^2$ ).

367 In contrast, as shown in Fig. 10, increasing the magnetic field to  $\Omega/\sqrt{\psi} = 1.8$ , removes  
368 the  $n = 2$  resonance; and because the higher resonances are weaker, the orbits can sus-  
369 tain higher  $E_r/\psi$  before becoming stochastic. This stabilizing effect is enhanced by the  
370 resulting reduction in gyroradius  $\rho$ .

## 6. Island widths, overlap, and trapped phase space

371 In the previous section we have shown that the island overlap criterion successfully  
372 predicts which trajectories are stochastic (and hence become untrapped) and which are  
373 permanently trapped. We therefore rely on this success and formulate an analytic con-  
374 dition for particles at different locations in phase space to be permanently trapped. We  
375 will take those parallel energies  $W_{\parallel}$  to be trapped which lie *below the bottom of the lowest*  
376 *overlapped island* and all others to be subject to detrapping. This criterion describes  
377 within typically 10% in  $W_{\parallel}$  what has been observed in the example cases we have shown.

378 The function  $F_n$ , for fixed  $w$  and  $w_{\parallel R}$ , is stationary at resonance ( $\sqrt{w_{\parallel}} = \sqrt{w_{\parallel R}}$ ), and  
379 its derivative in the vicinity of the resonance can be taken from eq. (20) as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F_n}{\partial \sqrt{w_{\parallel}}} &= 2\sqrt{w_{\parallel}} \frac{\partial F_n}{\partial w_{\parallel}} \\ &= \frac{n(\sqrt{w_{\parallel}} - \sqrt{w_{\parallel R}})}{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{w + w_{\parallel}}} \left[ \frac{\sqrt{w_{\parallel}} n/2}{(1 - \sqrt{w_{\parallel}})^{n/2}} + \frac{\pi}{8} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

380 Consequently the width of the island separatrix, which occurs at  $\xi = \pi/2$ , is determined  
381 by the  $\sqrt{w_{\parallel}}$  value for which  $F_n(w_{\parallel}) - F_n(w_{\parallel} = w_{\parallel R}) \simeq \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{w_{\parallel}} - \sqrt{w_{\parallel R}})^2 \frac{\partial^2 F_n}{\partial \sqrt{w_{\parallel}}^2}$  is equal to  
382  $E_{r0}/\psi$ . Therefore, regarding the second derivative as constant (adopting just the second-

order term in a Taylor expansion of  $F_n$ ) we can express the island (half-) width as

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &\equiv \sqrt{w_{\parallel}} - \sqrt{w_{\parallel R}} \\ &\simeq \left[ \frac{E_{r0}}{\psi} \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{n} \sqrt{w + w_{\parallel R}} \right]^{1/2} \left[ \frac{\sqrt{w_{\parallel R}} n/2}{(1 - \sqrt{w_{\parallel R}})^{n/2}} + \frac{\pi}{8} \right]^{-1/2}.\end{aligned}\quad (23)$$

We write  $w + w_{\parallel R} = w_{\perp}$  ( $\sqrt{2w_{\perp}} = v_{\perp}/\sqrt{\psi}$ ) and recognize that together the parameters  $n$ ,  $E_{r0}v_{\perp}/\psi^{3/2}$ , and  $w_{\parallel R}$  determine  $\delta_n$  as follows.

**Analytic Algorithm:** Eq. (14)  $w_{\parallel Rn} = [(n^2/2b^2)^{1/4} + 1 - 2^{1/4}]^{-4}$  enables us to find the energy of the upper and lower island limits of island  $n$  as

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{w_{\parallel Rn}} \pm \delta_n &= \\ \sqrt{w_{\parallel Rn}} \pm \left[ \frac{E_{r0}v_{\perp}}{\psi\sqrt{\psi}} \frac{2}{n} \right]^{1/2} &\left[ \frac{\sqrt{w_{\parallel Rn}} n/2}{(1 - \sqrt{w_{\parallel Rn}})^{n/2}} + \frac{\pi}{8} \right]^{-1/2}.\end{aligned}\quad (24)$$

Overlap occurs between the  $n$  and  $n+2$  harmonic islands when  $\sqrt{w_{\parallel Rn}} - \delta_n < \sqrt{w_{\parallel Rn+2}} + \delta_{n+2}$ . Beginning at the lowest value of  $n$  for which a resonance exists (requiring  $w_{\parallel Rn} < 1$ ) determine from evaluation of  $\sqrt{w_{\parallel Rn}} - \delta_n$  and  $\sqrt{w_{\parallel Rn+2}} + \delta_{n+2}$  whether it overlaps with the  $n+2$  island. If so, then it is the *lowest energy overlapped island*; if not, increment  $n$  by 2 and repeat until overlap is found. The resulting  $n$  is the harmonic whose island's lower energy limit is sought, which is

$$W_{\parallel t}/\psi = -w_{\parallel t} = -(\sqrt{w_{\parallel Rn}} + \delta_n)^2. \quad (25)$$

Energies below this approximate bound are predicted trapped, energies above have stochastic orbits and are detrapped.

Figure 11(a) shows the universal contours that result. Where  $W_{\parallel t}/\psi$  is close to zero (light regions), very few orbits are detrapped; while where  $W_{\parallel t}/\psi$  is close to -1 (dark regions) almost all orbits are detrapped. Discontinuities in  $W_{\parallel t}$  occur where  $n$  changes: it starts at 2 at the bottom (right, below  $\Omega/\sqrt{\psi} \simeq 1$ ) and increments through 4, 6, ... as one

400 moves to larger  $\Omega/\sqrt{\psi}$ . To avoid almost complete detrapping for  $\Omega/\sqrt{\psi} \lesssim 1$ , extremely  
 401 weak perturbation is required. In contrast, for  $\Omega/\sqrt{\psi} \gtrsim 2$  there is a substantial region of  
 402 permanently trapped orbits even up to the largest perturbation strength shown.

403 In Fig. 11(b) are shown vertical profiles through the contours at three values of the  
 404 perturbation strength, giving  $W_{\parallel t}$  as a function of  $b$ . These lines are each accompanied  
 405 by points, each of which comes from full numerical orbit integration. A point gives the  
 406 lowest starting energy that escapes during the first 200 bounces (which might take as  
 407 many as a million time-steps). We observe that there is rather good agreement (even in  
 408 respect of the discontinuities) at moderate magnetic field  $\Omega/\sqrt{\psi} \lesssim 2$  between the points  
 409 and the lines. At higher field, the overlap criterion is pessimistic compared with orbit  
 410 following, predicting somewhat more detrapping than is observed. This discrepancy may  
 411 arise in part from the approximations implicit in equations (18) and (23). But it might  
 412 also reflect limitations in the criterion for detection of orbit loss because of using fixed  
 413 initial phase  $\xi = 0$ , or because of limited orbit integration length. It is known theoretically  
 414 [Meiss, 1992] that there can sometimes be extremely slow trajectory diffusion coefficients  
 415 even in stochastic regions. This warns us that it is an over-simplification to suppose  
 416 that stochastic orbits can have negligible depression of phase-space density  $f(v)$  from the  
 417 marginally untrapped value. In any case, agreement in the loss boundary deduced from  
 418 analytic and numerical treatments is within 0.1 in  $W_{\parallel t}/\psi$ .

419 A more approximate form of the island widths can be obtained by substituting the more  
 420 approximate frequency fit  $w_{\parallel R} = 4\Omega^2/n^2\psi = 4b^2/n^2$ , and approximating  $(1 - \sqrt{w_{\parallel R}})^{n/2} =$   
 421  $(1 - 2b/n)^{n/2} \simeq e^{-b}$ . Then we find  $\delta_n$  is approximately proportional to  $1/\sqrt{n}$  and can be

422 written

$$\delta_n \simeq \left[ \frac{E_{r0}}{\psi} \frac{2\sqrt{2}w_\perp}{n} \right]^{1/2} \left[ be^b + \frac{\pi}{8} \right]^{-1/2} \quad (26)$$

423 With reference to this approximation, the behavior can readily be understood as follows.  
 424 Island overlap leading to stochastic trajectories occurs if  $\delta_n$  is too large; that is if  $E_{r0}v_\perp$   
 425 is too large, or  $b$  ( $= \Omega/\sqrt{\psi}$ ) is too small, or  $n$  is too large. The last of these cases (high  $n$   
 426 at modest  $E_{r0}$  and  $b$ ) predicts that there is in principle *always* a stochastic region at very  
 427 small  $w_\parallel$ , where the bounce frequency is correspondingly small and the resonant bounce  
 428 harmonic number large, regardless of the exact  $E_{r0}$  and  $b$  values. Consequently, a steady  
 429 electron hole of limited transverse extent will always have a stochastic transition between  
 430 trapped and passing orbits that in practice smooths out any steep  $f$ -gradients at the  
 431 separatrix. Our numerical orbit integration confirms this prediction (at the computing  
 432 cost of very long integrations and fine energy resolution) but not with particularly accurate  
 433 agreement on  $W_{\parallel t}$ , as already mentioned.

434 When  $b$  ( $= \Omega/\sqrt{\psi}$ ) is large, the term  $e^b$  makes  $\delta_n$  small, regardless of  $E_{r0}$ , and suppresses  
 435 overlap. This effect can be considered to arise because when the gyro-period is small  
 436 compared with the central transit time ( $\tau_t \propto 1/\sqrt{\psi}$ , the duration of the impulse), the  
 437 Fourier transform of a single impulse has become exponentially small at the cyclotron  
 438 frequency. The suppression applies at essentially all  $w_\parallel$  up to 1, because the impulse  
 439 width is a rather weak (slowly increasing) function of  $w_\parallel$ . Only the exponentially-large- $n$   
 440 orbits at exponentially-small- $w_\parallel$  will then be stochastic. And the region of stochasticity  
 441 is limited to very small  $w_\parallel$ . High enough magnetic field thus justifies the drift orbit  
 442 treatment, and eventually imposes no minimum  $L_\perp$  requirement for a long-lived hole to  
 443 exist.

444 The opposite case  $b \ll 1$  (weak magnetic field) preserves the assumed localization in  $r$   
 445 only if the transverse length scale remains greater than the gyro-radius  $E_{r0}/\psi = 1/L_\perp \lesssim$   
 446  $1/\rho = \Omega/v_\perp = b\sqrt{\psi}/v_\perp$  so  $E_{r0}v_\perp/\psi^{3/2} \lesssim \Omega/\sqrt{\psi}$ . The valid region of Fig. 11(a) is therefore  
 447 above the diagonal straight line  $E_{r0}v_\perp/\psi^{3/2} = \Omega/\sqrt{\psi}$  drawn in purple. And in Fig. 11(b),  
 448 the lines are drawn only in the valid region. In the invalid region one can expect the  
 449 permanent trapping to be poor, and this is confirmed by the points.

450 A perhaps more intuitive way to portray typical results is as in Fig. 12, where are shown  
 451 examples of boundaries between trapped and untrapped orbits in velocity-space (based on  
 452 the island overlap calculation). The important regions of this domain extend to thermal  
 453 velocities ( $v_\perp \gtrsim 1$ , not just  $v_\perp \gtrsim \sqrt{\psi}$ ). We need orbits to be permanently trapped for  
 454 most of the range of possible  $v_\perp$  to allow the depression of  $f(v_\parallel, v_\perp)$  to contribute sufficient  
 455 positive charge to sustain the hole. For smaller  $\psi$  the effective perturbation strength  
 456  $\propto v_\perp/\sqrt{\psi}L_\perp$  becomes stronger for given  $L_\perp$ , which makes orbits more easily detrapped.  
 457 However, the effects of varying resonance condition as  $\psi$  changes are very strong; so the  
 458 boundaries do not behave monotonically with  $\psi$ . When the  $n = 2$  resonance is avoided,  
 459 as in Fig. 12(b), the boundary lies at fairly high velocity near  $W_\parallel = 0$ . That leads us to  
 460 expect qualitatively that a distribution  $f(v_{\parallel 0})$  that is approximately flat above  $v_{\parallel 0t}$ , in the  
 461 stochastic region, can still sustain an electron hole with these parameters.

462 In all cases, increasing  $L_\perp$  and making the hole more oblate, i.e. closer to one-  
 463 dimensional reduces the detrapped phase-space area. But unless  $\Omega/\sqrt{\psi} \gtrsim 2$ , holes of  
 464 large transverse dimension are unstable to transverse perturbations that grow in a few  
 465 hundred plasma periods and break up the holes into shorter transverse lengths, causing



466 them to collapse. So there is a competition between the requirements of equilibrium and  
 467 stability.

## 7. Summary

468 It has been shown that parallel energies of deeply trapped orbits in axisymmetric elec-  
 469 tron holes have limited excursions in parallel energy, provided the transverse electric field  
 470 perturbation is weak enough. There is a parallel energy threshold which is a function  
 471 of perturbation strength and magnetic field, above which the parallel energy trajectory  
 472 becomes stochastic, and is no longer limited in extent, instead becoming detrapped. Such  
 473 orbits cannot therefore contribute to the electron deficit needed to sustain the hole. The  
 474 stochasticity arises when trajectory islands overlap, as has been confirmed by numerical  
 475 orbit integration. The parallel energy threshold for detrapping has been quantitatively  
 476 evaluated using the **Analytic Algorithm** as a universal function of the hole parameters.  
 477 Magnetic fields strong enough that  $\Omega/\sqrt{\psi} \gtrsim 2$  allow a large fraction of the orbits with  
 478 negative parallel energy to be permanently trapped, even for quite short transverse scale  
 479 lengths. However, lower magnetic field strengths  $\Omega/\sqrt{\psi} \lesssim 1$  have most of their orbits  
 480 detrapped unless the transverse scale length is rather large. Although fully self-consistent  
 481 hole equilibria have not yet been calculated, the present results appear to give an expla-  
 482 nation based upon equilibrium trapping constraints for the observation that holes with  
 483 lower magnetic field and lower peak potential generally must have greater transverse ex-  
 484 tent than those with greater field or greater potential. Future work will aim to use the  
 485 quantitative results of this trapped-phase-space calculation, illustrated in Figs. 11 and 12,  
 486 to explore when fully self-consistent 2D holes can exist and what their forms are likely to  
 487 be.

## Appendix: Mathematical Function Details

488 The integrated expressions for  $F_n$  are as follows

$$F_n = \frac{n^2}{2\sqrt{2}}g_n + \frac{n\pi}{16\sqrt{2}}g_0, \quad (27)$$

with

$$g_0 = \int \frac{(\sqrt{w_{\parallel}} - \sqrt{w_{\parallel R}})dw_{\parallel}}{\sqrt{w + w_{\parallel}}\sqrt{w_{\parallel}}}; \quad (28)$$

$$g_n = \int \frac{(\sqrt{w_{\parallel}} - \sqrt{w_{\parallel R}})dw_{\parallel}}{\sqrt{w + w_{\parallel}}(1 - \sqrt{w_{\parallel}})^{n/2}}. \quad (29)$$

489 The first function is easy:  $g_0 = 2[\sqrt{w + w_{\parallel}} - w\sqrt{w_{\parallel R}} \ln(\sqrt{w + w_{\parallel}} + \sqrt{w_{\parallel}})]$ . To evaluate

490  $g_n$ , define the integrals

$$I_m(a, x) = \int \frac{dx}{\sqrt{a + x^2}(1 - x)^m}, \quad (30)$$

$$J_m(a, x) = \int \frac{xdx}{\sqrt{a + x^2}(1 - x)^m}; \quad (31)$$

491 then, since  $x^2 = (x - 1)x + x$ , it is easy to show that

$$g_n = 2[(1 - \sqrt{w_{\parallel R}})J_{n/2}(w, \sqrt{w_{\parallel}}) - J_{n/2-1}(w, \sqrt{w_{\parallel}})]. \quad (32)$$

492 The  $J_m$  and  $I_m$  are related by

$$J_m(a, x) = \int \frac{(x - 1) + 1}{\sqrt{a + x^2}(1 - x)^m} dx = I_m - I_{m-1}. \quad (33)$$

493 Also  $J_m$  can be integrated by parts as

$$\begin{aligned} J_m &= \frac{\sqrt{a + x^2}}{(1 - x)^m} - m \int \frac{(1 - x)^2 - 2(1 - x) + 1 + a}{\sqrt{a + x^2}(1 - x)^{m+1}} dx \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{a + x^2}}{(1 - x)^m} - mI_{m-1} + 2mI_m - m(1 + a)I_{m+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

494 Eliminating  $J_m$  between (33) and (34), and gathering terms we obtain the following re-

495 cursion relation:

$$I_{m+1} = \left[ \frac{\sqrt{a + x^2}}{(1 - x)^m} + (2m - 1)I_m - (m - 1)I_{m-1} \right] \frac{1}{m(a + 1)}. \quad (35)$$

Given  $J_0 = \sqrt{a + x^2}$ , and the initial values of the recursion:  $I_0 = \ln(\sqrt{a + x^2} + x)$ , and  
 $I_1 = [\ln(\sqrt{a + 1}\sqrt{a + x^2} + a + x) - \ln(1 - x)]/\sqrt{a + x^2}$  we can efficiently obtain by iteration  
 $I_m$  and  $J_m$  for  $m$  as high as required. This iterative scheme has been implemented and  
 verified, and is used to give the island plots in this paper.

## Acknowledgements

I am grateful for useful discussions about transverse structure of electron holes with  
 Ivan Vasko. The codes that were used to do the calculations and create the figures in  
 this article are publically available at <https://github.com/ihutch/AxisymOrbits>. This  
 work was partially funded by NASA grant NNX16AG82G.

## References

- Andersson, L., et al. (2009), New features of electron phase space holes observed by the  
 THEMIS mission, *Physical Review Letters*, *102*(22), 225,004, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.  
 102.225004.
- Bale, S. D., P. J. Kellogg, D. E. Larsen, R. P. Lin, K. Goetz, and R. P. Lepping  
 (1998), Bipolar electrostatic structures in the shock transition region: Evidence of  
 electron phase space holes, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *25*(15), 2929–2932, doi:  
 10.1029/98GL02111.
- Berk, H. L., C. E. Nielsen, and K. V. Roberts (1970), Phase Space Hydrodynamics of  
 Equivalent Nonlinear Systems: Experimental and Computational Observations, *Physics  
 of Fluids*, *13*(4), 980, doi:10.1063/1.1693039.
- Bernstein, I. B., J. M. Greene, and M. D. Kruskal (1957), Exact nonlinear plasma oscil-  
 lations, *Physical Review*, *108*(4), 546–550.

- 516 Chen, L.-J., and G. K. Parks (2002), BGK electron solitary waves in 3D magnetized  
517 plasma, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *29*(9), 41–45, doi:10.1029/2001GL013385.
- 518 Chirikov, B. V. (1960), Resonance processes in magnetic traps, *The Soviet Journal of*  
519 *Atomic Energy*, *6*(6), 464–470, doi:10.1007/BF01483352.
- 520 Chirikov, B. V. (1979), A universal instability of many-dimensional oscillator systems,  
521 *Physics Reports*, *52*(5), 263–379, doi:10.1016/0370-1573(79)90023-1.
- 522 Eliasson, B., and P. K. Shukla (2006), Formation and dynamics of coherent structures  
523 involving phase-space vortices in plasmas, *Physics Reports*, *422*(6), 225–290, doi:10.  
524 1016/j.physrep.2005.10.003.
- 525 Ergun, R. E., C. W. Carlson, J. P. McFadden, F. S. Mozer, L. Muschietti, I. Roth, and  
526 R. J. Strangeway (1998), Debye-Scale Plasma Structures Associated with Magnetic-  
527 Field-Aligned Electric Fields, *Physical Review Letters*, *81*(4), 826–829, doi:10.1103/  
528 PhysRevLett.81.826.
- 529 Franz, J. R., P. M. Kintner, C. E. Seyler, J. S. Pickett, and J. D. Scudder (2000), On the  
530 perpendicular scale of electron phase-space holes, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *27*(2),  
531 169–172, doi:10.1029/1999GL010733.
- 532 Goldman, M. V., M. M. Oppenheim, and D. L. Newman (1999), Nonlinear two-stream  
533 instabilities as an explanation for auroral bipolar wave structures, *Geophysical Research*  
534 *Letters*, *26*(13), 1821–1824, doi:10.1029/1999GL900435.
- 535 Holmes, J. C., et al. (2018), Electron Phase-Space Holes in Three Dimensions: Mul-  
536 tispacecraft Observations by Magnetospheric Multiscale, *Journal of Geophysical Re-*  
537 *search: Space Physics*, *123*(12), 9963–9978, doi:10.1029/2018JA025750.

- 538 Hutchinson, I. H. (2017), Electron holes in phase space: What they are and why they  
539 matter, *Physics of Plasmas*, *24*(5), 055,601, doi:10.1063/1.4976854.
- 540 Hutchinson, I. H. (2018a), Kinematic Mechanism of Plasma Electron Hole Transverse  
541 Instability, *Physical Review Letters*, *120*(20), 205,101, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.  
542 205101.
- 543 Hutchinson, I. H. (2018b), Transverse instability of electron phase-space holes in multi-  
544 dimensional Maxwellian plasmas, *Journal of Plasma Physics*, *84*, 905840,411, doi:10.  
545 1017/S0022377818000909.
- 546 Hutchinson, I. H. (2019a), Transverse instability magnetic field thresholds of electron  
547 phase-space holes, *Physical Review E*, *99*, 053,209, doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.99.053209.
- 548 Hutchinson, I. H. (2019b), Electron phase-space hole transverse instability at high mag-  
549 netic field, *Journal of Plasma Physics*, *85*(5), doi:10.1017/S0022377819000564.
- 550 Hutchinson, I. H., and D. M. Malaspina (2018), Prediction and Observation of Electron  
551 Instabilities and Phase Space Holes Concentrated in the Lunar Plasma Wake, *Geophys-  
552 ical Research Letters*, *45*, 3838–3845, doi:10.1029/2017GL076880.
- 553 Jovanović, D., P. K. Shukla, L. Stenflo, and F. Pegoraro (2002), Nonlinear model for elec-  
554 tron phase-space holes in magnetized space plasmas, *Journal of Geophysical Research:  
555 Space Physics*, *107*(A7), 1–6, doi:10.1029/2001JA900180.
- 556 Krasovsky, V. L., H. Matsumoto, and Y. Omura (2004), Effect of trapped-particle deficit  
557 and structure of localized electrostatic perturbations of different dimensionality, *Journal  
558 of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, *109*(A4), A04,217, doi:10.1029/2003JA010198.
- 559 Krasovsky, V. L., H. Matsumoto, and Y. Omura (2006), Condition for charged particle  
560 trapping in a three-dimensional electrostatic potential well in the presence of a magnetic


- field, *Physica Scripta*, 74(2), 227–231, doi:10.1088/0031-8949/74/2/014.
- Lu, Q. M., B. Lembege, J. B. Tao, and S. Wang (2008), Perpendicular electric field in two-dimensional electron phase-holes: A parameter study, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 113(A11), A11,219, doi:10.1029/2008JA013693.
- Malaspina, D. M., D. L. Newman, L. B. Willson, K. Goetz, P. J. Kellogg, and K. Kerstin (2013), Electrostatic solitary waves in the solar wind: Evidence for instability at solar wind current sheets, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 118(2), 591–599, doi:10.1002/jgra.50102.
- Malaspina, D. M., L. Andersson, R. E. Ergun, J. R. Wygant, J. W. Bonnell, C. Kletzing, G. D. Reeves, R. M. Skoug, and B. A. Larsen (2014), Nonlinear electric field structures in the inner magnetosphere, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41, 5693–5701, doi:10.1002/2014GL061109.
- Mangeney, A., et al. (1999), WIND observations of coherent electrostatic waves in the solar wind, *Annales Geophysicae*, 17(3), 307–320, doi:10.1007/s00585-999-0307-y.
- Matsumoto, H., H. Kojima, T. Miyatake, Y. Omura, M. Okada, I. Nagano, and M. Tsutsui (1994), Electrostatic solitary waves (ESW) in the magnetotail: BEN wave forms observed by GEOTAIL, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 21(25), 2915–2918, doi:10.1029/94GL01284.
- Meiss, J. D. (1992), Symplectic maps, variational principles, and transport, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 64(3), 795–848, doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.64.795.
- Miyake, T., Y. Omura, H. Matsumoto, and H. Kojima (1998), Two-dimensional computer simulations of electrostatic solitary waves observed by Geotail spacecraft, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 103(A6), 11,841, doi:10.1029/98JA00760.

- 584 Morse, R. L., and C. W. Nielson (1969), One-, two-, and three-dimensional numerical  
585 simulation of two-Beam plasmas, *Physical Review Letters*, *23*(19), 1087–1090, doi:10.  
586 1103/PhysRevLett.23.1087.
- 587 Mottez, F., S. Perraut, A. Roux, and P. Louarn (1997), Coherent structures in the magne-  
588 totail triggered by counterstreaming electron beams, *Journal of Geophysical Research*,  
589 *102*(A6), 11,399, doi:10.1029/97JA00385.
- 590 Mozer, F. S., et al. (2016), Magnetospheric Multiscale Satellite Observations of Parallel  
591 Electron Acceleration in Magnetic Field Reconnection by Fermi Reflection from Time  
592 Domain Structures, *Physical Review Letters*, *116*(14), 4–8, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.  
593 116.145101.
- 594 Mozer, F. S., O. V. Agapitov, B. Giles, and I. Vasko (2018), Direct Observation of Elec-  
595 tron Distributions inside Millisecond Duration Electron Holes, *Physical Review Letters*,  
596 *121*(13), 135,102, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.135102.
- 597 Muschietti, L., I. Roth, C. W. Carlson, and R. E. Ergun (2000), Transverse instability of  
598 magnetized electron holes, *Physical Review Letters*, *85*(1), 94–97.
- 599 Ng, C. S., and A. Bhattacharjee (2005), Bernstein-green-kruskal modes in a  
600 three-dimensional plasma, *Physical Review Letters*, *95*(24), 245,004, doi:10.1103/  
601 PhysRevLett.95.245004.
- 602 Ng, C. S., A. Bhattacharjee, and F. Skiff (2006), Weakly collisional Landau damping  
603 and three-dimensional Bernstein-Greene-Kruskal modes: New results on old problems,  
604 *Physics of Plasmas*, *13*(5), 55,903, doi:10.1063/1.2186187.
- 605 Omura, Y., H. Matsumoto, T. Miyake, and H. Kojima (1996), Electron beam instabilities  
606 as generation mechanism of electrostatic solitary waves in the magnetotail, *Journal of*


- 607 *Geophysical Research*, 101(A2), 2685, doi:10.1029/95JA03145.
- 608 Oppenheim, M., D. L. Newman, and M. V. Goldman (1999), Evolution of Electron Phase-  
609 Space Holes in a 2D Magnetized Plasma, *Physical Review Letters*, 83(12), 2344–2347,  
610 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.2344.
- 611 Oppenheim, M. M., G. Vetoulis, D. L. Newman, and M. V. Goldman (2001), Evolution  
612 of electron phase-space holes in 3D, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 28(9), 1891–1894,  
613 doi:10.1029/2000GL012383.
- 614 Pickett, J. S., et al. (2008), Furthering our understanding of electrostatic solitary waves  
615 through Cluster multispacecraft observations and theory, *Advances in Space Research*,  
616 41(10), 1666–1676, doi:10.1016/j.asr.2007.05.064.
- 617 Schamel, H. (1979), Theory of Electron Holes, *Physica Scripta*, 20(3-4), 336–342, doi:  
618 10.1088/0031-8949/20/3-4/006.
- 619 Schamel, H. (1986), Electrostatic Phase Space Structures in Theory and Experiment,  
620 *Physics Reports*, 140(3), 161–191.
- 621 Singh, N., S. M. Loo, and B. E. Wells (2001), Electron hole structure and its stabil-  
622 ity depending on plasma magnetization, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 106(A10),  
623 21,183–21,198, doi:10.1029/2001JA900056.
- 624 Tong, Y., et al. (2018), Simultaneous Multispacecraft Probing of Electron Phase  
625 Space Holes, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 45(21), 11,513–11,519, doi:10.1029/  
626 2018GL079044.
- 627 Turikov, V. A. (1984), Electron Phase Space Holes as Localized BGK Solutions, *Physica*  
628 *Scripta*, 30(1), 73–77, doi:10.1088/0031-8949/30/1/015.




- 629 Vasko, I. Y., O. V. Agapitov, F. Mozer, A. V. Artemyev, and D. Jovanovic (2015), Mag-  
630 netic field depression within electron holes, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *42*(7), 2123–  
631 2129, doi:10.1002/2015GL063370.
- 632 Vasko, I. Y., O. V. Agapitov, F. S. Mozer, A. V. Artemyev, J. F. Drake, and I. V.  
633 Kuzichev (2017), Electron holes in the outer radiation belt: Characteristics and their  
634 role in electron energization, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, *122*(1),  
635 120–135, doi:10.1002/2016JA023083.
- 636 Wilson, L. B., C. A. Cattell, P. J. Kellogg, K. Goetz, K. Kersten, J. C. Kasper, A. Szabo,  
637 and M. Wilber (2010), Large-amplitude electrostatic waves observed at a supercrit-  
638 ical interplanetary shock, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, *115*(12),  
639 A12,104, doi:10.1029/2010JA015332.




**Figure 1.** Example of a trapped electron orbit in a model electron-hole potential  $\phi = \psi \exp([r_0 - r]/L_\perp) \text{sech}^4(z/4)$ , starting at  $x = r_0$ ,  $y = 0$ ,  $z = 0$ ,  $v_x = 1$ ,  $v_y = 0$ ,  $v_z = 1$ . Viewed (a) in the transverse  $x, y$  plane, and (b) in three-dimensions showing the bouncing parallel to the magnetic field ( $z$ ) direction. (Parameters:  $\psi = 1$ ,  $\Omega = 0.9$ ,  $r_0 = 10$ ,  $1/L_\perp = 0.05$ .)




**Figure 2.** Illustration of relatively narrow islands in energy when  $d\omega_n/dW_{\parallel}$  and  $E_n v_{\perp}$  can be taken as constant, for two different magnetic field strengths and hence different resonant parallel energies  $w_{\parallel R} = -W_{\parallel}/\psi$ . ( $E_r = 0.002$ ,  $\psi = 1$ ,  $n = 2$ .)




**Figure 3.** The energy dependence of bounce frequency  $\omega_b$  for trapped 1-D motion in a potential energy well  $-\psi \text{sech}^4(z/4)$ . Numerical integration gives the solid line, and several limits and approximations are shown.




**Figure 4.** Comparison between numerically integrated Fourier coefficients for a  $\text{sech}^4(z/4)$  potential variation (solid lines) and the interpolation eq. (18) (dashed lines), for different harmonic number (line labels).




**Figure 5.** Example energy trajectories for different magnetic field strengths, all for the lowest harmonic  $n = 2$ .




**Figure 6.** (a) Example analytic energy trajectories for different harmonics ( $n$ ), and fixed magnetic field strength. (b) Poincaré plot of the corresponding numerically integrated orbit.



**Figure 7.** (a) Analytic energy trajectories for different harmonics ( $n$ ), and fixed magnetic field strength and (b) Poincaré plot of the corresponding numerically integrated orbit, for a stronger transverse electric field.




**Figure 8.** (a) Analytic energy trajectories for different harmonics ( $n$ ), and fixed magnetic field strength and (b) Poincaré plot of the corresponding numerically integrated orbit, for an extremely strong transverse electric field.




**Figure 9.** (a),(c) Analytic energy trajectories fixed magnetic field strength and (b),(d) Poincaré plots of the corresponding numerically integrated orbits, for a lower magnetic field, and two perturbation amplitudes.






**Figure 10.** Analytic energy trajectories (a,c), and corresponding Poincaré plots (b,d), for  $\Omega/\sqrt{\psi} = 1/8$ , and  $E_r/\psi = 0.04$  (a,b) or 0.2 (c,d).



**Figure 11.** (a) Contours of the energy boundary  $W_{\parallel t}$  between trapped and detrapped orbits as a function of perturbation strength  $E_{r0}v_{\perp}/\psi^{3/2}$  and magnetic field  $\Omega/\sqrt{\psi}$ . (b) The energy boundary  $W_{\parallel t}$  between trapped and detrapped orbits from eq. (25) compared with the lowest detrapped orbits found from numerical orbit integration.



**Figure 12.** The boundary in velocity-space measured at  $z = 0$  between trapped and untrapped orbits at different  $\psi$ -values: (a) for low magnetic field  $\Omega = 0.5$ , (b) for higher  $\Omega = 1.2$ .