

UKAEA-CCFE-PR(21)44

A J T Holmes R McAdams

Space charge compensation of positive ion beams used in magnetic fusion applications

Enquiries about copyright and reproduction should in the first instance be addressed to the UKAEA Publications Officer, Culham Science Centre, Building K1/O/83 Abingdon, Oxfordshire, OX14 3DB, UK. The United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority is the copyright holder.

The contents of this document and all other UKAEA Preprints, Reports and Conference Papers are available to view online free at scientific-publications.ukaea.uk/

Space charge compensation of positive ion beams used in magnetic fusion applications

A J T Holmes R McAdams

Space charge compensation of positive ion beams used in magnetic fusion applications

A J. T. Holmes¹ and R McAdams^{2*}

¹Marcham Scientific, Hungerford, Berkshire RG17 0LH, UK

²United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, Culham Centre for Fusion Energy, Culham Science Centre, Abingdon, Oxon. OX14 3DB, UK


e-mail address: roy.mcadams@ukaea.uk

A model is presented for space charge neutralisation of positive ion beams. The model is used for the particular case of the beams used for magnetic based fusion applications. The beams consist, after a gas neutraliser, of ions and atoms at different energies. Account is taken of the contribution of all beam components to ionization of the background gas. Consideration is also given to not only beam heating of the plasma generated by the beam, due to Coulomb collisions, but also to Coulomb heating by fast electrons produced in ionization by all beam particles and stripping of the neutral components. Two approximations are considered for the motion of the secondary ions out of the beam potential; a drift approximation and a freefall approximation. All the beam plasma parameters can be calculated. The model is applied to a typical extracted beam of deuterium ions of 120kV,60A. It is found that these beams are very highly compensated and that beam plasma heating by the electrons produced is generally greater than that due to the beam ions.

I. INTRODUCTION

A charged particle beam is subject to two internal forces arising from interactions between the particles. Firstly there is a repulsive force due to the Coulombic interaction between the like charges in the beam. Secondly there is an attractive force due to the magnetic fields arising from the moving charges. For a non-relativistic beam the ratio of the magnitudes of the magnetic to electric forces is β^2 [1] where $\beta = v_b/c$ and v_b is the beam velocity and c is the velocity of light. For applications such as producing neutral beams of atoms and molecules for controlled magnetic fusion on devices such as the Joint European Torus (JET) indicative precursor beams of 60A, 120kV D^+ are used [2]. Such a beam is non-relativistic and the magnetic force can be ignored. The potential across the beam from the centre to the beam edge for a uniform distribution of ions is $I/4\pi\epsilon_0v_b$ where I is the beam current and ϵ_0 is the permittivity of free space. For such a beam this potential is ~ 158 kV and if this repulsion is unmitigated the beam cannot travel any significant distance. Space charge effects could thus affect the transmission of the beam into the fusion device and the trajectories of residual ions removed from the beam in order to produce a neutral beam for injection into the fusion device.

The mitigation of the repulsive space charge force is known as space charge compensation or neutralisation. The beam passes through a background gas and forms a plasma consisting of the beam ions, secondary slow ions and electrons causing by collisions with the gas. Ionisation and charge exchange give rise to the slow ions and electrons e.g. for a D^+ beam for example



The ejected electrons may also ionize the background gas. The slow ions are expelled from the beam due to the positive potential. The electrons remain in the beam unless they have sufficient energy to escape. The overall beam potential is thus reduced and the beam can then move with much reduced divergence compared to the uncompensated beam case.

Space charge compensation has been studied extensively by Gabovich and Soloschenko and co-workers; see the reviews [3,4] for example. Soloschenko [4] developed an expression for the compensated potential of the beam. The approach was to balance the energy required for the electrons to leave the beam with that derived from heating by the beam itself. The resulting expression for the compensated beam potential involved two terms. One term is dominant at low pressure and does not involve the motion of the secondary ions whereas the second term is dominant at higher pressures and involves an average velocity for the secondary ions and also depends on the size of the beam. Winklehner et al. [5] measured the beam potential for Ar^{8+} and O^{6+} beams and found good agreement with this model if an ion temperature was chosen close to the value of the beam potential. This model does not allow for the electron temperature or the plasma densities to be determined.

Holmes [6] was able to close the equations fully to determine the potential, plasma densities and temperature using continuity equations for the ions and electrons and the overall energy balance. Solving the continuity equation fully

* Author to whom correspondence should be addressed

to give the radial density of ions taking into account the creation of ions at different radial positions and assuming the ions were in freefall in the potential from where they were created to the beam edge led to parabolic dependence of the potential on radius at small radii. Given the freefall nature of the movement of the ions this model is essentially only applicable at low pressures or to small beams.

In this paper a model of space charge compensation in beams such as those used for magnetic fusion applications is presented. A basic model is developed and applied under two approximations. In the freefall approximation the secondary ions move out of the beam solely under the potential between where they are created and the edge of the beam. Such a model is applicable to small beams or low pressures in the beam path. In the drift approximation the secondary ions move with a velocity determined by their collisions with the background gas and thus is more applicable to large beams and high beamline pressures where the mean free path is smaller than the beam dimension. The equations are solved not only to give the beam potential but also the plasma electron temperature and densities.

In all of the work described so far [3,4,6] it is assumed that the heating of the plasma electrons arises due to Coulomb collisions between these electrons and the beam ions. In this paper it is argued that the source of the heating is not from the beam ions alone but from the energy of the electrons ejected in forming the secondary ions. Their role in producing secondary electrons is also taken into account since it will be shown that their energy is sufficiently high.

In Section II, the properties of the beams used in magnetic fusion applications are described briefly. In Section III the basic space charge neutralisation model is developed and then used in Section IV in the freefall and drift approximations. The method for solving the resultant equations is also outlined. The results from applying the model to a 120kV, 60A deuterium beam typical of that used on JET are discussed in Section V and some conclusions are drawn in Section VI.

II. ION BEAMS FOR MAGNETIC FUSION APPLICATIONS

Beams of fast atoms and molecules are used in magnetic fusion devices for heating the plasma, diagnostics and current drive. They must be neutral to avoid interaction with the magnetic field of the fusion machine used to confine the plasma. These beams are derived by extraction of an ion beam from a source, passing this beam through a gas cell or neutraliser to produce neutral components. The neutralisation is not 100% efficient and residual ions are swept out of the composite beam of ions and neutrals by a

magnetic field. The neutral beam is then injected into the fusion device.

The JET machine uses positive ion beams of primarily deuterium but also tritium and hydrogen [2]. Taking the deuterium beam as an example, D^+ , D_2^+ and D_3^+ ions are extracted from a magnetic multipole source. At high power the total extracted current is $\sim 60A$ and this is accelerated in a triode accelerator to 120kV. The flux fractions of the D^+ , D_2^+ and D_3^+ ions, $f_1:f_2:f_3$ are $\sim 0.72:0.22:0.06$. The neutraliser contains the same gas species as the ion source. The efficiency of the gas neutraliser for these beam parameters at the operating filling pressure is measured as $\sim 42\%$. Taking into account transmission and other losses the injected neutral beam power from the injector is just over 2MW. JET has sixteen such injectors giving a total injected power capability of over 32MW.

After exiting the neutraliser the composite beam has fourteen components arising from the interaction of the three extracted species with the gas in the neutraliser. The nine ion components are $D^+(E_b)$, $D^-(E_b)$, $D_2^+(E_b)$, $D^+(E_b/2)$, $D^-(E_b/2)$, $D_3^+(E_b)$, $D_2^+(2E_b/3)$, $D^+(E_b/3)$, and $D^-(E_b/3)$. The five neutral components are $D(E_b)$, $D_2(E_b)$, $D(E_b/2)$, $D_2(2E_b/3)$, and $D(E_b/3)$. This paper does not deal with the space charge effects within the neutraliser as the fractions of the components are changing as the beam travels through the gas; the space charge compensation of the composite beam after the neutraliser will be modelled. Both the ionic and neutral components can contribute to the processes giving rise to space charge neutralisation e.g. all components can ionize the background gas creating secondary ions and electrons and the neutrals can be stripped to create further electrons. This is a lot to deal with.

The situation can be simplified because for an infinitely thick neutraliser target, the only remaining ion components are $D^+(E_b)$, $D^+(E_b/2)$, and $D^+(E_b/3)$ and the remaining neutral components are $D(E_b)$, $D(E_b/2)$, and $D(E_b/3)$ as these fractions have reached an equilibrium value. The kinetic energy of the component is shown in the brackets. These are the eventual products of the initial D^+ , D_2^+ and D_3^+ ions. In the case of the JET injector operating parameters the 42% neutralisation corresponds to a target thickness of $\sim 5.5 \times 10^{19} \text{ m}^{-2}$. At this target thickness the three ionic components above comprise $\sim 95\%$ of the residual ion beam power and the neutral components are also $\sim 95\%$ of the neutral beam power. Hence it is a reasonable approximation to assume the beam is only made up of those six components.

The equilibrium fractions for the three neutral components $D(E_b)$, $D(E_b/2)$, and $D(E_b/3)$ are $F(E_b)$, $F(E_b/2)$, and $F(E_b/3)$ such that the equilibrium neutral fractions of the extracted power are $f_1 * F(E_b)$, $f_2 * F(E_b/2)$, $f_3 * F(E_b/3)$ respectively. The equilibrium fraction F only depends on various cross-sections for the processes in the neutraliser and values are

found in various databases. Similarly, the fractions of the extracted power in the residual ions are $f_1*(1-F(E_b))$, $f_2*(1-F(E_b/2))$, $f_3*(1-F(E_b/3))$ respectively. A more concise notation for $F(E_b)$, $F(E_b/2)$, and $F(E_b/3)$ of F_1 , F_2 and F_3 respectively will be used in the remainder of this paper.

The general model will apply to the region between the exit of the neutraliser and the bend magnet. Space charge effects in this region and indeed in the neutraliser could affect the beam divergence and hence the transmission into the machine. However, the model is general enough to consider the ion components alone beyond the magnet.

III. THE BASIC SPACE CHARGE COMPENSATION MODEL

1. Processes, cross-sections and rates

The basic process of space charge compensation involves the production of slow ions and electrons by the beam components. The electrons are trapped in the beam potential and reduce its magnitude and the slow ions are expelled from the beam due to the resulting potential.

The slow ions are produced in a number of ways. The ion beam will ionize the background gas. Charge exchange between the ion beam and the background gas will also produce slow ions. The cross-sections for these processes are σ_i and σ_{cx} respectively. Since the beam under consideration also contains neutral components these can also ionize the background gas with an associated cross-section σ_{oi} .

Electrons to be used in the compensation of the beam potential are produced initially in the ionization of the background gas by the beam ions. Rudd [7] has measured both the energy and angular distribution of electrons produced in ion collisions with gases. For the case of H^+ collisions with H_2 the average energy of the ejected electrons integrated over all angles is plotted in Figure 1 against the proton energy.

This average energy, E_r , is fitted by the equation

$$E_r = 0.084 \left(\frac{E_b}{K} \right)^{0.4861} \quad (1)$$

where E_b is the beam acceleration energy in eV and K is the ion mass number. The mass dependence has been added to allow scaling to other species. Rudd also found that the differential cross-section with respect to energy i.e. the cross-section for ejection of electrons with a given energy versus the energy of the ejected electrons was almost exponential. Thus the ejected electrons have a wide distribution of energies that is exponential in form.




FIG. 1. The average energy of ejected electrons in $H^+ + H_2$ collisions.

Electrons will also be produced in the ionization of the background gas by the neutral components of the beam. It is assumed here that the average energy and the energy distribution are the same as those produced in ionization by the ion beam components.

Electrons are also produced in stripping or re-ionisation of the neutral components on the background gas with a cross-section σ_{0s} . In this case the electrons are initially mono-energetic with a velocity equal to the beam component velocity and their energy, E_s , is then

$$E_s = \frac{m_e E}{K m_p} \quad (2)$$

where m_e and m_p are the electron and proton masses respectively. E is the beam component energy. It is argued in the appendix that these electrons from the various processes form thermal distributions. These will have a characteristic temperature $T = 2E/3$. These electrons have high enough energies to contribute to the ionization of the background gas with rate $\langle \sigma v \rangle_{ie}$.

The cross-sections and rate used are empirical fits to those from the IAEA Aladdin database [8] except for the cross-section for ionization of the gas by the beam ions. Rudd [7] has measured cross-sections for this process and these have been used to be consistent with the use of the average ejected electron energies. It is worth noting though that Rudd's cross-sections are significantly higher than the database values by ~50% in the proton energy range 20-100keV. The electron ionization rate for deuterium is assumed to be the same as for hydrogen. The equilibrium fractions have been taken from the ORNL red book [9]. All cross-sections for hydrogen collisions have been scaled using a constant velocity to other isotopes such as deuterium. So

$$v_b = (2eE_b/M_b)^{0.5} = (2eE_b/Km_p)^{0.5} \\ = (2eE_{bH}/m_p)^{0.5}$$

where M_b is the beam ion mass and $E_{bH} = E_b/K$ is the equivalent proton energy.

In the following analysis it is assumed that the beam profile is parabolic for both ions and neutrals. As the ultimate intention is to examine the beam optics in the presence of a beam plasma and its associated potentials, it is useful to have a definition of the beam radius. The distribution of beam ion density is characterized by a single radial parameter, the beam radius, A , which is defined by the outer limit where the density is zero. Other profiles could be considered, for example a Gaussian profile but that implies that the beam still has a significant density at a multiple of the beam radius with consequent beam scraping and more complex mathematical expressions. In a subsequent paper, the dependence of the beam radius, A with the space charge electric field will be explored. The notation is used that n_{bx} or n_{0x} is the ion beam or neutral density of energy component x , with x being 1,2 or 3 representing the full, half or third energy component respectively. In a similar way the axial densities are designated n_{b0x} or n_{00x} . For the case of the ion beam components then the profile is

$$n_{bx}(r) = n_{b0x}(1 - r^2/A^2) \quad (3)$$

where r is the radial dimension and A is the beam half width.

Using the fractions of the extracted ion components and the equilibrium fractions of the neutral beam, the axial ion densities can be found from

$$\frac{If_1(1 - F_1)}{e} = 2\pi \int_0^A n_{b1}(r)v_{b1}rdr \\ = \frac{\pi A^2}{2} n_{b01}v_b \quad (4)$$

where I is the extracted current, f_1 is the extracted fraction of full energy ions and $(1-F_1)$ is the equilibrium fraction of full energy ions after the neutraliser, v_{b1} is the velocity of the full energy ion component which is just designated v_b . Thus the axial ion densities are for the three components are

$$n_{b01} = \frac{2If_1(1 - F_1)}{\pi e A^2 v_b} \\ n_{b02} = \frac{2^{1.5} \times 2If_2(1 - F_2)}{\pi e A^2 v_b} \quad (5)$$

$$n_{b03} = \frac{3^{1.5} \times 2If_3(1 - F_3)}{\pi e A^2 v_b}$$

In equations (5) the factor 2 comes from the profile definition. The factors $2^{1.5}$ and $3^{1.5}$ appearing arise from two causes. For instance, for the half energy component there is a factor $2^{0.5}$ from the relation between v_{b2} and v_b and a factor 2 because the D_2^+ (E_b) will end up as two D^+ ($E_b/2$). The total axial beam density is then

$$n_{b0} = n_{b01} + n_{b02} + n_{b03} \quad (6)$$

Similarly, density equations can be written for the neutral components e.g. the full energy component density is

$$n_{01} = \frac{2If_1F_1}{\pi e A^2 v_b}$$

and the total axial neutral density is

$$n_{00} = n_{001} + n_{002} + n_{003} \quad (7)$$

The total production rate, Q_{bi} (m^3s^{-1}) on axis of slow ions and fast ejected ("Rudd") electrons by the ion beam components can then be written down as

$$Q_{bi} = Nv_b \left(n_{b01}\sigma_i(E_b) + \frac{n_{b02}\sigma_i(E_b/2)}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{n_{b03}\sigma_i(E_b/3)}{\sqrt{3}} \right)$$

where N is the gas density. Eliminating the individual ion densities gives

$$Q_{bi} = \frac{2IN}{\pi e A^2} (f_1(1 - F_1)\sigma_i(E_b) \\ + 2f_2(1 - F_2)\sigma_i(E_b/2) \\ + 3f_3(1 - F_3)\sigma_i(E_b/3)) \quad (8)$$

An equivalent equation for the production rate of ions and fast Rudd electrons by the neutral species, Q_{oi} , can then also be derived

$$Q_{oi} = \frac{2IN}{\pi e A^2} (f_1F_1\sigma_{oi}(E_b) + 2f_2F_2\sigma_{oi}(E_b/2) \\ + 3f_3F_3\sigma_{oi}(E_b/3)) \quad (9)$$

The neutral components can also be re-ionised or stripped on the background gas to produce a fast beam ion and an

electron with energy given by equation (2). The rate, Q_{0s} , for this process is then

$$Q_{0s} = \frac{2IN}{\pi e A^2} (f_1 F_1 \sigma_{0s}(E_b) + 2f_2 F_2 \sigma_{0s}(E_b/2) + 3f_3 F_3 \sigma_{0s}(E_b/3)) \quad (10)$$

By similar arguments the production rate of slow ions by charge exchange, Q_{cx} , is

$$Q_{cx} = \frac{2IN}{\pi e A^2} (f_1(1 - F_1)\sigma_{cx}(E_b) + 2f_2(1 - F_2)\sigma_{cx}(E_b/2) + 3f_3(1 - F_3)\sigma_{cx}(E_b/3)) \quad (11)$$

Taking n_{r0} to be the axial density of Rudd electrons from ionization by the ion and neutral components and stripped electrons the axial production rate of slow ions and also the production rate of slow electrons by these electrons is then

$$Q_e = N n_{r0} \langle \sigma v \rangle_{ie} \quad (12)$$

$$T_r = \frac{\left[\sum_{x=1}^{x=3} T_{rx} f_x x (1 - F_x) \sigma_{bi} \left(\frac{E_b}{x} \right) + \sum_{x=1}^{x=3} T_{rx} f_x x F_x \sigma_{oi} \left(\frac{E_b}{x} \right) + \sum_{x=1}^{x=3} T_{sx} f_x x F_x \sigma_{0s} \left(\frac{E_b}{x} \right) \right]}{\left[\sum_{x=1}^{x=3} f_x x (1 - F_x) \sigma_{bi} \left(\frac{E_b}{x} \right) + \sum_{x=1}^{x=3} f_x x F_x \sigma_{oi} \left(\frac{E_b}{x} \right) + \sum_{x=1}^{x=3} f_x x F_x \sigma_{0s} \left(\frac{E_b}{x} \right) \right]} \quad (15)$$

Substitution of values shows that T_r is close to the temperature of most of the individual Rudd/stripped temperatures but smaller than that for the full energy stripped electrons. This average temperature can be used in the evaluation of the slow electron and slow ion production in equations (12) and (13).

In the following sections ion beam heating of the plasma through Coulomb interactions will be discussed. It is convenient now to define the parameter, S_b given by

$$S_b = K^{1/2} \sum_{x=1}^3 \frac{n_{b0x}}{(E_b/x)^{0.5}} \quad (16)$$

2. Electron confinement

The potential established within the beam takes the form

$$\phi(r) = -V_0(1 - \exp(-\alpha r^2)) \quad (17)$$

Hence the total production rate of slow ions, Q_i , is the sum of the process rates above

$$Q_i = Q_{bi} + Q_{oi} + Q_{cx} + Q_e \quad (13)$$

The total fast electron production rate, Q_r , is then

$$Q_r = Q_{bi} + Q_{0s} \quad (14)$$

As can be seen there are fewer plasma electrons formed than slow positive ions. The Rudd/stripped electrons escape easily from the beam plasma and always are treated separately. Due to the energies of the ion and neutral beam components there are three temperatures of the Rudd electrons from ionization by both ions and neutrals, T_{rx} with $x = 1, 2, 3$ referring to the full, half and third energy ions and neutrals. In addition, there are three temperatures of stripped electrons T_{sx} . It is convenient to use a single weighted average value to replace these six values. This is justified on the basis of Coulomb friction between these electrons leading to a single temperature. The weighting is the relative electron production cross-sections. This weighted average value of the fast electron temperature can be written as

At low values of r near the beam axis, this gives $\phi = -\alpha V_0 r^2$ which the required form as proved by Holmes [6]. The convention chosen is that V_0 and α are positive numbers such that the potential on the beam axis is zero and $-V_0$ at the outer wall.

The fast electrons with temperature T_r are confined within this potential. Their production rate within a volumetric element of length L and radius equal to the beam radius, A , must equal their loss through the surface of the element due to their thermal flux. Thus

$$L \int_0^A Q_r \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{A^2} \right) 2\pi r dr = \frac{n_{r0} v_r}{4} 2\pi A L \exp(\phi/T_r)$$

where n_{r0} and v_r are the axial density and the velocity of the fast or Rudd electrons. These electrons are deemed to escape when they reach the outer wall at potential $-V_0$ and so

$$n_{r0} = \frac{A Q_r}{v_r} \exp(V_0/T_r) \quad (18)$$

This density scales as $(NI/A) \exp(V_0/T_e)$. The confinement of the thermal plasma electrons can be dealt with in an entirely analogous way leading to an equation for their axial density, n_{e0} , with temperature T_e and velocity v_e ,

$$n_{e0} = \frac{AQ_e}{v_e} \exp(V_0/T_e) \quad (19)$$

It is assumed that the fast electrons have the same spatial distribution as the beam ions.

3. The energy balance

The plasma electrons have been considered, in earlier work [3,4] to have been heated only by the beam ions

$$v_{be} = n_{e0} \lambda \left(\frac{2K^{1/2} 1.7 \times 10^{-10}}{E_b^{3/2}} - \frac{1.8 \times 10^{-13}}{K^{1/2} E_b^{3/2}} - \frac{K^{1/2} T_e 1.7 \times 10^{-10}}{E_b^{5/2}} \right) \quad (21)$$

where K is the mass number of the beam ions and λ is the Coulomb logarithm and this has a value of approximately 7. Note that [10] uses cgs units but equation (21) has been converted to SI units. Inspection of the terms in equation (21) shows that the second term is much smaller than the first. The third term is also much smaller than the first if T_e is much less than the beam energy which is indeed the case. Thus

$$v_{be} = n_{e0} \lambda \left(\frac{2K^{1/2} 1.7 \times 10^{-10}}{E_b^{3/2}} \right) \quad (22)$$

The actual energy transferred by a beam ion, E_i , is

$$E_i = 3.4 \times 10^{-10} \frac{K^{1/2} n_{e0} \lambda}{E_b^{3/2}} e E_b \tau_b \quad (23)$$

where τ_b is the transit time of a beam ion through a volume of plasma. This is simply L/v_b with L being the length of the plasma volume and v_b the beam velocity. Hence rationalizing for each species x gives

$$E_{ix} = 3.4 \times 10^{-10} \frac{K^{1/2} x^{1/2} n_{e0} \lambda e L}{E_b^{1/2} v_{bx}} \quad (24)$$

In the case of heating of the plasma electrons by the fast Rudd and stripped electrons, the appropriate NRL

through Coulomb interactions as discussed earlier. In this section, heating by the fast Rudd and stripped electrons is also taken into account. The heating of the plasma electrons by the ion beam will be considered firstly for the case of the full energy beam. The total energy transfer rate from ions to the electrons, v_{be} , is given by [10]

$$v_{be} = 2v_s - v_{//} - v_{\perp} \quad (20)$$

where v_s , $v_{//}$ and v_{\perp} are the rates for slowing, parallel and perpendicular energy transfer respectively. Using explicit expressions for these rates gives

equations [10] are used again. The slowing frequency, v_s , is equal to the perpendicular frequency, v_{\perp} , and the parallel frequency, $v_{//}$, is lower than these by a factor $\sim 2T_e/T_e$. Hence the energy transfer rate (in SI units) from the fast electrons to the plasma electrons is

$$v_{re} = 7.7 \times 10^{-12} \frac{n_{e0} \lambda}{T_r^{3/2}} \quad (25)$$

Thus, the total energy input, E_{re} , to the thermal electron distribution per fast electron (in joules) during its confinement time, τ_r , is

$$E_{re} = 7.7 \times 10^{-12} \frac{n_{e0} \lambda}{T_r^{3/2}} e T_r \tau_r \quad (26)$$

The next stage is to calculate how many new beam ions or Rudd/stripped electrons appear in the beam volume $\pi A^2 L/2$ per second. For the latter it is Q_r and for the former it is

$$\frac{\pi A^2 L}{2} \sum_{x=1}^3 n_{b0x} v_{bx}$$

The thermal electrons leave the plasma with their energy eT_e and assuming they are also bound by the potential V_0 the energy balance is then

$$3.4 \times 10^{-10} \frac{n_{e0} \lambda K^{\frac{1}{2}}}{E_b^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{x=1}^3 x^{\frac{1}{2}} n_{b0x} \frac{eL\pi A^2}{2} + 7.7 \times 10^{-12} \frac{n_{e0} \lambda}{T_r^{\frac{3}{2}}} e T_r \tau_r \frac{Q_r \pi A^2 L}{2}$$

$$= \frac{n_{e0} v_e e T_e}{4} 2\pi A L \exp(-V_0/T_e)$$

or

$$3.4 \times 10^{-10} \lambda A K^{1/2} \sum_{x=1}^3 \frac{x^{1/2} n_{b0x}}{E_b^{1/2}} + 7.7 \times 10^{-12} \frac{\lambda}{T_r^{3/2}} T_r \tau_r Q_r A = v_e T_e \exp(-V_0/T_e)$$

Each fast electron, once created transfers an energy E_r to the thermal population so the total energy transfer depends on the total rate of ionization. The volumetric production

rate is equal to the density of fast electrons divided by the confinement time i.e. $Q_r = n_{r0}/\tau_r$ giving

$$\lambda A \left(3.4 \times 10^{-10} K^{1/2} \sum_{x=1}^3 \frac{x^{1/2} n_{b0x}}{E_b^{1/2}} + 7.7 \times 10^{-12} \frac{n_{r0}}{T_r^{1/2}} \right) = v_e T_e \exp(-V_0/T_e)$$

or

$$\lambda A \left(3.4 \times 10^{-10} S_b + 7.7 \times 10^{-12} \frac{n_{r0}}{T_r^{1/2}} \right) = v_e T_e \exp(-V_0/T_e) \quad (27)$$

where the parameter S_b has been used from equation (16). This gives the energy balance in the plasma where Coulombic heating of the plasma electrons by the beam and fast electrons is balanced by the energy lost as they escape from the potential.

IV. THE DRIFT AND FREEFALL APPROXIMATIONS

Consideration is now given to the two approximations of how the secondary slow ions move out of the beam under the influence of the beam potential; namely the drift and freefall approximations. These two methods of deriving the ion velocity exist in all plasma modelling with the former applying when the plasma dimension is larger than the ion-neutral mean free path. For example, in plasma sheaths, whose width is a few Debye lengths, the ion motion is free fall whereas in the main body of the plasma the motion is normally collisional drift and so both exist at the same time. As the beam can operate at low and high pressures any model must encompass both modes of plasma ion motion. In the drift approximation the ions are collisional and freefall only exists in the presheath at the beam edge. In the freefall approximation the ions move solely under the influence of the potential between the point where they are created and that towards the edge of the beam. They are in

freefall throughout the entire beam. In the presheath for the drift situation, whose width is roughly the Debye length, it is somewhat similar as the plasma ions are considered collisionless and hence move by free-fall. In the free fall case, there is no presheath and the freefall region extends from the beam centre to the outer edge. The applicability of these approximations is discussed later.

1. The drift approximation

From Kaye and Laby [11] the drift velocity, v_i , of hydrogen ions in their parent gas under the influence of an electric field of 1 V/m is $1.13 \times 10^{-4} \text{ ms}^{-1}$ for a gas density of $N = 2.68 \times 10^{25} \text{ m}^{-3}$ at 273K. This drift velocity is related to the general mobility k_i by

$$v_i = \frac{k_i E}{N}$$

This gives a value for k_i of $3.03 \times 10^{22} \text{ m}^5 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ V}^{-1}$. For deuterium a factor of $1/\sqrt{2}$ has to be applied. The electric field can be found from the potential ϕ in equation (17) to give

$$v_i = \frac{k_i E}{N} = \frac{k_i}{N} 2V_0 \alpha r \exp(-\alpha r^2) \quad (28)$$

Then in any annular ring at radius r the local ion density is given by

$$2\pi r n_i v_i = Q_i \pi r^2 \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{2A^2}\right)$$

where Q_i is the total slow ion production rate given in equation (13). Hence the ion density, n_i , is

$$n_i = \frac{Q_i \frac{rN}{2} \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{2A^2}\right)}{k_i 2r \alpha V_0 \exp(-\alpha r^2)}$$

At low values of r the axial slow ion density, n_{i0} , is then

$$n_{i0} = \frac{QN}{4k_i \alpha V_0} \quad (29)$$

At this stage plasma neutrality is invoked

$$n_{i0} = n_{e0} + n_{r0} - n_{b0} \quad (30)$$

If V_0 and T_e are known, the two electron and the beam densities can be determined and this gives a method of determining the product αV_0

$$[\alpha V_0]_a = \frac{QN}{4k_i n_{i0}} \quad (31)$$

The subscript ‘‘a’’ refers to the first method of determining this product.

A balance for the slow ions can also be established for the whole beam where the ion production is balanced by the ions leaving the beam at the ionic sound speed, c_s . This gives

$$L \int_0^A Q_i 2\pi r dr = L Q_i \frac{\pi A^2}{2} = n_{i0} 2\pi A L c_s$$

where the ionic sound speed (or Bohm velocity) is

$$c_s = 0.6 \left(\frac{eT_e}{M_i}\right)^{0.5}$$

with M_i being the plasma ion mass. The factor of 0.6 accounts for the density drop across the presheath.

Substituting for n_{i0} gives the second method (‘‘b’’) of determining the product αV_0 .

$$[\alpha V_0]_b = \frac{0.6N}{k_i A} \left(\frac{eT_e}{M_i}\right)^{0.5} \quad (32)$$

In order to solve the drift equations an initial value of V_0 is provided which allows the fast electron density n_{r0} to be calculated. Using equation (27) a value of the plasma electron temperature, T_e , can be determined. This equation is transcendental but can be solved by iterative methods such as Newton-Raphson. With knowledge of T_r , T_e and n_{r0} and n_{e0} can be calculated using equation (19) leading to values of $[\alpha V_0]_a$ and $[\alpha V_0]_b$ from equations (31) and (32). These values will not generally be equal for an arbitrary guess for V_0 and the difference between them can be used to update the value of V_0 . This process is repeated until a satisfactory convergence criterion has been satisfied. Note that V_0 is being iterated to give closely equal values of $[\alpha V_0]_a$ and $[\alpha V_0]_b$ and these have the same dependence on the ion mobility k_i , V_0 is independent of k_i but not α .

2. The freefall approximation

In this approximation the ions move under the influence of the potential from where they are created until they escape the beam. Thus, the slow ion balance is

$$2\pi r n_i(r) = Q_i \int_0^r \frac{2\pi a da}{\left(\frac{2e}{M_i}\right)^{0.5} (\phi(a) - \phi(r))^{0.5}} \quad (33)$$

The potential (16) can be expanded as

$$\phi(r) = -V_0 \alpha r^2 + \frac{V_0 \alpha^2 r^4}{2}$$

The integral is only finite if the first term is quadratic [6] which gives

$$n_i(r) = \frac{Q}{r \left(\frac{2e}{M_i}\right)^{0.5}} \int_0^r \frac{ada}{(V_0 \alpha r^2 - V_0 \alpha a^2)^{0.5}}$$

Or limiting this expression to the axial value this becomes

$$n_{i0} = \frac{Q_i}{\left(\frac{2e \alpha V_0}{M_i}\right)^{0.5}} \quad (34)$$

Using plasma neutrality as in the drift case, n_{i0} can be calculated and then equation (34) allows a value of αV_0 to be determined. In this case V_0 and α cannot be separated.

Again, applying the ion balance equation

$$2\pi ALn_{i0}v_i = 2\pi L \int_0^A Q_i \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{A^2}\right) r dr \quad (35)$$

where v_i is now not the ion sound speed but the average velocity acquired by the ions and is defined as

$$v_i = \left(\frac{2e\langle U_i \rangle}{M_i}\right)^{0.5} \quad (36)$$

with $\langle U_i \rangle$ being the average energy gained by the ions whilst in the beam. This energy is $V_0 + \phi(r)$ and so the average value $\langle U_i \rangle^{0.5}$ is

$$\langle U_i \rangle^{0.5} = \frac{\int_0^A 2\pi r Q_i \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{A^2}\right) (V_0 + \phi(r))^{0.5} dr}{\int_0^A 2\pi r Q_i \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{A^2}\right) dr}$$

Or on using the potential from equation (17) this becomes

$$\langle U_i \rangle^{0.5} = \frac{2V_0^{0.5} \int_0^A \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{A^2}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha r^2}{2}\right) r dr}{2 \int_0^A r \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{A^2}\right) dr}$$

This is integrated to give

$$\langle U_i \rangle^{0.5} = \frac{V_0^{0.5} \left[2 \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha A^2}{2}\right) + \alpha A^2 - 2 \right]}{\frac{\alpha^2 A^4}{4}}$$

Setting $W = \alpha A^2/2$ this is

$$\langle U_i \rangle^{0.5} = \frac{2V_0^{0.5}}{W^2} \times [\exp(-W) + W - 1] \quad (37)$$

Substituting for n_{i0} , v_i , and $\langle U_i \rangle$ from equations (34), (35) and (37) into the slow ion balance equation (34) then leads to

$$\frac{(2W)^{0.5} W^2}{8} = [\exp(-W) + W - 1] \quad (38)$$

This has the unique solution

$$W = \frac{\alpha A^2}{2} = 2.27144 \quad (39)$$

or

$$\alpha = \frac{4.54288}{A^2} \quad (40)$$

This determines α for any value of beam radius and is independent of gas density unlike the drift model. Since α is known V_0 can be determined from the product αV_0 found from equation (34).

The solution to the freefall equations initially follows that for the drift equations. From an initial value of V_0 the fast electron density n_{r0} can be calculated. Using equation (27) a value of the plasma electron temperature, T_e , can be determined. This then allows n_{e0} can be calculated using equation (19). From plasma neutrality, the slow ion density n_{i0} is then calculated and since α is known from the chosen beam radius through equation (40) a new value of V_0 is determined from equation (34). From the initial guess of V_0 and its updated value a new estimate is made and the procedure is repeated until the value of V_0 has converged to a suitable degree.

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. General results

In order to illustrate the power of the model it has been applied to the nominal 120kV, 60A beam referred to earlier. For this beam the flux fractions of the D^+ , D_2^+ and D_3^+ ions, $f_1:f_2:f_3$ are $\sim 0.72:0.22:0.06$. In Figure 2 the potential, V_0 , and plasma electron temperature, T_e , are plotted against the background gas pressure for a beam of nominal radius $A = 0.1$ m.




FIG. 2. (Colour online) The potential V_0 and the plasma electron temperature T_e for a nominal 120kV, 60A deuterium beam with radius $A=0.1$ m as a function of the

background gas pressure in both the drift and freefall approximations.

At low pressures the models both show potentials and plasma temperatures which are close to each other of approximately 90eV and 12eV respectively. As the pressure increases the potential and electron temperature fall. The predictions of the two models separate with the drift model giving a higher potential and plasma temperature than the freefall model. At the highest pressure shown of $3 \times 10^{20} \text{m}^{-3}$ the potential is $\sim 40 \text{eV}$ for the drift model and approximately half that for the freefall model.

The axial densities of the plasma electrons (n_{e0}/n_{b0}), slow positive ions (n_{i0}/n_{b0}) and the fast electrons (n_{r0}/n_{b0}) relative to the beam ion density (n_{b0}) are shown in Figure 3 for the two approximations.




FIG. 3. (Colour online) The axial densities of the plasma electrons (n_{e0}/n_{b0}), slow positive ions (n_{i0}/n_{b0}) and the fast electrons (n_{r0}/n_{b0}) relative to the beam ion density (n_{b0}) for the nominal 120kV, 60A beam with radius $A=0.1\text{m}$.

The plasma electron and ion densities rise with increasing background gas pressure. In the freefall approximation the ion density is lower than the plasma electron density at lower gas densities although they become equal at the higher gas densities. In the drift approximation the plasma electron and ion densities are almost equal at all gas densities. The fast electron density in the drift model increases slowly as the pressure increases since there is relatively little production of these electrons before their density increases more rapidly as the pressure increases. The density of these electrons is a balance between their production rate and the rate at which they escape from the beam due to their energy, the potential trying to retain them and the electron temperature. In the freefall model the fast electron density falls slightly as the pressure starts to increase. This is due to the ions being able to escape more easily and to maintain plasma neutrality the electron density reduces.

In Figure 4 the ratio of the contributions of the beam and fast electron heating of the plasma is plotted for the two

models. Over the whole range of the gas densities the electron heating of the plasma dominates that due to the beam itself. At low pressures both models give the beam to fast electron heating ratio as ~ 0.7 . At higher densities the freefall model indicates that these two contributions become almost equal but in both models this ratio falls with increasing density. At the highest gas density the beam heating contribution becomes relatively small for both the drift and freefall models. This dominant electron heating of the beam plasma electrons was not considered by earlier workers [3,4,5].




FIG. 4. The ratio of the beam and fast electron heating contributions to the plasma electrons for the nominal 120kV, 60A beam with radius $A=0.1\text{m}$ for the two models.

The dependence of the potential and electron temperature on beam radius is shown in Figure 5 for a background gas density of $3 \times 10^{17} \text{m}^{-3}$. Both the potential and the electron temperature decrease as the beam radius increases as the electrons remain within the beam due to its increased size. At this low gas density, the two models are in good agreement in accordance with Figure 2.




FIG. 5. (Colour online) The dependence of the potential V_0 and the electron temperature T_e on beam radius for the nominal 120kV, 60A beam with a background gas density of $3 \times 10^{17} \text{m}^{-3}$ for the two models.

As discussed earlier the ionization cross-sections from Rudd [7] have been used in the implementation of the

model. These cross-sections are somewhat higher than those from the Aladdin database [8]. Using these latter cross-sections has only a small effect of a few percent on the potential V_0 and temperature T_e and the relative densities. The heating ratio is increased by up to $\sim 10\%$ at intermediate gas densities. Use of these cross-sections does not change the conclusions reached.

4. The potential and radial field

A plot of the radial potential is shown for the drift model in Figure 6 at different gas densities and a beam radius $A = 0.1\text{m}$. The potential is plotted against the radial distance r . At low gas densities there is very little potential drop between the axis and the beam radius although this does increase with gas density. Most of the potential drop is beyond the beam edge.




FIG. 6. (Colour online) The radial potential dependence within the beam for a 120kV, 60A beam at different background gas densities for the drift model with a beam radius $A = 0.1\text{m}$.

Although the drift and freefall models give similar results of V_0 and T_e at low gas densities the potential distributions are very different as shown in Figure 7 for a gas density of 10^{17} m^{-3} and a beam radius of 0.1m . In the case of the freefall model the value of the parameter α which defines the potential extent (equation (17)) is constant at all gas densities and from equation (40) it has in this case a value of ~ 454 indicating that the potential drop is mostly within the beam as illustrated by Figure 7.




FIG. 7. The radial potential dependences within the beam for a 120kV, 60A beam at a background gas density of 10^{17} m^{-3} with a beam radius $A = 0.1\text{m}$ for both the drift and freefall models.

Although the total potentials are the similar at low pressure between freefall and drift, the fact that most of the potential drop occurs in an outer sheath beyond the beam edge for the drift case means that the electric field inside the beam which ultimately controls the beam divergence is much larger in the freefall case. In the freefall approximation the average electric field across the beam is, from Figure 7, $\sim 700\text{V/m}$ whereas it is almost zero for the drift approximation.

Direct measurement of the beam space potential is very difficult because of the beam power and the lack of any developed diagnostic to do this. Such a diagnostic could be a retarding ion analyser [5,14] placed outside the beam which looks at the energy of plasma ions emitted by the beam. Although it is not yet possible to measure the beam space potential in such a way for these beams, an inferred method is possible which is to look at the consequences of this potential such as on the beam optics. In the Neutral Beam Test Bed [12] the composite beam drifts for a distance of $\sim 10\text{m}$ in a vacuum chamber at low pressure. Any effect on the beam profile due to space charge effects might become apparent over this distance. Using the drift and freefall models the effect of the profile can be calculated and compared to measurements which may allow differentiation between the applicability of the models. This will be the subject of a future paper.

5. The applicability of the drift and freefall approximations

The question naturally arises as to the region of applicability of both approximations. The transition between the two approximations is taken to occur when the value of $1/N\sigma_s A \sim 1$ where σ_s is the scattering cross-section for slow ions leaving the beam. The theoretical value of the ion mobility is given by

$$k_i = \frac{e}{\sigma_s M_i c_T} \quad (41)$$

where c_T is the thermal ion velocity. For deuterium $k_i = 2.1 \times 10^{22} \text{ m}^5 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ V}^{-1}$ and $c_T = 1250 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ giving a scattering cross-section of $\sigma_s = 9 \times 10^{-19} \text{ m}^2$. Thus using this the transition between the approximations might be expected to occur at a product of gas density and radius of $NA \sim 1.1 \times 10^{18} \text{ m}^{-2}$. In the case of the example with $A = 0.1 \text{ m}$ the transition between the two models will be at a gas density of $\sim 1.1 \times 10^{19} \text{ m}^{-3}$ (0.046 Pa or 4.5×10^{-4} mbar). From Figure 2 the two approximations begin to diverge at a gas density of $\sim 5 \times 10^{17} \text{ m}^{-3}$ which is somewhat lower than this simple estimate.

Although the drift approximation is more likely to apply at higher gas densities and given the situation shown in Figure 7 where both approximations give similar V_0 and T_e but different potentials it would require measurement of the beam potential and plasma properties to distinguish between the two approximations.

For the JET neutral beam injectors, the gas target in the neutraliser is approximately $5 \times 10^{19} \text{ m}^{-2}$ which for the 2m long neutraliser gives an estimate of the average gas density of $2.5 \times 10^{19} \text{ m}^{-3}$. The model described here is only applicable downstream of the neutraliser when the species fractions are assumed to have reached their equilibrium fractions. Outside the neutraliser, the gas density is expected to fall very rapidly due to the very high pumping speed of approximately 10^6 l/s. Typically the pressure in the injector vacuum system is less than 10^{-5} mbar (10^{-3} Pa or $2.4 \times 10^{17} \text{ m}^{-3}$). This value of gas density is just within the region where both approximations give very similar results at least in terms of V_0 and T_e but as pointed out above there are important differences in the models.

4. The degree of space charge compensation

In designing neutral beam injection systems it is generally assumed that there are no space charge forces involved. This makes it relatively straightforward to calculate the trajectories of the beam ions for instance as they move to residual ion dumps since the ions move independently of each other. If substantial potentials exist with the beam then space charge forces would need to be taken into account. In order to understand if this is the case the potentials can be compared with those of an uncompensated beam to give the degree of space charge compensation. The potential due to the beam when it is uncompensated can be calculated using Gauss's Law.

$$\frac{Q}{\epsilon_0} = \frac{e}{\epsilon_0} \int n dV = \int \mathbf{E} \cdot d\mathbf{s} \quad (42)$$

where Q is the total charge within some volume V , n is the charge density, \mathbf{E} is the electric field and $d\mathbf{s}$ is an element of the surface enclosing the volume. Applying this to a cylindrical beam of length L gives an equation for the radial electric field component E_r

$$\frac{Q}{\epsilon_0} = \frac{2\pi e L}{\epsilon_0} \int_0^r r' n_b(r') dr' = 2\pi r E_r L \quad (43)$$

The beam density profile is given from equations (3), (5) and (6). Evaluation of the integral gives the radial electric field

$$E_r = \frac{en_{b0}}{\epsilon_0} \left(\frac{1}{2} r - \frac{r^3}{4A^2} \right) \quad r \leq A \quad (44)$$

$$E_r = \frac{en_{b0}}{4\epsilon_0 r} A^2 \quad r > A$$

To obtain the potential distribution this equation can be integrated again using the condition that $V(r=0) = 0$ to give

$$V(r) = -\frac{en_{b0}}{4\epsilon_0} \left(r^2 - \frac{r^4}{4A^2} \right) \quad r \leq A$$

$$V(r) = -\frac{en_{b0}A^2}{4\epsilon_0} \left(\frac{3}{4} - \ln\left(\frac{A}{r}\right) \right) \quad r > A \quad (45)$$

The degree of space charge compensation, η , is defined as

$$\eta = 1 - \frac{\Delta\phi_c}{\Delta\phi_u} \quad (46)$$

where $\Delta\phi_c$ and $\Delta\phi_u$ are the compensated and uncompensated potential differences across the beam. Using the data from Figure 7, $\Delta\phi_c$ is 0.32V for the drift approximation and 77.5V for the freefall approximation. From equation (44) the uncompensated potential difference across the beam, $\Delta\phi_u$, is 158kV. This indicates that in both approximations the beam is very highly compensated indeed.

This beam consisting of a mixture of ions and atoms travels a distance of up to 2m between the exit of the neutraliser and bend magnet where the ions are swept out of the beam unto beam dumps. At this stage the ions are separated and there is no longer a single beam. Up until that point space charge forces seem unlikely to have a noticeable effect on the beam transport. The magnet could affect the space charge neutralisation as both the fast electrons and plasma electrons are trapped by the magnetic

field however there is no evidence of the separated ion species stalling under the influence of their own space charge. Before being installed on JET, the injectors are tested and characterized on the Neutral Beam Test Bed [12]. The composite beam travels a distance of 10m on this facility. Although there are no obvious signs of space charge effects since the injector works on JET as expected a more detailed survey is to be carried out.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

A model has been developed describing the process of space charge neutralisation in a beam consisting of a mixture of ion and atoms with different energies as used in the heating beams for fusion applications. The model is powerful in that it allows the beam potential and the plasma density and temperature to be calculated in both a drift and free fall approximation. When applied to a typical beam of 120kV, 60A the model shows that the beam is very highly compensated and so space charge forces play little or no role in the beam transport at least until the bend magnet is reached. There are outstanding questions such as which approximation is valid at low pressures and this will be studied in a subsequent paper.

The model can be easily adapted for use in a single species ion beam by choosing the beam parameters appropriately. It could also be modified to describe the space charge compensation in negative ion based beams such as those to be use in higher energy neutral beam injection for fusion applications.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been carried out within the framework of the Contract for the Operation of the JET Facilities and has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the European Commission.

APPENDIX

Thermalization of the fast electrons

In section 3.1, it was argued that the fast electrons should have an energy of 2/3 of the Rudd energy given in equation 1. This also applies to the stripped electrons. In this appendix this argument is examined. In order for these electrons to thermalize, they must undergo significant scattering before escape from the beam. There are two possible scattering events, scattering by gas collisions and/or via coulomb collisions. The *total* scattering cross-

section via gas collisions, σ_s , is given in the database of Smith and Glasser [13] and has a value for electron collisions with H_2 of $1.4 \times 10^{-19} m^2$ for a Rudd energy of about 15 eV. These electrons will have a quasi-thermal distribution if the collision time is shorter than their confinement time in the beam. The collision frequency derived from coulomb scattering via the plasma ions and beam ions is smaller by a factor of about 20, even at low pressures and so will be ignored.

The gas collision frequency is $N\sigma_s v_r$ while the confinement time, τ_r , can be obtained from the expression:

$$L \int_0^A Q_r \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{A^2}\right) 2\pi r dr \cong \frac{\pi L A^2 n_{r0}}{2\tau_r}$$

This LHS of this expression was used in deriving equation (18) above. This leads to:

$$\tau_r = \frac{n_{r0}}{Q_r}$$

Thermalization will occur if the product of the gas collision frequency and confinement time is at least unity. So:

$$\frac{n_{r0}}{Q_r} \times N\sigma_s v_r > 1$$

As Q_r is proportional to Nn_{b0} , this ratio is independent of gas density. At low pressures, the ratio above is a little above unity indicating that a moderate amount of thermalization occurs. However, as n_{r0} becomes larger than n_{b0} at higher pressures as seen in Figure 3 this ratio will become significantly greater than unity.

-
- [1] A.J.T. Holmes, Proceedings 1986 CERN Accelerator School, Aarhus, Denmark, Report 87-10 (1987)
 - [1] D. Čirić et al., Fusion Engineering and Design **86** 509-512 (2011)
 - [3] M.D. Gabovich, Sov. Phys.Usp. **20** 134 (1977)
 - [4] I.A. Soloshenko, Rev. Sci. Instrum. **67** 1346-1352 (1998)
 - [5] D. Winklehner, D. Leitner, D. Cole, G. Machicoane, and L. Tobos, Rev. Sci. Instrum. **85**, 02A739 (2014)
 - [6] A.J.T. Holmes, Phys. Rev. A **19**, 389 – 409 (1979)
 - [7] M. E. Rudd, Physical Review A **20**, 787 - 796 (1979)
 - [8] IAEA AMDIS Aladdin Database, <https://www-amdis.iaea.org/ALADDIN>
 - [9] Atomic Data for Controlled Fusion Research, Vol I, 4.54288ORNL 5206 (1977)
 - [10] NRL Plasma Formulary (2019) <https://www.nrl.navy.mil/News-Media/Publications/NRL-Plasma-Formulary/>

- [11] Kaye and Laby, "Tables of Chemical and Physical Constants", Archived version at <https://www.npl.co.uk/resources>
- [12] R. McAdams, et al., Fusion Eng. Des. **96-97**, 527-531 (2015)
- [13] K. Smith, and A. H. Glasser, Computer Phys. Communications. Phys. **54**, 391-407 (1989)
- [14] J. Sherman, E. Pitcher and P.Allison, Proceedings of the 1988 Linear Accelerator Conference, CEBAF-R-89-001, Williamsburg, VA (1988)