

Motivation

• We want to understand the universe.

• The universe is complicated.



• Mathematical models describing the universe are frequently too complicated to solve analytically.

- We use numerical simulations to approximate solutions to mathematical models.
- We understand the universe a little better.





- Numerical simulations allow us to play around with a system and observe how different initial conditions and different physical processes affect the system.
- Understand the consequences of physical laws.

• Help interpret observations/experiments.

• Predict new requirements for observations/experiments.



Motivation

- What happens if we change the initial conditions?
 - Distribution of particles (e.g. Maxwellian or power-law)?
 - Initial distribution parameters (e.g. position, energy spectra, temporal)?
- What happens if we add/remove physical processes?
 - Particle transport and/or diffusion.
 - Particle collisions.
- What happens if we interact with waves?
 - Electromagnetic waves.
 - Plasma waves.



Basic Process





- Pseudo code is a great way to plan your program before you start at the computer.
- Description of your code is there to help YOU (and others).

Initialise slide to 1 Introduce the topic to be studied **WHILE** lecture not complete Increment the slide number Describe the concept on the slide **IF** additional explanation is required Draw on the whiteboard to assist the description END IF **END WHILE**



Program Description Examples

Initialise variables Get ready for the night out Arrange transport Meet friends at the pub WHILE not drunk or fired or bored socialise **IF** thirsty or want alcohol then drink **IF** location has moved to club **IF** music is good then dance **END IF END WHILE** Return home Drink water Sleep

Initialise core variables READ input spreadsheet of distributions Set important variables **IF** any variables are junk set them to zero flag the indices in the error array **END IF FORALL** distributions calculate distribution moments **END FORALL FORALL** distributions correlate moments **IF** correlation is high then generate fit **END FORALL** Plot relevant graphs.



Code Comments

- Have an initial description of what the program does including inputs and outputs.
- Include a sample call to the program.
- Add comments throughout the code to explain what the program is doing.

Function y=square(x) % This program will find the % square of any number % INPUTS: % x - the number that will be% squared % OUTPUTS: % y – the value of x^2 % Sample Call: % y = square(5);

y = x^2

 $\%\,$ This line finds the square of x



Numerical Approaces

- Test-particle
- Kinetic
- MHD



- Usually we deal with **INITIAL VALUE PROBLEMS**. We know the initial value of our function at t=0. We then integrate over t to find the function at t=tmax.
- Propagation Equation:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + v \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = 0$$

- Start with an initial condition:
- $d/2 = stdev, x_0 = mean.$

$$u(x,t=0) = \exp\left(\frac{-(x-x_0)^2}{d^2}\right)$$







 \mathcal{U}_{i}^{n}

- We represent our function u using the notation
- $t_{\min} \le t_n \le t_{\max}$ at $x_{\min} \le x_j \le x_{\max}$
- Using a simple Euler method we represent derivatives as

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \frac{u_j^{n+1} - u_j^n}{\Delta t} \qquad \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = \frac{u_{j+1}^n - u_j^n}{\Delta x}$$
$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + v \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = 0 \qquad \longrightarrow \qquad \frac{u_j^{n+1} - u_j^n}{\Delta t} = -v \frac{u_{j+1}^n - u_j^n}{\Delta x}$$



Finite Difference

$$\frac{u_j^{n+1} - u_j^n}{\Delta t} = -v \frac{u_{j+1}^n - u_j^n}{\Delta x} \implies u_j^{n+1} = u_j^n - \frac{v\Delta t}{\Delta x} \left(u_{j+1}^n - u_j^n \right)$$

• We have $u_j^{n=0}$ and we want to have $u_j^{n=1}$

 We can use other more complicated schemes than the simple Euler scheme. For instance the central difference method would look like:

$$\frac{u_{j}^{n+1} - u_{j}^{n}}{\Delta t} = -v \frac{u_{j+1}^{n} - u_{j-1}^{n}}{2\Delta x}$$



Propagation Example





- What can causes this numerical instability?
- We can find out through the von Neumann Stability Analysis.
- If we assume that the system is stable in space and time we can find the solution or *eigenmodes* of the equations are of the form:

$$u_j^n = \xi^n e^{ikj\Delta x}$$

• where k is a real spatial wave number and ξ is complex. The system is unstable if $|\xi| > 1$ for some k where ξ is called the **amplification factor**.



• Substitute the value of u back into the equation for the finite difference approximation and we get



Now divide through by the value of u and we are left with

$$\frac{\xi - 1}{\Delta t} = -v \frac{e^{ik\Delta x} - e^{-ik\Delta x}}{2\Delta x}$$



Numerical Stability

$$\frac{\xi - 1}{\Delta t} = -v \frac{e^{ik\Delta x} - e^{-ik\Delta x}}{2\Delta x}$$

• Rearrange the above equation and we obtain:

$$\xi = 1 - \frac{v\Delta t}{2\Delta x} \left(e^{ik\Delta x} - e^{-ik\Delta x} \right)$$

- Using the relation that $e^{ix} e^{-ix} = 2i\sin(x)$ we obtain $\xi = 1 - i\frac{v\Delta t}{\Delta x}\sin(k\Delta x)$
- The modulus of this function is always > 1 for all k.



- The von Neumann method is not rigorous but generally gives a good approximation for your scheme.
- It can be VERY useful when dealing with your code as it allows you to asses the stability criteria and tweak your timestep to make sure your system is stable.

 Is the future bleak for our method? Will it always be unstable?



Lax Method

- Of course not! Recall $u_j^{n+1} = u_j^n \frac{v\Delta t}{2\Delta x} \left(u_{j+1}^n u_{j-1}^n \right)$
- We can perform a simple change to FTCS. We replace

$$u_{j}^{n} \rightarrow 0.5 \left(u_{j+1}^{n} + u_{j-1}^{n} \right)$$

$$u_{j}^{n+1} = 0.5 \left(u_{j+1}^{n} - u_{j-1}^{n} \right) - \frac{v\Delta t}{2\Delta x} u_{j+1}^{n} - u_{j-1}^{n}$$
Lax

• We obtain an amplification factor such that:

$$\xi = \cos(k\Delta x) - i\frac{v\Delta t}{\Delta x}\sin(k\Delta x)$$



Courant Condition

$$\xi = \cos(k\Delta x) - i\frac{v\Delta t}{\Delta x}\sin(k\Delta x)$$
• We now have a system where if $|\xi|^2 < 1$ then we must have
$$\frac{|v|\Delta t}{\Delta x} \le 1$$

- This is the Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy stability criterion or simply the **Courant condition** for short.
- What does this mean I hear you cry?



If you are travelling at a velocity v then you will go a distance vΔt in time Δt. If Δt is larger then you will travel a larger distance. You cannot travel farther in one step than the distance of a grid point Δx. Otherwise past information is not enough to evaluate your position.





• Unfortunately I have bent the truth. I have used the following condition for some of the previous simulations.

$$\frac{|v|\Delta t}{\Delta x} = 1$$

• When we have the condition that $\frac{|v|\Delta t}{\Delta x} < 1$ we get what is know as amplitude dissipation. $\frac{\Delta x}{\Delta x}$

• This is because we have effectively added a diffusion term to the system (see Numerical Recipes 20.1).



• There is more than just amplitude error that we have to contend with. There is also a phase error that can cause problems.

• If
$$\frac{|v|\Delta t}{\Delta x} < 1$$
 then we can get a phase error in LAX.

• We can rewrite the previous equation for the amplification factor in a different way.

Amplitude Error

$$\xi = e^{-ik\Delta x} + i\left(1 - \frac{v\Delta t}{\Delta x}\right)\sin(k\Delta x)$$
Phase Error



- What can we do about this?
- We can use a more simple model that **physically** deals with the problem better, the simple Euler upwind scheme we started with but including a little twist.

$$\frac{u_{j}^{n+1} - u_{j}^{n}}{\Delta t} = -v \begin{cases} \frac{u_{j}^{n} - u_{j-1}^{n}}{\Delta x}, & v_{j}^{n} > 0\\ \frac{u_{j+1}^{n} - u_{j}^{n}}{\Delta x}, & v_{j}^{n} < 0 \end{cases}$$

- When v is positive then u_{j+1} is affected but not u_{j-1}
- When v is negative then u_{i-1} is affected but not u_{i+1}



 Applying the same stability analysis to the upwind scheme we obtain the following amplification factor for constant v:

$$\left|\xi\right|^{2} = 1 - 2\left|\frac{v\Delta t}{\Delta x}\right| \left(1 - \left|\frac{v\Delta t}{\Delta x}\right|\right) \left[1 - \cos(k\Delta x)\right]$$

• This satisfies the stability criteria of $|\xi|^2 < 1$ when we have the Courant condition (again).



 Previously we were using methods that were first order accurate in time. What about a method that is second order accurate in time, the staggered leapfrog

$$\frac{u_{j}^{n+1} - u_{j}^{n-1}}{2\Delta t} = -v \frac{u_{j+1}^{n} - u_{j-1}^{n}}{2\Delta x}$$

 The staggered leaprog method is more stable but does not use the information at the last point in space and time.



 The staggered leapfrog has a quadratic equation for the amplification factor that can be solved to give the following equation:

$$\xi = -i\frac{v\Delta t}{\Delta x}\sin(k\Delta x) \pm \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{v\Delta t}{\Delta x}\sin(k\Delta x)\right)^2}$$

- We actually have $|\xi|^2 = 1$ for any value of $v\Delta t \le \Delta x$
- There is no amplitude dissipation!



• The staggered leapfrog is not the be-all and end-all of finite differencing mechanisms. It has problems with large gradients as points can become decoupled from each other.

 We can solve this problem using another advanced technique.
 See Numerical Recipes 20.1.





- What if our velocity was not a constant?
- We can use our stability analysis to make sure that our system is stable (to ensure that $v\Delta t \le \Delta x$).
- This is VERY IMPORTANT when dealing with real world problems.

• Consider a person riding their bike to work....



t

- We must keep $v\Delta t \leq \Delta x$
- For a constant Δt, it will have to be small to deal with the hill but that will be tedious to deal with the flat ground.
- If we evaluate $v\Delta t \leq \Delta x$ we can decease Δt when we get to the hill and we can increase it afterwards.



- We can use Implicit methods that go backwards in time to go forward. Uses a tri-diagonal matrix of the method to find u_j^{n+1} .
- Implicit schemes are more complicated to code but are generally stable in time for any time step.
- Other techniques can be used such as the Crank-Nicolson scheme that are a hybrid between explicit and implicit schemes.



 Plasma emission is the generally accepted mechanism for non-thermal particles producing solar radio bursts *Ginzburg & Zhelezniakov (1958)*.





Emission Process





- Most of the energy of the system is contained in the electrons.
- Some electron energy is deposited into the Langmuir waves.
- Some Langmuir wave energy is deposited into the radio waves.

 We can concentrate on the easier task of simulating the wave-particle interactions to understand the dynamics of the non-thermal particles.



- Popular approach is the quasilinear approach that uses the WKB approximation (waves as particles).
- f(v,t) is the electron distribution function.
- W(v,t) is the Langmuir wave spectral energy density.

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = \frac{4\pi^2 e^2}{m^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \left(\frac{W}{v} \frac{\partial f}{\partial v} \right)$$
$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial t} = \frac{\pi \omega_{pe}}{n_e} v^2 W \frac{\partial f}{\partial v} \qquad \omega_{pe} = kv$$



 Past work (e.g. Ryutov & Sagdeev, 1970, Vedenov & Ryutov, 1972, Mel'nik et al 1998, Kontar 2001) used the asymptotic solution for these equations assuming certain initial condition for f and W.



Quasilinear Interaction





 The bump-in-tail instability forms when an electron beam is injected at the Sun and streams away from the acceleration region.





Wave-Particle Instability





One dimensional quasilinear equations describing the kinetics of energetic electrons and Langmuir waves (e.g. Reid and Kontar 2015).





 The characteristic time that is involved for the quasilinear interaction is related to the ratio of the beam density and the background density.

$$\tau_{ql} = \frac{n_e}{\pi \omega_{pe} n_b}$$



- A problem posed by Sturrock 1964 with the bump-in-tail instability is that all the energy from the particles will be deposited into the Langmuir waves over a very short distance.
- Consider: $n_e = 10^8 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, $\omega_{pe} = 10^9 \text{ s}^{-1}$, $n_b = 10^4 \text{ cm}^{-3}$
- Quasilinear time is 10⁻⁶ s[,] much faster than any collisional damping rate of the waves by 10⁻² s.



• We will lose ALL of the electron energy to Langmuir waves within a very small distance – metres!

• This is a large problem as we observe electron beams at the Earth, over distances of 1 AU.

• We need a way for the wave-particle interaction to be LESS efficient.



- One method to solve the dilemma is the beam-plasma structure. This was suggested analytically by Zheleznyakov & Zaitsev (1970) and further developed by Zaitsev et al. (1972).
- It was numerically worked on initially by Takakura & Shibahashi (1976); Magelssen & Smith (1977); Grognard (1985) but there have been many other authors that have worked on this subject.
- What is a beam-plasma structure?



Consider the growth rate of Langmuir waves is related to

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial t} = \frac{\pi \omega_{pe}}{n_e} v^2 W \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial v}\right)$$

- The electron beam has a width in space. Langmuir waves are generated at the front of the beam and absorbed at the back of the beam.
- Beam-plasma structure moves at the velocity of the electrons despite the Langmuir wave group velocity being low.



Beam-Plasma Structure





Beam-Plasma Structure





 The background density gradient is also important in reducing the amount of Langmuir waves that are generated by the electron beam.

- Refraction.
- Nice paper by Eduard (Kontar 2001) that demonstrates this....



Negative Density Gradients





Positive Density Gradients





 Another important physical process that can be simulated is Coulomb collisions between the electrons in the beam and the ions in the background plasma.

• Proportional to the background plasma density.

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = \frac{4\pi e^4 n_e \ln \Lambda}{m_e^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \left(\frac{f}{v^2} + \frac{v_{te}^2}{v^3} \frac{\partial f}{\partial v} \right)$$



Coulomb Collisions





• Collisions affect the non-thermal particles when they are in the low corona or the chromosphere.

 We can treat the particles as collisionless when they are in the solar wind – background density is too low so the mean-free-path becomes very high.



Bi-directional T3s



Li et al 2012



Starting Frequency



$$h_{typeIII} = d\alpha + h_{acc}$$

Reid et al 2011



Temporal Profile

Time profile of the radio waves dominated by the inhomogeneity of the Solar Wind



Ratcliffe et al 2014



Stopping Frequency

The production of Langmuir waves is related to the number of electrons. By increasing the expansion of the magnetic field you increase the stopping frequency. Similarly, less intense or dense beams have less stopping frequency.





Exciter Velocity

 Excited velocity deduced from the simulations is not constant but decreases as a function of distance from the Sun.



Ratcliffe et al 2014



Density Fluctuations







Vidojevic et al 2011



Wave Fluxtuations

Time = 100.0 seconds



Reid & Kontar 2010



Wave Fluctuations

Time = 100.0 seconds



Reid et al 2010



Temperature Fluctuations





- The background plasma damps the Langmuir waves that have phase velocity close to the thermal velocity.
- In the solar wind the background plasma is NOT a Maxwellian but a kappa distribution.
- The kappa tail causes more damping of the plasma.



Li et al 2014

Kappa Background





Electron Spectra



Kontar & Reid 2009



Electron Spectra





2D Electron Distribution





2D Langmuir Waves





2D Ion-Sound Waves





• What about when we have more than one dimension in space? What will happen?

- NOTE: 1D n points.
- 1D 10 points.
- 1D 1000 points.

- $3D n^3$ points.
- 3D 1000 points.
- 3D 100000000 points
- Best to start small and slowly increase number of points.



• Numerical simulations are a powerful tool to understand the world around us.

• Large effort for numerical simulations to understand solar accelerated electrons and their radio signatures.

• Still much more to be understood. We need you!