Three-dimensional, impulsive reconnection events in the Magnetic Reconnection Experiment (MRX)

Seth Dorfman

MRX Group and Collaborators: H. Ji, M. Yamada, J. Yoo, T. Tharp, E. Lawrence, C. Myers, W. Daughton, and V. Roytershteyn

This research is brought to you by the NDSEG Fellowship Program, DOE, NASA, and NSF.



US/Japan Reconnection Workshop May 24, 2012



Outline

Long Standing Question: How do we explain the fast, impulsive reconnection rates observed in laboratory and natural environments?

- Introduction and Motivation: Impulsive Reconnection
- Introduction to MRX
- Experimental Investigations of Impulsive Events:
 - Ejection of "Flux Rope" Structures
 - Observed Out-of-Plane Gradients
 - Out-of-Plane Spreading of Fast Reconnection
- Proposed physical picture of 3-D two-fluid effects
- Conclusions

Fast, Impulsive Reconnection Observed in Lab and Space

Impulsive: Slow buildup phase followed by a comparatively quick release of magnetic energy





Solar plasma (SDO Data)

Magnetosphere (NASA Animation)



Laboratory Sawtooth Crash (Yamada, et. al., 1994)

Motivation: Is impulsive reconnection in real systems fundamentally 3-D?

Fundamentally 3-D \rightarrow Variation in all three spatial dimensions necessary to explain observed behavior

2.5-D Models \rightarrow No out-of-plane variation ($\partial/\partial y=0$)



2.5-D Hall Effect (Collisonless): Fast but Steady-State

How can impulsive behavior be explained by 2.5-D models?

- Ejection of Magnetic Islands
- Transition between Collisional and Collisionless Reconnection
- Sheer Flow

How can 3-D dynamics change the reconnection process?

Complex Flux Rope Structures

 Islands in 2.5-D are analogous to flux ropes in 3-D

Waves and Turbulence

• 3-D variation allows for a large class of waves: Can these waves generate anomalous resistivity that speeds up reconnection?



(Daughton, et. al., Nature Physics, 2011)



3-D Reconnection Previously Studied in Lab

Externally Generated 3-D Flux Ropes



Localized Reconnection Onset due to a Global Toroidal Mode





Current Work: Local 3-D Reconnection with spontaneously generated "flux ropes"



The Magnetic Reconnection Experiment (MRX)



Experimental Setup in MRX





"Pull" reconnection

Details of reconnection layer resolved in MRX



Typical Parameters:

- Gas: H_2 , D_2
- No applied guide field
- Density: 0.5-15 x 10¹³/cm³
- Electron Temperature: 4-12eV
- Reconnecting Field: 150-300G
- Collisionless at the time of the impulsive behavior to be discussed

Magnetic and Electrostatic Diagnostics used to probe the details of the electron layer



Diagnostics:

- Fine Structure Probes (Magnetic Field)
- Magnetic Fluctuation Probes
- Langmuir Probes (Density and Temperature)



Coils/Probe	50
Components	B _Z , B _y
Max Resolution	3.75mm
Coverage Area	19.25cm

Probe Location in the Current Sheet



Blue = Fluctuation Probe

٠

٠

Current Layer with "Flux Ropes" Resolved by Magnetic Probes



"Flux Ropes:" 3-D High Current Density Regions associated with an O point

Current Layer Disrupts over a short time period



"Flux Ropes" Ejected in Current Layer Disruption



Probe setup to examine structure in the current direction



Disruptions Occur in Discharges with Strong Out-of-Plane Gradients



Layer narrows, then suddenly disrupts in the electron flow direction!



(Dorfman, et. al., Submitted to PRL)

17

During disruptions, reconnection takes place in a truly 3-D way!

Furthermore, several observed features cannot be explained by an anomalous resistivity model.

Observed in MRX	Present in 2.5-D?	Anomalous Resistivity Model Prediction
"Flux Rope" Ejection	2.5-D island ejection	No
Out-of-Plane Gradients	No	No
Spread of Fast Reconnection in the electron flow direction	No	Yes
Magnetic Fluctuations	No	Yes

How does 3-D variation lead to disruptions?

To understand 3-D, let's first review the 2.5-D Hall Effect

In the electron frozen in region, electrons and magnetic field move together! Slower ions control the plasma density.



Proposed Physical Picture: 3-D Two-Fluid Effects



- 1) $\partial v_{ey}/\partial y > 0$ in inflow region along the y gradient.
- 2) Electron flow continuity demands increased v_{ex}.
- 3) Dissipation region adjusts / current layer disrupts.
- 4) V_{ey} gradient spreads in the +y (electron) direction.

20

(Related to Rudakov, et. al. 2002, Huba, et. al., 2002, Huba et. al., 2003, Lapenta et. al., 2006)

Proposed Physical Picture: 3-D Two-Fluid Effects



- 1) $\partial v_{ey}/\partial y > 0$ in inflow region along the y gradient.
- 2) Electron flow continuity demands increased v_{ex}.
- 3) Dissipation region adjusts / current layer disrupts.
- 4) V_{ey} gradient spreads in the +y (electron) direction.

21

(Related to Rudakov, et. al. 2002, Huba, et. al., 2002, Huba et. al., 2003, Lapenta et. al., 2006)

Main Conclusions

- 1) Observed disruptions are fundamentally three-dimensional.
- 2) Signatures of flux ropes identified."Flux Ropes" play a key role in the observed disruptions.
- 3) Magnetic Fluctuations are not the key to impulsive reconnection.

Main Conclusions

- 1) Current layer disruptions are observed in MRX as a fast, impulsive, and **fundamentally threedimensional** example of magnetic reconnection.
- 2) Several signatures of flux ropes are identified in the reconnecting current layer. The observed disruptions are due to the buildup and ejection of these 3-D high current density regions associated with O-points at the measurement location.
- 3) By contrast, magnetic fluctuations, long considered as a possible cause of anomalous resistivity, are not the key physics responsible for the observed impulsive phenomena.

Abundant Opportunities for Future Work

- 3-D Probe configuration
- Flux Ropes and small scale structure
- Origin of Out-of-plane gradients
- 3-D Simulations of Disruptions
- Generation of Disruptions via Localized
 Perturbations

r = 37.5 cm

20 cm