## Letters to the Editor

The Board of Editors does not hold itself responsible for opinions expressed in the letters published in this section. The notes containing short reports of original investigations communicated to this section should not contain many figures and should not exceed 500 words in length. The contributions reaching the Secretary by the 15th of any month may be expected to appear in the issue for the next month. No proof will be sent to the author.

9

## ON MEASUREMENT OF ELECTRON DENSITY OF PLASMA

## A. K. GHOSHAL, S. K. SEN AND J. BASU\*

INSTITUTE OF RADIO PHYSICS AND ELECTRONICS

UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA

(Received January 9, 1965)

The usual methods for determining the electron density in a narrow plasma column are :

(a) Perturbation method, —to note the detuning of a cavity due to introduction of a coaxial plasma in it. The mode of the cavity, used most often, is  $TM_{010}$  mode. For a  $TM_{010}$  mode in a cylindrical cavity the change in the resonant frequency of the cavity is related to the electron density in Plasma as shown by Agdur and Enander (1962).

(b) Admittance method, —to note the admittance offered by the plasma column when placed in a waveguide parallel to the microwave electric field vector of  $TE_{10}$  mode. The relation between the admittance and electron density is given by Davidson and Farvis (1962).

However, both the above methods have certain limitations. The perturbation method is assumed to be valid if  $N/N_c < 1 + (\lambda/2\pi r_1)^2$  (Buchsbaum, Mower, and Brown, 1960), where N is the electron density in plasma,  $N_c$  is the critical electron density corresponding to the wavelength of microwave radiation  $\lambda$ , and  $r_1$  is the radius of the plasma column. The admittance method is assumed to be applicable if  $r_1/a << 1$  (Davidson and Farvis, 1962), where a is the width of the waveguide. Nevertheless the results given by the methods are somewhat approximate. Besides, in both the methods the effect of the plasma container, viz. a quartz or pyrex glass tube, is not properly taken into consideration.

<sup>\*</sup>Present Address :---Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Calcutta.

To assess the accuracy of the results and for comparison with the results as given by the perturbation and admittance methods for a typical plasma, a more accurate method termed, in this report, the exact method, has been developed. With the plasma placed coaxially in it, the cylindrical cavity operating in  $TM_{010}$ mode is tuned. Maxwell's equations for the different media in the cavity, viz. plasma, its container and air (air assumed equivalent to free space), are solved, and the following transcendental equations relating the operating frequency fand the electron density N are obtained by applying proper boundary conditions (Sen, Basu, and Ghoshal, 1964)

For 
$$N < Nc$$
,  

$$\begin{bmatrix} J_0(\beta_2 r_2) - \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_2}{\epsilon_0}} & AJ_1(\beta_2 r_2) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Y_0(\beta_2 r_1) J_1(\beta_1 r_1) - \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_2}{\epsilon_1}} & J_0(\beta_1 r_1) Y_1(\beta_2 r_1) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_2}{\epsilon_0}} & AY_1(\beta_2 r_2) - Y_0(\beta_2 r_3) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_2}{\epsilon_1}} & J_0(\beta_1 r_1) J_1(\beta_2 r_1) - J_1(\beta_2 r_1) J_1(\beta_1 r_1) \end{bmatrix} \dots (1a)$$
For  $N > Nc$ ,

$$\left[J_{0}(\beta_{2}r_{2})-\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{2}}{\epsilon_{0}}}AJ_{1}(\beta_{2}r_{2})\right]\left[Y_{0}(\beta_{2}r_{1})I_{1}(\beta_{1}r_{1})-\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{2}}{\epsilon_{1}}}I_{0}(\beta_{1}r_{1})Y_{1}(\beta_{2}r_{1})\right]$$

$$= \left[ \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_2}{\epsilon_0}} A Y_1(\beta_2 r_2) - Y_0(\beta_2 r_2) \right] \left[ \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_2}{\epsilon_1}} I_0(\beta_1 r_1) J_1(\beta_2 r_1) - J_0(\beta_2 r_1) I_1(\beta_1 r_1) \right] \dots$$
(1b)

Where

$$A = \frac{J_0(\beta_0 r_2) Y_0(\beta_0 r_3) - J_0(\beta_0 r_3) Y_0(\beta_0 r_2)}{J_1(\beta_0 r_2) Y_0(\beta_0 r_3) - J_0(\beta_0 r_3) Y_1(\beta_0 r_2)}$$

 $\beta_0 =$ propagation constant corresponding to f

 $\beta_1 = \text{propagation constant in plasma} = \beta_0 \sqrt{\frac{c_1}{c_0}} = \beta_0 (1 - N/Nc)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ 

 $\beta_2 = \text{propagation constant in the medium constituting the plasma container}$ 

$$=\beta_0\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_2}{\epsilon_0}}$$

 $\epsilon_0$ ,  $\epsilon_1$ ,  $\epsilon_2$  are the permittivities of free space, plasma and its container respectively.  $r_1$ ,  $r_2$  are the inner and outer radii of the container,

 $r_3$  is the radius of the cavity.

 $J_0$ ,  $J_1$  are the Bessel functions of the first kind ;  $Y_0$ ,  $Y_1$  are the Bessel functions of the second kind,

 $I_0$ ,  $I_1$  are the modified Bessel functions of the first kind.

Experiments have been carried out, at S-band frequency, on a typical mercury discharge plasma column of radius  $r_1 = 3.89$  mm, for discharge currents ranging from 0 to 500 mA. The plasma is contained in a pyrex glass tube of thickness 1.1 mm and dielectric constant 4.58, the latter being determined by the method, the authors have described elsewhere (Sen, Basu, and Ghoshal, 1964). The cavity radius  $r_3$  is 38.37mm., and the width of the waveguide a is 72 mm. Pressure in the plasma was of the order of  $1\mu$ .

The electron densities at various discharge currents have been determined by the perturbation, admittance method and by the exact method using equations (1a) and (1b). The electron density at the maximum current was of the order of  $1.7 \times 10^{11}$  per c.c., corresponding to  $N/Nc \simeq 1.5$ . Compared with the results given by the exact method, those by the perturbation and admittance methods were within 15% and 20% respectively. It appears that, of the perturbation and admittance methods, the former is somewhat more accurate.

The authors are indebted to Prof. J. N. Bhar, D.Sc., F.N.I. for his keen interest in the work and for helpful discussions.

## REFERENCES

Agdur, B., and Enander, B., 1962, Journal of Applied Physics, **38**, 575. Buchsbeum, S. J., Mower, Lyman., and Brown, S. C., 1960, Physics of Fluids, **3**, 806. Davidson, C. W., and Farvis, W. E. J., 1962, Physical Review, **127**, 1858. Sen, S. K., Basu, J., and Ghoshal, A. K., 1964, Ind. Jour. of Phys. **38**, 601.