

## KINETIC SIMULATIONS OF ELECTRON PRE-ENERGIZATION BY MAGNETIZED COLLISIONLESS SHOCKS IN EXPANDING LABORATORY PLASMAS

K. V. LEZHININ<sup>1</sup>, W. FOX<sup>1,2</sup>, D. B. SCHAEFFER<sup>1</sup>, A. SPITKOVSKY<sup>1</sup>, J. MATTEUCCI<sup>1</sup>, A. BHATTACHARJEE<sup>1,2</sup>, AND K. GERMASCHEWSKI<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Astrophysical Sciences, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA

<sup>2</sup>Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Princeton, New Jersey 08543, USA and

<sup>3</sup>Department of Physics and Space Science Center, University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire 03824, USA

*Draft version December 3, 2020*

### ABSTRACT

Collisionless shocks are common features in space and astrophysical systems where supersonic plasma flows interact, such as in the solar wind, the heliopause, and supernova remnants. Recent experimental capabilities and diagnostics allow detailed laboratory investigations of high-Mach-number shocks, which therefore can become a valuable way to understand shock dynamics in various astrophysical environments. Using 2D particle-in-cell simulations with a Coulomb binary collision operator, we demonstrate the mechanism for generation of energetic electrons and experimental requirements for detecting this process in the laboratory high-Mach-number collisionless shocks. We show through a parameter study that electron acceleration by magnetized collisionless shocks is feasible in laboratory experiments with laser-driven expanding plasmas.

Both Earth- and space-based detections of energetic particles spanning from MeV to EeV indicate that there are universal mechanisms for particle energization in astrophysical plasmas (Glasmacher et al. 1999). Two major plasma physics phenomena, magnetic reconnection (Yamada, Kulsrud & Ji 2010; Bulanov 2016) and collisionless shocks (Treumann 2009; Burgess & Scholer 2015), are usually considered as main contributors to energetic particle populations. Magnetized collisionless shocks are naturally formed in many space environments with a pre-existing magnetic field, such as galaxy clusters, supernova remnants, and solar winds. The Fermi mechanism, commonly known as Diffusive Shock Acceleration (Krymsky 1977; Bell 1978a,b) (DSA), is a mechanism by which shocks can energize particles, creating a power-law energy spectrum of charged particles due to scattering of energized particles back and forth between upstream and downstream.

One of the major questions of electron energization by high-Mach-number magnetized collisionless shocks is the so-called “injection problem”: in order to enter the Fermi energization cycle, particles must be pre-energized from the thermal level to have a gyroradius large enough to be able to scatter on upstream and downstream waves. Based on simulations (e.g., Amano & Hoshino (2007, 2009, 2010); Guo, Sironi & Narayan (2014)), several different competing mechanisms have been proposed, but the need for a conclusive model still exists (Katou & Amano 2019). Besides that, energetic particles are observed in the shock transition layer of moderate-level Alfvén Mach number shocks with  $M_A \sim 10$ , even though turbulence in upstream and downstream may not be developed enough for lower shock speeds; thus, some other mechanism than DSA should be responsible for particle energization (Matsumoto, Amano & Kato 2015). Moderate-level Alfvén Mach number shocks are observed in the Earth magnetosphere, and the presence of energized electrons was revealed from data by the Cassini satellite (Masters et al. 2013).

Laboratory astrophysics experiments using expanding abla-

tion plasmas from high power laser-solid interactions provide a platform for modeling of astrophysical processes, such as magnetic reconnection (Nilson et al. 2006; Zhong et al. 2010; Dong et al. 2012; Rosenberg et al. 2015a,b), collisionless shocks (Schaeffer et al. 2017a,b, 2019; Umeda et al. 2019; Fiuza et al. 2020), and Weibel instability (Fox et al. 2013; Huntington et al. 2015), allowing for detailed diagnostics (Schaeffer et al. 2019) and controllable dimensionless parameters. Recently, magnetized collisionless shock formation with  $M_A \sim 15$ , and upstream electron beta  $\beta_e = 8\pi p_e/B^2 \sim 1$  was observed in the lab at the OMEGA laser facility (Schaeffer et al. 2017a,b). Laboratory experiments with repeatable and controlled conditions and diagnostics which span local and global plasma scales can provide important information for solving the shock acceleration problem, benchmarking simulation, and ultimately providing important insight into interpreting energized particle observations in space and astrophysical plasmas. Simulations using the Plasma Simulation Code (PSC) (Germaschewski et al. 2016), which can match almost all dimensionless parameters of the system, allow detailed interpretation and predictions for the experiments. A significant opportunity is therefore to design experiments to measure the efficiency of particle acceleration by shocks, and study how it relates to the geometry, plasma and field parameters, and microphysics of the shock.

In this Letter, we demonstrate with simulations the possibility of and requirements for observing electron pre-energization in magnetized shocks in the laboratory. The pre-acceleration is attributed to Shock Drift Acceleration (SDA), and we provide predictions for the first laboratory demonstration of this phenomenon. In contrast to typical shock simulations initiated by a moving simulation wall, we directly simulate self-consistent shock formation created by a laser-driven piston in plasma, including Coulomb particle collisions (Fox et al. 2018), providing insights into the temporal behavior of particle acceleration in this strongly driven system. This leads to experimental requirements on the shock evolution time needed to distinguish particles accelerated at the shock from those generated by laser heating. Finally, we

conduct simulations for a range of Mach numbers, collisionalities and magnetic field inclinations, and find the optimal values for obtaining rapid particle acceleration at parameters which are not too distant from parameters obtained in recent laser driven shock experiments, and therefore may be possible in near future experiments.

We perform simulations using the particle-in-cell code PSC, which has a module to simulate binary collisions and a heating operator to mimic laser-foil interaction (Germaschewski et al. 2016; Fox et al. 2018). The 2-D simulation grid is in the  $x - z$  plane, with  $z$  being the shock propagation and primary ablation direction. In the simulations, a high density target is heated, which produces an energetic ablation plume (the “piston”) expanding from a high density reservoir at density  $n_{\text{ab}}$  and temperature  $T_{\text{ab}}$ , which interacts with and drives a shock in a low density magnetized background plasma (the “upstream”) at density  $n_{\text{up}}$ ,  $T_{\text{up}}$ , with magnetic field  $B_0$  (Fox et al. 2018; Schaeffer et al. 2020). In this work we simulate quasi-perpendicular shocks and therefore the initial magnetic field is oriented out-of-plane,  $\mathbf{B}_0 = B_0(\sin \theta_{\text{Bn}} \mathbf{e}_y + \cos \theta_{\text{Bn}} \mathbf{e}_z)$ , with inclination angle  $\theta_{\text{Bn}}$  ranging from  $50^\circ$  to  $90^\circ$ . The total number of particles per cell is chosen to be 500 at ablation density  $n_{e,\text{ab}}$ . The simulation box is 40000 cells in  $z$  and 40 cells in  $x$ , corresponding to a domain size of  $30000 \times 30d_{e,\text{ab}}$ , where  $d_{e,\text{ab}} = c/\omega_{pe,\text{ab}}$  is the electron skin depth calculated at the ablation density  $n_{\text{ab}}$ . The heating operator is uniform in the transverse direction and applied during the first  $2\Omega_i^{-1}$  ( $\Omega_i \equiv eB_{\text{up}}/m_i$  is the ion upstream gyrofrequency). The simulations were carried out with a reduced ion-to-electron mass ratio  $m_i/m_e = 100$  (meaning  $d_{i,\text{ab}} = 10d_{e,\text{ab}}$ ) and a reduced speed of light compared to the electron thermal speed,  $T_{e,\text{ab}}/m_e c^2 = 0.04$  (Fox et al. 2018). A single ion species plasma with  $Z = 1$  is considered. The runs cover a range of upstream plasma beta  $\beta_{e,\text{up}} = 2n_{e,\text{up}}T_{e,\text{up}}/B_{\text{up}}^2 = 0.5 - 2$  through varying the upstream temperature with fixed upstream density  $n_{\text{up}}/n_{\text{ab}} = 0.05$ . We conduct both collisionless and modestly collisional runs, where the collisionality is parameterized by  $\Lambda_{\text{up}} \equiv \lambda_{e,\text{mfp}}^{\text{th}}/d_{i,\text{up}} \sim 0.01 - 0.34$ , where  $\lambda_{e,\text{mfp}}^{\text{th}}$  is the mean free path calculated for an electron traveling in upstream plasma with  $T_{\text{up}}$  and  $n_{\text{up}}$ . The shock speed is typically  $M_A = v_{\text{sh}}/V_{A,\text{up}} \sim 15$  and  $M_e^{\text{th}} = v_{\text{sh}}/v_{e,\text{up}}^{\text{th}} \sim 2.8$ , where  $v_{e,\text{up}}^{\text{th}} = \sqrt{2T_{e,\text{up}}/m_e}$  is the upstream electron thermal speed. We conduct simulations for  $\sim 8\Omega_i^{-1}$ , which is sufficient to observe shock formation and the initial stages of particle acceleration. We also tag particles that originated from the ablating foil (“piston” particles) and from the ambient magnetized plasma (“background” particles) in order to clarify the physics of piston-driven collisionless shocks.

Figure 1a shows transversely averaged 1D profiles at  $\Omega_i t = 8$  for simulation with  $M_A \sim 15$ ,  $\beta_{e,\text{up}} = 2$ ,  $M_e^{\text{th}} \sim 2.8$ , and  $\Lambda_{\text{up}} = 0.34$ , which exhibits electron pre-acceleration. This shock is self-consistently formed by a piston plasma expanding into the ambient magnetized plasma and requires a few ion gyrotimes to separate from the piston. Here, we define the shock regions as follows. The piston is defined as the region from the target ( $z=0$ ) to the edge of the magnetic cavity ( $z/d_{i,\text{up}} = 105$ ); the shock layer is defined as the region between the overshoot peak ( $z/d_{i,\text{up}} = 140$ ) and the location where ion gyration stops ( $z_{\text{up}}/d_{i,\text{up}} \equiv (z_{\text{shock}} + \rho_i)/d_{i,\text{up}} = 153$ ); the downstream and upstream appear to the left and to the right from the shock layer. Here,  $\rho_i \approx 13d_{i,\text{up}}$  is




FIG. 1.— Structure of an ablation driven shock with accelerated electron population at  $M_A \sim 15$ ,  $\beta_{e,\text{up}} \sim 1$ ,  $\theta_{\text{Bn}} = 60^\circ$ ,  $m_i/m_e = 100$ ,  $\Lambda_{\text{up}} = 0.34$  shock at  $\Omega_i t = 8$ . Transversely averaged 1D profiles of plasma density,  $B_y$ , and flow speed (a), ion (b) and electron (c)  $z - p_z$  phase distributions and ion density profiles. (d) electron  $z - p_z$  phase distribution for a similar collisionless run. Dashed vertical lines separate shock regions - piston, downstream, shock layer, and upstream.

the ion gyroradius at the shock front. The jump ratios for magnetic field, density, and electron and ion temperatures are  $B_{\text{down}}/B_{\text{up}} \approx 4$ ,  $n_{i,\text{down}}/n_{i,\text{up}} \approx 4$ ,  $T_{e,\text{down}}/T_{e,\text{up}} \approx 20$ , and  $T_{i,\text{down}}/T_{i,\text{up}} \approx 35$ , which is in approximate agreement with the Rankine-Hugoniot MHD jump conditions in the  $M_A \gg 1$  limit (Fitzpatrick 2014), and which indicate the formation of a shock. Figure 1b shows the ion  $z - p_z$  phase space distribution, with the blue line representing the ion density near  $z \approx 145d_{i,\text{up}}$ . In this quasi-perpendicular shock with  $\theta_{\text{Bn}} = 60^\circ$ , ions are not reflected far upstream, gyrating with  $\rho_i = M_A d_{i,\text{shock}} \approx 13d_{i,\text{up}}$ . The relative velocity of reflected ions in the shock layer is  $\approx 2.2 v_{e,\text{up}}^{\text{th}}$ , which is larger than the upstream electron thermal and Alfvén ( $\sim 0.22 v_{e,\text{up}}^{\text{th}}$ ) velocities. This may lead to multi-stream instabilities in the shock layer (Umeda et al. 2014).

Electron energization in the shock layer and upstream is also observed in the electron  $z - p_z$  phase space distribution, Fig. 1c, around  $z/d_{i,\text{up}} \approx 150 - 160$ . These fast particles have significantly enhanced momentum and  $\sim 100\times$  energy compared to the thermal upstream particles, and may ultimately start the cyclic DSA process (Xu et al. 2020). A similar effect was observed in prior 1D/2D PIC simulations (Amano & Hoshino 2007, 2009; Guo, Sironi & Narayan 2014) with shock parameters close to those presented in this work and was interpreted as a combination of Shock Surfing Acceleration (SSA), in which electrons are pre-accelerated by electrostatic solitary waves formed in the shock foot region by multi-




FIG. 2.—  $z-p_{e,z}$  phase space distribution for particles tagged as (a) piston and (b) background electrons, (c) upstream electron energy spectrum for the same run as in Figure 1. Dashed lines in (c) show the piston-tagged particle energy spectrum in the upstream at  $t \sim 2, 4, 6, 8 \Omega_i^{-1}$ , and the circled line is the fit of bulk part of the upstream spectrum at  $\sim 8 \Omega_i^{-1}$ .

stream instabilities, and Shock Drift Acceleration (SDA), in which electrons are reflected by the shock magnetic overshoot (Treumann 2009). Collisions play an important role in the electron pre-energization, as we see in Figures 1c,d, where the smaller energized fraction is evident in a collisional case (Fig 1c), in contrast to an identical collisionless run (Fig 1d).

Figure 2 shows in greater detail the time history of electron acceleration. Figures 2a and 2b show the electron phase space for piston- and background-tagged electrons at  $\Omega_i t = 8$ , respectively. The same shock structure regions as above are specified here with dashed lines. Blue curves indicate the total electron density profiles, while the green lines indicate the piston electron (Fig 2a) or background electron (Fig 2b) density profiles. Due to collisions, the piston electrons are collisionally slowed in the ambient plasma and are largely stopped before the shock. In contrast, in collisionless simulations, we observe a strong electron bunch which is able to trigger waves in the shock layer (see Figure 1d). Figures 2a and 2b show that the whole shock structure (downstream, shock layer, upstream) is well developed and independent of the piston at this time.

Figure 2c shows the energy spectrum in the upstream (from  $z_{\text{up}}$  to the right boundary of the simulation box) at several times from  $\Omega_i t = 0$  to 8. The contribution to the spectrum from piston-tagged particles is shown with dashed lines.

The fit of the bulk part of the late-time electron spectrum is also presented (green solid-circled line). Here, we see that at  $t = 2 \Omega_i^{-1}$  (the duration of the experiment in Schaeffer et al. (2017a,b)), the non-thermal tail is already there, though the downstream is not yet developed at that time and the non-thermal population is predominantly comprised of piston particles. We find that it requires at least  $6 \Omega_i^{-1}$  for the non-thermal tail to be dominated by background particles. The green dashed line, representing the energy spectrum of piston-tagged electrons at  $t = 8 \Omega_i^{-1}$  in Figure 2c, shows that by this time the piston contribution to the energized particles is small in comparison to the background particles, comprising  $< 10\%$  for  $\mathcal{E}/T_{e,\text{up}}$  in the range of 10-100. Electron energization is fairly efficient: the fraction of upstream electrons with energy  $\mathcal{E} > 20 T_{e,\text{up}}$  is  $\epsilon_e \sim 5\%$ , in agreement with 1D simulations with similar dimensionless shock parameters (Xu et al. 2020). We convert maximum electron energy to physical units, assuming that it is proportional to the kinetic energy of the shock flow relative to the upstream,  $\mathcal{E}_{e,\text{max}} \propto m_i v_{\text{sh}}^2$ . Auxiliary simulations with two-slab shock geometry verify this scaling. For  $v_{\text{sh}} = 700 \text{ km/s}$  (typical laboratory speeds),  $\mathcal{E}_{e,\text{max}} \approx 11 \text{ keV}$ .

Figure 3 illustrates the mechanism for electron energization for an electron which ends up in the upstream. Figure 3a shows the evolution of the density profile over time superposed with a particle trajectory near the shock. It shows the evolution of the shock structure (dashed line labeled ‘shock’), expansion of the ablating foil (white area labeled ‘expanding foil’), propagation of the piston (yellow area labeled ‘piston’), and development of the contact discontinuity and shock downstream (starting from  $\sim 3 \Omega_i^{-1}$ ). The white line shows a particle track in  $(z, t)$  space. During the first  $5 \Omega_i^{-1}$ , the electron quivers around  $z/d_{i,\text{up}} \sim 110$  with nearly constant magnetic moment  $\mu \equiv v_{e\perp}^2/B$  (Figure 3b) and energy (Figure 3c), and once the electron gets within  $\sim 1 - 10 d_{i,\text{up}}$  from the overshoot, the electron experiences a non-adiabatic (Fig. 3b) gain of perpendicular energy over a time  $\sim \Omega_i^{-1}$ . This type of particle energization is consistent with SDA (Guo, Sironi & Narayan 2014), which only requires (a) the presence of the motional electric field being dominantly responsible for perpendicular energy gain (Fig. 3c) and (b)  $\nabla B$  drift in the shock layer ( $\nabla B \times \hat{B} \parallel \mathbf{e}_x \neq 0$ , as seen in Figure 1a). After traveling with the shock front for  $\approx 1 \Omega_i^{-1}$  at a location within  $\sim 6 - 8 d_{i,\text{up}}$  from the overshoot, the accelerated electron is reflected from the magnetic overshoot to the upstream, losing its perpendicular energy (Fig. 3c) and escaping along the magnetic field line. Tracking back all energized particles in the upstream (i.e., particles with  $p_e/m_e c > 0.3$  and  $z > z_{\text{up}}$ ), we estimate where this particle population was accelerated (i.e., where  $p_e/m_e c > 0.3$  for the first time throughout the simulation) with respect to the shock,  $z_{\text{energ}} - z_{\text{shock}}$ , and how deep these particles get into the shock over the whole shock evolution,  $z_{\text{min}} - z_{\text{shock}}$ , Fig. 3d. This analysis indicates that particles are predominantly energized in the shock foot ( $z_{\text{energ}} - z_{\text{shock}} > 0$ ), rather than in the downstream, and that only a small number of particles even sample the downstream. Average values of these quantities are:  $\langle z_{\text{energ}} - z_{\text{shock}} \rangle \approx 5.6 d_{i,\text{up}}$  and  $\langle z_{\text{min}} - z_{\text{shock}} \rangle \approx 0.8 d_{i,\text{up}}$ . The mean energy e-folding time of this population is  $1.8 \Omega_i^{-1}$ , which is again in good agreement with (Guo, Sironi & Narayan 2014). The typical energy gain in SDA,  $\Delta \mathcal{E}_{\text{SDA}}/T_{e,\text{up}} =$




FIG. 3.— Trajectory of the energized electron (solid white line) in (a) density profile evolution over time, (b) first adiabatic invariant normalized to its initial value, and (c) total kinetic energy (black solid line), perpendicular kinetic energy (red dotted line), parallel kinetic energy (blue dotted line), energy deposited onto particle by motional electric field (green dashed line) evolution of particle normalized to initial electron energy. (d) 2D histogram of energized ( $p_e/m_e c > 0.3$ ) particles reflected into the upstream ( $z > z_{up}$ ) at the end of simulation in  $(z_{energ} - z_{shock}, z_{min} - z_{shock})$  coordinates. The red dashed line demarkates  $z_{min} \leq z_{energ}$ , which is required by definition.

$M_A^{-1} (m_i/m_e) (m_e v_{sh}^2 / T_{e,up}) \sin \theta_{Bn} (\delta x / d_{i,up}) \sim 565$  ( $\Delta \mathcal{E}_{SDA} / m_e c^2 \sim 1.1$ ), is fairly consistent with energy gains observed in our simulations ( $\delta x \sim 10 d_{i,up}$  is the transverse distance travelled by electron in shock layer before the reflection). SSA (Amano & Hoshino 2007) and cyclic SDA (Guo, Sironi & Narayan 2014) were not observed in the run, since the waves are suppressed in collisional simulations:  $\delta B / B_{up} < 20\%$  and  $E_{es} / B_{up} < 0.1$  in the collisional case, in contrast to  $\delta B / B_{up} \sim 100\%$  and  $E_{es} / B_{up} \sim 0.3$  in the collisionless run. Here,  $\delta B$  is the magnetic field perturbation magnitude and  $E_{es}$  is the electrostatic component of the electric field.

Figure 4a-b summarizes the whole set of our collisionless (blue) and collisional (red) ablation simulations with  $M_A \sim 15$  and  $\beta_{e,up} \sim 1$ . We varied the shock angle  $\theta_{Bn}$ , collisionality ( $\Lambda_{up}$ ), and Alfvén Mach number  $M_A$ , and observe significant energization of the upstream electron population. We quantify the accelerated electrons in terms of two parameters:  $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_{e,up} \equiv \int_{z_{up}} \mathcal{E} f(\mathcal{E}) d\mathcal{E} / \int_{z_{up}} f(\mathcal{E}) d\mathcal{E}$ , which is the energy moment of the distribution function  $f(\mathcal{E})$  calculated in the upstream; and shock reflectivity  $R$ , which is the fraction of nonthermal particles in the upstream  $R \equiv n_{e,up}(\mathcal{E} > 20 T_{e,up}) / n_{e,up}$ . Error bars are obtained by varying the analysis window within  $5 d_{i,up}$ . The green asterisk corresponds to the reference simulation described above. A parametric scan shows a range around  $R \approx 1\% - 2\%$  of nonthermal particles and  $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_{e,up} / T_{e,up} \sim 4 - 5$  for  $\theta_{Bn} = 60^\circ$  for collisional runs. The trend toward smaller number of particles for larger shock angles is in qualitative agreement with similar simulations in Amano & Hoshino (2007). This is tied to the size of the loss cone allowing particles to escape along the magnetic field line when the condition  $u_{\perp} \geq C_{s,up} (B_{up} / B_{overshoot})^{1/2}$  is satisfied (Amano & Hoshino 2007). Here,  $u_{\perp}$  is the perpendicular

velocity with respect to local magnetic field and  $C_{s,up}$  is the upstream sound speed. The fraction of non-thermal particles saturates for angles smaller than  $65^\circ$ , which is again in agreement with the analytical prediction from Amano & Hoshino (2007). The fraction of reflected particles is suppressed for collisional runs in comparison to collisionless, but still stays within  $R \approx 1\% - 2\%$ . Figures 4c-f demonstrate a scan on collisionality (Figure 4c,e) and  $M_A$  (Figure 4d,f). They show the robustness of the proposed pre-acceleration mechanism to variations in shock speed for Alfvén Mach numbers larger than threshold for injection  $M_A^{inj}$ ,  $M_A \geq M_A^{inj} \equiv 0.5 \cos(\theta_{Bn}) (\beta_{e,up} m_i / m_e)^{1/2} \approx 3.5$  (Amano & Hoshino 2010). Figure 5a-c presents the collisionality scan for  $\Lambda_{up}$  from 0.11 to 0.011, and it clearly shows how the gradual transition to more collisional plasma suppresses the population of energetic electrons in the upstream. The collisionality threshold criteria is found to be  $\Lambda_{up} \gg 0.01$ .

Let us summarize the experimental requirements that will allow us to study shock acceleration of electrons. (1) *Shock parameters* - we need the shock parameters to be in the right regime for the efficient SDA manifestation, which, according to our simulations and data from literature, requires  $33 \geq M_A \geq 7 \geq M_{inj}$  and  $\beta_{e,up} \sim 1$ . The shock angle is also important, as only quasi-perpendicular shocks with  $\theta_{Bn} < 70^\circ$  show significant acceleration. (2) *System size* - we require the spatial size of the setup to be large enough, so the shock will have enough time to develop and accelerate electrons. This is a constraint on both the experiment time  $t_{exp}$  and system size  $L_{exp}$ , which are related by  $t_{exp} = L_{exp} / v_{sh}$ , where  $v_{sh}$  is the shock speed. We find that the shock develops in  $\sim 2 \Omega_i^{-1}$ , that the timescale for particle acceleration is  $\sim 1.8 \Omega_i^{-1}$ . However, we then find  $\sim 6 \Omega_i^{-1}$  are required for the background-accelerated particles to dominate,




FIG. 4.— Dependence of the properties of the nonthermal electron population - (a)  $\overline{\mathcal{E}_{e,up}/T_{e,up}}$  and (b)  $R$  - on shock angle  $\theta_{Bn}$  for collisionless (blue) and collisional (red) simulations; scans on (c,e)  $\Lambda_{up}$  and (d,f)  $M_A$  for collisional simulations. Green asterisk corresponds to the reference simulation described in Fig. 1-3.

allowing a clean detection of acceleration. (3) *Collisionality* - another condition for the experimental observation of nonthermal electrons is sufficiently low collisionality. This requirement can be naturally separated into two subcategories: (I) sufficiently low collisionality for the SDA to effectively accelerate electrons (our numerical analysis implies that the sufficient condition is  $\Lambda_{up} \gg 0.01$ ) and (II) sufficiently low collisionality for the accelerated electrons to leave the shock layer and reach the detector without significant energy losses, i.e. the mean free path of energetic electron is larger than the system size ( $\lambda_{e,mfp}^e/L_{exp} \geq 1$ ). Another condition that is related to collisionality is that  $\mathcal{E}_{max}$ , the maximum electron energy that can be achieved by the given collisionless shock via SDA (Guo, Sironi & Narayan 2014), is no less than the min-




FIG. 5.— Electron phase space distribution in  $(z/d_{i,up}, p_e/m_e c)$  coordinates for the parameters of the run presented above with the collisionality level  $\Lambda_{up}$  being (a) 0.11, (b) 0.034, (c) 0.011. The gradual drop of the maximum energies and pre-accelerated electron numbers is seen for larger collisionalities. Colormap of the maximum electron energy achievable by collisionless shock via SDA that may be detected in the experimental setup similar to (d) OMEGA and (e) NIF.

imum electron energy that satisfies escape conditions,  $\epsilon_{min}$ :  $\mathcal{E}_{max} \geq \epsilon_{min}$ .

Figures 5d,e illustrate the parameter space  $(n, B, \mathcal{E}_{max})$  which satisfies the conditions listed above for typical parameters of experimental setups at large laser facilities like OMEGA and NIF. For typical experimental parameters at the OMEGA facility (system size  $L_{exp} = 1$  cm, background plasma temperature  $T_e \sim 20$  eV, shock speed  $v_{sh} = 700$  km/s (Schaeffer et al. 2017a,b)), observation of nonthermal electrons requires a regime with  $B \sim 10$  T magnetic field and upstream plasma density  $n_e \sim 10^{18} - 10^{19} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ . In this case, we expect the electrons of energies between

$\varepsilon_{\min} = 1.5 \text{ keV}$  and  $\varepsilon_{\max} = 5 \text{ keV}$  to escape the experimental setup and be available for observation. These parameters are already available at the OMEGA facility (e.g., magnetic fields of around 15 T were previously reported in Fiksel et al. (2015)). For NIF-like parameters ( $L_{\text{exp}} = 2 \text{ cm}$ ,  $T_e = 100 \text{ eV}$ ,  $v_{\text{sh}} = 1500 \text{ km/s}$ ), a regime with  $B \sim 10^1 \text{ T}$  and  $n_e \sim 10^{18} - 10^{19} \text{ cm}^{-3}$  is needed, allowing observations of particles in the range from 1.5 to 10 keV; our PIC simulations demonstrate that such high electron energies are achievable. While magnetized collisionless shock experiments have not yet been conducted at NIF, these values are reasonable extensions from OMEGA experiments to a larger laser facility like NIF. Some parameters, such as temperature and flow speed, were recently reported for the experimental study of a Weibel shock at NIF (Fiuza et al. 2020).

It is useful to note that we do not expect a significant influence of the shock curvature on the SDA acceleration of electrons. In principle, the shock front curvature does affect the efficiency of the SDA, since it requires a significant transverse motion of the pre-accelerated particle. But in our case, at later stages of shock evolution, the radius of curvature scales as  $M_A \Omega_i t$  and, after a few ion gyrotimes, will be significantly larger than transverse acceleration scales within the shock. Thus, the SDA mechanism will not be affected.

It is also important to note that we conduct 2D simulations with ‘out-of-plane’ magnetic field (i.e., with significant magnetic field component along  $\mathbf{e}_y$ , which is perpendicular to the simulation box plane  $\{\mathbf{e}_x, \mathbf{e}_z\}$ ), which is known to affect the structure of the shock itself (Wieland et al. 2016; Bohdan et al. 2017), as well as the electron energization efficiency (Guo, Sironi & Narayan 2014; Crumley et al. 2019). Our auxiliary simulations suggest that out-of-plane runs demonstrate at least an order of magnitude advantage in shock reflectivity  $R$  in comparison to in-plane runs. Resolving this will require 3D simulations, which are too computationally demanding at

present, and, of course, experimental measurements. In order to study the convergence of our results, we conducted a few auxiliary runs with  $M_A \sim 15$ ,  $\beta_{e,\text{up}} \sim 1$ ,  $\Lambda_{\text{up}} \sim 0.34$ , and  $\theta_{\text{Bn}} = 60^\circ$ , varying transverse size (strictly 1D,  $2\times$  and  $4\times$  the transverse size of the box mentioned above), heating radius (so the heating radius equals the transverse size of the box), mass ratio (running a strictly 1D run with  $m_i/m_e = 400$ ), and absolute value of the shock speed relative to the speed of light, and concluded that changing these parameters does not significantly affect  $R$  and  $\overline{\varepsilon}_{e,\text{up}}$ .

In summary, we have conducted a multi-parameter investigation of electron pre-acceleration by collisionless magnetized shocks in experimental conditions of expanding laboratory laser plasmas. Our quasi-1D PIC simulations show that it is possible to generate a population of non-thermal electrons in the upstream and shock layer with energies up to tens of keV when the shock parameters are close to those that were obtained experimentally in Schaeffer et al. (2017a,b, 2019). We also formulate the experimental conditions needed for the robust observation of electron injection by magnetized collisionless shocks. In the near future, we believe controlled laboratory experiments on electron energization by magnetized collisionless shocks will allow for better understanding of electron energization by moderate-level Alfvén Mach number shocks observed in the Earth’s magnetosphere, as well as to address the injection problem for high-Mach-number shocks.

Simulations were conducted on the Titan and Summit supercomputers at the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, supported by the Office of Science of the DOE under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725. This research was also supported by the DOE under Contracts No. DE-SC0014405, DE-SC0016249, DE-NA0003612, and NSF grants PHY-1748958, AST-1814708 and PHY-1804048.

## REFERENCES

- Amano T., Hoshino M., 2007, ApJ, 661, 190  
Amano T., Hoshino M., 2009, ApJ, 690, 244  
Amano T., Hoshino M., 2010, Phys. Rev. Lett., 104, 181102  
Bohdan A., Niemiec J., Kobzar O., Pohl M., 2017, ApJ, 847, 71  
Bell A.R., 1978, MNRAS, 182, 147  
Bell A.R., 1978, MNRAS, 182, 443  
Bulanov S.V., 2016, Plasm. Phys. Cont. Fus., 59, 014029  
Burgess D., Scholer M., 2015, *Collisionless Shocks in Space Plasmas*, Cambridge University Press  
Crumley P., Caprioli D., Markoff S., Spitkovsky A., 2019, MNRAS, 485, 5105  
Dong Q.L., Wang S.J., Lu Q.M., Huang C., Yuan D.W., Liu X., Liu X.X., Li Y.T., Wei H.G., Zhong J.Y., Shi J.R., 2012, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 215001  
Fiksel G., Agliata A., Barnak D., Brent G., Chang P.Y., Folsbee L., Gates G., Hasset D., Lonobile D., Magoon J., Mastro Simone D., 2015, Rev. Sc. Inst. 86, 016105  
Fiuza F., Swadling G.F., Grassi A., Rinderknecht H.G., Higginson D.P., Ryutov D.D., Bruulsema C., Drake R.P., Funk S., Glenzer S., Gregori G., C. K. Li, B. B. Pollock, B. A. Remington, J. S. Ross, W. Rozmus, Y. Sakawa, A. Spitkovsky, S. Wilks & H.-S. Park, 2020, Nat. Phys. 16, 916  
Fitzpatrick R., 2014, *Plasma Physics. An Introduction.*, CRC Press  
Fox W., Fiksel G., Bhattacharjee A., Chang P.Y., Germaschewski K., Hu S.X. and Nilson P.M., 2013, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 225002  
Fox W., Matteucci J., Moissard C., Schaeffer D.B., Bhattacharjee A., Germaschewski K., Hu S.X., 2018, Phys. Plasmas 25, 102106  
Germaschewski K., Fox W., Abbott S., Ahmadi N., Maynard K., Wang L., Ruhl H., Bhattacharjee A., 2016, J. Comp. Phys. 318, 305  
Glasmacher M.A.K., Catanese M.A., Chantell M.C., Covault C.E., Cronin J.W., Fick B.E., Fortson L.F., Fowler J.W., Green K.D., Kieda D.B., Matthews J., 1999, Astroparticle Phys. 10, 2911302  
Guo X., Sironi L., Narayan R., 2014, ApJ, 794, 153  
Huntington C.M., Fiuza F., Ross J.S., Zylstra A.B., Drake R.P., Froula D.H., Gregori G., Kugland N.L., Kuranz C.C., Levy M.C., Li C.K., 2015, Nature Phys., 11, 173  
Katou T., Amano T., 2019, ApJ, 874, 119  
Krymsky G.F., ASR USSR, 1977, 234, 1306  
Masters A., Stawarz L., Fujimoto M., Schwartz S.J., Sergis N., Thomsen M.F., Retino A., Hasegawa H., Zieger B., Lewis G.R., Coates A.J., 2013, Nature Phys. 9, 164  
Matsumoto Y., Amano T., Hoshino M., 2012, ApJ, 755, 109  
Matsumoto Y., Amano T., Kato T.N., Hoshino M., 2015, Science 347, 974  
Nilson P.M., Willingale L., Kaluza M.C., Kamperidis C., Minardi S., Wei M.S., Fernandes P., Notley M., Bandyopadhyay S., Sherlock M., Kingham R.J., 2006, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 255001  
Rosenberg M.J., Li C.K., Fox W., Zylstra A.B., Stoeckl C., Séguin F.H., Frenje J.A., Petrasso R.D., 2015, Phys. Rev. Lett. 114, 205004  
Rosenberg M.J., Li C.K., Fox W., Igumenshchev I., Séguin F.H., Town R.P.J., Frenje J.A., Stoeckl C., Glebov V., Petrasso R.D., 2015, Nat. Commun. 6, 6190  
Schaeffer D.B., Fox W., Haberberger D., Fiksel G., Bhattacharjee A., Barnak D.H., Hu S.X., Germaschewski K., 2017, Phys. Rev. Lett. 119, 025001  
Schaeffer D.B., Fox W., Haberberger D., Fiksel G., Bhattacharjee A., Barnak D.H., Hu S.X., Germaschewski K., Follett R.K., 2017, Phys. Plasmas 24, 122702  
Schaeffer D.B., Fox W., Follett R.K., Fiksel G., Li C.K., Matteucci J., Bhattacharjee A., Germaschewski K., 2019, Phys. Rev. Lett. 122, 245001  
Schaeffer D. B., Fox W., Matteucci J., Lezhnin K.V., Bhattacharjee A., Germaschewski K., 2020, Phys. Plasmas 27, 042901  
Treumann R. A., 2009, A.&A. Rev. 17, 409  
Umeda T., Kidani Y., Matsukiyo S., Yamazaki R., 2014, Phys. Plasmas 21, 022102

Umeda T., Yamazaki R., Ohira Y., Ishizaka N., Kakuchi S., Kuramitsu Y.,  
Matsukiyo S., Miyata I., Morita T., Sakawa Y., Sano T., 2019, Phys.  
Plasmas 26, 032303  
Wieland V., Pohl M., Niemiec J., Rafighi I., Nishikawa K.-I., 2016, ApJ,  
820, 62

Xu R., Spitkovsky A., Caprioli D., 2020, ApJL 897, L41  
Yamada M., Kulsrud R., Ji H., 2010, Rev. Mod. Phys. 82, 603  
Zhong J., Li Y., Wang X., Wang J., Dong Q., Xiao C., Wang S., Liu X.,  
Zhang L., An L., Wang F., 2010, Nat. Phys. 6, 984