

Experimental determination of the electric field and charge distribution in magnetically insulated ion diodes

Y. Maron

*Laboratory of Plasma Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853
and Department of Physics, Weizmann Institute, 76 100 Rehovot, Israel*

M. D. Coleman, D. A. Hammer, and H. S. Peng*

Laboratory of Plasma Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853

(Received 24 March 1987)

We have measured the electric field distribution across the high-voltage gap of a magnetically insulated intense ion beam diode by observing the Stark shift of line emission from ions accelerating in the gap. The measured distribution yielded the time dependence of the actual diode gap. We observed rapid gap closure early in time resulting from expansion of the electric-field-excluding electrode plasmas in the diode. This can contribute substantially to the previously observed ion-current-density enhancements over the values calculated based upon the mechanical diode gap. Assuming planar geometry the electric field distribution was used to determine the electron density across the diode gap. This was compared with one-dimensional Brillouin-flow model calculations using the *actual* acceleration gap. The electrons were observed to spread towards the anode beyond the region of the theoretical electron sheath. The electron presence near the anode was further enhanced when a cathode vane was used. In addition, an increase in the total electron number in the gap relative to analytic theory was inferred. This serves to explain the enhancement of the measured ion current density over the one calculated with use of the *actual* diode gap that we observed for the configurations tested.

I. INTRODUCTION

Crossed electric and magnetic fields have been applied in a variety of high-power charged-particle-beam devices. The magnetic field may be externally applied or it may be produced by the large beam currents in the device. Examples are (1) magnetically insulated ion diodes¹⁻³ for the generation of intense ion beams, (2) plasma erosion switches^{4,5} for high-current switching, (3) magnetrons⁶ for the generation of high-power microwave radiation, and (4) high-power electron diodes.⁷ A common feature of these devices is that electrons and ions (drawn from the cathode and the anode plasmas, respectively) are accelerated by electric fields > 1 MV/cm which prevail in gaps of a few millimeters to a few centimeters width between the electric-field-excluding plasmas in the devices. While the ions (being little affected by the magnetic fields) move in the acceleration gap along nearly straight trajectories, electrons execute complicated gyrations and drifts.

In magnetically insulated ion diodes, a magnetic field is applied parallel to the electrodes in order to inhibit the electron flow to the anode, thereby enhancing the ion generation efficiency of the diode relative to a few percent or less predicted by space-charge-limited flow calculations. Equilibrium solutions⁸⁻¹⁰ for the electron and ion flow yield the distribution of the electric potential and the charge density in the gap under the key assumption of one dimensionality. However, the actual charge flow does not obey these solutions, probably due to the finite size of the diodes,¹¹ the nonuniformity of both the

value and the direction of the applied magnetic field,^{2,12} and nonuniformities of the plasmas in the diodes.^{13,14} These problems are demonstrated by a substantial electron flow to the anode (which significantly reduces the diode efficiency and causes damage to the anode surface) in spite of strong magnetic insulation. Such nonideal configurational effects may also result^{13,15} in a considerable divergence of the ion beams, which imposes limitation on their use.¹⁶

Measurements inside high-power diodes are difficult to perform due to the small gap spacing and high-voltage stress there. Prior to the measurements reported here, only the plasmas in the diodes have been observed. The high-density plasma front motion has been monitored using interferometry,¹⁷⁻¹⁹ plasma density has been measured by spectral line broadening,^{19,20} and cathode plasma temperature has been inferred from line intensity ratios.¹⁹ However, these observations yielded the density profile of only the relatively dense part of the electrode plasmas ($\approx 10^{15}$ cm⁻³) rather than the boundaries of the electric-field-excluding plasmas in the diode. The actual diode gap (i.e., the distance between the zero electric field positions) throughout the pulse was, therefore, still unknown. Thus, although possible effects of electrode plasma expansion in diodes have been considered,^{17,21-23} measured ion current densities were usually compared to theoretically predicted values based on the *mechanical* (initially set) diode gap. On the other hand, the electron flow in the gap and the ion current density are very sensitive to the actual diode gap; hence a better determination of the latter is necessary. Furthermore, no investi-

gation of the potential distribution in the acceleration gap (between the electrode plasmas) has been attempted prior to the work presented here.

The present study was motivated by a recent suggestion²⁴ that the electric field in the acceleration gap of a high-power ion diode can be determined by measuring the Stark shift of line emission from ions traversing the gap, as shown schematically in Fig. 1(a). Observation of the spectral profile of specially selected ion emission lines at different distances x [see Fig. 1(a)] from the anode allows the electric field distribution $E(x)$ across the diode acceleration gap to be obtained. In this scheme, in which ion spontaneous emission is observed, the measurement integrates over the line of sight, and the line emission (collected parallel to the electrodes) is Doppler broadened due to the transverse ion motion (parallel to the electrodes). The Doppler broadening can be canceled by the use of two-photon Doppler-free absorption of tunable dye laser light to excite the ions,²⁴ which would yield local measurements of the electric field. Here we report measurements of the electric field distribution in the gap of a magnetically insulated diode by the spontaneous emission method. The ions are excited in the anode plasma and are observed while accelerating in the diode gap [Fig. 1(a)]. For each position x , the electric field $E(x)$, averaged over a plane parallel to the anode, was obtained as a function of time in one or two pulses of the intense ion beam source.

We have measured²⁵ the electric field distribution $E(x)$ for planar diode configurations and for a vaned-cathode configuration. The $E(x)$ distribution showed that the electric-field-excluding anode plasma expanded rapidly early in the pulse, causing a gap reduction which considerably affected the ion current density. The determination of the *actual* (instantaneous) diode gap throughout the pulse allowed a comparison of measured $E(x)$ profiles and ion current densities with one-dimensional calculations⁹ for a magnetically insulated

diode which has the measured accelerating gap, voltage, and applied magnetic field. Furthermore, from the experimentally determined $E(x)$ distribution it is possible to obtain the distributions of the electrostatic potential, ion density, and the electron density. The additional assumption of laminar $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ electron drift motion can then be used to obtain the distribution of the electron drift current in the diode gap. Finally, the total electron drift current can be compared with the diode electron current that is inferred from the measured total diode current minus the ion current obtained from Faraday cup measurements of the ion current density together with the active diode area. The inferred electron density distribution showed electron presence close to the anode beyond the region of the calculated electron sheath. For the planar cathode configuration this phenomenon was associated, in certain cases, with a measured ion current density about twice the calculated one. For the vaned-cathode configuration the electron migration towards the anode was more pronounced and was accompanied by an increase in the total electron number in the gap. The total electron drift current was about twice the calculated value. The extra electrons in the gap provide a qualitative explanation for our observed ion-current-density enhancement of 3–8 over the value calculated⁹ using the *actual* diode gap.

II. EXPERIMENTAL SYSTEM

In order to obtain line emission from ions traversing the gap, the ions must be excited in the anode plasma and the upper level of the transition must have a lifetime about equal to the ion transit time in the gap (a few nanoseconds). If the lifetime is much longer, the emission in the gap may be too weak to obtain reasonable accuracy. Secondly, the Stark shift of the line emission under the influence of electric fields in the range of interest must be sufficiently large that the Doppler broadening of the line which results from transverse ion velocities is not important.²⁴ Proton beam divergences of about 5° were measured outside the diode used for these experiments.²⁶ If such a divergence were present inside the diode the Doppler broadening of a visible line emitted in the transverse direction from ions produced in a 300-kV diode would be of the order of 1 Å. For a Stark shift to exceed this, line emission from a high-lying upper level of a light ion must be used. Alternatively, heavy ions can be accelerated in the gap²⁴ for which energy levels close to the ground level can also be sufficiently Stark shifted. Obviously, the shift must also be smaller than the spectral distance to nearby line emission. An additional consideration is that the observed ions must be abundant in the anode plasma (which is composed mostly of protons in magnetically insulated diodes unless major effort is invested to avoid them¹⁵); the desired upper level must be sufficiently populated so that the small fraction of ions drawn from the plasma into the gap will provide sufficiently intense emission. Furthermore, the observed ions must be easily and reproducibly generated in the anode plasma. Finally, since the electric field is inferred from the measured line shift, the oscillator




FIG. 1. (a) Method (Ref. 24) for measuring the electric field E in the acceleration gap of a magnetically insulated diode. (b) An end view of the ion diode showing the location of the cathode vane and the anode ion emission region. (c) Schematic illustration of the planar magnetically insulated ion diode and the optical arrangement. The distance of the observation region from the anode is varied by moving the mirror M in the x direction.

strengths of the relevant dipole transitions should be known relatively well. [The uncertainty in the calculation, however, only scales the inferred values of E , thus not affecting the distribution of $E(x)$]. Hence, it may be advantageous to select an ion with one electron in the outer shell.

For our experiments we used the racetrack shaped planar magnetically insulated diode²⁶ which is illustrated in Figs. 1(b) and 1(c). The insulating magnetic field²⁷ ($B_z = 5\text{--}8$ kG) which inhibits the electron motion across the gap was produced by an external current through a single turn coil which also acted as the cathode. The dielectric-anode surface was made up of a $140 \times 50 \times 1.6$ mm³ polyethylene sheet (with the long dimension parallel to B_z) drilled with 1-mm-diam holes, 2.7 mm apart. The diode was powered by about a 400-kV, 80-ns pulse delivered by a 10- Ω water dielectric transmission line mounted on the output of a 5- Ω , 80-ns pulse-forming line. Typical diode voltage and current waveforms are shown in Fig. 2.

A schematic diagram of the optical arrangement is shown in Fig. 1(c). Line radiation emitted in the z direction from a surface parallel to the anode was directed by the mirror M to a lens L which focused it on the input slit of a λ -Minuteman 0.5-m spectrometer. Light was collected from a volume 14 cm long and 5 cm high as determined by the input slit length (4 mm) and the demagnification factor 12 of the lens L . The thickness of this volume in the x direction (i.e., the spatial resolution) of 0.6 mm was similarly determined by the slit width of 50 μm . The spatial resolution was also checked by observing light from a point source placed in different regions of the diode viewed by the system.

Using the cylindrical lens CL [see Fig. 1(c)], the spectrometer output was magnified about 10 times to further disperse the spectrum. It was then directed onto an array of seven fiber bundles, each 10 mm high and 0.8 mm wide. The width of the spectral window observed by each fiber bundle was determined by the lens magnification and input slit width. The spectral resolution of the system for the 50- μm input slit was 0.7 \AA . Each fiber bundle transmitted the light to a photomultiplier tube, the signal from which was recorded by an os-

cilloscope giving a temporal resolution of 8 ns. Thus, seven points of a spectral line profile were obtained as a function of time in a single discharge.

For our measurements, we selected the Al^{+2} ions produced in the anode plasma from an aluminum coating on the polyethylene anode which resulted from aluminum blown off the anode stalk due to electron bombardment. We used the radiative decay of the $4d$ level (of 20.6 eV above the ground state) which is Stark shifted mainly due to interaction with the $4f$ level. The shift results in a red-shifted radiative transition to the almost unshifted $4p$ level. We made most of our measurements on the $4d_{5/2} \rightarrow 4p_{3/2}$ (4529.2- \AA) line although the shift of the $4d_{3/2} \rightarrow 4p_{1/2}$ emission (4512.5 \AA) was also observed. The electric field causes the $4d_{5/2}$ level to split into three shifted components. Further modification of the emission pattern results from the magnetic field (Zeeman effect). For most of our measurements, the entire line profile could be obtained on a single discharge using the seven-channel fiber bundle array with 0.7 \AA width per channel. However, when the electric field was ≥ 1.2 MV/cm, the shifted line profile was sufficiently broad that the complete profile had to be obtained on two successive discharges.

We note that except for the first few discharges after the insertion of a new polyethylene anode sheet, the electric field derived from the Al^{+2} line emission was reproducible to within 10% for more than a hundred discharges, thus allowing us to obtain the electric field distribution across the entire diode gap using the same diode setup.

The ion current density J_i was measured using negatively biased Faraday cups placed 17 cm from the anode. To determine the fraction of ions heavier than protons in the ion beam, we placed 2- μm thick polyethylene foil (which lets through only protons of at least 180 keV energy) in front of the cups. From such measurements and ion time of flight considerations we concluded that the nonprotonic component of the ion beam was about 35%. From observed line emission from the anode plasma we believe that this component is comprised mainly of singly and doubly charged ions of carbon, oxygen, nitrogen, and aluminum.




FIG. 2. Typical inductively corrected diode voltage (monitored by a capacitive probe), diode current, and ion current density waveforms.

III. MEASUREMENTS

A. Line-shift measurement

For each diode configuration, we first observed line emission from a position about 1 mm from the solid anode surface. This region is occupied by the electric-field-excluding anode plasma. The line emission from this region started about 15 ns, and reached a plateau about 35 ns, after the start of the diode voltage pulse (denoted here as $t=0$). A typical profile of the 4529- \AA Al^{+2} emission from the anode plasma is shown in Fig. 3(a) for $t=70$ ns. Each point represents the signal recorded by one fiber channel. The profile is unshifted, consistent with previous measurements²⁸ which showed a negligible shift for this line at our anode plasma density (less than $6 \times 10^{15} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ (Ref. 20)). The observed linewidth was determined by the system spectral resolu-

tion. Observations of the emission from the anode plasma were used to verify that the plasma provided no other line emission close to the lines of interest.

The mirror M [see Fig. 1(c)] was then moved to observe ion emission from the acceleration gap. The light signal from the gap began coincident (within our temporal resolution) with the start of the light signal from the anode plasma, as expected from the short ion transit time in the gap. Also, it was a few hundred times smaller than that from the plasma on the electrodes. A profile of the red-shifted 4529-Å line emission from the gap is shown in Fig. 3(b). The signal at the zero-field wavelength (i.e., the signal from the fiber channel centered at 4529.2 Å) was probably due to the unshifted intense plasma light scattered into the detection system (when it was set to look into the acceleration gap). Indeed, by varying the position of the window through which the light was extracted from the vacuum chamber, and placing baffles in the vacuum chamber to block the electrode light, we found that almost the entire unshifted signal of the 4529-Å line initially observed from the gap was due to scattered electrode light. Therefore, the residual signal was ignored when the ion emission from the gap was unfolded to give the electric field. We note that at later times, when the anode plasma expanded far enough into the gap to be observed by the optical system, the measured line emission became unshifted and about 100 times more intense, as expected.

B. Unfolding the electric field

In order to determine the electric field from the measured shifted line spectral profile, we calculated the expected emission pattern along the magnetic field from an ion under perpendicular electric E_x and magnetic B_z fields. Both electric and magnetic dipole contributions to the shifts and splitting of the ion energy levels were taken into account. We considered only the $n=4$ levels, since the interactions of the $4d$ and the $4p$ levels with




FIG. 3. (a) Spectral profile of the $4d_{5/2} \rightarrow 4p_{3/2} \text{Al}^{+2}$ emission from the anode plasma ($x=0.15$ cm) at $t=70$ ns. The zero-field wavelength is 4529.2 Å. The initial A - K gap (d_0) was 0.65 cm, the peak diode voltage was about 300 kV, and B was 8.4 kG. The spectral window of each fiber channel was 0.67 Å. (b) Profile of the emission from the acceleration gap: $x=0.375$ cm and $t=65$ ns. The lines in (a) and (b) indicate the trend.

levels of $n \neq 4$ have negligible effect. For the oscillator strengths we used values calculated by Cowan.²⁹ For B_z , we used the value of the externally applied magnetic field. This is justified since, firstly, the variation of the magnetic field in our low-current diode due to diamagnetic effects is small.⁸⁻¹⁰ Secondly, the magnetic field is assumed to totally penetrate the electrode plasmas based upon the field penetration time scale being short compared to the pulse length (determined using resistivities of the anode and the cathode plasmas calculated from the observed plasma conditions^{17,19}). Furthermore, the calculated emission pattern was not sensitive to the value of B_z in the range 0–10 kG once the Doppler broadening was included in each component of the split line.

In the calculation of the predicted spectral line profiles, each component of the $4d_{5/2} \rightarrow 4p_{3/2}$ emission was broadened to account for the Doppler broadening due to the ion transverse velocities. The Doppler broadening of the 4529-Å line was inferred from our measured³⁰ Doppler broadening of the 3602-Å Al^{+2} line. The latter line is not shifted by the electric field; thus its broadening [full width at half maximum (FWHM) approximately 1 Å] was used to obtain the Al^{+2} ion transverse velocities.³⁰ The Doppler broadening of the shifted pattern components had a negligible effect on the fit of the calculated pattern to the observed one because the broadening does not alter the average shift of the pattern. (The effect of the system spectral resolution was even smaller than that of the Doppler broadening.) Examples of calculated line profiles as seen by our spectral system for three values of E_x for $B_z=0$ are shown in Fig. 4.

The electric field was inferred from a least-squares fit of a calculated emission pattern for a range of E (0.4–1.5 MV/cm) to the measured points of the emission spectral distribution. Since this analysis assumed a single value of the electric field, it gives, for each position, x , the mean electric field E over the gap region observed by the collection optics.

C. Tests of the measurement method

We observed line emission from the gap which should not be measurably shifted by our electric fields. These lines were Al^{+2} 5722 Å, Al^{+2} 3602 Å, and C^{+2} 4647 Å, all of which were unshifted. In addition, we observed the shift of the other transition from the Al^{+2} $4d$ level, i.e., the Al^{+2} 4512-Å line ($4d_{3/2} \rightarrow 4p_{1/2}$). This line emission must also be red shifted and, since the shift is




FIG. 4. Calculated spectral profiles for the $4d_{5/2} \rightarrow 4p_{3/2} \text{Al}^{+2}$ emission for three electric fields with $B=0$. Each of the components of the shifted emission was assumed to be Gaussian-like with a FWHM of 1.3 Å due to Doppler broadening. The zero-field wavelength is 4529.2 Å.

determined by the $4f-4d$ oscillator strength, as is the case for the 4529-Å line, it should yield the same value for the electric field as that inferred from the 4529-Å line (with no dependence on the specific value used for the oscillator strength). Indeed, the measured shift of these two lines yielded the same electric fields well within the measurement accuracy.

IV. RESULTS

The electric field profile $E(x)$ was measured for two types of cathodes. The first type (called here the “planar cathode”) is a planar cathode made of a slotted aluminum plate with an ion transmissivity of 58%. In the second type (called here the “vaned cathode”), a 14-cm-long thin stainless-steel vane was connected to the cathode [see Fig. 1(b)], opposite the top of the dielectric anode, parallel to the magnetic field lines (the electrons in the gap $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ drifted downward). The vane projected 3.5 mm into the gap. Electrons originating from the tip of the vane and $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ drifting in the gap are often described as forming a “virtual cathode” over a plane parallel to the anode and including the vane tip.¹⁵ The purpose for using this configuration was to examine whether indeed such a virtual cathode is formed, and if it screens out the electric field from the region between the cathode plasma and the vane tip. For this configuration we also attempted to check whether the formation of the virtual cathode is responsible for the observed enhancement in the ion current density. Using vaned cathodes, we observed an ion current density, about 120 A/cm², which is significantly larger than that expected based upon the diode voltage, the applied magnetic field, and the mechanical spacing. The anode surface to cathode surface spacing yields a predicted current density of about 8 A/cm², while the anode surface to vane tip distance gives about 20 A/cm². This discrepancy will be discussed in Sec. V.

Using a planar cathode, we measured the profiles $E(x)$ for three sets of parameters: $B = 8.0$ kG, $d_0 = 0.75$ cm; $B = 6.7$ kG, $d_0 = 0.75$ cm; and $B = 8.4$ kG, $d_0 = 0.65$ cm, where B and d_0 are the applied magnetic field and the mechanical A - K gap, respectively. The diode voltage V_d was measured with a capacitive monitor located at the power feed to the diode, the signal from which was corrected for the inductive voltage drop between the monitor location and the diode gap.

Profiles of $E(x)$ for $B = 8.0$ kG and $d_0 = 0.75$ cm are given in Fig. 5 at three times after the start of the diode voltage pulse: $t = 35, 55, 75$ ns. Also shown is a profile for the same d_0 but for $B = 6.7$ kG. The measurement error indicated in the figures is dominated by the fluctuations of the photomultiplier-tube signals resulting from the weak ion emission from the diode gap. Some uncertainty in the inferred electric field was also due to the limited spectral resolution of the system (determined by the number of the fiber channels used to observe the shifted pattern).

As indicated by the error bars, the smallest measurable value for the electric field was 0.4 MV/cm, observed near the cathode and the anode plasmas. The diode re-




FIG. 5. The measured electric field distribution $E(x)$ for a planar-diode configuration with $d_0 = 0.75$ cm is shown at the three times 35, 55, and 75 ns in (a), (b), and (c), respectively. (d) The electric field profile for a similar configuration but with a different applied magnetic field B . The solid anode surface is at $x = 0$ and the cathode surface is indicated by C . Each point is an average of two discharges.

gions between each of these two points and the closest electrode are occupied by the diode plasmas from which intense and unshifted line emission was observed. An upper limit for the actual diode acceleration gap d (i.e., the distance between the position x_a on the anode side and the position x_b on the cathode side at which the electric field vanishes) is obtained from the distance between the positions at which anode and cathode plasmas are observed as indicated by intense line emission. A lower limit is determined from the distance between the positions on the two sides at which an electric field certainly larger than zero (i.e., > 0.4 MV/cm) is measured. These limits determine an uncertainty of ± 0.075 cm in inferring the actual gap d as a function of time from the measured $E(x)$ profiles. The diode voltage V can then be obtained from the integration $\int_0^{d_0} E(x) dx$. This gives 374, 367, 260, and 288 kV for the profiles in Figs. 5(a), 5(b), 5(c), and 5(d), respectively. These numbers should be compared to the instantaneous capacitive monitor values V_d , which are 356, 355, 306, and 300 kV, respectively. V and V_d agree to within 15%, which is within the experimental error for this pair of quantities [most of which is in the $E(x)$ measurement].

The electric field distributions given in Fig. 5 show that the electric-field-excluding anode plasma expanded about 3 mm off the solid anode surface during the first 35 ns of the pulse, then expanded much slower (0.5 mm or less) between 35 and 75 ns. To determine the anode-plasma expansion velocity during the first period, the formation time of the anode plasma must be known. Assuming that the plasma was formed at the solid anode surface at the start of the diode voltage pulse ($t = 0$) or at the start of the Al^{+2} line emission near the anode surface ($t \approx 15$ ns) determines lower and upper limits, respectively, for the axial velocity of the electric-field-

excluding plasma. Accounting also for the measurement spatial resolution this yields a range of 5–15 cm/ μ s. Similar velocities were deduced from the observation of C^{+2} line emission.

For the vane-cathode configuration, we measured $E(x)$ for $d_0=1$ cm between the anode and the planar cathode and $B=6.6$ kG. Our optical system could not observe light from the top of the diode, which ensured that no light from plasma produced at the vane tip could be detected. Figure 6 shows $E(x)$ profiles for $t=35$ and 45 ns. A strong electric field is present at positions between the planar solid cathode and the vane tip. The electric field vanishes only at the cathode plasma as in the cases of the planar-cathode configurations. Thus, the virtual cathode formed by electrons emitted from the vane tip does not cause the electric field to abruptly drop to zero at the x position of the vane tip. This is consistent with two-dimensional (2D) simulation results by Desjarlais and Sudan.³¹ Note that the anode plasma expands about 3 mm during the first 35 ns of the pulse for the vane-cathode configuration, as for the planar-cathode configuration.

V. DATA ANALYSIS

A. Electron density distribution

We analyze our measurements assuming one-dimensional geometry. We also assume that the electric field profile $E(x)$ is constant over a period equal to the ion transit time in the gap since no significant variation of the electric field could have been observed on this time scale with the oscilloscopes used. For each time instant we normalize our $E(x)$ data points to give $\int_0^{d_0} E(x) dx = V_d$. We then draw smooth curves through the normalized $E(x)$ points, as shown in Figs. 7




FIG. 6. Measured $E(x)$ profiles at two times for a vane-cathode configuration with $d_0=1$ cm, peak diode voltage about 280 kV, and $B=6.6$ kG. The solid anode surface is at $x=0$ and the cathode is indicated by C. Each point is an average of two discharges. The vane projected 0.35 cm off the cathode surface, as indicated by the line l .




FIG. 7. The solid lines in (a), (b), (c), and (d) are simply smooth curves drawn through the data points (open circles) from Figs. 5(a), 5(b), 5(c), and 5(d), respectively. The dashed lines are calculated (Ref. 9) $E(x)$ profiles (see Sec. V A) using the instantaneous diode gap $d=x_c-x_a$, where x_c and x_a are the zero-field points on the anode and cathode sides, respectively.

and 8 for the data sets given in Figs. 5 and 6, respectively. Here we note that the electron density is determined by the local derivative of these curves. Therefore, since the curves are subjectively drawn, the electron-density distributions which we present from them should be regarded only as approximations. Later on we will discuss a quantitative analysis in which no use of these curves is made and for which error bars can be assigned.

We now compare our results to calculations based on the one-dimensional relativistic Brillouin-flow model⁹ analyzed by Antonsen and Ott. We calculate the $E(x)$ profiles for each time instant using the instantaneous diode voltage V_d and the actual instantaneous diode gap d (determined as explained in Sec. IV). We use the applied magnetic field B_z for the magnetic field in the gap,




FIG. 8. The same as Fig. 7 but for the data in Fig. 6 (vane-cathode configuration).

as discussed in Sec. III B. Calculated $E(x)$ profiles are shown in Figs. 7 and 8. There is a noticeable tendency for the experimentally determined electric field to be higher than the calculated one in the region close to the anode. The difference is enough to be beyond the error bars of the measurement for the vaned-cathode configuration (Fig. 8). The difference between the measured and the calculated $E(x)$ profiles can occur if electrons are present close to the anode, unlike the model prediction of an electron sheath confined near the cathode. (Notice that the maximum measured E field is close to the anode while the boundary of the theoretical electron sheath is the point of maximum calculated E .) This can be demonstrated quantitatively by calculating the electron density profile $n_e(x)$ from the $E(x)$ profiles. To this end, we obtain the potential profile $\varphi(x)$ across the gap, $\varphi(x) = V_d - \int_0^x E(x) dx$, from which the ion velocity profile can be determined:

$$v_i(x) = [2e(V_d - \varphi(x))/m_i]^{1/2},$$

where e is the ion charge, m_i is the ion mass, and $v_i(0) = 0$. From $v_i(x)$ we obtain the ion density $n_i(x) = J_i / ev_i(x)$ using the measured ion current density J_i . To determine $n_i(x)$ from J_i we estimated that the beam nonprotonic component has an average charge e and mass $10m_p$, where e and m_p are the electron charge and the proton mass, respectively (in keeping with the discussion in Sec. II). The uncertainty in this estimate does not affect the conclusions drawn below. A differentiation of the curve assumed for $E(x)$ can now be used to yield the electron density profile:

$$n_e(x) = n_i(x) - 5.53 \times 10^{11} dE/dx, \quad (1)$$

where $n_i(x)$ and $n_e(x)$ are expressed in cm^{-3} and dE/dx is in MV/cm^2 . The profiles $n_e(x)$ thus obtained are compared in Figs. 9 and 10 to the calculated⁹ ones for the measured electric field profiles shown in Figs. 7 and

8, respectively. This comparison shows the tendency of the electron cloud in the diode gap not to be confined to a relatively narrow region near the cathode as the Brillouin-flow model requires. The enhanced electron presence outside the theoretical electron-sheath region is seen more clearly for the vaned-cathode configuration (Fig. 10). Also, the spatial spread of the electron cloud towards the anode in the vaned-cathode case is significantly larger than the spatial resolution of our system. Evidently, the vane tip emits electrons which provides the electrons near the anode, as will be further discussed shortly.

Diffusion of electrons toward the anode from the cathode sheath has been treated theoretically.^{32,33,14} Mouthaan and Susskind³² suggested that electron transport across the magnetic field in a smooth-bore magnetron occurs due to the random fluctuations of the fields (brought about by a presumed instability in the electron flow) which cause the electron position to become a random function of time. On this basis they obtained spatial distributions (falling off towards the anode) of the electron charge and current density across the gap (no ion presence was assumed). Poukey and collaborators³³ suggested electron migration towards the anode due to the presence of an electric field E_y in the electron-drift direction that reduces the energy of the electron distribution. A significant electron pileup near the anode was deduced for E_y about 10% of the vacuum E_x field. Desjarlais and Sudan¹⁴ showed that small perturbations of the potential may bring about stochastic transport of electrons in the gap, leading to electron convection to the anode. They also pointed out the large sensitivity of the electron trajectories to small perturbations for equilibria near the Brillouin-flow state. A related possibility is electron flow to the anode as a result of nonuniform expansion of cathode and/or anode plasmas, as suggested by experiments¹³ performed on a long pulse diode.

For a quantitative analysis which is much less dependent on the assumed $E(x)$ curves we proceed as follows. We define the total electron number $N_e(x) = \int_x^{x_c} n_e(x) dx$ per cm^2 between the cathode plasma




FIG. 9. Electron density profiles $n_e(x)$ inferred from the $E(x)$ profiles in Fig. 7. Also shown are the corresponding Brillouin-flow (Ref. 9) profiles calculated using the actual diode gap d .




FIG. 10. Electron density profiles inferred from the $E(x)$ profiles in Fig. 8 and the corresponding Brillouin-flow (Ref. 9) profiles.

boundary position x_c and a position x in the gap, given by

$$N_e(x) = 5.53 \times 10^{11} E(x) + N_i(x), \quad (2)$$

where $N_i(x)$ is the total ion number per cm^2 between x_c and x , and $E(x)$ is expressed in MV/cm . A lower limit N_g for the total electron population per cm^2 in the diode gap is given by $N_e(x_1)$, where x_1 is the smallest x (i.e., closest to the anode) at which an electric field > 0 is measured. [For instance, $x_1 = 0.35$ cm and $E(x_1) = 0.95$ MV/cm for the profile shown in Fig. 5(a).] The electron population in the region $x < x_1$ cannot be inferred from our data due to the large error in the electric field measurement very close to the anode plasma and the rapid rise of the ion density there. The total number of ions in the region $x > x_1$ can be determined relatively accurately since the ion density in this region changes relatively slowly, being within a factor of 3 of the fully-accelerated-ion density at the cathode. This is because the ions at the point x_1 have already accelerated to an energy of a few tens of keV. We will shortly return to the error bars of the various inferred parameters.

We now use the theoretical model⁹ to calculate the electron-sheath thickness s and the total electron number N_{theor} per cm^2 in the sheath (i.e., the theoretical number in the entire gap) as a function of time. In addition, we obtain, using Eq. (2), the experimental electron number

N_s per cm^2 in a slab of thickness s adjacent to the cathode plasma, i.e., $N_s = N_e(x_2)$ where $x_2 = x_c - s$. We define $\alpha = N_g / N_{\text{theor}}$ and $\beta = N_g / N_s$. $\alpha - 1$ is a lower limit for the fractional difference between the total experimental electron number in the gap and the calculated one. $\beta - 1$ is the ratio of the number of electrons in the gap which reside outside the theoretical sheath region to the number of electrons within the sheath region. Assuming the ion current is space charge limited, one expects^{33,34} that for the cases for which both α and β are larger than unity, the measured ion current density would be larger than the theoretical one. The theoretical ion current density $J_{i,\text{theor}}$ is obtained from the value given by the model⁹ (for the actual diode gap d) by assuming that the ion beam is comprised of 65% protons and 35% singly charged ions of mass $10m_p$, as mentioned above.

Table I lists the experimental parameters, the experimentally determined diode gap d , the calculated sheath thickness s and the calculated total electron number in the gap N_{theor} , the inferred electron number N_s in the theoretical sheath region, the inferred electron number N_g in the entire diode gap, and the corresponding ion numbers in these regions (N_{si} and N_{gi} , respectively), at a few times for the three planar-cathode configurations and the vaned-cathode configuration. Also given are the ratios α and β defined above, the actual ratio B/B_* of

TABLE I. The diode voltage V_d , actual measured diode gap d , theoretical electron-sheath thickness s and total electron number N_{theor} , experimental electron numbers N_g and N_s in the entire gap and in the theoretical sheath region, respectively (see Sec. V A), the corresponding ion numbers N_{gi} and N_{si} , and the ratios $\alpha = N_g / N_{\text{theor}}$ and $\beta = N_g / N_s$. Also given are the measured ion current density J_i , and the space-charge-limited current densities J_{ic} and J_{ic0} which correspond to the measured diode gap d and the mechanical diode gap d_0 , respectively. Also tabulated are the actual B/B_* , the actual ion current enhancements $J_i / J_{i,\text{theor}}$ and J_i / J_{ic} , the ratio J_i / J_{ic0} , and the ratio γ between the experimental total electron drift current in the diode gap to the current in the theoretical sheath region, for the three planar-cathode configurations and the vaned-cathode configuration at 3 or 4 times during the pulse.

No.	t (ns)	V_d (kV)	d (cm)	s (cm)	N_{theor} (10^{11} cm^{-3})	N_g (10^{11} cm^{-3})
Planar cathode, $d_0 = 0.75$ cm, $B = 8.0$ kG						
1	35	356	0.425	0.15	8.1	7.4
	± 5	($\pm 10\%$)	± 0.075	± 0.04	($\pm 20\%$)	($\pm 15\%$)
2	55	355	0.425	0.15	8.1	8.4
3	75	306	0.375	0.14	8.2	8.3
Planar cathode, $d_0 = 0.75$ cm, $B = 6.7$ kG						
4	35	310	0.425	0.18	7.6	7.9
5	55	300	0.425	0.17	7.2	7.8
6	75	245	0.375	0.15	6.8	8.0
Planar cathode, $d_0 = 0.65$ cm, $B = 8.4$ kG						
7	35	295	0.35	0.13	8.4	9.4
8	55	270	0.35	0.11	7.7	9.1
9	75	230	0.35	0.09	5.2	9.5
Vaned cathode, $d_0 = 1$ cm, $B = 6.6$ kG						
10	35	260	0.475	0.13	4.7	13.9
11	45	260	0.475	0.13	4.7	13.5
12	55	245	0.475	0.12	4.3	12.8
13	65	230	0.475	0.12	4.0	12.3

the applied magnetic field to the critical magnetic field²⁷ (B_* is determined using the actual diode gap d), the measured ion current density J_i , and the ratio $J_i/J_{i\text{theor}}$. Figure 11 shows $J_i/J_{i\text{theor}}$ as a function of α and β using all the cases listed in Table I. In spite of the large error bars the results show that for most of the planar-cathode cases, α and β are close to unity. This implies that for the planar configuration, the measured ion current density should tend to agree with the calculated value. Indeed, for most of the planar-cathode cases studied, the ratio $J_i/J_{i\text{theor}}$ based upon the actual diode gap is close to 1. The cases for which α and β seem to be relatively large are the cases numbered 6 and 9 in Table I (see the points marked 6 and 9 in Fig. 11). The results for these two cases suggest, that for a relatively low magnetic field or a narrow planar gap, respectively, large electron population and electron migration towards the anode can occur late in the pulse ($t=75$ ns). The corresponding enhancement $J_i/J_{i\text{theor}}$ may be about 2, as shown in the figure.

Markedly larger values for α and β are obtained for the vaned-cathode configuration. The total electron number in the gap is more than twice the calculated value ($\alpha \gtrsim 2$) and the excess electrons reside mainly outside the region of the theoretical electron sheath ($\beta \sim 2$). For this diode configuration a relatively large enhancement of the ion current density was observed, $J_i/J_{i\text{theor}} \sim 3-8$, as shown in Fig. 11. Such an enhancement evidently results from the electron accumulation near the anode, as discussed above.

The relatively large electron population close to the anode ($\beta \gtrsim 2$) in the vaned-cathode cases can be reasonably understood since the vane-tip projects farther than the zero electric field position x_c on the cathode side.

Electrons emitted from the vane tip approach the anode plasma since the actual B/B_* , using the distance between the vane tip and the anode plasma is about 1. These electrons $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ drift over the entire anode area, thus suppressing the electron population in the theoretical sheath region. However, at the x position of the vane tip, they are not numerous enough to zero the electric field. Electrons emitted from the cathode plasma presumably contribute very little to the electron presence near the anode since the B/B_* for the distance between the anode and the cathode plasmas, for the vaned-cathode configuration, is even larger than those for the planar-cathode configurations (see the values of d in Table I). The inferred values of α ($\gtrsim 2$) for the vaned configuration implies that this phenomenon also results in an enhanced electron accumulation in the diode gap. The enhancement in the ion current density (with respect to the planar-cathode configurations and to the theoretical solution) results from the increase in the electron population in the gap and the electron presence near the anode rather than from the formation of a true virtual cathode (surface beyond which $E=0$) at the plane of the vane tip as previously¹⁵ described. The possibility of an enhancement of the ion current due to electron accumulation in the diode gap was considered previously.³³

We would now like to discuss the error bars indicated in Fig. 11 which were estimated by considering the errors due to the variety of sources. The error in the determination of the actual diode gap d dominates the uncertainty in s , N_{theor} , B/B_* , $\alpha = N_g/N_{\text{theor}}$ and $J_i/J_{i\text{theor}}$. This results from the great sensitivity of the calculated total electron number in the gap N_{theor} (and the calculated ion current density $J_{i\text{theor}}$) to the diode

TABLE I. (Continued).

No.	N_{gi} (10^{11} cm^{-3})	N_s (10^{11} cm^{-3})	N_{si} (10^{11} cm^{-3})	α	β	B/B_*
Planar cathode, $d_0=0.75$ cm, $B=8.0$ kG						
1	1.5 ($\pm 15\%$)	6.3 ($\pm 15\%$)	0.6 ($\pm 15\%$)	0.91 ($\pm 25\%$)	1.2 ($\pm 32\%$)	1.5 ($\pm 20\%$)
2	2.1	6.4	0.9	1.0	1.3	1.5
3	2.0	5.9	0.9	1.0	1.4	1.4
Planar cathode, $d_0=0.75$ cm, $B=6.7$ kG						
4	2.6	6.3	1.5	1.0	1.3	1.3
5	2.8	5.8	1.4	1.1	1.3	1.4
6	3.5	6.5	2.0	1.2	1.2	1.4
Planar cathode, $d_0=0.65$ cm, $B=8.4$ kG						
7	2.7	7.1	1.5	1.1	1.3	1.4
8	3.1	5.8	1.4	1.3	1.6	1.5
9	4.2	4.3	1.4	2.0	2.2	1.7
Vaned cathode, $d_0=1$ cm, $B=6.6$ kG						
10	9.7	5.5	2.9	3.0	2.5	1.6
11	9.7	5.5	2.8	2.9	2.5	1.6
12	9.0	5.5	3.0	2.9	2.3	1.7
13	9.3	5.3	2.9	3.1	2.3	1.7

gap. It emphasizes the need for an accurate measurement of the actual diode gap in order to understand the charge flow in high power diodes. We note, however, that an increase in the gap d decreases s , $J_{i\text{theor}}$ and N_{theor} (and increases B/B_*). Hence, the error bars in Fig. 11(a) indicate the range within which α and $J_i/J_{i\text{theor}}$ may change together and in the same direction. The errors in the measured J_i or in the heavy-ion component in the beam (the latter is used for the calculation of $J_{i\text{theor}}$, see earlier) are much smaller than the error in $J_{i\text{theor}}$ which is caused by the uncertainty in d . The error in β results from the error in $E(x)$ and $N_i(x)$ which are used to infer N_g and N_s [see Eq. (2)]. The shape of $n_i(x)$ is obtained relatively accurately since $n_i(x)$ changes relatively slowly in the region $x > x_1$ and it is dependent on $\varphi(x)$ which is obtained by an integration of the data points. Thus, the error in $N_i(x)$ [which is obtained by an integration of $n_i(x)$] is mainly due to the error in the measured J_i . In determining $N_i(x)$ the inferred zero-field point x_c at the cathode side was used. However, the uncertainty in x_c modifies $N_i(x)$ only slightly, thus causing a negligible error in the calculated electron population N_g and N_s .

The ion current density is often compared to the space-charge-limited value. In Table I we compare J_i to the monopolar space-charge-limited value J_{ic} which corresponds to the measured diode gap d . For completeness we also give J_i/J_{ic0} , where J_{ic0} corresponds to the mechanical gap d_0 . This ratio is usually given in discussions of intense ion beam diodes. For the vaned-cathode configuration we use the mechanical distance between

the vane tip and the anode, 0.65 cm, to determine J_{ic0} (again in keeping with analyses in previous studies). We note here that the error in the relations between the ratios $J_i/J_{i\text{theor}}$, J_i/J_{ic} , and J_i/J_{ic0} is relatively small since the error in J_i is common to these ratios, and the errors in J_{ic} and $J_{i\text{theor}}$ are about the same (both are caused by the uncertainty in d).

As seen in the table, the enhancement J_i/J_{ic} is only a few tens of percent larger than $J_i/J_{i\text{theor}}$ since the enhancement $J_{i\text{theor}}/J_{ic}$ due to the magnetic insulation is 1.2–1.6 for our diode configurations. This results from the fact that the ratios B/B_* , even when calculated using the actual diode gap, are moderately large (the B/B_* for the vaned-cathode configuration given in Table I is also calculated using the zero electric field position x_c). Thus, for the planar-cathode configurations, the actual enhancement J_i/J_{ic} is generally below 2 (see Table I). For the vaned-cathode configuration J_i/J_{ic} is larger (as $J_i/J_{i\text{theor}}$ is larger). The enhancement J_i/J_{ic0} is obviously considerably larger than J_i/J_{ic} . Also, the relative difference between the J_i/J_{ic0} values for the planar-cathode configurations and those for the vaned-cathode configuration is smaller than the corresponding difference for the J_i/J_{ic} values since the difference between the actual gap and the mechanical diode gap is smaller for the vaned-cathode configuration. We note here that in spite of the large ion current enhancement observed for the vaned-cathode configuration, the diode efficiency does not increase significantly (it remains near 25%) due to the increase in the electron current, as will be discussed in Sec. V B. (See I_e for cases 10–13 in Fig.

TABLE I. (Continued).

No.	J_i (A/cm ²)	$\frac{J_i}{J_{i\text{theor}}}$	$\frac{J_i}{J_{ic}}$	$\frac{J_i}{J_{ic0}}$	γ + 100% – 36%
Planar cathode, $d_0=0.75$ cm, $B=8.0$ kG					
1	30 $\pm 15\%$	0.5 ($\pm 75\%$)	0.7 ($\pm 30\%$)	2.2 $\pm 25\%$	1.3 ($\pm 100\%$) ($\pm 36\%$)
2	43	0.8	1.1	3.5	1.3
3	40	0.7	1.0	4.4	1.4
Planar cathode, $d_0=0.75$ cm, $B=6.7$ kG					
4	46	1.0	1.5	4.7	1.3
5	52	1.1	1.8	5.5	1.4
6	72	1.5	2.8	11.0	1.5
Planar cathode $d_0=0.65$ cm, $B=8.4$ kG					
7	65	0.9	1.5	5.0	1.6
8	65	1.1	1.4	4.8	2.4
9	80	2.1	2.4	8.2	3.9
Vaned cathode $d_0=1$ cm, $B=6.6$ kG					
10	120	4.7	6.0	11	5.2
11	120	4.6	5.8	11	4.6
12	120	5.0	6.0	11	5.2
13	120	5.5	6.6	12	4.8




FIG. 11. The ion current density enhancement $J_i/J_{i\text{theor}}$ [with $J_{i\text{theor}}$ calculated (Ref. 9) using the actual diode gap d] as a function of (a) α and (b) β for the cases listed in Table I. The circles belong to rows 10–13 (vaned-cathode configuration). The points marked by 6 and 9 correspond to rows 6 and 9 in Table I, respectively.

15.) Thus, the vaned cathode allows operation at a lower impedance than that of the planar diode, but with the same efficiency.

B. Electron current distribution

Our data can be analyzed to give information about the distribution of the electron-drift current across the diode gap. First, the electron drift velocity $V_y(x)$ was obtained by assuming a laminar electron flow (based on simulation results³⁵), i.e., $V_y(x) = -cE(x)/B(x)$. The distribution of the magnetic field $B(x)$ was calculated [from the measured electric field distribution $E(x)$ and the ion kinetic pressure across the gap] using the momentum balance equation given by Mendel.³⁶ The variation of the magnetic field in our diode is about 10% according to that model. Thus, the profile of the electron drift-velocity $|V_y(x)| = cE(x)/B(x)$ approximately follows that of $E(x)$, as shown, for example, in Figs. 12 and 13 for the profiles given in Fig. 7 and 8, respectively. Also shown in these figures are the inferred current density profiles $J_y(x) = |en_e(x)V_y(x)|$ of the drifting electrons and the theoretical⁶ ones $J_{y\text{theor}}(x) = en_{e\text{theor}}(x)V_{y\text{theor}}(x)$. As expected, these profiles show that for the vaned-cathode configuration (Fig. 13) $J_y(x)$ spreads towards the anode more than for the planar-cathode configuration.

In a similar manner to the analysis of the electron




FIG. 12. Profiles of the electron drift velocity $|V_y(x)|$ and the drift current density $J_y(x)$ inferred from the $E(x)$ profiles in Fig. 7. Also shown are the corresponding theoretical (Ref. 9) current density $J_{y\text{theor}}(x)$.

density distribution we can obtain quantitative information about the distribution of the drift-current density by calculating the total drift current in the gap [$I_y = \int_{x_a}^{x_c} J_y(x) dx$] and the drift current in the region of the theoretical electron sheath [$I_{ys} = \int_{x_c-s}^{x_c} J_y(x) dx$]. Both quantities are per unit anode length. We define the ratio $\gamma = I_y/I_{ys}$ (analogous to β in Sec. V A), where $\gamma - 1$ gives the ratio between the electron current outside the theoretical electron-sheath region to that within the sheath region. The ratio γ is given in Table I and is plotted in Fig. 14. Although the error bars are large, γ is systematically larger for the vaned-cathode configuration. Its value (between 2 to 9) means that the fraction of the drift current outside the theoretical sheath region is between 50% and 90%, indicating substantial electron flow close to the anode.

The inferred total drift current I_y is compared in




FIG. 13. Profiles of $|V_y(x)|$, $J_y(x)$, and $J_{y\text{theor}}(x)$ for the cases in Fig. 8.




FIG. 14. The ratio $\gamma = I_y / I_{ys}$ for the cases listed in Table I. The numbers along the ordinate are the row numbers in the table. The circles correspond to rows 10–13 in Table I (vaned configuration).

Fig. 15 with the theoretical⁹ drift current $I_{y \text{ theor}} = \int J_{y \text{ theor}}(x) dx$ in the electron sheath (the ratio $I_y / I_{y \text{ theor}}$ is analogous to α in Sec. V A). Also given in the figure is the diode electron current I_e per unit length of the diode, obtained by dividing the total diode electron current by the anode length. The total experimental diode electron current is inferred from subtraction of the total ion current (obtained from the Faraday cup measurements by assuming a uniformity of J_i over the entire anode area) from the measured total diode current. The error in I_e may be large due to uncertainty in the actual size of the active anode area and to possible nonuniformity of J_i where the anode is “turned on.”




FIG. 15. The total electron drift current I_y obtained from integration of $J_y(x)$ and the corresponding calculated total drift current $I_{y \text{ theor}}$ for the cases listed in Table I. Also shown is the diode electron current I_e per unit anode length.

The error in $I_{y \text{ theor}}$ is about +70, –50%, which is due to the uncertainty in the actual diode gap d . The error in the experimental I_y is estimated to be about $\pm 30\%$. The comparison suggests that for the planar-cathode configurations (cases 1–9) the observed I_y is generally close to the predicted $I_{y \text{ theor}}$, while for the vaned-cathode configuration (cases 10–13) it is larger. This results from the increased electron total population in the diode gap (with respect to the theoretical one) for the vaned configuration.

VI. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

We have measured the electric field distributions $E(x)$ across the acceleration gaps of magnetically insulated intense ion beam diodes by observing the Stark shift of ion line emission. We have used planar-cathode configurations and a vaned-cathode configuration in a “race-track” shaped magnetically insulated diode.

Our measurements revealed rapid gap closure early in the pulse, resulting mainly from the expansion of the surface-flashover-produced anode plasma at a velocity in the range 5–15 cm/ μ s. Such a gap contraction (by about 3 mm at 35 ns into the diode voltage pulse) considerably affects the ion current density. Johnson and collaborators³⁷ have said that a plasma expansion velocity of 5 to 10 cm/ μ s throughout the voltage pulse was required to explain the temporal impedance decrease in their applied- B ion diodes. The early fast expansion of the anode plasma and its slower expansion later on in the pulse observed here are not explained as yet.

The determination of the instantaneous *actual* diode gap d allowed us to determine the actual ion current enhancement J_i / J_{ic} and to compare the measured $E(x)$ distributions, assuming planar geometry, with a one-dimensional solution for magnetically insulated gaps. This comparison showed that the measured electric field tends to be larger close to the anode and smaller close to the cathode than the one predicted by the Brillouin-flow model.⁹ The $E(x)$ profiles together with the measured ion current densities were analyzed to study the ion and electron density distributions in the diode gap. This analysis showed that for the diode configurations used, the electron cloud in the gap is not confined to a narrow sheath near the cathode; rather it migrates towards the anode. The measured $E(x)$ profiles were also used to infer the distribution of the electron drift velocity and the electron-drift current density $J_y(x)$ under the assumption of laminar $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ flow.

The enhanced electron presence near the anode may result from electron transport due to the effects of temporal fluctuations of the electric field^{29,32,33} or of nonuniform expansion of the anode and the cathode plasmas¹³ on the drifting electrons. For the planar-cathode configuration, the electron presence near the anode does not seem to result in a significant enhancement of the ion current over the one ($J_{i \text{ theor}}$) calculated⁹ using the actual diode gap d . However, when the total electron number in the gap is larger than the calculated⁹ value (see points 6 and 9 in Fig. 11), an enhancement $J_i / J_{i \text{ theor}} \sim 2$ may have been observed. This is expect-

ed^{33,34} if the ion current is assumed to be space-charge limited.

For the vaned-cathode configuration the increase of the total electron number over the theoretical value (by a factor ≥ 2) and the electron presence near the anode are more pronounced (about half of the electrons in the gap reside outside the theoretical sheath region). The electron accumulation near the anode is associated with an enhancement of about 3–8 of the measured ion current J_i over the one ($J_{i\text{theor}}$) predicted by a one-dimensional Brillouin-flow-model solution⁹ of a magnetically insulated configuration. While we believe that the relative comparison between the $J_i/J_{i\text{theor}}$ values for the planar- and the vaned-cathode configurations is valid, the absolute value of $J_i/J_{i\text{theor}}$ has to be treated cautiously since as mentioned above J_i is obtained with Faraday cups which view a small area of the anode.

The electrons near the anode presumably are emitted from the vane and $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ drift to cover the whole anode surface. However, they are insufficient in number to eliminate the electric field behind the vane tip, and emission from the cathode plasma probably occurs. We attempted to examine whether considerable electron accumulation near the anode would also occur in a planar-cathode configuration with A - K gap $d_0 = 0.65$ cm (the same as the vane-tip-solid anode distance in the vaned-cathode configuration) and about the same magnetic field as that for the vaned-cathode configuration. In those experiments a considerable decrease in the diode impedance occurred. Keeping $d_0 = 0.65$ cm and increasing B to 8.4 kG (see lines 7–9 in Table I) prevented the impedance collapse. However, the electron presence near the anode was less pronounced than in the vaned-cathode configuration (α and β were not as large—see Table I), although a moderate increase in the electron population seems to have occurred at $t = 75$ ns [see the points marked 9 in Figs. 11(a) and 11(b)]. The implication of this result is that, for the same diode efficiency, a vaned cathode yields higher ion currents than a planar one (i.e., it allows diode operation at a lower impedance while maintaining the efficiency). Increasing the ion current with a planar cathode by applying a weaker magnetic field results in a reduction of the diode efficiency.

For both the vaned- and the planar-cathode configurations the enhancement J_i/J_{ic} of the ion current density with respect to the actual space-charge-limited value (calculated using the measured diode gap d) is a few tens of percent larger than $J_i/J_{i\text{theor}}$ (see Table I), since $J_{i\text{theor}}$ is only 20 to 60 % larger than J_{ic} (due to the electrons in the theoretical cathode sheath). Calculating the ion current enhancement J_i/J_{ic0} (using the mechanical gap d_0) gives, for our diode configurations, values larger by 2–4 than the actual values J_i/J_{ic} . Furthermore, the ratio J_{ic}/J_{ic0} varies for different diode configurations. Thus, in studying ion diode operation, one has to be cautious if one compares values of the enhancement J_i/J_{ic0} for different configurations.

The difference between the inferred drift current density $J_y(x)$ and the calculated profile $J_{y\text{theor}}(x)$ is also much more pronounced for the vaned-cathode

configuration. $J_y(x)$ spreads considerably towards the anode (see the relatively large values of γ in Fig. 14 for the vaned-cathode configuration) and the total experimental drift current I_y is about twice the calculated value $I_{y\text{theor}}$ (see cases 10–13 in Fig. 15). For higher intensity diodes, such an increase in the electron drift current and its broad distribution across the gap would result in strong diamagnetic effects which would considerably affect the distribution of the electron density and the ion current density, as discussed in Refs. 22 and 23. In addition, this may cause an increase of the diamagnetic currents in the anode plasma, which may affect the plasma properties.

We may compare our results to those obtained by Slutz and collaborators²³ from a computer simulation of a virtual-cathode configuration operating at 1.5–3 MeV in which no plasma expansion was taken into account. In this study, an annular cathode geometry was assumed, with the distance between the cathode blade and the anode corresponding to a B/B_* close to 1. This is similar to the B/B_* for our vaned-cathode configuration if the distance between the vane tip and anode-plasma front is used. The simulation reveals an enhancement factor of 16 for the ion current density over the space-charge-limited value. The authors believe that about a factor 4 of this enhancement results from a substantial motion of the virtual cathode towards the anode due to diamagnetic effects (which are absent in our relatively low-current diode). One would expect, therefore, that in virtual-cathode diodes which utilize surface-flashover anode plasmas in which diamagnetic effects are also significant, the early gap closure would contribute to producing large enhancements of the ion current density (with respect to J_{ic0}). This may serve to explain the enhancement factors of up to 40 reported by Miller²² on the basis of accumulated data from Proto-I, Proto-II, and PBFA-I.

We believe that our diagnostic tool can be utilized to obtain detailed information about the charge flow in various high-power, high-voltage devices, especially if the spatial resolution and the accuracy in measuring $E(x)$ are improved. Better measurement accuracy can be obtained mainly by increasing the intensity of the observed line emission from the gap. Either the concentration of the ion species being observed must be larger or a line with stronger emission must be selected. For diodes powered by higher voltage pulses, the light signal can be larger due to the higher ion current density. Also, due to the quadratic dependence of the shift on E , the higher the electric field in the diode, the easier is the selection of lines suitable for these measurements, since the low-lying ion energy level will be sufficiently Stark shifted. Observing emission from low-lying levels would also result in a more intense emission from the gap. Once more intense emission in a line of interest is achieved, it will be possible to use a larger number of fiber channels for observing the spectral emission profile. The resulting improvement in the spectral resolution would increase the accuracy in determining the electric field from the shifted pattern. Finally if the ion beam divergence does not increase for higher electric fields, then the Doppler

broadening effect for higher voltage diodes would be much smaller, since the Stark shift increases quadratically with $E(x)$ while the ion transverse velocities will increase with the square root of the voltage. For higher electric fields suitable ion lines may be Al^{+2} 3713 Å for E about 2 MV/cm, Al^{+2} 5722 Å for E about 3 MV/cm, C^{+2} 4647 Å for E about 4 MV/cm, and Al^{+2} 3602 Å for E about 5 MV/cm. We have observed these lines in our diode gap^{25,30} but they were shifted very little under our electric fields.

Due to the great sensitivity of the charged particle flow in the diode to the actual diode gap, the uncertainties in our data analysis were dominated by the uncertainty (± 0.75 mm) in determining the actual diode gap d (i.e., the zero-field points in the gap). Thus, an improvement of the spatial resolution, which could also come from more intense line emission, will significantly improve the comparison of further results with theoretical treatments.⁸⁻¹⁰

Finally, intense line emission will allow local measurements (perpendicular to the acceleration direction) to be made since specially selected ions can be "seeded" in a localized area of the anode for observation by our

method. Furthermore, a better spatial resolution in the axial direction can be obtained by observing a narrower region of the gap. Improvement in the spectral resolution will allow measurements of smaller electric fields as long as the Doppler broadening does not exceed the Stark shift, thus again increasing the accuracy in determining d . Employing the laser-induced-fluorescence technique with a geometry as previously suggested,²⁴ is expected to result in better spectral resolution as well as satisfactory spatial resolution in all directions. We believe that the improved measurements that we are suggesting will contribute substantially to achieving an understanding of the details of electron flow and its dependence on geometry in general, and on nonuniformities in the electrode plasmas in particular.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

One of the authors (Y.M.) wishes to thank C. Mendel for valuable suggestions. The authors are grateful to R. N. Sudan and M. Desjarlais for stimulating discussions, to C. Chang for providing the calculated $E(x)$ profiles, and to E. Elias for assistance in the data analysis.

*Present address: Southwest Institute of Nuclear Physics and Chemistry, P.O. Box 515, Chengdu, Sichuan, China.

¹P. Dreike, C. Eichenberger, S. Humphries, and R. N. Sudan, *J. Appl. Phys.* **47**, 85 (1976).

²S. Humphries, Jr., *Nucl. Fusion* **20**, 1549 (1980).

³G. Yonas, in *Proceedings of IAEA Meeting on Advances in Inertial Confinement Fusion Research*, Kobe, Japan, 1983, edited by C. Yamanaka (unpublished), p. 307.

⁴See, for example, R. A. Meger *et al.*, *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on High-Power Particle Beams*, San Francisco, California, 1983 (unpublished), p. 330 and references therein.

⁵P. Ottinger, S. A. Goldstein, and R. A. Meger, *J. Appl. Phys.* **56**, 774 (1984).

⁶T. J. Orzechowski and G. Bekefi, *Phys. Fluids* **19**, 43 (1976); **22**, 978 (1979).

⁷See, for example R. B. Miller, *Intense Charged Particle Beams* (Plenum, New York, 1982), and references therein.

⁸R. N. Sudan and R. V. Lovelace, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **31**, 1174 (1973).

⁹T. M. Antonsen and E. Ott, *Phys. Fluids* **19**, 52 (1976).

¹⁰K. D. Bergeron, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **28**, 306 (1976).

¹¹R. N. Sudan, in *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on High-Power Electron and Ion Beam Research and Technology*, Plaiseau, France, 1981 (unpublished), p. 389.

¹²J. B. Greenly and H. S. Peng (private communication).

¹³Y. Maron, *Phys. Fluids* **27**, 285 (1984); Y. Maron and C. Litwin, *Phys. Fluids* **30**, 1526 (1987).

¹⁴M. Desjarlais and R. N. Sudan, *Phys. Fluids* **29**, 1245 (1986).

¹⁵J. M. Neri, Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University, 1982.

¹⁶Craig L. Olsen, *Laser Particle Beams* **2**, 255 (1984); G. Yonas, *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Plasma Physics and Controlled Nuclear Fusion Research* (IAEA, Vienna, 1983), Vol. II, p. 353 and references therein.

¹⁷D. J. Johnson, E. J. T. Burns, J. P. Quintenz, K. W. Bieg, A.

V. Farnsworth, Jr., L. P. Mix, and M. A. Palmer, *J. Appl. Phys.* **52**, 168 (1981).

¹⁸J. E. Maenchen, F. C. Young, R. Stringfield, S. J. Stephanakis, D. Mosher, Shyke A. Goldstein, R. D. Genuario, and G. Cooperstein, *J. Appl. Phys.* **54**, 89 (1983).

¹⁹D. Hinshelwood, NRL Memo. Report No. 5492, 1985 (unpublished).

²⁰R. Pal and D. A. Hammer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50**, 732 (1983).

²¹S. Humphries, Jr., J. R. Freeman, J. B. Greenly, G. W. Kuswa, C. W. Mendel, J. W. Poukey, and D. M. Woodall, *J. Appl. Phys.* **51**, 1876 (1980).

²²P. A. Miller, *J. Appl. Phys.* **57**, 1473 (1985).

²³S. A. Slutz, D. B. Seidel, and R. S. Coats, *J. Appl. Phys.* **59**, 11 (1986).

²⁴Y. Maron and C. Litwin, *J. Appl. Phys.* **54**, 2086 (1983).

²⁵Y. Maron, M. D. Coleman, D. A. Hammer, and H. S. Peng, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 699 (1986).

²⁶J. Maenchen, L. Wiley, S. Humphries, Jr., E. Peleg, R. N. Sudan, and D. A. Hammer, *Phys. Fluids* **22**, 555 (1979).

²⁷R. V. Lovelace and E. Ott, *Phys. Fluids* **17**, 1263 (1974); A. W. Hull, *Phys. Rev.* **18**, 31 (1921).

²⁸M. A. Mazing and N. A. Vrublevskaya, *Opt. Spectrosc.* **16**, 6 (1984).

²⁹R. D. Cowan (private communication).

³⁰Y. Maron, M. D. Coleman, D. A. Hammer, and H. S. Peng, *J. Appl. Phys.* **61**, 4781 (1987).

³¹M. P. Desjarlais and R. N. Sudan (private communication).

³²K. Mouthaan and C. Susskind, *J. Appl. Phys.* **37**, 2598 (1966).

³³J. W. Poukey, S. Humphries, Jr., and T. R. Lockner, *Phys. Fluids* **25**, 1471 (1982).

³⁴Shyke A. Goldstein and R. Lee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **35**, 1079 (1975).

³⁵D. B. Seidel, S. A. Slutz, and C. W. Mendel (private communication).

³⁶C. W. Mendel, Jr., *J. App. Phys.* **50**, 3830 (1979); C. W. Mendel, Jr., D. B. Seidel, and S. E. Rosenthal, *Laser Particle Beams* **1**, 311 (1983).

³⁷D. J. Johnson, G. W. Kuswa, A. V. Farnsworth, Jr., J. P. Quintenz, R. J. Leeper, E. J. T. Burns, and S. Humphries,

Phys. Rev. Lett. **42**, 610 (1979); D. J. Johnson, P. L. Dreike, S. A. Slutz, R. J. Leeper, E. J. T. Burns, J. R. Freeman, T. A. Mehlhorn, and J. P. Quintenz, *J. Appl. Phys.* **54**, 2230 (1983).