

000020

MEMORANDUM  
RM-4109-PR  
JUNE 1964

37-P-#1.00

CONDUCTIVITY OF A HOT ELECTRON GAS

V. Gilinsky and D. F. DuBois

PREPARED FOR:  
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE PROJECT RAND

DDC  
JUN 8 1964

296 600 739A 2

The RAND Corporation  
SANTA MONICA • CALIFORNIA

**MEMORANDUM**

**RM-4109-PR**

**JUNE 1964**

## **CONDUCTIVITY OF A HOT ELECTRON GAS**

**V. Gilinsky and D. F. DuBois**

This research is sponsored by the United States Air Force under Project RAND—contract No. AF 49(638)-700 monitored by the Directorate of Development Planning, Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Development, Hq USAF. Views or conclusions contained in this Memorandum should not be interpreted as representing the official opinion or policy of the United States Air Force.

### **DDC AVAILABILITY NOTICE**

Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from the Defense Documentation Center (DDC).

---

*The* **RAND** *Corporation*

1700 MAIN ST • SANTA MONICA • CALIFORNIA • 90406

---

PREFACE

This report is part of a program of research on the properties of high temperature plasmas. The conductivity of an electron gas in a uniform background of positive charge is calculated. This model has received considerable attention in the plasma literature. However, previous calculations of the conductivity have not included a complete treatment of the collective effects.

One of the authors, D. F. DuBois, was a consultant to The RAND Corporation.

SUMMARY

The dissipative part of the high frequency conductivity tensor of a hot, dilute electron gas near equilibrium is calculated exactly to terms proportional to the plasma parameter  $k_D^3 n$ , (the inverse of the number of particles in a Debye sphere), in the limit of classical statistics. The calculation includes high frequency collective dynamic screening effects consistently to this order. These collective effects have an important effect on the frequency dependence of the conductivity for frequencies greater than about twice the electron plasma frequency.

CONTENTS

PREFACE .....	111
SUMMARY .....	v
Section	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. GENERAL BACKGROUND .....	4
Units .....	5
III. CALCULATION .....	11
Longitudinal Conductivity .....	18
Transverse Conductivity .....	21
IV. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND APPLICATION TO INCOHERENT SCATTERING .....	23
REFERENCES .....	32

## I. INTRODUCTION

This report is concerned with the calculation of the dissipative part of the high frequency collisional conductivity of a hot, dilute electron gas (in a uniform positive background) near equilibrium.

The problem has attracted considerable theoretical interest. Several calculations have been presented<sup>(1-5)</sup> of the collisional damping rate of plasma waves, which is proportional to the dissipative part of the conductivity near the plasma frequency. However, no two of them agree because they make different approximations in treating the collective behavior of the electron gas. The present calculation includes the collective effects consistently so that in the limit of high temperatures ( $kT \gg \text{Rydberg}$ ) the result is exact to first order in the weak coupling parameter  $k_D^3/n$ .

Our calculation shows that the detailed frequency dependence of the conductivity is affected by high frequency collective effects. At twice the plasma frequency there is very slight inflection in the conductivity curve which can be interpreted as resulting from the excitation of two plasmons. Because there is no actual resonance near  $\omega = 2\omega_p$ , it is shown from this calculation that frequency shifts in incoherent scattering of radiation from a uniform plasma at the second harmonic of the plasma frequency will not be observable.

The electron-electron collisional conductivity which is proportional to  $k^2$  for small wave numbers  $k$  is generally not of great practical interest for real plasmas since the contribution from electron-ion collisions is independent of  $k$  in this limit and also has a  $k^2$  term of comparable magnitude to the electron-electron contribution.\* However, the frequency dependence of the electron-electron contribution is different than the ion-electron contribution in the frequency region near  $2\omega_p$ .

---

\*The  $k^2$  correction due to electron-ion collisions has recently been computed by H. L. Berk, Phys. Fluids, Vol. 7, 1964, p. 257. This calculation coupled with our result gives the complete collisional conductivity to order  $k^2$ .

## I. INTRODUCTION

This report is concerned with the calculation of the dissipative part of the high frequency collisional conductivity of a hot, dilute electron gas (in a uniform positive background) near equilibrium.

The problem has attracted considerable theoretical interest. Several calculations have been presented<sup>(1-5)</sup> of the collisional damping rate of plasma waves, which is proportional to the dissipative part of the conductivity near the plasma frequency. However, no two of them agree because they make different approximations in treating the collective behavior of the electron gas. The present calculation includes the collective effects consistently so that in the limit of high temperatures ( $kT \gg \text{Rydberg}$ ) the result is exact to first order in the weak coupling parameter  $k_D^3/n$ .

Our calculation shows that the detailed frequency dependence of the conductivity is affected by high frequency collective effects. At twice the plasma frequency there is very slight inflection in the conductivity curve which can be interpreted as resulting from the excitation of two plasmons. Because there is no actual resonance near  $\omega \approx 2\omega_p$ , it is shown from this calculation that frequency shifts in incoherent scattering of radiation from a uniform plasma at the second harmonic of the plasma frequency will not be observable.

The electron-electron collisional conductivity which is proportional to  $k^2$  for small wave numbers  $k$  is generally not of great practical interest for real plasmas since the contribution from electron-ion collisions is independent of  $k$  in this limit and also has a  $k^2$  term of comparable magnitude to the electron-electron contribution.\* However, the frequency dependence of the electron-electron contribution is different than the ion-electron contribution in the frequency region near  $2\omega_p$ .

---

\*The  $k^2$  correction due to electron-ion collisions has recently been computed by H. L. Berk, Phys. Fluids, Vol. 7, 1964, p. 257. This calculation coupled with our result gives the complete collisional conductivity to order  $k^2$ .

In Section IV we discuss the frequency dependence of our results. At  $\omega = \omega_p$  we compare our results with the recent work of Wu and Klevans.<sup>(3)</sup>

We find weak inflection in the conductivity curves at  $2\omega_p$  due to double plasmon production. There is no sharp resonance at this frequency due to the dispersion and damping of the plasmons. We conclude this section by commenting on the application of these results to the line shape of incoherently scattered radiation from a plasma<sup>(11)</sup> near frequencies displaced by  $\pm 2\omega_p$  from the incident frequencies.

II. GENERAL BACKGROUND

The starting point for our computation of the local conductivity\* is the general expression, obtained from Eqs. (3.5) and (4.12) of Ref. 9 and Appendix A of Ref. 4, which relates the conductivity to matrix elements of the Heisenberg current operator  $J_i(t)$ .

$$4\pi \text{Im } \sigma_{ij}(k, \omega) = \frac{1}{2\omega} \sum'_{nm} \rho_n \langle n | J_i(0) | m \rangle \langle m | J_j(0) | n \rangle (1 - e^{-\beta\hbar\omega})$$

$$(2\pi)^3 \delta^3(\hbar\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}_m + \mathbf{p}_n) 2\pi \delta(\hbar\omega - E_m + E_n). \quad (2.1)$$

The density matrix is

$$\rho_n = e^{\beta\Omega} e^{-\beta(E_n - \mu N_n)}$$

$$e^{-\beta\Omega} = \sum_n e^{-\beta(E_n - \mu N_n)} \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\mu$  is the chemical potential and, of course,  $\mathbf{p}_n$ ,  $E_n$ , and  $N_n$  are the momentum, energy, and number of particles in the state  $n$ .

Eq. (1) is similar to the Golden Rule of time dependent perturbation theory and it is shown in Ref. 9 how the result can be calculated in terms of a diagrammatic expansion in a coupling parameter. The prime on the summation indicates that in perturbation theory only proper diagrams are to be considered in calculating the local conductivity. (This is the point discussed in Appendix A of Ref. 4.) We can then give a simple prescription for directly calculating  $\text{Im } \sigma_{ij}(k, \omega)$ .

---

\*Our definition of the conductivity is such that  $j_i(k, \omega) = -i\sigma_{ij}(k, \omega) E_j(k, \omega)$  so real and imaginary parts are interchanged from the usual definition. We shall compute only the imaginary part of the conductivity. The real part corresponds to the polarizability and is found from the imaginary part via a familiar dispersion relation.

UNITS

We shall use the same units as in Ref. 9,  $\beta^{-1} = kT$  is the natural unit of energy,  $\omega_p = (4\pi e^2 n/m)^{1/2}$  is the natural unit of frequency (and so  $\hbar$  will be measured in units of  $(\beta \omega_p)^{-1}$ ),  $p_T = (m/\beta)^{1/2}$  is the natural unit of momentum, and  $k_D = (4\pi e^2 n \beta)^{1/2}$  is the natural unit of wave number, and the coupling constant which arises naturally is  $\lambda = k_D^3/n$ .

These units are especially convenient for doing classical problems since it is easy to see the order of diagrams, both in  $\lambda$  and  $\hbar$ . In the limit of very high temperatures we are still left with a term proportional to  $\ln(\hbar)$ .

It follows from the considerations in Refs. 4 and 10 and Langer's proofs<sup>(12)</sup> on the analytic properties of expressions of the form of Eq. (2.1) in quantum statistical mechanics that  $4\pi \text{Im } \sigma_{ij}$  can be computed in perturbation theory in terms of unperturbed quantum statistical states  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

These states are understood relative to the state of complete thermal equilibrium which is to be considered as sort of a vacuum state. They are described in terms of the number of particles of given momenta (upward lines) representing an excess of one particle in each momentum state relative to the equilibrium population and the number of holes (downward lines) representing a depletion of one particle in the given state relative to equilibrium.

The formula for  $\text{Im } \sigma_{ij}$  is similar in form to Eq. (2.1);

$$4\pi \text{Im } \sigma_{ij}(k, \omega) = \frac{1}{2\omega} \sum_{\alpha\beta} \omega_\alpha J_1(\alpha, \beta; k, \omega) J_1^*(\alpha, \beta; k, \omega) (1 - e^{-\beta\hbar\omega})$$

$$(2\pi\hbar)^3 \delta^3(\hbar\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}_\beta + \mathbf{p}_\alpha) 2\pi \delta(\hbar\omega - E_\beta + E_\alpha)$$
(2.3)

where  $\mathbf{p}_\alpha(E_\alpha)$  is the sum of particle momenta (energies) minus hole momenta (energies) in the unperturbed  $\alpha$ .  $\omega_\alpha$  is the statistical weighting factor for the initial state  $\alpha$  described below in rule 7.

The current amplitudes  $J_1$  are computed in perturbation theory according to the following set of rules:

0. Drawn all topologically distinct open diagrams for the current amplitudes  $J_1(\alpha, \beta; k, \omega)$  leading from the initial state of one quantum  $(k, \omega)$  to a given excited final state of the system (examples are shown in Figs. 1 and 2). The current amplitude has a contribution from each diagram obtained by multiplying together the following factors:

1. To each internal particle line carrying momentum  $p$  and energy  $p_0$  there corresponds a factor of

$$i \tilde{G}(p, p_0) = \frac{1}{p_0 - \xi_p} \quad (2.4)$$

where  $\xi_p = (p^2/2m) - \mu$  where  $m$  is the particle's mass in units of the electron mass and  $\mu$  is the chemical potential for this type of particle. In natural units  $\mu$  is defined by

$$e^\mu = \frac{\hbar^3}{\lambda} \left(\frac{2\pi}{m}\right)^{3/2}. \quad (2.5)$$

2. To each Coulomb interaction line carrying momentum  $\hbar q$  and energy  $\hbar q_0$  there corresponds a factor of the dynamically screened Coulomb propagator

$$-i \tilde{V}_s(\hbar q, \hbar q_0) = \frac{-1}{q^2 + \tilde{Q}(\hbar q, \hbar q_0)} \quad (2.6)$$

where  $\tilde{Q}(\hbar q, \hbar q_0)$  is the screening function (i.e., the proper polarization part). To lowest order in  $\lambda$  (i.e., the RPA)  $\tilde{Q}$  is given by

$$\tilde{Q}(\hbar q, \hbar q_0) = \lambda \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \frac{f(p - \frac{\hbar}{2} q) - f(p + \frac{\hbar}{2} q)}{\hbar\omega - \hbar \frac{p \cdot q}{m}} \quad (2.7)$$

where  $m$  is the mass of the screening particles in electron units. In the classical ( $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ ) limit this can be written

$$\lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \tilde{Q}_0(q, q_0) = \tilde{Q}_0(mq_0/q) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \frac{y}{y - m(q_0/q)} e^{-\frac{1}{2} y^2} \quad (2.8)$$

so in this limit

$$\lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \tilde{V}_s(\hbar q, \hbar q_0) = \tilde{V}_s(q, q_0) = \frac{1}{q^2 + \tilde{Q}_0\left(\frac{mq_0}{q}\right)} .$$

3. At each Coulomb vertex there is a factor

$$i z \sqrt{\lambda} \quad (2.9)$$

where  $z$  is the charge (in electron units) of the particle line.

4. To each single photon-particle vertex there corresponds a factor

$$- i \sqrt{\lambda} z \hat{e} \cdot \frac{1}{2m} (\underline{p} + \underline{p}') \quad (2.10)$$

where  $\hat{e}$  is the (transverse) photon polarization and  $\underline{p}$  and  $\underline{p}'$  are the incoming and outgoing particle momenta.

5. There is a factor of (-1) for each closed loop.  
 6. Energy and momentum are conserved at each vertex and internal momentum and energy variables are summed over according to

$$i \sum_{p_0} \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \quad \text{or} \quad i \sum_{q_0} \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \quad (2.11)$$

where the energy variables take on the discrete values  $p_0, q_0 = i\pi\nu$  where  $\nu$  runs over odd intergers for Fermions and even integers for Bosons (including the screened interaction).

7. Add all current amplitudes with the same initial and final states to insert into Eq. (2.3). Diagrams which

differ only the exchange of identical Fermions in the final state differ by a factor of  $(-1)$ . The sum and average over initial and final states is accomplished by inserting weight factors  $(1 - f(p))$  for particles and  $f(p)$  for holes where

$$f(p) = \left[ e^{\beta \xi_p} \pm 1 \right]^{-1} . \quad (2.12)$$

In the limit of classical statistics

$$f(p) = e^{-\beta \xi_p} = e^{\mu} e^{-(p^2/2m)} = \frac{\hbar^3}{\lambda} \left( \frac{2\pi}{m} \right)^{3/2} e^{-(p^2/2m)} \ll 1 \quad (2.13)$$

all final particle and hole states are summed using the familiar  $(2\pi\hbar)^{-3} \int d^3p$ . Since this counts the same final state more than once when identical particles are involved the result must be divided by  $(n!)$  where  $n$  is the number of particles of a given type in the final state. (Thus in Eq. (3.1) below there occurs a factor of  $1/2$ .)

8. The amplitudes must be analytically continued to continuous values of the external energy variables by setting  $q_0 = u + i\epsilon$  and  $k_0 = \omega + i\epsilon$  is a positive infinitesimal.

The final state can consist of a single pair which corresponds to collisionless Landau damping and its virtual corrections.<sup>(9)</sup> A final state of two pairs can be obtained only if collisions between particles are taken into account. The basic collision process taking into account screening in the RPA is shown in Fig. 1a. The initial photon must be connected to this final state in all equivalent ways. We must attach the photon in turn to each particle line including the lines in the polarization loops. This is shown for a prototype diagram in Fig. 1b where the x's represent the possible places for attaching a photon line. For each particular photon insertion additional polarization parts can be inserted to fully

screen the Coulomb lines. The result is the complete set of diagrams in Fig. 2. Note again that in any diagram a closed loop can be inserted along with an additional interaction line without changing the order in  $\lambda$ . This is because each closed loop will have at least one factor of  $\frac{1}{\lambda}$  arising from the  $e^\mu$  of Eqs. (2.5) and (2.13) which cancels the additional factor of  $\lambda$  from the extra interaction line. This principle operates in forming the screened interaction propagator and in the diagrams with the internal loops of Fig. 2.

It is easy to see that all other diagrams leading to the same final state must be higher powers in  $\lambda$  since one must add more interaction lines than closed loops. We can neglect such contributions to obtain the leading term in  $\lambda$ .

Before turning to the calculation let us make a few comments concerning these diagrams. The resonance at  $\omega = 2\omega_p$  comes, of course, from the plasmon resonances in the two screened interaction propagators in Figs. 2e and 2f. Since this resonant effect is of greatest interest, it would be tempting to consider these two diagrams as dominant and neglect the other four. However, we shall see that even near  $\omega = 2\omega_p$  there is an important cancellation between diagrams e, f and diagrams a, b, c, d which must be taken into account to get the proper  $k^2$  proportionality of the conductivity for small  $k$ .

It follows from the symmetries of the system that the tensor conductivity can be decomposed into longitudinal and transverse parts

$$\sigma_{ij}(k, \omega) = \frac{k_i k_j}{k^2} \sigma_L(k, \omega) + \left( \delta_{ij} - \frac{k_i k_j}{k^2} \right) \sigma_T(k, \omega). \quad (2.14)$$

The functions  $\sigma_L$  and  $\sigma_T$  can be projected out of  $\sigma_{ij}$  by using unit polarization vectors  $\hat{e}^{(\alpha)}$  where  $\hat{e}^{(0)} = \hat{k}$  for the longitudinal case and  $\hat{e}^{(1,2)}$  are perpendicular to  $\hat{k}$  and to each other in the transverse case. The well known sum over transverse polarizations takes the form:

$$\sum_{\alpha=1,2} \hat{e}_1^\alpha \hat{e}_j^\alpha = \delta_{1j} - \frac{k_1 k_j}{k^2} . \quad (2.15)$$

Using these definitions we can write

$$\sigma_L(k, \omega) = \hat{e}_1^{(0)} \hat{e}_j^{(0)} \sigma_{1j}(k, \omega) = \hat{k}_1 \hat{k}_j \sigma_{1j}(k, \omega) \quad (2.16)$$

$$\sigma_T(k, \omega) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1,2} \hat{e}_1^\alpha \hat{e}_j^\alpha \sigma_{1j}(k, \omega) . \quad (2.17)$$

In the following section we will apply these rules to the calculation of the collisional conductivity of electron gas from the diagrams of Fig. 2. In Section IV we will discuss these results and their application to a realistic two component plasma.

### III. CALCULATION

From the rules of the previous section and Fig. 2 the following expression for the dissipative part of the conductivity due to electron-electron collisions ( $m = 1$ ) can immediately be set down:

$$\begin{aligned}
 4\pi \hat{e}_1 \hat{e}_j \text{Im } \sigma_{1j}(k, \omega) &= \frac{1}{4\omega} \int \frac{d^3 p_1}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \int \frac{d^3 p_2}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \int \frac{d^3 p_3}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \int \frac{d^3 p_4}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \\
 &\cdot \hbar^6 \frac{(2\pi)^3}{\lambda^2} e^{-\frac{1}{2} p_1^2} e^{-\frac{1}{2} p_2^2} (1 - e^{-\hbar\omega}) \left| \underline{j} \cdot \hat{e} \right|^2 \quad (3.1) \\
 &\cdot (2\pi\hbar)^3 \delta^3(\hbar\underline{k} + \underline{p}_1 + \underline{p}_2 - \underline{p}_3 - \underline{p}_4) 2\pi \delta(\hbar\omega + \xi_1 + \xi_2 - \xi_3 - \xi_4)
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\xi_1 = \xi(p_1)$ , etc. The analytically continued (see rule 7) current amplitudes are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \underline{j} \cdot \hat{e} &= i \lambda v_s^+(\underline{p}_4 - \underline{p}_2, \xi_4 - \xi_2) \left[ \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} (\underline{p}_1 + \frac{1}{2} \hbar\underline{k}) \cdot \hat{e}}{\hbar\omega - \xi(\underline{p}_1 + \hbar\underline{k}) + \xi_1} - \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} (\underline{p}_3 - \frac{1}{2} \hbar\underline{k}) \cdot \hat{e}}{\hbar\omega + \xi(\underline{p}_3 - \hbar\underline{k}) - \xi_3} \right] \\
 &+ i \lambda v_s^+(\underline{p}_3 - \underline{p}_1, \xi_3 - \xi_1) \left[ \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} (\underline{p}_2 + \frac{1}{2} \hbar\underline{k}) \cdot \hat{e}}{\hbar\omega - \xi(\underline{p}_2 + \hbar\underline{k}) + \xi_2} - \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} (\underline{p}_4 - \frac{1}{2} \hbar\underline{k}) \cdot \hat{e}}{\hbar\omega + \xi(\underline{p}_4 - \hbar\underline{k}) - \xi_4} \right] \\
 &- \lambda^2 v_s^+(\underline{p}_4 - \underline{p}_2, \xi_4 - \xi_2) v_s(\underline{p}_3 - \underline{p}_1, \xi_3 - \xi_1) \hat{e} \cdot \underline{T}(\underline{p}_3 - \underline{p}_1, \xi_3 - \xi_1; \\
 &\quad \underline{p}_4 - \underline{p}_2, \xi_4 - \xi_2; k, \omega) \quad (3.2)
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $T$  is the amplitude arising from the triangular closed loops in Fig. 2. Defining the momentum and energy transfer variables

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hbar q_1 &= \underline{p}_3 - \underline{p}_1 & \hbar u_1 &= \xi_3 - \xi_1 = \hbar q_1 \cdot \underline{p}_1 + \frac{\hbar^2}{2} q_1^2 \\
 \hbar q_2 &= \underline{p}_4 - \underline{p}_2 & \hbar u_2 &= \xi_4 - \xi_2 = \hbar q_2 \cdot \underline{p}_2 + \frac{\hbar^2}{2} q_2^2
 \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

we have

$$\hat{e} \cdot \underline{T}^+(q_1, u_1; q_2, u_2; k, \omega) = i \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{e} \cdot \underline{T}^+(q_1, u_1; k, \omega) + i \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{e} \cdot \underline{T}^+(q_2, u_2; k, \omega) \quad (3.4)$$

where the two functions  $\underline{T}$  on the right hand side arise from the two directions of the closed loop in Figs. 2e and 2f, respectively. These functions are the analytic continuations of

$$\hat{e} \cdot \underline{T}(q_1, q_{10}; k, k_0) = \int \frac{d^3 t}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \hat{e} \cdot \left( \underline{t} + \frac{1}{2} \hbar \underline{k} \right) \sum_{t_0} \frac{1}{(t_0 - \xi(\underline{t}))(t_0 + k_0 - \xi(\underline{t} + \hbar \underline{k}))(t_0 + q_{10} - \xi(\underline{t} + \hbar \underline{q}_1))} \quad (3.5)$$

from the discrete values  $k_0 = \frac{i\pi n}{B}$ ,  $q_{10} = \frac{i\pi n_1}{\beta}$  where  $n$  and  $n_1$  are even integers to continuous values  $\hbar(\omega + i\epsilon)$  and  $\hbar(u_1 + i\epsilon)$  in the upper complex half planes. The sum is over  $t_0 = \frac{i\pi v}{\beta}$  where  $v$  is an even integer for Bosons and odd for Fermions. The sum is easily carried out by converting to a contour integral with the result

$$\hat{e} \cdot \underline{T}(q_1, q_{10}; k, k_0) = - \int \frac{d^3 t}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \frac{\left( \underline{t} + \frac{1}{2} \hbar \underline{k} \right) \cdot \hat{e}}{k_0 - \xi(\underline{t} + \hbar \underline{k}) + \xi(\underline{t})} \left[ \frac{f(\underline{t}) - f(\underline{t} + \hbar \underline{q}_1)}{q_{10} + \xi(\underline{t}) - \xi(\underline{t} + \hbar \underline{q}_1)} - \frac{f(\underline{t} + \hbar \underline{k}) - f(\underline{t} + \hbar \underline{q}_1)}{q_{10} - k_0 + \xi(\underline{t} + \hbar \underline{k}) - \xi(\underline{t} + \hbar \underline{q}_1)} \right]. \quad (3.6)$$

Now going back to Eq. (3.1) the momentum conserving  $\delta$ -function can be trivially integrated out by making the substitutions

$$\underline{q}_1 = \underline{q} + \frac{\underline{k}}{2} \quad (3.7)$$

$$\underline{q}_2 = -\underline{q} + \frac{\underline{k}}{2}.$$

The definitions of Eq. (3.3) for  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  can be introduced by inserting delta functions and Eq. (3.1) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 4\pi \hat{e}_1 \hat{e}_j \text{Im } \sigma_{1j}(k, \omega) &= \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{1 - e^{-\hbar\omega}}{\hbar\omega} \right) \frac{(2\pi)^4}{\lambda^2} \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^3p_1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^3p_2}{(2\pi)^3} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(p_1^2 + p_2^2)} \\
 &\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} du_1 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} du_2 \delta(\omega - u_1 - u_2) \delta \left[ u_1 - p_1 \cdot \left( \underline{q} + \frac{\underline{k}}{2} \right) - \frac{\hbar}{2} \left( \underline{q} + \frac{\underline{k}}{2} \right)^2 \right] \\
 &\delta \left[ u_2 + p_2 \cdot \left( \underline{q} - \frac{\underline{k}}{2} \right) - \frac{\hbar}{2} \left( \underline{q} - \frac{\underline{k}}{2} \right)^2 \right] \cdot |\underline{J} \cdot \hat{e}|^2
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.8}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
 -i(\underline{J} \cdot \hat{e}) &= -\lambda^{\frac{3}{2}} V_s^+ \left( \hbar \underline{q} + \frac{\hbar \underline{k}}{2}, \hbar u_1 \right) \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[ \frac{(p_2 + \frac{1}{2}\hbar \underline{k}) \cdot \hat{e}}{\omega - \underline{k} \cdot p_2 - \frac{1}{2}\hbar k^2} - \frac{(p_2 + \hbar \underline{q}) \cdot \hat{e}}{\omega - \underline{k} \cdot p_2 - \hbar \underline{k} \cdot \underline{q}} \right] \\
 &+ \lambda^{\frac{3}{2}} V_s^+ \left( -\hbar \underline{q} + \frac{\hbar \underline{k}}{2}, \hbar u_2 \right) \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[ \text{same term with} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \underline{q} \rightarrow -\underline{q}, p_2 \rightarrow p_1 \right] \\
 &- \lambda^{\frac{5}{2}} V_s^+ \left( \hbar \underline{q} + \frac{\hbar \underline{k}}{2}, \hbar u_1 \right) V_s^+ \left( -\hbar \underline{q} + \frac{\hbar \underline{k}}{2}, \hbar u_2 \right) \left[ \hat{e} \cdot \underline{\tau} \left( \underline{q} + \frac{\underline{k}}{2}, u_1; k, \omega \right) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \hat{e} \cdot \underline{\tau} \left( -\underline{q} + \frac{\underline{k}}{2}, u_2; k, \omega \right) \right].
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.9}$$

It is convenient next to take the limit  $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ : Remembering that in this limit  $V_s^+(\hbar \underline{q}, \hbar u) = V_s^+(\underline{q}, u)$

$$\begin{aligned}
 -iJ^c \cdot \hat{e} &= i \lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} J \cdot \hat{e} = \lambda^{\frac{3}{2}} v_s^+(q + \frac{\hbar k}{2}, u_1) v_s^+(q - \frac{\hbar k}{2}, u_2) \\
 &\left\{ v_s^{-1}(q + \frac{\hbar k}{2}, u_2) \left[ \frac{\frac{1}{2}(\underline{k} \cdot \hat{e}) - (\hat{e} \cdot q)}{\omega - \underline{k} \cdot p_2} - \frac{(\underline{k} \cdot q - k^2)(p_2 \cdot \hat{e})}{(\omega - \underline{k} \cdot p_2)^2} \right] \right. \\
 &+ v_s^{-1}(q + \frac{\hbar k}{2}, u_1) \left[ \frac{\frac{1}{2}(\underline{k} \cdot \hat{e}) + (\hat{e} \cdot q)}{\omega - \underline{k} \cdot p_1} + \frac{(\underline{k} \cdot q + k^2)}{(\omega - \underline{k} \cdot p_1)^2} (p_1 \cdot \hat{e}) \right] \\
 &\left. - \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \left[ \hat{e} \cdot \underline{\tau}^+(q + \frac{\hbar k}{2}, u_1; k, \omega) + \hat{e} \cdot \underline{\tau}^+(q - \frac{\hbar k}{2}, u_2; k, \omega) \right] \right\} \cdot (3.10)
 \end{aligned}$$

From Eq. (3.6) after analytic continuation

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{e} \cdot \underline{\tau}^+(q + \frac{\hbar k}{2}, u_1; k, \omega) &= -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int \frac{d^3 t}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \frac{(\underline{t} + \frac{1}{2} \hbar \underline{k}) \cdot \hat{e}}{\omega - \underline{k} \cdot (\underline{t} + \frac{1}{2} \hbar \underline{k})} \\
 &\cdot \left[ \frac{f(\underline{t}) - f(\underline{t} + \hbar \underline{q} + \frac{1}{2} \hbar \underline{k})}{u_1 - (q + \frac{\hbar k}{2}) \cdot (\underline{t} + \frac{1}{2} \hbar \underline{q} + \frac{1}{4} \hbar \underline{k})} + \frac{f(\underline{t} + \hbar \underline{k}) - f(\underline{t} + \hbar \underline{q} + \frac{1}{2} \hbar \underline{k})}{u_2 - \underline{k} \cdot (\underline{t} + \frac{1}{2} \hbar \underline{k}) + (q + \frac{\hbar k}{2}) \cdot (\underline{t} + \frac{\hbar \underline{q}}{2} + \frac{\hbar \underline{k}}{4})} \right] \\
 & \hspace{15em} (3.11)
 \end{aligned}$$

where the energy conservation condition  $\omega = u_1 + u_2$  has been used and where  $\omega, u_1, u_2$  are understood to have small positive imaginary parts.

This equation can be made more symmetrical looking by making the substitutions  $\underline{t} \rightarrow \underline{t} - \frac{1}{2} \hbar (q + \frac{1}{2} k)$  in the first term in square brackets and  $\underline{t} + \hbar k \rightarrow \underline{t} - \frac{1}{2} \hbar (q - \frac{1}{2} k)$  in the second term. The result can be written in the form

$$\hat{e} \cdot \underline{\tau}(\underline{q} + \frac{\underline{k}}{2}, u_1; k, \omega) = \hat{e} \cdot \underline{\theta}(\underline{q}, u_1; k, \omega; \hbar) + \hat{e} \cdot \underline{\theta}(-\underline{q}, u_2; k, \omega; \hbar) \quad (3.12)$$

where

$$\hat{e} \cdot \underline{\theta}(\underline{q}, u_1; k, \omega; \hbar) = -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int \frac{d^3 t}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \frac{\hat{e} \cdot [\underline{t} - \frac{1}{2} \hbar(\underline{q} - \frac{1}{2} \underline{k})]}{\omega - \underline{k} \cdot (\underline{t} - \frac{1}{2} \hbar(\underline{q} - \frac{1}{2} \underline{k}))} \cdot \left[ \frac{f(\underline{t} - \frac{1}{2} \hbar(\underline{q} + \frac{1}{2} \underline{k})) - f(\underline{t} + \frac{1}{2} \hbar(\underline{q} + \frac{1}{2} \underline{k}))}{u_1 - (\underline{q} + \frac{1}{2} \underline{k}) \cdot \underline{t}} \right]. \quad (3.13)$$

From Eq. (3.12) it follows that

$$\lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \hat{e} \cdot \left[ \underline{\tau}(\underline{q} + \frac{\underline{k}}{2}, u_1; k, \omega) + \underline{\tau}(-\underline{q} + \frac{\underline{k}}{2}, u_2; k, \omega) \right] \quad (3.14)$$

$$= \lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \hat{e} \cdot \left[ \underline{\theta}(\underline{q}, u_1; k, \omega; \hbar) + \underline{\theta}(-\underline{q}, u_2; k, \omega; -\hbar) + \underline{\theta}(-\underline{q}, u_2; k, \omega; \hbar) + \underline{\theta}(\underline{q}, u_1; k, \omega; -\hbar) \right]. \quad (3.15)$$

Since the leading term in  $\hat{e} \cdot \underline{\theta}$ , as  $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ , goes as  $\hbar^{-1}$ , this term cancels out in the limit and the remaining term is independent of  $\hbar$

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \hat{e} \cdot \left[ \underline{\tau}(\underline{q} + \frac{\underline{k}}{2}, u_1; k, \omega) + \underline{\tau}(-\underline{q} + \frac{\underline{k}}{2}, u_2; k, \omega) \right] \quad (3.16) \\ &= \int \frac{d^3 t}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \left[ \frac{\hat{e} \cdot (\underline{q} - \frac{1}{2} \underline{k})}{\omega - \underline{k} \cdot \underline{t}} + \frac{(\hat{e} \cdot \underline{t}) \underline{k} \cdot (\underline{q} - \frac{1}{2} \underline{k})}{(\omega - \underline{k} \cdot \underline{t})^2} \right] \frac{\underline{t} \cdot (\underline{q} + \frac{\underline{k}}{2})}{u_1 - \underline{t} \cdot (\underline{q} + \frac{\underline{k}}{2})} f(\underline{t}) \\ &+ (\underline{q} \rightarrow -\underline{q}, u_1 \rightarrow u_2). \end{aligned}$$

The case  $k \ll 1$  (i.e.,  $k \ll k_p$ ) is of greatest interest so the next step is to expand in powers of  $k$ . The right hand side of Eq. (3.16) becomes

$$\int \frac{d^3 t}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \left[ \frac{(\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q})}{\omega} - \frac{(\hat{e} \cdot \underline{k})}{2\omega} + \frac{(\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q})(\underline{k} \cdot \underline{t})}{\omega^2} + \frac{(\hat{e} \cdot \underline{t})(\underline{k} \cdot \underline{q})}{\omega^2} \right] \frac{\underline{t} \cdot \underline{q} f(\underline{t})}{u_1 - \underline{t} \cdot \underline{q}}$$

$$+ \int \frac{d^3 t}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \frac{(\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q})}{\omega} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\underline{t} \cdot \underline{k}}{u_1 - \underline{t} \cdot \underline{q}} f(\underline{t}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\underline{t} \cdot \underline{q} \underline{k} \cdot \underline{t} f(\underline{t})}{(u_1 - \underline{t} \cdot \underline{q})^2} \right] + \left( \frac{q}{u_1} - \frac{q}{u_2} \right).$$

(3.17)

Using the Eq. (2.7) we see that

$$\lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} Q_0^+(\hbar q, \hbar u) = Q_0^+\left(\frac{u}{q}\right) = \lambda \int \frac{d^3 t}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \frac{\underline{t} \cdot \underline{q}}{u - \underline{t} \cdot \underline{q}} f(\underline{t})$$

$$= \int \frac{d^3 t}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \frac{\underline{t} \cdot \underline{q}}{u - \underline{t} \cdot \underline{q}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} t^2}$$

(3.18)

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial q} Q_0^+(q, u) = \frac{\lambda}{2q^2} \int \frac{d^3 t}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \left[ \frac{\underline{t} \cdot \underline{q}}{(u - \underline{t} \cdot \underline{q})} + \frac{(\underline{t} \cdot \underline{q})^2}{(u - \underline{t} \cdot \underline{q})^2} \right] f(\underline{t}).$$

(3.19)

We can write Eq. (3.17) in the form

$$\lambda \lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \left[ \mathcal{I}(q + \frac{k}{2}, u_1; k, \omega) + \mathcal{I}(-q + \frac{k}{2}, u_2; k, \omega) \right]$$

$$= (\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q}) \frac{1}{\omega} \left[ Q_0^+\left(\frac{u_1}{q}\right) - Q_0^+\left(\frac{u_2}{q}\right) \right]$$

$$= (\hat{e} \cdot \underline{k}) \frac{1}{2\omega} \left[ Q_0^+\left(\frac{u_1}{q}\right) + Q_0^+\left(\frac{u_2}{q}\right) \right] + \frac{(\underline{k} \cdot \underline{q})(\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q})}{\omega} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial q} Q_0^+\left(\frac{u_1}{q}\right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial q} Q_0^+\left(\frac{u_2}{q}\right) \right]$$

$$+ 2(\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q}) \frac{k \cdot q}{\omega^2 q^2} \left[ u_1 Q_0^+\left(\frac{u_1}{q}\right) + u_2 Q_0^+\left(\frac{u_2}{q}\right) \right] + O(k^2).$$

(3.20)

To complete the expansion of  $(\underline{J} \cdot \hat{e})$  to linear terms in  $k$ , the first two terms in brackets in Eq. (3.10) must be expanded. Carrying this out and using Eq. (3.20) the complete result is

$$\begin{aligned}
 -1(\hat{e} \cdot \underline{J}^c) = & -\lambda^{3/2} v_s^+(q, u_1) v_s^+(q, u_2) \left\{ \left[ Q_0^+ \left( \frac{u_1}{q} \right) - Q_0^+ \left( \frac{u_2}{q} \right) \right] \frac{(\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q})}{\omega} \right. \\
 & + \frac{2}{\omega} (\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q})(\underline{k} \cdot \underline{q}) + \frac{(\underline{k} \cdot \underline{q})}{\omega} (\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q}) \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial q} Q_0^+ \left( \frac{u_1}{q} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial q} Q_0^+ \left( \frac{u_2}{q} \right) \right] \\
 & + \left[ q^2 + Q_0^+ \left( \frac{u_1}{q} \right) \right] \left[ \frac{1}{2\omega} (\hat{e} \cdot \underline{k}) + \frac{(\underline{k} \cdot \underline{q})(\hat{e} \cdot \underline{p}_1)}{\omega^2} + \frac{(\underline{k} \cdot \underline{p}_1)}{\omega^2} (\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q}) \right] \\
 & + \left[ q^2 + Q_0^+ \left( \frac{u_2}{q} \right) \right] \left[ \frac{1}{2\omega} (\hat{e} \cdot \underline{k}) - \frac{(\underline{k} \cdot \underline{q})(\hat{e} \cdot \underline{p}_2)}{\omega^2} - \frac{(\underline{k} \cdot \underline{p}_2)(\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q})}{\omega^2} \right] \\
 & \left. + (\text{terms in Eq. (3.20)}) \right\} . \tag{3.21}
 \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the terms of zero order in  $k$  cancel, as they should, making the amplitude proportional to  $k$  and the conductivity proportional to  $k^2$ . This cancellation depends critically on the closed loop terms in Eq. (3.2). A consistent theory with dynamic screening cannot be made without these terms, except if  $\omega = 0$ , in which case  $u_1 = u_2$ , so that the term of order 1 vanishes identically without cancellation. In a two component plasma the terms corresponding to the  $k$  independent terms in Eq. (3.21) and (3.20) are responsible for the leading contribution to the conductivity.

Using Eqs. (3.20) and (3.21) the term proportional to  $k$  in the current amplitude can be written

$$\begin{aligned}
 -1 \hat{e} \cdot \underline{j}^c &= \frac{\lambda^{3/2}}{\omega} v_s^+(q, u_1) v_s^+(q, u_2) \left\{ \hat{e} \cdot \underline{k} q^2 - 4 \hat{e} \cdot \underline{q} \underline{q} \cdot \underline{k} \right. \\
 &+ \frac{1}{\omega} (\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q} \underline{k} \cdot \underline{p}_1 + \underline{k} \cdot \underline{q} \hat{e} \cdot \underline{p}_1) [v_s^+(q, u_1)]^{-1} - \frac{1}{\omega} (\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q} \underline{k} \cdot \underline{p}_2 + \underline{k} \cdot \underline{q} \hat{e} \cdot \underline{p}_2) [v_s^+(q, u_2)]^{-1} \\
 &+ 2 \frac{\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q} \underline{q} \cdot \underline{k}}{q^2} \left[ \frac{u_1}{\omega} [v_s^+(q, u_1)]^{-1} + \frac{u_2}{\omega} [v_s^+(q, u_2)]^{-1} \right] \left. \right\} \\
 &= \frac{\lambda^{3/2}}{\omega} v_s^+(q, u_1) v_s^+(q, u_2) \hat{e} \cdot \underline{M} \quad (3.22)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 4\pi \epsilon_i \epsilon_j \text{Im } \sigma_{ij}(k, \omega) &= \frac{\lambda}{4\omega^2} (2\pi)^4 \int \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^3 p_1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^3 p_2}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} du_1 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} du_2 \\
 &\delta(\omega - u_1 - u_2) \delta(u_1 - \underline{q} \cdot \underline{p}_1 - \frac{\hbar}{2} q^2) \delta(u_2 + \underline{q} \cdot \underline{p}_2 - \frac{\hbar}{2} q^2) e^{-\frac{1}{2}(p_1^2 + p_2^2)} \\
 &|v_s(q, u_1)|^2 |v_s(q, u_2)|^2 |\hat{e} \cdot \underline{M}|^2. \quad (3.23)
 \end{aligned}$$

### LONGITUDINAL CONDUCTIVITY

To obtain the longitudinal conductivity from Eqs. (3.22) and (3.23) let  $\hat{e} = \hat{k}$ . In the following, let

$$\begin{aligned}
 [v_s^+(q, u_1)]^{-1} &= \left[ q^2 + Q_0^+ \left( \frac{u_1}{q} \right) \right] = D(u_1), \\
 [v_s^+(q, u_2)]^{-1} &= \left[ q^2 + Q_0^+ \left( \frac{u_2}{q} \right) \right] = D(u_2) \quad (3.24)
 \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{k} \cdot \underline{M} &= k \left\{ 1^2 + (k \cdot \hat{q})^2 \left[ -4q^2 + \frac{2u_1}{\omega} D(u_1) + \frac{2u_2}{\omega} D(u_2) \right] \right. \\
 &+ \frac{2}{\omega} (\hat{k} \cdot \underline{q}) (\hat{k} \cdot \underline{p}_1) D(u_1) - \frac{2}{\omega} (\hat{k} \cdot \underline{q}) (\hat{k} \cdot \underline{p}_2) D(u_2) \left. \right\}. \quad (3.25)
 \end{aligned}$$

Since the final result cannot depend on the direction of  $k$ , the average over the directions of  $k$  can be taken after squaring  $(\hat{k} \cdot \underline{M})$ .

The following identities are useful for this:

$$\frac{1}{4\pi} \int d\Omega_k (\hat{k} \cdot \underline{a}) (\hat{k} \cdot \underline{b}) = \frac{1}{3} \underline{a} \cdot \underline{b} \quad (3.26a)$$

$$\frac{1}{4\pi} \int d\Omega_k (\hat{k} \cdot \underline{a})^2 (\hat{k} \cdot \underline{b}) (\hat{k} \cdot \underline{c}) = \frac{1}{15} [a^2 (\underline{b} \cdot \underline{c}) + 2(\underline{a} \cdot \underline{b})(\underline{a} \cdot \underline{c})]. \quad (3.26b)$$

On squaring and averaging over  $\hat{k}$  an expression of the following form arises

$$\frac{1}{4\pi} \int d\Omega_k |\hat{k} \cdot \underline{M}|^2 = A + B(\underline{p}_1 \cdot \underline{p}_2) + C p_1^2 + D p_2^2 \quad (3.27)$$

where the coefficients  $A$ ,  $B$ ,  $C$ , and  $D$  are functions of  $q^2$ ,  $u_1$ ,  $u_2$ ,  $D(u_1)$  and  $D(u_2)$ . At this point the  $\underline{p}_1$  and  $\underline{p}_2$  integrals can be done using the following formulas:

$$\int d^3 p_1 \int d^3 p_2 \delta(u_1 - \underline{p}_1 \cdot \underline{q} - \frac{\hbar q^2}{2}) \delta(u_2 + \underline{p}_2 \cdot \underline{q} - \frac{\hbar q^2}{2}) e^{-\frac{1}{2}(p_1^2 + p_2^2)} \\ [1; \underline{p}_1 \cdot \underline{p}_2; p_1^2] \\ = \frac{(2\pi)^2}{q} e^{\hbar\omega} e^{-\frac{\hbar^2 q^2}{4}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \frac{u_1^2 + u_2^2}{q^2}} \left[ 1; -\frac{u_1 u_2}{q}; \frac{u_1^2}{q} \right]. \quad (3.28)$$

It is consistent with the assumptions discussed in Section II to set  $e^{\hbar\omega} = 1$  (i.e., if in ordinary units  $\beta\hbar\omega \ll 1$ ). However, since the integration is over arbitrarily large values of  $q$ , we cannot, in general, consider  $\hbar^2 q^2 \ll 1$ .

Collecting results, Eq. (3.23) becomes

$$4\pi \operatorname{Im} \sigma_L(k, \omega) = \frac{1}{120\pi^2} \lambda \frac{k^2}{\omega^4} \int dq q^2 e^{-\frac{1}{4} \hbar^2 q^2} \int du_1 \int du_2 \delta(\omega - u_1 - u_2) e^{-\frac{u_1^2 + u_2^2}{2q^2}} |v_s(q, u_1)|^2 |v_s(q, u_2)|^2 [23 \omega^2 q^2 + 8|D(u_1)|^2 + 8|D(u_2)|^2]. \quad (3.29)$$

Changing integration variables to

$$u_1 = u + \frac{\omega}{2}$$

$$u_2 = -u + \frac{\omega}{2}$$

the delta function is trivially removed and using the definitions of Eq. (3.24) the result is obtained:

$$4\pi \operatorname{Im} \sigma_L(k, \omega) = \frac{1}{15\pi^2} \lambda \frac{k^2}{\omega^4} \int dq q^2 e^{-\frac{1}{4} \hbar^2 q^2} \int du e^{-\frac{\omega^2}{4q^2}} e^{-\frac{u^2}{q^2}} \left[ \frac{23}{8} \omega^2 q^2 |v_s^+(q, \frac{\omega}{2} + u)|^2 |v_s^+(q, \frac{\omega}{2} - u)|^2 + |v_s^+(q, \frac{\omega}{2} + u)|^2 + |v_s^+(q, \frac{\omega}{2} - u)|^2 \right]. \quad (3.30)$$

It is obvious that the last two terms in brackets make equal contributions. Letting  $z = \frac{u}{q}$  the result can be written in terms of two integrals  $J(\omega)$  and  $I(\omega)$ :

$$4\pi \operatorname{Im} \sigma_L(k, \omega) = \frac{2}{15\pi^2} \lambda \frac{k^2}{\omega^4} \left( \frac{23}{16} J(\omega) + I(\omega) \right) \quad (3.31)$$

where

$$J(\omega) = \omega^2 \int_0^{\infty} dq q^5 e^{-\frac{1}{4} \frac{\omega^2}{q^2}} e^{-\frac{1}{4} \hbar^2 q^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz \frac{e^{-z^2}}{|q^2 + Q_0^+(z + \frac{\omega}{2q})|^2 |q^2 + Q_0^+(z - \frac{\omega}{2q})|^2} \quad (3.32)$$

$$I(\omega) = \int_0^{\infty} dq q^3 e^{-\frac{1}{4} \frac{\omega^2}{q^2}} e^{-\frac{1}{4} \hbar^2 q^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz \frac{e^{-z^2}}{|q^2 + Q_0^+(z + \frac{\omega}{2q})|^2} \quad (3.33)$$

Note that in the expression for  $J(\omega)$  we can set  $\hbar = 0$  but that  $I(\omega)$  diverges logarithmically in this case. This behavior at large  $q$  will be discussed more fully below.

### TRANSVERSE CONDUCTIVITY

To obtain the transverse conductivity take  $\hat{e} = e^{(1,2)}$  and average over polarizations in equations (3.25) and (3.22) using

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1,2} (\hat{e}^{\alpha} \cdot \underline{a})(\hat{e}^{\alpha} \cdot \underline{b}) = \frac{1}{2} (\underline{a} \cdot \underline{b} - \frac{\underline{a} \cdot \underline{k} \underline{k} \cdot \underline{b}}{k^2}) \quad (3.34)$$

and  $\underline{k} \cdot \hat{e}^{(1,2)} = 0$ . Omitting the superscript on  $\hat{e}^{(1,2)}$  Eq. (3.22) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e} \cdot \underline{M} = & k \left\{ -4(\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q})(\underline{q} \cdot \hat{k}) - \frac{1}{\omega} (\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q} \hat{k} \cdot \underline{p}_2 + \hat{k} \cdot \underline{q} \hat{e} \cdot \underline{p}_2) D(u_1) \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{\omega} (\hat{e} \cdot \underline{q} \hat{k} \cdot \underline{p}_1 + \hat{k} \cdot \underline{q} \hat{e} \cdot \underline{p}_1) D(u_2) + \frac{2 \hat{e} \cdot \underline{q} \underline{q} \cdot \hat{k}}{q^2} \left[ \frac{u_1}{\omega} D(u_1) + \frac{u_2}{\omega} D(u_2) \right] \right\} . \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

On squaring this and summing over polarizations according to Eq. (3.34) a sum of terms of the form  $(\hat{k} \cdot \underline{q})^a (\hat{k} \cdot \underline{p}_1)^b (\hat{k} \cdot \underline{p}_2)^c$  where  $a + b + c = 2$  or  $4$  is obtained. The average over the directions of  $\hat{k}$  is then performed using Eq. (3.26), resulting after some algebra in the expression

$$\frac{1}{4\pi} \int d\Omega_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{\alpha=1,2} |\hat{\mathbf{e}}^{\alpha} \cdot \underline{\mathbf{M}}|^2 = \bar{A} + \bar{B} (\underline{p}_1 \cdot \underline{p}_2) + \bar{C} p_1^2 + \bar{D} p_2^2 \quad (3.36)$$

which is the same form as Eq. (3.27). Again using Eq. (3.28) to perform the  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  integrations the result emerges:

$$4\pi \operatorname{Im} \sigma_{\mathbb{T}}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{120\pi^2} \lambda \frac{k^2}{\omega^2} \int dq q^2 e^{-\frac{1}{4} \hbar^2 q^2} \int du_1 \int du_2 \delta(\omega - u_1 - u_2) e^{-\frac{u_1^2 + u_2^2}{q^2}} |v_{\mathbf{s}}^+(q, u_1)|^2 |v_{\mathbf{s}}^+(q, u_2)|^2 [16 \omega^2 q^2 + 6|D(u_1)|^2 + 6|D(u_2)|^2] \quad (3.37)$$

which can again be expressed in terms of the integrals  $I(\omega)$  and  $J(\omega)$ :

$$4\pi \operatorname{Im} \sigma_{\mathbb{T}}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{10\pi^2} \lambda \frac{k^2}{\omega^2} \left( \frac{4}{3} J(\omega) + I(\omega) \right) . \quad (3.38)$$

IV. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND APPLICATION  
TO INCOHERENT SCATTERING

The frequency dependence of our results, Eqs. (3.31) and (3.35), is considerably different than that of previous workers.<sup>(1-5)</sup> To make contact with the results of classical calculations we must discuss the treatment of the large  $q$  (or short range) cut-offs in our results. Strictly speaking, our results are valid only if  $kT \gg$  Rydberg which is the condition for validity of the Born collision approximation in which case the thermal deBroglie wavelength  $\hbar(2m/\beta)^{1/2}$  is greater than the classical distance of closest approach  $e^2\beta$ . Thus the exponential,  $\exp(-\frac{\hbar^2}{4}q^2)$ , in the integrand of Eq. (3.33) enforces a cut-off at approximately the thermal deBroglie wave number. For lower temperatures,  $kT \ll$  Rydberg, one expects the cut-off at the distance of closest approach and this is usually accomplished by dropping the exponential and cutting the  $q$  integral off at  $q_{\max} = 3/e^2\beta = \frac{12\pi}{\lambda} k_D$ .

Again we note that  $J(\omega)$  is sufficiently convergent at  $q \rightarrow \infty$  that the cut-off introduces higher order terms in  $\hbar$  and  $\lambda$  which must be dropped for consistency in our calculation. However, the cut-off must be kept in  $I(\omega)$  since it introduces a logarithmic dependence on  $\hbar$  or  $\lambda$  in the two cases. It is probably possible in the electron gas model to treat the large  $q$  cut-off exactly at lower temperatures by summing ladder diagrams of electron-electron collisions, but we shall not attempt this here.

The values of  $I(\omega)$  and  $J(\omega)$  for  $\omega \gg 1$  (i.e.,  $\omega \gg \omega_p$ ) are easy to evaluate for in this case the screening becomes ineffective.

$$I(\omega) = \int \frac{dq}{q} e^{-\frac{1}{4}\hbar^2 q^2} e^{-\frac{1}{4}\frac{\omega^2}{q^2}} \int dz e^{-z^2} \quad (4.1)$$

and in the limit of small  $\hbar$  this becomes

$$I(\omega) \approx \sqrt{\pi} \ln \left( \frac{4e^{-C}}{\hbar\omega} \right) \quad (4.1a)$$

where  $C \approx .58$ .

To evaluate  $J(\omega)$  we change variables and rewrite the integral in the form

$$J(\omega) = \int_0^{\infty} du u e^{-\frac{1}{4}u^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz \frac{e^{-z^2}}{\left|1 + \frac{u^2}{\omega^2} Q(z - \frac{u}{2})\right|^2 \left|1 + \frac{u^2}{\omega^2} Q(z + \frac{u}{2})\right|^2} \quad (4.2)$$

and in the limit  $\omega \rightarrow \infty$  we have

$$J(\omega) = 2 \sqrt{\pi} .$$

In the low frequency region ( $\omega \ll 1$ ) the screening complicates the integrals. If we replace the dynamic screening function  $Q(y)$  by a static screening constant  $K^2$  (where  $K^2 = 1$ ) then near  $\omega = 0$  we have

$$I(\omega) \approx \int dq q^3 e^{-\frac{1}{4} \hbar^2 q^2} \int dy \frac{e^{-y^2}}{(q^2 + K^2)^2} \quad (4.3)$$

$$J(\omega) \approx \omega^2 \int dq q^3 \int dy \frac{e^{-y^2}}{(q^2 + K^2)^4} . \quad (4.4)$$

We now obtain

$$I(\omega) \approx \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \left( \int_b^{\infty} dx \frac{e^{-x}}{x} - 1 \right) \quad (4.4a)$$

where  $b = \frac{\hbar^2}{4} K^2$ , and in the limit of  $\hbar \rightarrow 0$  we get

$$I(\omega) \approx \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \left( -\ln \left( e^C \frac{\hbar^2 K^2}{4} \right) - 1 \right) \quad (4.4b)$$

$$\approx \sqrt{\pi} \left( \ln (.67\hbar) - \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad (4.4c)$$

since  $K \approx 1$ . The other integral yields, near  $\omega = 0$ ,

$$J(\omega) \approx \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{6} \frac{\omega^2}{K^2} . \quad (4.4d)$$

Note that  $J(\omega)$  vanishes like  $\omega^2$  in this limit.

In Fig. 4 the results of numerical integration for  $J(\omega)$  and  $I(\omega)$  are plotted for the values  $\hbar = 10^{-1}$ . The results obtained using the classical high wave number cut-off do not differ significantly from these for typical values of  $\lambda$  because of the weak logarithmic dependence of  $I(\omega)$  on the cutoff. For  $\omega \ll 1$  we notice that the contribution of  $J(\omega)$  is negligible compared to  $I(\omega)$  but at  $\omega \sim 2$  the two terms are comparable and for  $\omega \gg 1$   $J(\omega)$  dominates. It is not difficult to show that the Balescu type<sup>(8,9)</sup> of kinetic equation yields a result which is equivalent to replacing the combinations  $I(\omega) + \frac{23}{16} J(\omega)$  and  $I(\omega) + \frac{4}{3} J(\omega)$  in Eqs. (3.31) and (3.38) by simply  $I(0)$ . For  $\omega > 1$  we see this is a poor approximation. The integral  $J(\omega)$  which contains the primary effect of the perturbation of the screening electrons by the incident field is the dominant contribution for  $\omega \gtrsim 2$ .

It is probably meaningful to associate the enhancement of the curve in Fig. 3 due to  $J(\omega)$  with the production of two plasmons in the final state as suggested by Figs. 2c and 2d. It is clear from Eq. (3.32) that only  $J(\omega)$  contains a contribution from the collective resonance associated with the dynamically screened interaction in both of the outgoing lines. This enhancement, however, cannot be described as a resonance. From Fig. 3 we see that it is very broad. This is due to the dispersion and Landau damping of the plasmons which contribute for larger values of  $q$  in the integrand of (3.32). Notice that small values of  $q$ , for which the plasmon resonance is sharp, are suppressed by the factor of  $q^5$  in the integrand. Because of the  $1/\omega^4$  factor of Eqs. (3.31) and (3.38) the complete conductivity will be a smoothly decreasing curve even for  $\omega \gtrsim 2\omega_p$  and the enhancement discussed above will be hardly discernable.

We can use our result to compare the damping of plasma oscillations due to electron-electron collisions with the work of other authors. We will make an explicit comparison to the recent work of Wu and Klevans<sup>(3)</sup> who make comparisons with Refs. 1 and 2. The damping rate defined by Wu and Klevans is

$$\gamma/\omega_p = 2\pi \text{Im} \sigma_L(k, \omega_p)$$

in our notation (and therefore differs by a factor of 2 from the conventions in Ref. 10). Using Eq. (3.31) we have the result (in plasma units)

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma/\omega_p &= \frac{1}{15\pi^2} \lambda k^2 \left[ I(1) + \frac{23}{16} J(1) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{15\pi^{3/2}} \left( \frac{k}{k_D} \right)^2 \frac{k_D^3}{n} [2.95] . \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Wu and Klevans result including only electron-electron correlations (the last terms on the right in their Eqs. (50b) and (50c) is

$$\gamma/\omega_p = \frac{1}{15\pi^{3/2}} \left( \frac{k}{k_D} \right)^2 \frac{k_D^3}{n} \left[ \ln \left( 0.707 \frac{k_T}{k_D} \right) + \ln(1870) \right] . \tag{4.7}$$

In their expression we have used the quantum cut-off  $k_T = \frac{k_D}{\beta \hbar \omega_p}$  (instead of their  $k_L$ ) to make contact with our results. For the value  $k_T/k_D = \frac{1}{\beta \hbar \omega_p} = 10$  for which our result was obtained the factor in square brackets in Eq. (4.7) is 9.49. Our result which should be exact in the limit as  $k_D^3/n \rightarrow 0$  for  $k \ll k_D$  and for  $kT \gg$  Rydberg for which the Born approximation is valid is more than a factor of three smaller than this. This may be accounted for by their approximate treatment of the short range cut-off. In the case  $kT \ll$  Rydberg for which the classical cut-off applies, neither method handles the cut-off exactly and we can only say that the results consistent to within the uncertainties in the cut-off

procedure. It is interesting to note that a very simple calculation neglecting collective screening effects entirely yields the factors [3.13] for  $k_T/k_D = 10$  which is surprisingly close to the exact result. (This approximation corresponds to using the high  $\omega$  approximation Eq. (4.1a) for  $I(\omega)$  and neglecting  $J(\omega)$  entirely!)

The electron gas result which we are considering is actually applicable near  $2\omega_p$  to a two component plasma in the limit of infinite ion mass. The contributions to the conductivity due to electron-ion and ion-ion collisions are smooth near  $\omega = 2\omega_p$ . This follows since the primary change in the formulas in these cases is to replace the exponential  $\exp - (u_1^2 + u_2^2)/2q^2$  in Eq. (3.29) to  $\exp - (M_1 u_1^2 + M_2 u_2^2)/2q^2$  where  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are the masses in units of  $m$ .<sup>\*</sup> Thus, near the resonance where  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are near unity (i.e.,  $\omega_p$ ) these contributions are  $\exp - (M_1 + M_2 - 2)/q^2$  smaller than the contribution from electron-electron collisions. However, e-i, e-e and i-i collisions contribute to the smooth background of thermal noise at  $\omega \approx 2\omega_p$  and of these the e-i contribution, which is finite at  $k \rightarrow 0$ , is the major contribution. It is also straightforward to show that the effect of ion screening in electron-electron collisions is negligible in the limit  $m/M \rightarrow 0$ .

We can apply this result to the observation of the frequency shifts at the second harmonic of  $\omega_p$  in the incoherent scattering of radiation from plasmas. It follows from the results of Ref. 11 that the spectral distribution of the scattered light is essentially proportional to  $\text{Im } \sigma_L(k, \omega)$ . Near  $2\omega_p$  the only contribution from two plasmon excitation is the weak inflection of the e-e contribution which is superimposed on the smooth background of noise contributed by the e-i contribution which is larger by a factor of order  $k^{-2}$ . The inflection would be at most a one percent effect (say for  $k \geq 10^{-1}$ ) and is most likely unobservable.

---

<sup>\*</sup>The calculation in the arbitrary mass case follows essentially exactly that in Section III.

For a plasma in which appreciable density gradients exist over distances short compared to a Debye length the production of the second harmonic will be much stronger as can be seen from the work of Boyd,<sup>(13)</sup> for example. However, for the incoherent scattering of radiation from the ionosphere where such strong density gradients do not exist our calculation shows that a frequency shift at about  $\pm 2 \omega_p$  is probably unobservable.

This study profited by the conversations of one of the authors (D. F. DuBois) with Mr. Martin Goldman.





Fig. 1. (a) Basic diagrams for the dynamically screened collisions.  
(b) Typical diagram showing possible locations, indicated by x's for attachment of an external photon line.




Fig. 2. Diagrams of order  $\lambda$  contributing to collisional conductivity.




Fig. 3. Numerical evaluation of the integrals  $I$  and  $J$  for the value  $\hbar = 0.1$ .

REFERENCES

1. Ichikawa, Y.H., Prog. of Theo. Phys., Vol. 24, 1960, p. 1083.
2. Willis, C. R., Phys. Fluids, Vol. 5, 1962, p. 219.
3. Wu, C. S. and E. M. Klevans, Proceedings of the 6th International Conferences on Ionization Phenomena in Gases, Paris, 1963.
4. DuBois, D.F., V. Gilinsky and M. G. Kivelson, Propagation of Electromagnetic Waves in Plasmas, The RAND Corporation, RM-3224-AEC, August 1962.
5. Gorman, D. and D. Montgomery, Phys. Rev., Vol. 131, 1963, p. 7. These authors apparently have not yet presented the numerical solution of the complicated equations which they derive here, so it is difficult to make a comparison with their work.
6. Dawson, J. and C. Oberman, Phys. Fluids, Vol. 5, 1962, p. 517.
7. Balescu, R., Phys. Fluids, Vol. 3, 1961, p. 52; see also N. Rostoker and M. N. Rosenbluth, Phys. Fluids, Vol. 3, 1960, p. 1; A. Lennard, Ann. Phys. (New York), Vol. 10, 1960, p. 390.
8. Wyld, Jr., H.W. and D. Pines, Phys. Rev., Vol. 127, 1962, p. 1851.
9. DuBois, D.F., V. Gilinsky, and M. G. Kivelson, Phys. Rev., Vol. 129, 1963, p. 2376.
10. Berk, H. L., Phys. Fluids, Vol. 7, 1964, p. 257.
11. DuBois, D.F., and V. Gilinsky, Phys. Rev., Vol. 133, 1964, p. A1308 Part I, and p. A1317 Part II.
12. Langer, J.S., Phys. Rev., Vol. 127, 1962, p. 5.
13. Boyd, T.J.M., Phys. Fluids, Vol. 7, 1964, p. 59.