Stopping of ions in a plasma irradiated by an intense laser field

H.B. NERSISYAN[1,2] AND C. DEUTSCH[3]

[1]Institute of Radiophysics and Electronics, Ashtarak, Armenia
[2]Centre of Strong Fields Physics, Yerevan State University, Yerevan, Armenia
[3]LPGP (UMR-CNRS 8578), Université Paris XI, Orsay, France

Abstract

The inelastic interaction between heavy ions and an electron plasma in the presence of an intense radiation field (RF) is investigated. The stopping power of the test ion averaged with a period of the RF has been calculated assuming that $\omega_0 > \omega_p$, where ω_0 is the frequency of the RF and ω_p is the plasma frequency. In order to highlight the effect of the radiation field we present a comparison of our analytical and numerical results obtained for nonzero RF with those for vanishing RF. It has been shown that the RF may strongly reduce the mean energy loss for slow ions while increasing it at high–velocities. Moreover, it has been shown, that acceleration of the projectile ion due to the RF is expected at high–velocities and in the high–intensity limit of the RF, when the quiver velocity of the plasma electrons exceeds the ion velocity.

Keywords: Inelastic interaction; Radiation field; Stopping power

1. INTRODUCTION

The interaction of charged particles with plasma in the presence of radiation field (RF) has been a subject of great activity, starting with the work of Tavdgiridze, Aliev, Gorbunov, and other authors (Tavdgiridze & Tsintsadze, 1970; Aliev *et al.*, 1971; Arista *et al.*, 1989; Akopyan *et al.*, 1997; Nersisyan & Akopyan, 1999). A comprehensive treatment of the quantities related to inelastic particle–solid and particle–plasma interactions, like scattering rates and differential and total mean free paths and energy losses, can be formulated in terms of the dielectric response function obtained from the electron gas model. The results have important applications in radiation and solid–state physics (Ritchie *et al.*, 1975; Tung & Ritchie, 1977; Echenique, 1987), and more recently, in studies of energy deposition by ion beams in inertial confinement fusion (ICF) targets (Arista & Brandt, 1981; Mehlhorn, 1981; Maynard & Deutsch, 1982; Arista & Piriz, 1987; D'Avanzo *et al.*, 1993; Couillaud *et al.*, 1994). On the other hand, the achievement of high–intensity laser beams with frequencies ranging between the infrared and vacuum–ultraviolet region has given rise to the possibility of new studies of interaction processes, such

as electron–atom scattering in laser fields (Kroll & Watson, 1973; Weingartshofer *et al.*, 1977, 1983), multiphoton ionization (Lompre *et al.*, 1976; Baldwin & Boreham, 1981), inverse bremsstrahlung and plasma heating (Seely & Harris, 1973; Kim & Pac, 1979; Lima *et al.*, 1979), screening breakdown (Miranda *et al.*, 2005), and other processes of interest for applications in optics, solid–state, and fusion research. In addition, a promising ICF scheme has been recently proposed (Stöckl *et al.*, 1996; Roth *et al.*, 2001), in which the plasma target is irradiated simultaneously by intense laser and ion beams. Within this scheme several experiments (Frank *et al.*, 2010; Hoffmann *et al.*, 2010) have been performed to investigate the interactions of heavy ion and laser beams with plasma targets. An important aspect of these experiments is the energy loss measurements for the ions in a wide-range of plasma parameters. It is expected in such experiments that the ion propagation would be essentially affected by the parametric excitation of the plasma target by means of laser irradiation. This effect has been supported recently by particle-in-cell (PIC) numerical simulations (Hu *et al.*, 2011).

In this paper, we present a study of the effects of intense RF on the interaction of nonrelativistic projectile ions with an electron plasma. Our objective is to study two regimes of the ion energy loss, which have not been considered in detail. For the first part of our study, we consider energy

Address correspondence and reprint requests to: H.B. Nersisyan, Institute of Radiophysics and Electronics, 0203 Ashtarak, Ameria. E-mail: hrachya@irphe.am

loss of a slow ion. In particular, this is motivated by the fact that the alpha-particles resulting from the nuclear fusion in a very dense plasma with temperature in the keV range, display a velocity mostly below electron thermal velocity. The second objective of our study is to investigate the energy loss in high–velocity regime. Previously, this has been done for a classical plasma (Tavdgiridze & Tsintsadze, 1970; Aliev *et al.*, 1971; Nersisyan & Akopyan, 1999) treating only the collective excitations as well as in the range of solid–state densities (fully degenerate plasma) and at the intermediate intensities of the RF (Arista *et al.*, 1989) when the electron quiver amplitude is comparable to the screening length of the target. To gain more insight into the RF effect on the energy loss process, we consider here the regime of intense RF when the quiver amplitude largely exceeding the typical screening length of the fully degenerate electron plasma.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we briefly outline the RPA formulation for the energy loss of a heavy ion uniformly moving in a plasma in the presence of an intense RF. The limiting case of a weak RF is also considered. In Sections 3 and 4, we have calculated the effects of the RF on the mean energy loss (stopping power) of the test ion considering two somewhat distinct cases with slow (Sec. 3) and fast (Sec. 4) projectiles moving in a classical and fully degenerated electron gas, respectively. In the latter case, the degenerated electron gas is treated within a simple plasmon–pole approximation proposed by Basbas and Ritchie (1982). It has been shown, that besides usual stopping in a plasma, it is possible to accelerate the charged particles beam through RF. This effect is expected for fast projectiles and in the high–intensity limit of the RF, when the "quiver velocity" of the plasma electrons exceeds the projectile ion velocity. The results are summarized in Section 5, which also includes discussion and outlook.

2. RPA FORMULATION

The whole interaction process of the projectile ion with plasma involves the energy loss and the charge states of the ion and — as an additional aspect — the ionization and recombination of the ion driven by the RF and the collisions with the plasma particles. A complete description of the interaction of the ion requires a simultaneous treatment of all these effects including, in particular, the effect of the ion charge equilibration on the energy loss process. In this paper, we do not discuss the charge state evolution of the projectiles under study, but concentrate on the RF effects on the energy loss process assuming an equilibrium charge state of the ion with an effective charge Ze. This is motivated by the fact that the charge equilibration occurs in time scales, which are usually much smaller than the time of passage of the ion through target.

The problem is formulated using the random–phase approximation (RPA) and includes the effects of the RF in a self–consistent way. The electromagnetic field is treated

in the long–wavelength limit, and the electrons are considered nonrelativistic. These are good approximations provided that (1) the wavelength of the RF ($\lambda_0 = 2\pi c/\omega_0$) is much larger than the typical screening length ($\lambda_s = v_s/\omega_p$ with v_s the mean velocity of the electrons and ω_p the plasma frequency), and (2) the "quiver velocity" of the electrons in the RF ($v_E = eE_0/m\omega_0$) is much smaller than the speed of light c. These conditions can be alternatively written as (1) $\omega_0/\omega_p \ll 2\pi c/v_s$, (2) $W_L \ll \frac{1}{2}n_0c(mc^2)(\omega_0/\omega_p)^2$, where $W_L = cE_0^2/8\pi$ is the RF intensity. As an estimate in the case of dense gaseous plasma, with electron density $n_0 = 10^{18}$ cm^{-3}, we get $\frac{1}{2}n_0mc^3 \simeq 1.2 \times 10^{15}$ W/cm^2. Thus the limits (1) and (2) are well above the values obtained with currently available high–power RF sources, and so the approximations are well justified.

We consider the time–dependent Hamiltonian for the plasma electrons in the presence of both a RF with vector potential $\mathbf{A}(t) = (c/\omega_0)\mathbf{E}_0 \cos(\omega_0 t)$, and a self–consistent scalar potential $\varphi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ (Arista *et al.*, 1989; Nersisyan & Akopyan, 1999), i.e.,

$$H(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \frac{1}{2m}\left(\mathbf{p} - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}(t)\right)^2 c_{\mathbf{p}}^+ c_{\mathbf{p}} - e\sum_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{k}} \varphi(\mathbf{k}, t)c_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{k}}^+ c_{\mathbf{p}}, \quad (1)$$

where $c_{\mathbf{p}}$, $c_{\mathbf{p}}^+$ are annihilation and creation operators for electrons with momentum $\mathbf{p}$, respectively, and $\varphi(\mathbf{k}, t)$ is the Fourier transform of $\varphi(\mathbf{r}, t)$.

The potential $\varphi(\mathbf{k}, t)$ is produced by the external charge and by the induced electronic density, *viz.*,

$$k^2\varphi(\mathbf{k}, t) = 4\pi\rho_0(\mathbf{k}, t) - 4\pi e\sum_{\mathbf{p}} N_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{k}, t), \quad (2)$$

being $\rho_0(\mathbf{k}, t)$ the Fourier transform of the external charge density $\rho_0(\mathbf{r}, t)$, and $N_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{k}, t) = (c_{\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}}^+ c_{\mathbf{p}})_t$ is the electrons number operator.

The time evolution of the operator $N_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{k}, t)$ is determined by the equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial N_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{k}, t)}{\partial t} = \left[N_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{k}, t), H(t)\right]. \quad (3)$$

In particular, for an oscillatory field $\mathbf{A}(t)$ and within random–phase approximation, Eq. (3) has the solution (Arista *et al.*, 1989; Nersisyan & Akopyan, 1999)

$$\begin{aligned}N_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{k}, t) = \frac{ie}{\hbar}&\left(f_{\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}} - f_{\mathbf{p}}\right)\int_{-\infty}^{t} dt'\varphi(\mathbf{k}, t') \\ &\times \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar}(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{p}})(t - t')\right] \\ &\times \exp\left[-i\zeta\left(\sin(\omega_0 t) - \sin(\omega_0 t')\right)\right],\end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\zeta = \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{a} = e\mathbf{E}_0/m\omega_0^2$ is the oscillation amplitude of the electrons driven by the RF (quiver amplitude), $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{p}} = p^2/2m$ is the electron energy with momentum $\mathbf{p}$. Here $f_{\mathbf{p}}$ is the equilibrium distribution function for the electron plasma.

Finally, using Eq. (2) and making a further Fourier transformation, we obtain a solution for the potential φ in the form

$$\widetilde{\varphi}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{4\pi\widetilde{\rho}_0(\mathbf{k}, \omega)}{k^2\varepsilon(k, \omega)}, \tag{5}$$

where we have introduced the frequency transforms $\widetilde{\varphi}(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$, $\widetilde{\rho}_0(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$ of the quantities

$$\begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{\rho}_0(\mathbf{k}, t) \\ \widetilde{\varphi}(\mathbf{k}, t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_0(\mathbf{k}, t) \\ \varphi(\mathbf{k}, t) \end{pmatrix} e^{i\zeta \sin(\omega_0 t)}, \tag{6}$$

and $\varepsilon(k, \omega)$ is the RPA dielectric function (Lindhard, 1954; Lindhard & Winther, 1964).

We consider a heavy point–like particle with mass M and effective charge Ze, which moves with rectilinear trajectory with constant velocity $\mathbf{v}$. We thus neglect the effect of the RF on the particle assuming that the quiver velocity of the ion in the laser field $v_q = ZeE_0/M\omega_0 \ll v_s, v$. Here v_s is the mean velocity of the target electrons. The charge density of the point–like ion is then given by $\rho_0(\mathbf{r}, t) = Ze\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{vt})$. Inserting the Fourier transformation of this formula with respect to $\mathbf{r}$ into Eq. (6) and making a further Fourier transformation we obtain

$$\widetilde{\rho}_0(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = 2\pi Ze \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} J_n(\zeta)\delta(\omega - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v} + n\omega_0), \tag{7}$$

where J_n is the Bessel function of nth order. Using Eqs. (5)–(7) for the self–consistent potential $\varphi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ we finally arrive at

$$\varphi(\mathbf{r}, t) = \frac{Ze}{2\pi^2} \sum_{m,n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i(n-m)\omega_0 t} \int d\mathbf{k} \frac{e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{vt})} J_m(\zeta)J_n(\zeta)}{k^2\varepsilon(k, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v} - n\omega_0)}. \tag{8}$$

This result represents the dynamical response of the medium to the motion of the test particle in the presence of the RF; it takes the form of an expansion over all the harmonics of the field frequency, with coefficients $J_n(\zeta)$ that depend on the intensity $W_L \propto a^2$.

From Eq. (8) it is straightforward to calculate the electric field $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}, t) = -\nabla \varphi (\mathbf{r}, t)$, and the time average (with respect to the period $2\pi/\omega_0$ of the laser field) of the stopping field $\mathbf{E}_{stop} = \langle\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{vt}, t)\rangle$ acting on the particle. Then, the averaged stopping power (SP) of the test particle becomes

$$\begin{aligned} S &\equiv -Ze\frac{\mathbf{v}}{v} \cdot \mathbf{E}_{stop} \\ &= \frac{2Z^2e^2}{(2\pi)^2 v} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \int d\mathbf{k}\frac{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}}{k^2} J_n^2(\zeta)\text{Im}\frac{-1}{\varepsilon(k, \Omega_n(\mathbf{k}))}, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

with $\Omega_n(\mathbf{k}) = n\omega_0 + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}$.

To illustrate the effects of the RF it is convenient to take into account the symmetry of the integrand in Eq. (9), with respect to the change $\mathbf{k}, n \to -\mathbf{k}, -n$. Using also the

property of Bessel functions, $J_{-n}^2(\zeta) = J_n^2(\zeta)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{Z^2e^2}{2\pi^2 v}\int d\mathbf{k}\frac{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}}{k^2} \left[J_0^2(\zeta)\text{Im}\frac{-1}{\varepsilon(k, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})} \right. \\ &\left. +2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} J_n^2(\zeta)\text{Im}\frac{-1}{\varepsilon(k, \Omega_n(\mathbf{k}))} \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Hence, the SP depends on the particle velocity $\mathbf{v}$, the frequency ω_0 and the intensity $W_L = cE_0^2/8\pi$ of the RF (the intensity dependence is given through the quiver amplitude $\mathbf{a}$). Moreover, since the vector $\mathbf{k}$ in Eq. (10) is spherically integrated, S becomes also a function of the angle ϑ between the velocity $\mathbf{v}$, and the direction of polarization of RF, represented by $\mathbf{a}$.

By comparison, the SP in the absence of the RF is given by Deutsch (1986) and Peter and Meyer-ter-Vehn (1991)

$$S_B = \frac{Z^2e^2}{2\pi^2 v}\int d\mathbf{k}\frac{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}}{k^2} \text{Im}\frac{-1}{\varepsilon(k, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})}. \tag{11}$$

In the presence of the RF, the SP S_B is modified and is given by the first term in Eq. (10) ("no photon" SP)

$$S_0 = \frac{Z^2e^2}{2\pi^2 v}\int d\mathbf{k}\frac{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}}{k^2} J_0^2(\zeta)\text{Im}\frac{-1}{\varepsilon(k, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})}. \tag{12}$$

Next we consider the case of a weak radiation field ($a < \lambda_s$, where λ_s is the characteristic screening length) at arbitrary angle ϑ between $\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{E}_0$. In Eq. (10), we keep only the quadratic terms with respect to the quantity $\mathbf{a}$ and for the stopping power S we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S &= S_B + \frac{Z^2e^2}{4\pi^2 v}\int\frac{d\mathbf{k}}{k^2}(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{a})^2 \\ &\times \text{Im}\left[\frac{1}{\varepsilon(k, \omega_0 + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon(k, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})} \right], \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where S_B is the field-free SP given by Eq. (11). Note that due to the isotropy of the dielectric function $\varepsilon(k, \omega)$ the angular integrations in Eqs. (10)–(13) can be easily done.

It is well known that within classical description an upper cut-off parameter $k_{max} = 1/r_{min}$ (where r_{min} is the effective minimum impact parameter) must be introduced in Eqs. (11) and (13) to avoid the logarithmic divergence at large k. This divergence corresponds to the incapability of the classical perturbation theory to treat close encounters between the projectile particle and the plasma electrons properly. For r_{min}, we use the effective minimum impact parameter excluding hard Coulomb collisions with a scattering angle larger than $\pi/2$. The resulting cut-off parameter $k_{max} \simeq m(v^2 + v_{th}^2)/|Z|e^2$ is well known for energy loss calculations (see, e.g., Zwicknagel *et al.* (1999); Nersisyan *et al.* (2007) and references therein). Here v_{th} is the thermal velocity of the electrons. In particular, at low projectile velocities this

cut-off parameter reads $k_{max} = T/|Z|e^2$, where T is the plasma temperature given in energy units.

3. ENERGY LOSS OF SLOW IONS

In this section, subsequent derivations are performed for the classical plasma and in the low–velocity limit of the ion. In this case, the RPA dielectric function is given by Fried and Conte (1961)

$$\varepsilon(k, \omega) = 1 + \frac{1}{k^2\lambda_D^2}W\left(\frac{\omega}{kv_{th}}\right), \tag{14}$$

where λ_D is the Debye screening length, and $W(z) = g(z) + if(z)$ is the plasma dispersion function (Fried & Conte, 1961) with

$$g(z) = 1 - ze^{-z^2/2}\int_0^z e^{t^2/2}dt, \quad f(z) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}ze^{-z^2/2}. \tag{15}$$

Consider now the SP determined by Eq. (10) in the limit of low–velocities, when $v \ll v_{th}$. As discussed above, we also assume that $v \gg v_q$ and neglect the effect of the RF on the ion. In the limit of the low–velocities from Eqs. (10)–(15), we obtain

$$S(\gamma, a, \vartheta) = S_B\Xi(\gamma, a, \vartheta), \tag{16}$$

Fig. 1. The dimensionless quantities $\Xi(\gamma, a, \vartheta)$ (the lines with symbols) and $\Xi_{av}(\gamma, a)$ (the solid line without symbols) vs the intensity parameter of the laser field a/λ_D for $\vartheta = 0$ (solid line), $\vartheta = \pi/4$ (dashed line), $\vartheta = \pi/2$ (dotted line) and for $\omega_0 = 1.2\omega_p$.

where

$$\Xi(\gamma, a, \vartheta) = \Xi_1(\gamma, a) + \Xi_2(\gamma, a)\sin^2\vartheta, \tag{17}$$

$$\Xi_s(\gamma, a) = \frac{6}{\psi(\xi)}\left\{\int_0^\xi \frac{k^3 dk}{(k^2+1)^2}\int_0^1 J_0^2(Ak\mu)f_s(\mu)d\mu \right.$$
$$\left. +2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\sum_{n=1}^\infty\int_0^\xi \text{Im}\left[\frac{W_1(n/k\gamma)k^3 dk}{(k^2+W(n/k\gamma))^2}\right]\int_0^1 J_n^2(Ak\mu)f_s(\mu)d\mu\right\}. \tag{18}$$

Here $s = 1, 2$, and $f_1(\mu) = \mu^2$, $f_2(\mu) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - 3\mu^2)$. Note that at the absence of the laser field (i.e., at $a \to 0$) $\Xi_1(\gamma, a) \to 1$, $\Xi_2(\gamma, a) \to 0$. In this case, the SP is determined by the quantity S_B in Eq. (11) (Deutsch, 1986; Peter & Meyer-ter-Vehn, 1991)

$$S_B = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\frac{Z^2 e^2}{6\lambda_D^2}\frac{v}{v_{th}}\psi(\xi), \tag{19}$$

where

$$\psi(\xi) = \ln(1 + \xi^2) - \frac{\xi^2}{1+\xi^2}, \tag{20}$$

is the Coulomb logarithm with $\xi = k_{max}\lambda_D$. Also in Eqs. (16)–(18), we have introduced the angle ϑ between the velocity **v** and the polarization **a** vectors, $W_1(z) = dW(z)/dz$, $A = a/\lambda_D$, $\gamma = \omega_p/\omega_0 < 1$. Note that while the k integral in Eq. (11) diverges logarithmically in a field–free case, Eqs. (12) and (18) are finite and do not require any cut-off. The Bessel functions involved in these expressions due to the radiation field guarantee the convergence of the k–integrations. However, since in the sequel we shall compare Eqs. (16)–(18) with field–free SP S_B, for consistency the upper limits of the k–integrals in Eq. (18) are kept finite with the same upper cutoff parameter as in Eqs. (11) and (19).

In many experimental situations, the ions move in plasma with random orientations of ϑ with respect to the direction of the polarization of laser field **a**. The stopping power appropriate to this situation may be obtained by carrying out a spherical average over ϑ of $S(\gamma, a, \vartheta)$ in Eqs. (16) and (17). We find

$$S_{av}(\gamma, a) = S_B\left[\Xi_1(\gamma, a) + \frac{2}{3}\Xi_2(\gamma, a)\right] \equiv S_B\Xi_{av}(\gamma, a). \tag{21}$$

The study of the effect of a radiation field on the SP is easier in the case of low-intensities W_L when $a < \lambda_D$. Then considering in Eqs. (16)–(18) only the quadratic terms with respect to a for the SP $S(\gamma, a, \vartheta)$ we obtain

$$S(\gamma, a, \vartheta) = S_B\left[1 - \frac{a^2}{5\lambda_D^2}(2\cos^2\vartheta + 1)D(\gamma, \xi)\right], \tag{22}$$

where

$$D(\gamma, \xi) = \frac{1}{\psi(\xi)} \int_{1/\xi}^{\infty} \frac{dx}{x^3} \left\{ \frac{1}{(x^2 + 1)^2} - \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \right.$$

$$\left. \times \text{Im} \left[\frac{W_1(x/\gamma)}{(1 + x^2 W(x/\gamma))^2} \right] \right\}. \qquad (23)$$

Taking into account that $\gamma < 1$ and $\xi \gg 1$ from Eqs. (22) and (23) we finally obtain $D(\gamma, \xi) \simeq 3/4\gamma^2$. It is seen that at low–velocities the SP $S(\gamma, a, \vartheta)$ decreases with the intensity of radiation field.

In Figure 1, the quantities $\Xi(\gamma, a, \vartheta)$ and $\Xi_{av}(\gamma, a)$ are shown *vs* the intensity parameter a/λ_D of the laser field for three values of angles $\vartheta = 0$, $\vartheta = \pi/4$, $\vartheta = \pi/2$ and for $\omega_0 = 1.2\omega_p$. It is convenient to represent the intensity parameter a/λ_D in the form $a/\lambda_D = 0.18\lambda_0^2 \sqrt{n_0 W_L/T}$, where the wavelength ($\lambda_0$) and the intensity ($W_L$) of the laser field and the density (n_0) and the temperature (T) of plasma are measured in units µm, 10^{15} W/cm^2, 10^{20} cm^{-3} and keV, respectively. As an example, consider the case when the electron quiver amplitude reaches the Debye screening length, $a = \lambda_D$. For the values of the RF and plasma parameters with $\lambda_0 = 0.5$ µm, $n_0 = 10^{18}$ cm^{-3}, $T = 0.1$ keV, the above condition is fulfilled at the radiation field intensity $W_L = 4.94 \times 10^{18}$ W/cm^2.

From Figure 1 it is seen that the intense laser field may strongly reduce the SP of the low–velocity ion. And as expected, the effect of the radiation field is maximal for $\vartheta = 0$. Note that in this case and at $a = \lambda_D$ the radiation field reduces the energy loss S_B approximately by 15%. For explanation of the obtained result, let us consider a simple physical model. The stopping power of the ion is defined as $S = -(1/v)\langle dW/dt \rangle$, where $\langle dW/dt \rangle$ is the averaged (with respect to the period of the radiation field) energy loss rate. We assume that the frequency of the radiation field ω_0 is larger than the effective frequency of the pairwise Coulomb collisions ν_{eff}. Also assuming that in the low– velocity limit the energy loss of the ion on the collective plasma excitations is negligible and is mainly determined by the Coulomb collisions we obtain $\langle dW/dt \rangle \sim \nu_{eff}W$. On the other hand $\nu_{eff} \sim 1/v_{eff}^3$, where v_{eff} is the averaged relative velocity of the colliding particles. At $v < v_{th}$ and for vanishing radiation field $v_{eff} \simeq v_{th}$. However, in the presence of the radiation field, the averaged relative velocity of the collisions is $v_{eff} \simeq (v_{th}^2 + v_E^2)^{1/2}$ and increases with the intensity of the laser field. Thus the effective collision frequency ν_{eff} and hence the stopping power of the ion are reduced with increasing intensity of the radiation field.

At the end of this section we consider a practical example. Let us consider the stopping of the α–particles in the corona of the laser plasma. Although the thermonuclear reactions mainly occur far below the critical surface the stopping length of the α–particles is larger than the characteristic

length scale of plasma inhomogeneity and some part of the α–particles transfer the energy to the plasma corona before they reach the critical surface (Max, 1982). In the vicinity of the plasma critical density, the intensity of the radiation field is very large and the stopping capacity of the plasma may be strongly reduced. In this example, the typical temperature is $T = 10$ keV and therefore $v_\alpha/v_{th} = 0.22$ ($E_\alpha = M_\alpha V_\alpha^2/2 = 3.5$ MeV, where E_α, M_α, v_α are the energy, the mass and the velocity of the α–particles). For $\lambda_0 = 0.5$ µm, $W_L = 2 \times 10^{17}$ W/cm^2, and $\omega_0 = \omega_p\sqrt{2}$ (the plasma density is $n_0 = n_c/2$, where n_c is the plasma critical density) we find $a \simeq \lambda_D$. In this parameter regime the radiation field reduces the SP of the α–particles by 20%.

4. ENERGY LOSS OF FAST IONS

In this section, we consider the energy loss of a fast heavy ion moving in a fully degenerate plasma (which means that the partially degenerate case could be postponed to a further presentation) in the presence of a radiation field. The longitudinal dielectric function of the degenerated electron gas is determined by Lindhard's expression (Lindhard, 1954; Lindhard & Winther, 1964). However, here we consider the simplest model of the dielectric function of a jellium. Previously, a plasmon–pole approximation to $\varepsilon(k, \omega)$ for an electron gas was used for calculation of the SP (Basbas & Ritchie, 1982; Deutsch, 1995; Nersisyan & Das, 2000). In order to get easily obtainable analytical results, Basbas and Ritchie (1982) employed a simplified form that exhibits collective and single–particle effects

$$\text{Im} \frac{-1}{\varepsilon(k, \omega)} = \pi\omega_p^2 \frac{|\omega|}{\omega} \left[\delta\left(\omega^2 - \omega_p^2\right) H(k_c - k) \right.$$

$$\left. + \delta\left(\omega^2 - \omega_k^2\right) H(k - k_c) \right], \qquad (24)$$

where $H(x)$ is the Heaviside unit–step function, $\omega_k = \hbar k^2/2m$, $k_c = (2m\omega_p/\hbar)^{1/2}$, and ω_p is the plasma frequency. The cut-off parameter k_c is determined by equating the arguments of the two delta–functions in Eq. (24) at $k = k_c$. The first term in Eq. (24) describes the response due to nondispersive plasmon excitation in the region $k < k_c$, while the second term describes free–electron recoil in the range $k > k_c$ (single–particle excitations). Note that this approximate dielectric function satisfies at arbitrary k the usual frequency sum rule (Basbas & Ritchie, 1982; Deutsch, 1995; Nersisyan & Das, 2000).

In contrast to the previous section, we consider here the fast projectile ion with $v \gtrsim v_c$ (where $v_c = \omega_p/k_c = (\hbar \omega_p/2m)^{1/2}$), which justifies the approximation (24) valid only in this specific case (Basbas & Ritchie, 1982).

It is constructive to consider first the case of a weak radiation field ($k_c a < 1$) at arbitrary angle ϑ between **v** and **a**. In this case, the SP is determined by Eq. (13), where the field–free SP S_B in the high–velocity limit is given by (Lindhard,

1954; Lindhard & Winther, 1964; Deutsch, 1986, 1995)

$$S_B = \frac{Z^2 e^2 \omega_p^2}{v^2} \ln\left(\frac{2mv^2}{\hbar \omega_p}\right). \tag{25}$$

Inserting Eq. (24) into (13) for the stopping power we obtain

$$S = \frac{2Z^2 \Sigma_0}{\lambda^2} \left\{ \ln\lambda + \frac{(k_c a)^2}{4}\left[\Phi_1(\lambda, \gamma) + \frac{1}{2}\Phi_2(\lambda, \gamma)\sin^2\vartheta\right]\right\}, \tag{26}$$

where $\Sigma_0 = e^2 k_c^2 = 2\hbar\omega_p/a_0$, a_0 is the Bohr radius, $\Phi_1 = \Phi_{1c} + \Phi_{1s}$, $\Phi_2 = \Phi_{2c} + \Phi_{2s}$, $\lambda = v/v_c$, $\gamma = \omega_p/\omega_0 < 1$. Also

$$\Phi_{1c}(\lambda, \gamma) = \frac{1}{2\lambda^2}\left[\frac{6}{\gamma^2}\ln\lambda + \left(\frac{1}{\gamma}+1\right)^3\right.$$
$$\left. \times \ln\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma} - \left(\frac{1}{\gamma}-1\right)^3\ln\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}\right], \tag{27}$$

$$\Phi_{2c}(\lambda, \gamma) = -3\left[\Phi_{1c}(\lambda, \gamma) + \frac{1}{2\gamma^2\lambda^2}\right], \tag{28}$$

$$\Phi_{1s}(\lambda, \gamma) = \frac{1}{4\lambda^2}\left[\frac{1}{2}(\beta_1^2 + \eta_1^2 - \alpha_1^2 - \delta_1^2)\right.$$
$$+ \frac{3}{\gamma}(\beta_1 + \delta_1 - \alpha_1 - \eta_1)$$
$$- \frac{1}{\gamma^3}\left(\frac{1}{\beta_1} - \frac{1}{\alpha_1} - \frac{1}{\eta_1} + \frac{1}{\delta_1}\right)$$
$$\left. + \frac{3}{\gamma^2}\ln\frac{\beta_1\eta_1}{\alpha_1\delta_1} + 1 - \lambda^4\right], \tag{29}$$

$$\Phi_{2s}(\lambda, \gamma) = \frac{\beta_1 - \alpha_1}{4}\left(1 - \frac{9}{\gamma\lambda^2}\right) + \frac{\eta_1 - \delta_1}{4}\left(1 + \frac{9}{\gamma\lambda^2}\right)$$
$$- \frac{3}{8\lambda^2}(\beta_1^2 + \eta_1^2 - \alpha_1^2 - \delta_1^2)$$
$$+ \frac{3}{4\gamma^3\lambda^2}\left(\frac{1}{\beta_1} - \frac{1}{\alpha_1} - \frac{1}{\eta_1} + \frac{1}{\delta_1}\right)$$
$$+ \frac{1}{4\gamma}\left(\ln\frac{\beta_1\delta_1}{\alpha_1\eta_1} - \frac{9}{\gamma\lambda^2}\ln\frac{\beta_1\eta_1}{\alpha_1\delta_1}\right)$$
$$+ \frac{1}{4}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\right)(\lambda^2 + 3), \tag{30}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix}\alpha_n \\ \eta_n\end{pmatrix} = \max\left[\left(\frac{\lambda}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{\lambda^2}{4}\mp\frac{n}{\gamma}}\right)^2 ; \; 1\right],$$
$$\begin{pmatrix}\beta_n \\ \delta_n\end{pmatrix} = \left(\frac{\lambda}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{\lambda^2}{4}\mp\frac{n}{\gamma}}\right)^2. \tag{31}$$

In Eq. (31), n is a positive integer ($n = 1, 2, \ldots$). The first term in Eq. (26) corresponds to the field–free SP (25) represented in a dimensionless form. The remaining terms proportional to the intensity of the radiation field (a^2), describe the collective (proportional to $\Phi_{1c;\,2c}(\lambda, \gamma)$) and single–particle (proportional to $\Phi_{1s;\,2s}(\lambda, \gamma)$) excitations. It should be noted

that the stopping power Eq. (26) is not vanishing only at high–velocities when $\lambda \geq 2/\sqrt{\gamma}$.

Consider next the angular distribution of the SP at low–intensities of the RF. An analysis of the quantity $P = (S - S_B)/S_B$ (the relative deviation of S from S_B) for the proton projectile shows that at moderate velocities ($\lambda \gtrsim 2/\sqrt{\gamma}$) the angular distribution of P has a quadrupole nature. At $0 \leq \vartheta \leq \vartheta_0(\lambda, \gamma)$, where $\vartheta_0(\lambda, \gamma)$ is some value of the angle ϑ, the excitation of the waves with the frequencies $\omega_0 \pm \omega_p$ leads to the additional energy loss. At $\vartheta_0(\lambda, \gamma) \leq \vartheta \leq \pi/2$ the proton energy loss changes sign and the total energy loss decreases. When the proton moves at angles $\vartheta = \vartheta_0(\lambda, \gamma)$ with respect to the polarization vector **a** the radiation field has no any influence on the SP. However, at very large velocities ($\lambda \gg 2/\sqrt{\gamma}$) the relative deviation P is negative for arbitrary ϑ and the radiation field systematically reduces the energy loss of the proton.

Let us now investigate the influence of the intense radiation field on the stopping process when **v** is parallel to **a**. It is expected that the effect of the RF is maximal in this case. From Eqs. (10) and (24) we obtain

$$S = S_0 + \frac{Z^2\Sigma_0}{\lambda^2}\left\{\sum_{n=1}^{n_-}\left(\frac{n}{\gamma}+1\right)J_n^2(Ap_n)\ln\frac{\lambda}{n/\gamma+1}\right.$$
$$- \sum_{n=1}^{n_+}\left(\frac{n}{\gamma}-1\right)J_n^2(Aq_n)\ln\frac{\lambda}{n/\gamma-1}$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\int_{\alpha_n(\lambda)}^{\beta_n(\lambda)}\frac{dx}{x^2}\left(\frac{n}{\gamma}+x\right)J_n^2(AP_n(x))$$
$$\left. - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\int_{\delta_n(\lambda)}^{\eta_n(\lambda)}\frac{dx}{x^2}\left(\frac{n}{\gamma}-x\right)J_n^2(AQ_n(x))\right\}, \tag{32}$$

where $A = k_c a$, $P_n(x) = (1/\lambda)(n/\gamma = x)$, $Q_n(x) = (1/\lambda)(n/\gamma - x)$, $p_n = P_n(1)$, $q_n = Q_n(1)$, and

$$S_0 = \frac{Z^2\Sigma_0}{\lambda^2}\left[J_0^2\left(\frac{A}{\lambda}\right)\ln\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\int_{1/\lambda}^{\lambda}\frac{dx}{x}J_0^2(Ax)\right] \tag{33}$$

is the SP without emission or absorption of the photons. Also we have introduced the notations

$$n_\pm = \text{int}\left(\frac{k_c v \pm \omega_p}{\omega_0}\right) = \text{int}[\gamma(\lambda \pm 1)],$$
$$N = \text{int}\left(\frac{mv^2}{2\hbar\omega_0}\right) = \text{int}\left(\frac{\gamma\lambda^2}{4}\right), \tag{34}$$

where $\text{int}(x)$ is the integer part of x. The quantities $\alpha_n(\lambda)$, $\beta_n(\lambda)$, $\delta_n(\lambda)$, $\eta_n(\lambda)$ in Eq. (32) are determined by Eq. (31). We note that in Eq. (32) the terms involving $n_\pm$ and N photons are not vanishing at $\lambda \geq 1/\gamma \mp 1$ and $\lambda \geq 2/\sqrt{\gamma}$, respectively. Similarly the SP (33) is not vanishing at $\lambda \geq 1$.

The first term in Eq. (33) describes the collective excitations while the second term corresponds to the single–particle excitations. From Eq. (33) it is seen that S_0 oscillates

Fig. 2. (**Left panel**) the ratio $R(a) = S(a)/S_B$ as a function of dimensionless quantity $k_c a$ at $v = 8.6v_c$, $\omega_0 = 1.2\omega_p$ (solid line), $\omega_0 = 1.6\omega_p$ (dashed line), $\omega_0 = 2\omega_p$ (dotted line), $\omega_0 = 3\omega_p$ (dash–dotted line). Thin solid line corresponds to $R_0(a) = S_0(a)/S_B$ (see Eq. (33)). (**Right panel**) same as in left panel but at $\omega_0 = 1.2\omega_p$, $v = 3v_c$ (solid line), $v = 7v_c$ (dashed line), $v = 11v_c$ (dotted line), $v = 17v_c$ (dash–dotted line).

with the intensity of the laser field. However, the radiation field suppresses the excitation of the collective and the single–particle modes and the SP S_0 is less than the field–free SP S_B. As follows from Eq. (33) at high–intensities of the RF the SP S_0 is close to zero when $A/\lambda \simeq \mu_m$ (or alternatively at $\gamma \, (v_E/v) \simeq \mu_m$) with $m = 1,2, \ldots$, where μ_m are the zeros of the Bessel function J_0 ($\mu_m) = 0$ ($\mu_1 = 2.4$, $\mu_2 = 5.52$, $\mu_3 = 8.63\ldots$). Then the energy loss of the ion is mainly determined by the other terms in Eq. (32) and is stipulated by excitation of plasma waves with frequencies $n\omega_0 \pm \omega_p$. The first and the last pairs of terms in Eq. (32) describe the excitation of the collective and single–particle modes, respectively, with emission or absorption several photons. The number of photons ($n_\pm$, N) involved in the process of the inelastic inter-action are determined by the energy–momentum conserva-tions (see the arguments of the delta–functions in the dielectric function (24)).

The results of the numerical evaluation of the SP (Eqs. (32) and (33)) are shown in Figure 2, where the ratio $R(a) = S(a)/S_B$ is plotted as a function of the laser field in-tensity ($k_c a = 5.38 W_L^{1/2}\omega_0^{-2}r_s^{-3/4}$, where r_s is the Wigner–Seitz density parameter and W_L and ω_0 are measured in units 10^{15} W/cm^2 and 10^{16} s^{-1}, respectively). For instance, for Al target with $r_s = 2.07$, $\hbar\omega_p = 15.5$ eV, and $v_c = 1.2 \times 10^8$ cm/s. From Figure 2 it is seen that the SP exceeds the field–free SP and may change sign due to plasma irradiation by intense ($k_c a \gg 1$) laser field. Similar properties of the SP has been obtained previously for a classical plasma (Nersis-yan & Akopyan, 1999). However, due to the higher density of the degenerate electrons (in metals typically $n_0 \sim 10^{23}$ cm^{-3}) the acceleration rate of the projectile particle is larger than similar rate in the case of a classical plasma. The acceleration effect occurs at $v_E/v \simeq \mu_m/\gamma$ (with $m = 1,2, \ldots$) when the SP S_0 nearly vanishes. It should be noted that in the laser irradiated plasma a parametric instabil-ity is expected (Silin, 1973) with an increment increasing with the intensity of the radiation field. This restricts the possible acceleration time with stronger condition than in

the case of a classical plasma. Finally, let us note that the effect of the enhancement of the SP of an ion moving in a laser irradiated plasma is intensified at smaller frequency (Fig. 2, left panel) of the radiation field ($\omega_0 \simeq \omega_p$ but $\omega_0 > \omega_p$) or at larger incident kinetic energy of the projectile ion (Fig. 2, right panel) when the numbers $n_\pm$ and N of the pho-tons involved in the inelastic interaction process are strongly increased (Eq. (34)).

5. SUMMARY

In this paper, within RPA we have investigated the energy loss of a heavy point–like ion moving in a laser irradiated plasma. In the course of this study, we derived a general expression for the SP, which has been also simplified in the limit of weak RF. As in the field–free case, the SP in a laser irradiated plasma is completely determined by the dielectric function of the plasma. We have considered two somewhat distinct cases of the slow– and high–velocity ion moving in a classical and fully degenerate electron plasma, respectively. At low–velocities the RF leads to the strong decrease of the energy loss. Physically, this is due to the strong reduction of the effective frequency of the pairwise Coulomb collisions between projectile ion and the plasma electrons. At high velocities the RF may strongly increase the SP. This effect is more pronounced when the laser frequency approaches the plasma frequency in agreement with PIC simulations (Hu *et al.*, 2011). More-over, at high–velocities and in the presence of the intense RF an ion projectile energy gain is expected when the quiver velocity of the plasma electrons exceeds the ion vel-ocity. The analysis presented above can in principle be ex-tended to the case of a partially degenerate plasma as well as to the case of light ion projectiles and also electrons and positrons when the effect of the intense RF on the ion cannot be neglected anymore. We intend to address these issues in our forthcoming investigations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

AKOPYAN, E.A., NERSISYAN, H.B. & MATEVOSYAN, H.H. (1997). Energy losses of a charged particle in a plasma in an external field allowing for the field action on plasma and particle motion. *Radiophys. Quant. Electrons.* **40**, 823–826.

ALIEV, Yu.M., GORBUNOV, L.M. & RAMAZASHVILI, R.R. (1971). Polarization losses of a fast heavy particle in a plasma located in a strong high frequency field. *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **61**, 1477–1480.

ARISTA, N.R. & BRANDT, W. (1981). Energy loss and straggling of charged particles in plasmas of all degeneracies. *Phys. Rev. A* **23**, 1898–1905.

ARISTA, N.R., GALVÃO, R.O.M. & MIRANDA, L.C.M. (1989). Laser-field effects on the interaction of charged particles with a degenerate electron gas. *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 3808–3816.

ARISTA, N.R. & PIRIZ, A.R. (1987). Energy loss of fast particles in confined atomic systems at very high temperatures. *Phys. Rev. A* **35**, 3450–3453.

BALDWIN, K.G.H. & BOREHAM, B.W. (1981). Investigation of tunneling processes in laser–induced ionization of argon. *J. Appl. Phys.* **52**, 2627–2633.

BASBAS, G. & RITCHIE, R.H. (1982). Vicinage effects in ion–cluster collisions with condensed matter and with single atoms. *Phys. Rev. A* **25**, 1943–1962.

COUILLAUD, C., DEICAS, R., NARDIN, Ph., BEUVE, M.A., GUIHAUME, J.M., RENAUD, M., CUKIER, M., DEUTSCH, C. & MAYNARD, G. (1994). Ionization and stopping of heavy ions in dense laser–ablated plasmas. *Phys. Rev. E* **49**, 1545–1562.

D'AVANZO, J., LONTANO, M. & BORTIGNON, P.F. (1993). Fast–ion interaction in dense plasmas with two–ion correlation effects. *Phys. Rev. E* **47**, 3574–3584.

DEUTSCH, C. (1986). Inertial confinement fusion driven by intense ion beams. *Ann. Phys. Paris* **11**, 1–111.

DEUTSCH, C. (1995). Correlated stopping of Coulomb clusters in a dense jellium target. *Phys. Rev. E* **51**, 619–631.

ECHENIQUE, P.M. (1987). Interaction of slow ions with bulk and surfaces. *Nucl. Instrum. Meths. B* **27**, 256–265.

FRANK, A., BLAŽEVIĆ, A., GRANDE, P.L., HARRES, K., HESSLING, Th., HOFFMANN, D.H.H., KNOBLOCH-MAAS, R., KUZNETSOV, P.G., NÜRNBERG, F., PELKA, A., SCHAUMANN, G., SCHIWIETZ, G., SCHÖKEL, A., SCHOLLMEIER, M., SCHUMACHER, D., SCHÜTRUMPF, J., VATULIN, V.V., VINOKUROV, O.A. & ROTH, M. (2010). Energy loss of argon in a laser-generated carbon plasma. *Phys. Rev. E* **81**, 0264011–6.

FRIED, D.B. & CONTE, S.D. (1961). *The Plasma Dispersion Function*. New York: Academic.

HOFFMANN, D.H.H., TAHIR, N.A., UDREA, S., ROSMEJ, O., MEISTER, C.V., VARENTSOV, D., ROTH, M., SCHAUMANN, G., FRANK, A., BLAŽEVIĆ, A., LING, J., HUG, A., MENZEL, J., HESSLING, Th., HARRES, K., GÜNTHER, M., EL-MOUSSATI, S., SCHUMACHER, D. & IMRAN, M. (2010). High energy density physics with heavy ion beams and related interaction phenomena. *Contrib. Plasma Phys.* **50**, 7–15.

HU, Z.-H., SONG, Y.-H., MIŠKOVIĆ, Z.L. & WANG, Y.-N. (2011). Energy dissipation of ion beam in two-component plasma in the presence of laser irradiation. *Laser Part. Beams* **29**, 299.

KIM, S.H. & PAC, P.Y. (1979). Heating of a collisionless turbulent plasma by multiphoton absorption. *Phys. Rev. A* **19**, 2139–2141.

KROLL, N.M. & WATSON, K.M. (1973). Charged-particle scattering in the presence of a strong electromagnetic wave. *Phys. Rev. A* **8**, 804–809.

LIMA, M.B.S., LIMA, C.A.S. & MIRANDA, L.C.M. (1979). Screening effect on the plasma heating by inverse bremsstrahlung. *Phys. Rev. A* **19**, 1796–1800.

LINDHARD, J. (1954). On the properties of a gas of charged particles. *K. Dan. Vidensk. Selsk. Mat.-Fys. Medd.* **28**, 1–57.

LINDHARD, J. & WINTHER, A. (1964). Stopping power of electron gas and equipartition rule. *K. Dan. Vidensk. Selsk. Mat.-Fys. Medd.* **34**, 1–22.

LOMPRE, L.A., MAINFRAY, G., MANUS, C., REPOUX, S. & THEBAULT, J. (1976). Multiphoton ionization of rare gases at very high laser intensity (10^{15} W/cm^2) by a 30-psec laser pulse at 1.06 μm. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **36**, 949–952.

MAX, C.E. (1982). *Laser–Plasma Interaction*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

MAYNARD, G. & DEUTSCH, C. (1982). Energy loss and straggling of ions with any velocity in dense plasmas at any temperature. *Phys. Rev. A* **26**, 665–668.

MEHLHORN, T.A. (1981). A finite material temperature model for ion energy deposition in ion–driven inertial confinement fusion targets. *J. Appl. Phys.* **52**, 6522–6532.

MIRANDA, D.F., GUIMARÃES, A.F., FONSECA, A.L.A., AGRELLO, D.A. & NUNES, O.A.C. (2005). Screening breakdown in a plasma by two laser fields and strong DC magnetic field. *Contrib. Plasma Phys.* **45**, 22–31.

NERSISYAN, H.B. & AKOPYAN, E.A. (1999). Stopping and acceleration effect of protons in a plasma in the presence of an intense radiation field. *Phys. Lett. A* **258**, 323–328.

NERSISYAN, H.B. & DAS, A.K. (2000). Dicluster stopping in a degenerate electron gas. *Phys. Rev. E* **62**, 5636–5647.

NERSISYAN, H.B., TOEPFFER, C. & ZWICKNAGEL, G. (2007). *Interactions Between Charged Particles in a Magnetic Field: A Theoretical Approach to Ion Stopping in Magnetized Plasmas*. Heidelberg: Springer.

PETER, Th. & MEYER-TER-VEHN, J. (1991). Energy loss of heavy ions in dense plasma. Linear and nonlinear Vlasov theory for the stopping power. *Phys. Rev. A* **43**, 1998–2014.

RITCHIE, R.H., TUNG, C.J., ANDERSON, V.E. & ASHLEY, J.C. (1975). Electron slowing–down spectra in solids. *Radiat. Res.* **64**, 181–204.

ROTH, M., COWAN, T.E., KEY, M.H., HATCHETT, S.P., BROWN, C., FOUNTAIN, W., JOHNSON, J., PENNINGTON, D.M., SNAVELY, R.A., WILKS, S.C., YASUIKE, K., RUHL, H., PEGORARO, F., BULANOV, S.V., CAMPBELL, E.M., PERRY, M.D. & POWELL, H. (2001). Fast ignition by intense laser–accelerated proton beams. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 436–439.

SEELY, J.F. & HARRIS, E.G. (1973). Heating of a plasma by multiphoton inverse bremsstrahlung. *Phys. Rev. A* **7**, 1064–1067.

SILIN, V.P. (1973). *Parametric Effect of High–Intensity Radiation on Plasmas*. Moscow: Nauka.

STÖCKL, C., FRANKENHEIM, O.B., ROTH, M., SUß, W., WETZLER, H., SEELIG, W., KULISH, M., DORNIK, M., LAUX, W., SPILLER, P., STETTER, M., STÖWE, S., JACOBY, J. & HOFFMANN, D.H.H. (1996).

Interaction of heavy ion beams with dense plasmas. *Laser Part. Beams* **14**, 561–574.

TAVDGIRIDZE, T.L. & TSINTSADZE, N.L. (1970). Energy losses by a charged particle in an isotropic plasma located in an external high frequency electric field. *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **58**, 975–978.

TUNG, C.J. & RITCHIE, R.H. (1977). Electron slowing–down spectra in aluminium metal. *Phys. Rev. B* **16**, 4302–4313.

WEINGARTSHOFER, A., HOLMES, J.K., CAUDLE, G., CLARKE, E.M. & KRÜGER, H. (1977). Direct observation of multiphoton processes in laser–induced free–free transitions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **39**, 269–270.

WEINGARTSHOFER, A., HOLMES, J.K., SABBAGH, J. & CHIN, S.L. (1983). Electron scattering in intense laser fields. *J. Phys. B* **16**, 1805–1817.

ZWICKNAGEL, G., TOEPFFER, C. & REINHARD, P.-G. (1999). Stopping of heavy ions in plasmas at strong coupling. *Phys. Rep.* **309**, 117–208.