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Abstract

An asymptotic analysis of electron collection at high bias \( \Phi_p \) serves to determine the domain of validity of the OML regime of cylindrical Langmuir probes, which is basic for the workings of conductive bare tethers. The breakdown of the regime is found to occur far from the probe, at energies comparable to the ion temperature \( T_i \). The radius of a wire collecting OML current in an unmagnetized plasma at rest cannot exceed a value, \( R_{\text{max}} \), that increases with \( T_i \), and exhibits a minimum as a function of \( \Phi_p \); at \( \Phi_p \) values of interest \( R_{\text{max}} \) is already increasing and is larger than the Debye length \( \lambda_{De} \). It is also found that 1) the maximum width of a thin tape is \( 4R_{\text{max}} \); 2) the electron thermal gyroradius must be large compared with both \( R \) and \( \lambda_{De} \) for magnetic effects to be negligible; and 3) an ion ram energy large compared with \( kT_i \) but small compared with \( e\Phi_p \) would have a complex but weak effect on \( R_{\text{max}} \).

1. Introduction

Each point of an electrodynamic bare tether collects current as if it were part of a cylinder uniformly polarized at the local tether bias \( \Phi_p \). This is because of the enormous disparity between tether thickness and collecting length, which lie in the millimeter and kilometer ranges respectively. Bare tether applications rest on the assumption that electron collection occurs in the (optimal) orbital-motion-limited regime of cylindrical probes. It is thus important to determine the parametric domain of orbital-motion-limited (OML) validity.

Since OML current is proportional to the perimeter of the cross section, a large tether current may require a large perimeter. If the crosswise dimension is too large, however, the current will not reach the OML value because of electrical screening effects related to a short plasma Debye length \( \lambda_{De} \). Here we determine the maximum radius of a cylinder collecting OML current in an unmagnetized plasma at rest, and how it depends on the ion temperature \( T_i \) and the bias \( \Phi_p \). Values of the ratio \( e\Phi_p/kT_i \) of interest for tethers \( (T_e \sim 0.15 \text{ eV}, \Phi_p \sim 400\text{V}) \) are \( 10^2 \) times larger than values previously explored numerically. We also consider the maximum width of a thin tape.

Again, if the crosswise dimension is too large, the current will not reach the OML value because of magnetic guiding effects due to a short thermal electron gyroradius \( l_e \). We consider how large has \( l_e \) to be for magnetic effects to be negligible. Finally, we also
study the effects of an ion ram energy large compared with thermal energies but small compared with $e\Phi_p$.

2. Circular cylinder at rest in an unmagnetized plasma

The electron current $I$ to a sufficiently long cylinder in a Maxwellian plasma of density $N_\infty$ and temperatures $T_e$ and $T_i$, may be written in dimensionless form as

$$\frac{I}{I_{th}} = \text{function of} \frac{R}{\lambda_{De}}, \frac{e\Phi_p}{kT_e}, \frac{T_i}{T_e}. \quad (1)$$

Here, $I_{th}$ is the thermal or random current

$$I_{th} = 2\pi R L \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\frac{8kT_e}{\pi m_e}} eN_\infty \quad (2)$$

where $R$ and $L$ are probe radius and length, and $\lambda_{De}$ is $\sqrt{kT_e/4\pi e^2N_\infty}$. In general, the determination of electron trajectories to obtain the current requires solving Poisson's equation for the potential $\Phi(r)$,

$$\frac{\lambda_{Di}^2}{r} \frac{d}{dr} \left( \frac{d\Phi}{r dkT_i} \right) = \frac{N_e}{N_\infty} - \frac{N_i}{N_\infty}, \quad (\lambda_{Di} = \lambda_{De}\sqrt{T_i/T_e}) \quad (3)$$

with boundary conditions

$$\Phi = \Phi_p > 0 \quad \text{at} \quad r = R, \quad \Phi \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad r \to \infty. \quad (4)$$

Both the electric field $-\nabla\Phi$ and the probe acting as a sink of particles affect the densities $N_e$ and $N_i$, and thus $\Phi(r)$ itself. The basic problem in probe theory usually lies in the attracted-particle density $N_e$. Actually, for the very large $e\Phi_p/kT_e$ values of interest, the repelled-particle density $N_i$ is accurately given by the simple Boltzmann law,

$$N_i \approx N_\infty \exp(-e\Phi/kT_i), \quad (5)$$

except near the probe where, anyway, $N_i$ is exponentially small (as the ion current itself). Because of Eq.(5), it proves convenient to normalize potential and radius with the ion parameters, $T_i$ and $\lambda_{Di}$, although final results may be given in terms of $T_e$ and $\lambda_{De}$.

For the highly symmetrical case of this section, the axial velocity $v_z$ (Fig.1) and the transverse angular momentum and energy,

$$J = m_e r v_\theta,$$
FIGURE 1
are conserved along electron orbits. The density $N_e$ at each radius $r$ may then be expressed as an integral of the undisturbed Maxwellian distribution function over appropriate ranges of those 3 constants of the motion $(1)$. After a trivial $v_z$ integration one has

$$N_e = N_\infty \frac{m_e}{2\pi kT_e} \int_{-J}^{J} \frac{\exp\left(-E/kT_e\right) dE dJ}{m_e \sqrt{J_r^2(E) - J^2}}$$

(7)

where we defined

$$J_r^2(E) = 2m_eJ^2[E + e\Phi(r)].$$

(8)

The $E$-integral, which only covers positive values (all electrons start at infinity), must be carried out once for $v_r < 0$ (incoming electrons) and again for $v_r > 0$ (electrons that have turned outwards at a radius between $r$ and $R$); the $J$-integral can be made to cover just positive values by writing $dJ \to 2dJ$. The $E$-$J$ domain of integration in Eq.(7) is $r$-dependent because of both the electric field and the sink effect of the probe:

i) For an incoming electron of energy $E > 0$ to actually reach $r$, $v_r^2$ must have been positive throughout the entire range $r < r' < \infty$. Using (8) in Eq.(6) for $E$,

$$m_e^2r^2v_r^2 = J_r^2(E) - J^2,$$

the $J$-range of integration at that energy will clearly be

$$0 < J < J_r^*(E) \equiv \text{minimum} \{ J_r(E) ; r < r' < \infty \};$$

(9)

in general, the minimum occurs at a different $r'$ for a different energy $E$. If $J_r^*(E)$ differs from $J_r(E)$, those electrons in the range $J_r^*(E) < J < J_r(E)$, for which $v_r^2$ would be positive, never actually reach $r$ and are thus excluded from the integral in (7); we say that there is an effective potential barrier for $r$, at energy $E$.

ii) For an $E$-electron outgoing at $r$ the $J$-range of integration will be

$$J_R^*(E) < J < J_r^*(E),$$

electrons with $J < J_R^*(E)$ having disappeared in the probe.

Equation (7) may now be written as

$$N_e = N_\infty \int_0^{\infty} \frac{dE}{kT_e} \exp\left(-E/kT_e\right) \left[ \sin^{-1} \frac{J_r^*(E)}{J_r(E)} - \sin^{-1} \frac{J_R^*(E)}{J_r(E)} \right],$$

(10)
half the first term in the bracket being the \( v_r < 0 \) contribution. The current itself can be easily found to be

\[
I = 2LN_0 \frac{e}{m_e} \int_0^\infty \frac{dE}{kT_e} \exp\left(-\frac{E}{kT_e}\right) J_R^*(E) .
\]  

(11)

We note at this point that, through its dependence on \( J_r^*(E) \) [and \( J_R^*(E) \)], the density \( N_e \) is a functional of \( \Phi(r) \) and thus cannot be known [for use in solving Eq.(3) for \( \Phi(r) \)] before the potential itself is found; this results in a complex, iterative numerical solution of Poisson's equation (3). A hypothetical potential with no barriers at all \([J_r^*(E) = J_r(E) \text{ for } R \leq r < \infty , 0 \leq E < \infty]\) would simplify \( N_e \) in (10) to a function of both \( r \) and the local value \( \Phi(r) \),

\[
N_e = N_0 \left[ 1 - \int_0^\infty \frac{dE}{kT_e} \frac{\exp(-E/kT_e)}{\pi} \sin^{-1} \left( \frac{R^2(E + e\Phi)}{r^2(E + e\Phi(r))} \right) \right] ,
\]  

(12)

and would allow a ready solution of Eq.(3), but has no real interest.

The case of interest here is that corresponding to the maximum possible current in Eq.(11). Since we have \( J_R^*(E) \leq J_R(E) \), from the definition of \( J_r^*(E) \) in (9), current is maximum under condition \( J_R^*(E) = J_R(E) \), for \( 0 < E < \infty \) (no potential barrier for just radius \( R \)). This is the orbital-motion-limited (OML) current,

\[
I_{OML} = 2LN_0 \frac{e}{m_e} \int_0^\infty \frac{dE}{kT_e} \exp\left(-\frac{E}{kT_e}\right) \sqrt{2m_eR^2(E + e\Phi)}
\]

\[
\rightarrow 2RLN_0 \sqrt{2e\Phi / m_e} , \quad \text{for } e\Phi >> kT_e .
\]  

(13)

With the current known, there would now be no need for solving Eq.(3), except for the very purpose of the present work: determining the parametric domain for the OML regime to hold. For \( e\Phi >> kT_e \) this problem comes out to be reasonably simple.

The OML condition, \( J_R^*(E) = J_R(E) \) for \( 0 < E < \infty \), which does reduce the second term in the bracket of (10) to a function of both \( r \) and the local value \( \Phi(r) \), is readily shown to be equivalent to condition

\[
r^2\Phi(r) \geq R^2\Phi_p \quad (R < r < \infty )
\]  

(14)

on the potential. Condition (14) can be conveniently illustrated by displaying \( \Psi \equiv e\Phi / kT \) versus \( \Psi_p R^2 / r^2 \) for potential profiles (Fig.2); (14) shows that the profile for \( R = R_{max} \)
FIGURE 2
(maximum radius for the OML regime to hold, with other parameters fixed) would just touch the diagonal in the figure, as in the case of profile c. Profiles a and b would lie in the OML regime, whereas d would not.

Next, note that the extreme condition \( J_r^*(E) = J_r(E) \) for \( R \leq r < \infty \), \( 0 < E < \infty \), which led to Eq.(12), would require the potential to satisfy the condition

\[
d(r^2\Phi)/dr \geq 0, \quad (R < r < \infty)
\]

which is, of course, more restrictive than (14). In Fig.2 only the hypothetical profile a satisfies (15). Note, however, that if \( d(r^2\Phi)/dr \) is positive just beyond some radius \( r_0 \), then we do have

\[
J_r^*(E) = J_r(E) \quad \text{for} \quad r_0 < r < \infty, \quad 0 < E < \infty
\]

and Eq.(10) reduces to (12) for \( r > r_0 \); cases b-d present this property (0 is the profile point where the tangent goes through the origin).

Figure 3 shows again the qualitative profile c of Fig.2, which we find corresponds to the actual profile for \( R = R_{\text{max}} \) at large \( \Psi_p = e\Phi_p/kT_i \); this may be taken as an ansatz that is used in solving Poisson's equation and verified at the end. Below, we sketch our asymptotic analysis of Eq.(3) for \( \Psi_p \gg 1 \), following closely a classical study (5), which assumed, however, a monoenergetic attracted-particle distribution function, and was developed for the non-OML, small \( \lambda_D/R \), regime:

i) Both the quasineutral approximation, \( N_e \approx N_i \), and the no barrier condition, \( J_r^*(E) = J_r(E) \), hold below point 0. Use of Eqs.(5) and (12) determines point 0 exactly.

ii) The quasineutral approximation remains valid up to a point 1 where \( d\Phi/dr \to \infty \). This property of point 1, and the proximity of values \( r_0 \) and \( r_1 \), make possible to get an accurate approximation to the potential barrier (and the density \( N_e \)) for points in the vicinity of 1, which can then be determined. The same barrier applies to points above 1, i.e., for \( r < r_1 \) we have \( J_r^*(E) = J_r^*(E) = \text{minimum} \) \([J_r(E), r_1 < r' < r_0, 0 < E < \infty] \).

iii) Above point 1 there are two thin, non-quasineutral layers that take the solution to a radius \( r_2 \) a bit closer to the probe, and to values \( \Phi \) satisfying \( \Phi_1 << \Phi << \Phi_p \).

iv) Finally, a solution to Poisson's equation (with \( N_e \) negligible) that matches the inner thin layer at \( r_2 \) and satisfies condition \( \Phi = \Phi_p \) at \( r = R \), yields a relation between parameters, i.e. determines \( R_{\text{max}} \).

Note that both \( \Psi_0 \) and \( \Psi_I \) are of order unity whereas \( \Psi_p \) is very large (~10^3,10^4). Hence, if Fig. 3 were drawn on scale, the near-vertical potential drop in the two thin layers, down to point 1, would occur very close to the \( \Psi \)-axis, and point 0 would lie very close to the origin. With \( e\Phi_0, e\Phi_i \sim kT_i \), the ion temperature should critically affect OML validity.
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Note also that the high probe bias \((\Psi_p \gg 1)\) makes space-charge effects negligible within some neighborhood of the probe (even if \(R\) is not small compared with Debye lengths). Within that neighborhood, and ignoring \(N_e - N_i\) in Eq.(3), \(\Phi(r)\) behaves as a (logarithmic) solution to the 2D Laplace-equation,

\[
\Phi = \Phi_p [1 - \alpha \ln (r/R)], \tag{17}
\]

\(\alpha\) being a moderately small constant (of order \(1/\ln \Psi_p\)).

Figure 4 shows \(R_{max}/\lambda_{De}\) versus \(e\Phi_p/kT_e\) for the ionospheric case, \(T/T_e \approx 1\); \(R_{max}\) goes through a minimum as the bias \(\Phi_p\) increases and, at high enough \(\Phi_p\), exceeds \(\lambda_{De}\). Numerical results for the range \(e\Phi_p / kT_i < 25\) had shown \(R_{max}\) decreasing monotonically with the bias (3). Figure 5 shows that \(R_{max}\) does increase sensibly with \(T_i\).

3. Thin tape at rest in an unmagnetized plasma

In the OML regime, the current to a cylindrical probe is independent of the shape of the cross section; it just depends on its perimeter (4). The limits of OML validity, however, must be determined anew for every cross section. Since angular momentum \(J\) is not conserved here, there is no close-form expression such as (10) for \(N_e\). Nonetheless, we find that the high bias condition \((\Psi_p \gg 1)\) makes possible to approximately reduce this problem to the case of the circular cylinder.

We use here elliptical coordinates \(v\) and \(w\) (see Fig.6, where we set \(a = 1\)),

\[
x = a \cos v \cosh w, \quad y = a \sin v \sinh w, \quad (0 \leq v < 2\pi, \quad 0 \leq w < \infty),
\]

Poisson’s equation then reading

\[
\frac{\lambda^2}{a^2 (\sinh^2 w + \sin^2 v)} \left( \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial w^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial v^2} \right) = \frac{N_e}{N_i} - \exp(-\Psi). \tag{18}
\]

The ellipses \(w(x,y) = \text{constant}\) approach circles as \(w\) increases; at large radial distances one has

\[
w = \ln \frac{r}{a} + \ln 2 - \frac{x^2 - y^2}{4r^2} \frac{a^2}{r^2} + ...
\]

We may reasonably use the approximation \(w = \ln(2r/a)\) for \(w > w^*\), with \(w^* = 1.25\) or 1.5, say. Note also that the limit ellipse \(w = 0\) is the segment \(y = 0, -a < x < a\), which may represent the cross section of a tape of width 2\(a\) and negligible thickness.
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As in the previous section, the space-charge may be ignored in some neighborhood of the probe, which, for \( \Psi_p \) large enough, extends into the region where \( \rho \)-ellipses are near-circles, that is, beyond \( \rho = \rho_0 \). We may then argue that the potential \( \Psi \) will be nearly independent of \( \nu \) everywhere, i.e. \( \Psi(\rho, \nu) \approx \Psi(\rho) \) (and the electric field at \( \rho > \rho_0 \) will be radial) in the following way:

i) The electron density for \( \rho > \rho_0 \) would then be a function of just \( \rho \), \( N_e = N_e(\rho) \). This is because, at a point in that region, incoming electrons, and outgoing electrons that did not reach values \( \rho < \rho_0 \), find a radial field throughout their motion and conserve the angular momentum \( J \); their contribution to \( N_e \) will be a function of \( \rho \), and thus, of \( \rho \). Those outgoing electrons that had reached values \( \rho < \rho_0 \) and missed the probe, have \( J \) changed by a quantity \( \Delta J \) that is small (\( \Delta J \approx J/\ln \Psi_p \)) as a result of the shallow (logarithmic) character of the potential in the vicinity of the probe, where the field is not radial; their contribution to \( N_e \) will be weakly dependent on \( \nu \). On the whole we would have \( N_e \approx N_e(\rho) \).

ii) Poisson’s equation reads

\[
\frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial \rho^2} + \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \rho} = 0
\]  

(20a)

for \( \rho < \rho_0 \), and

\[
\frac{\lambda_{Di}^2}{a^2 \sinh^2 \rho} \left( \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial \rho^2} + \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \rho} \right) \approx \frac{N_e}{N_\infty} \exp(-\Psi)
\]  

(20b)

for \( \rho > \rho_0 \), with some overlapping range of validity. In neither (20a) nor (20b) does \( \nu \) show up explicitly.

iii) Finally, boundary conditions refer to just \( \rho \),

\[
\Psi = \Psi_p \text{ at } \rho = 0, \quad \Psi \to 0 \text{ as } \rho \to \infty.
\]

With \( \Psi = \Psi(\rho) \), and \( \rho = \ln(2r/a) \) for \( \rho > \rho_0 \), we now have:

1) Equation (20a) and the probe boundary condition yield

\[
\Psi = \Psi_p[1 - \beta \rho]
\]  

(21)

\[
\rightarrow \Psi = \Psi_p \left[ 1 - \beta \ln \left( \frac{r}{a/2} \right) \right] \text{ for } \rho > \rho_0.
\]  

(22)

2) Equation (20b) for \( \rho > \rho_0 \) recovers (3), whose solution, as in Fig.3 of section 2, will show an outer quasineutral region, thin layers, and a broad, ion-free, inner region. This solution, rather than satisfying the boundary condition at the probe, must match smoothly the behavior given in (22), within the overlapping range of validity. Comparing
Eqs. (17) and (22) show that, beyond \( w^* \), the solution behaves as in the case of a circular cylinder with an effective radius \( R = a/2 \) (the coefficients \( \beta \) and \( \alpha \) being equal).

This suggests that, with all other parameters given, the maximum width of a thin tape in the OML regime relates quite simply to the maximum radius of a circular cylinder,

\[
2a_{\text{max}} = 4R_{\text{max}}.
\]  

(23)

Note that, since OML current is proportional to the perimeter, use of a tape would only increase the maximum current by a factor \( 4/\pi \), or 27%. A tape might be actually preferable for other reasons: a cylinder with \( R_{\text{max}} \) might be too heavy and rigid (7); a tape may lead to a shorter tether (2). The main interest of the result is then that the maximum half-width of a tape is twice \( R_{\text{max}} \) as given in Figs. 4 and 5.

One must still take into account the fact that the Laplace potential (21), for the region \( w < w^* \), is quite different from the potential (17). It then comes out that a tape, contrary to a circular cylinder, never collects the full OML current, although this has no practical consequences. There are potential barriers in the vicinity of any flat collecting surface, the effects being weak, however, in the case of a shallow 2D Laplace potential (4). Using (21) we find that potential barriers around the tape lie in a thin region of thickness \( \sim a/\ln\Psi_p \), and that current reduction below the OML value is of order \((1/\ln\Psi_p)^2\), or about 1%. Equation (23) should then properly read that current to a tape keeps very close to the OML value for \( a < 2R_{\text{max}} \).

4. Circular cylinder at rest in a magnetized plasma

As in the previous section, there is no closed-form expression for \( N_e \) in the presence of an uniform magnetic field \( B \), which allows for only two constants of the motion, energy and canonical angular momentum. Overall use of these two constants leads to the Parker-Murphy current law, which takes the character of an upper bound at the high bias of interest (6). For \( e\Phi_p >> kT_e \) and cylindrical geometry one has

\[
I_{\text{PM}} \approx I_{\text{OML}} \sqrt{\pi}/2 \times l_e/R, 
\]  

(24)

where \( l_e \) is the electron thermal gyroradius

\[
l_e = v_{\text{th}}/\Omega_e \sim 1/B, \quad (v_{\text{th}} = \sqrt{kT_e/m_e}, \quad \Omega_e = eB/m_e). 
\]

Equation (24) suggests that if \( R/l_e \) is small, \( I_{\text{OML}} \) then lying well below the \( I_{\text{PM}} \) bound, the OML current will hardly be affected by magnetic effects.

To get more definite results, we consider the exact equations for electron motion in the presence of the electric field due to probe and plasma, \(-\nabla\Phi(x, y)\) [probe and \( z \) axes
coincide], and an uniform magnetic field \( B \) perpendicular to the probe, say along the \( y \)-axis:

\[
\frac{d^2 v_x}{dt^2} + \Omega_e^2 \left[ 1 - l_e^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \left( \frac{e \Phi}{kT_e} \right) \right] v_x = v^2 y \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{e \Phi}{kT_e} \right),
\]

\( (25a) \)

\[
\frac{dv_y}{dt} = v^2 y \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{e \Phi}{kT_e} \right),
\]

\( (25b) \)

\[
\frac{d^2 v_z}{dt^2} + \Omega_e^2 v_z = -v^2 y \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{e \Phi}{kT_e} \right),
\]

\( (25c) \)

Equations \((25a\ and\ c)\) were obtained by deriving the respective equations of motion and using the derivative along the electron orbit \((10)\),

\[
\frac{dE_x}{dt} = \frac{\partial E_x}{\partial x} v_x + \frac{\partial E_x}{\partial y} v_y,
\]

The last two terms of \((25c)\) would give the usual \( E/B \) drift; the first two terms represent gyromotion. The important equation is \((25a)\), which should describe the approach to the probe across field lines.

The left-hand side of \((25a)\) would again represent gyromotion if the second term in the bracket were small, that is for \( B \) large enough \((l_e\ small\ enough)\). Assuming, on the contrary, that \( l_e \) is sufficiently large, we neglect the first (gyromotion) term and use the \( B = 0 \) solution of section 2 to determine how small must be the magnetic field for the second term in the bracket to be indeed large. In the broad region between probe and thin layers of Fig.3, the resulting condition is, basically, that the \( R/l_e \) ratio of the Parker-Murphy law \((24)\) be small; in particular, near the probe, where both Eq.(17) and the approximation

\[
\frac{d^2 \Phi}{dr^2} \approx -\frac{1}{r} \frac{d\Phi}{dr}
\]

hold, the left-hand-side of Eq.(25a) takes the simple form

\[
\frac{d^2 v_x}{dt^2} + \Omega_e^2 \left[ 1 - l_e^2 \left( \frac{R^2 x^2 - y^2}{r^2} - \frac{e \Phi}{kT_e} \right) \right] v_x
\]

with the first 3 factors in the parenthesis moderately small, and the last factor large. In the quasineutral region of Fig.3, the second term in the bracket is never large for \( T_i \approx T_e \), but
the electrons are then hardly affected by the potential before they reach $r_0 \approx 0.194 kT_e$). Finally, in the two thin layers, where we have $N_e - N_i \sim N_\infty$ and

$$\frac{d^2 \Phi}{dr^2} \ll \frac{-1}{r} \frac{d \Phi}{dr},$$

the left-hand-side becomes

$$\frac{d^2 v_x}{dt^2} + \Omega_e^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{l_e^2}{\lambda_{ne}^2} \frac{x^2}{r^2} \frac{N_e - N_i}{N_\infty} \right] v_x$$

This means that for $B$-effects to be negligible, both $R/l_e$ and $\lambda_{De}^2/l_e^2$ must be small.

At the relatively high densities of the $F$-layer, $\lambda_{De}^2/l_e^2 \approx B^2/N_\infty$ is indeed small (about $10^{-2}$ and $10^{-1}$ for $N_\infty = 10^{12}$ and $10^{11}$ m$^{-3}$ respectively), but it reaches above unity at extreme altitudes. Experiments on board an elliptical-orbit satellite (8) and a rocket (11) did show a current dependent on the angle between $B$ and a cylindrical probe ($B$-effects) when $N_e$ dropped low enough, at very low and high altitudes. In all cases probe bias was only moderately high.

5. **Circular cylinder moving through an unmagnetized plasma**

The case of interest is that of a large ion ram energy,

$$\frac{1}{2} m_i U^2 \gg kT_i,$$

where $U$ is the plasma velocity past the probe; for a tether orbiting in the $F$ layer (oxygen ions, orbiting velocity) we have indeed $\frac{1}{2} m_i U^2 \approx 4.5$ eV $\gg kT_i \sim 0.15$ eV. The unperturbed ion distribution function is now non isotropic and the electric field non radial, but the OML current law, which is independent of both ion distribution and cross section shape, is still valid. The high-bias limit law (13) is particularly robust: it is also independent of the unperturbed electron distribution function as long as it is isotropic, which is the case here ($\frac{1}{2} m_e U^2 \ll kT_e$).

The ion ram energy could affect, however, the domain of validity of the OML law. For the case of interest, $\frac{1}{2} m_i U^2 \ll e\Phi_p$, ions would be kept far away from the probe for all directions, with an (angle dependent) potential structure similar to that shown in Fig.3. For all other parameters fixed, the distance $r_1$ (or $r_2$) in Fig.3 is directly related to the characteristic ion energy. In a plasma with $T_i = T_e$, a crude model suggests the distances would correspond to an effective ion temperature $kT_i(\text{eff}) = \frac{1}{2} m_i U^2$ on the windward side, and $T_i(\text{eff}) = T_e$ on the lateral sides; when particularised for a small ratio $T_i/T_e$, the analysis sketched in section 2 would roughly give $T_i(\text{eff}) \sim T_e \times \sqrt{kT_e/(\frac{1}{2} m_i U^2)}$ for the lee side. Since $R_{\text{max}}$ increases with $T_i/T_e$ (Fig.5), a wire with $R = R_{\text{max}}(U = 0,$
$T/T_e = 1$) would collect current in agreement with the OML law at the lateral sides and at the front, and below the OML level at the lee side; a preliminary analysis of how the current lags behind the OML value as $R$ increases beyond $R_{\text{max}}$ shows, however, that $I/I_{\text{OML}}$ keeps closer to 1 the lower the ratio $T/T_e$. A wire with $R = R_{\text{max}}(U = 0, T/T_e = 1)$ should then collect current very close to the law (13).

We note finally that conditions in laboratory plasmas may substantially differ from those applying in the tether case. The ratio $T/T_e$ is usually small and, as a consequence of Fig. 5, cylindrical probes will collect current below the OML value unless $R$ is well below $\lambda_{\text{De}}$. Also, in flowing laboratory plasmas the ion ram energy may be comparable to the bias applied at the probe, $\frac{1}{2} m_i U^2 \sim e \Phi_p$; again, unless $R$ is much less than $\lambda_{\text{De}}$, the potential would be non monotonic, with an overshoot at the front and a trough on the lee side, and the prediction of current would be difficult.

6. Conclusions

Bare tether applications are based on the assumption that the tether collects electrons in the OML regime of cylindrical Langmuir probes. The definite and simple OML current law, which allows for detailed design considerations, has opened the way to a technology of electrodynamic tethers (2). Here, we have determined the domain of OML validity in parameter space; we studied the surface bounding that domain as a relation among the dimensionless numbers

$$R/\lambda_{\text{De}}, \quad e \Phi_p/kT_e, \quad T/T_e, \quad \frac{1}{2} m_i U^2/kT_i, \quad \text{and} \lambda_{\text{De}}/l_i,$$

for the very large $e \Phi_p/kT_e$ values of interest. (The mass ratio $m_e/m_i$ enters through the irrelevant numbers $\frac{1}{2} m_e U^2/kT_e$ and $\lambda_{\text{De}}/l_i$.)

We found that the ratio $\lambda_{\text{De}}/l_i$ (actually, $\lambda_{\text{De}}^2/l_i^2$) must be small for magnetic effects which would break the OML law otherwise to be ignorable. This ratio is a property of the plasma rather than a free design parameter. In the Earth’s ionosphere $\lambda_{\text{De}}^2/l_i^2$ is small for $N_e$ clearly above $10^{10}$ m$^{-3}$; this breaks down at low, and sufficiently high, altitudes.

For $\lambda_{\text{De}}^2/l_i^2$ small, and first taking $\frac{1}{2} m_i U^2/kT_i \sim 0$, we determined the maximum radius for the OML regime to hold, giving

$$R_{\text{max}} \lambda_{\text{De}} \quad \text{versus} \quad e \Phi_p/kT_e \quad \text{and} \quad T/T_e.$$

$R_{\text{max}}$ exhibits a minimum as a function of $\Phi_p$ but, at the bias of interest, is slowly increasing, and above $\lambda_{\text{De}}$ in the ionospheric case ($T/T_e \sim 1$). For $\lambda_{\text{De}}^2/l_i^2$ small and $R \sim \lambda_{\text{De}}$, we have $R^2/l_i^2$ small too, a second condition we found required for magnetic effects to be weak. We also found $R_{\text{max}} \lambda_{\text{De}}$ increasing with $T/T_e$. 
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We finally found that if
\[ \frac{1}{2}m_i U^2/kT_i \times T_e/T_e \times kT_e/e\Phi_p = \frac{1}{2}m_i U^2/e\Phi_p \]
is small, as in the tether case, the ion ram energy \( \frac{1}{2}m_i U^2 \) will only affect the potential structure far away from the probe. This structure reaches a distance that depends on the ion characteristic energy, the ram energy making that distance angle-dependent. Both the increase of \( R_{max} \) with \( T_e/T_e \) (for vanishing \( U \)), and the fact that, at low \( T_e/T_e \), the current hardly lags behind the OML value as \( R \) exceeds \( R_{max} \), indicate that a wire with \( R \leq R_{max}(U = 0, T_e/T_e = 1) \) would collect current very close to the OML value.

If a thin tape is used instead of a wire (with all others parameters equal), the maximum valid width is found to be \( 4R_{max} \).
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