Behavior of magnetohydrodynamic modes of infernal type at H-mode pedestal with plasma rotation

Linjin Zheng, M. T. Kotschenreuther, P. Valanju



INSTITUTE FOR FUSION STUDIES THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

Outline

I. Experimental observations of edge harmonic oscillation (EHO)/outer modes (OMs)

— The differences between ELMs and EHO

- II. Infernal (or low magnetic shear) modes vs EHO— Numerical results
- III. Summary

Magnetic-surface-preserving resonant magnetic perturbations (RMPs)

Outline

- I. Experimental observations of edge harmonic oscillation (EHO)/outer modes (OMs)
 The differences between ELMs and EHO
- II. Infernal (or low magnetic shear) modes vs EHO
 Numerical results
- III. Summary

— Magnetic-surface-preserving resonant magnetic perturbations (RMPs)

Observation of EHOs at DIII-3



Observation of OMs (EHOs) at JET



E.R. Solano, IAEA FEC, 2010



Current and safety factor reconstruction



C.E. Kessel et al., Nucl. Fusion 47 (2007) 1274

There is a safety factor maximum q_{max} (or reduced magnetic shear) near plasma edge

Existing peeling ballooning theory

Snyder et al. Nucl. Fusion 44 (2004) 320



EHO/OMs are not peeling ballooning modes

Experimental observations:

- 1. Modes resonate at the pedestal top
- 2. Mode frequencies are n-multiple of rotation frequency at pedestal top



Peeling mode has resonance in the vacuum region and therefore does not fit the frequency of experimentally observed modes.

Outline

I. Experimental observations of edge harmonic oscillation (EHO)/outer modes (OMs)

— The differences between ELMs and EHO

II. Infernal (or low magnetic shear) modes vs EHO — Numerical results

III. Summary

Magnetic-surface-preserving resonant magnetic perturbations (RMPs)

Equilibrium Reversed or reduced magnetic shear profile

Equilibrium pressure and safety factor profiles computed by VMEC. Rotation and density have same profiles as pressure



MHD stability computed by AEGIS code

The case with q-plateau > 4 is more unstable, because higher pressure gradient meets with low

magnetic shear.



FIG. 4: Critical wall position vs q-plateau: q_p .

The n = 1 MHD eigen modes





FIG. 6: MHD eigenfunction for the case with q-plateau = 3.96 and wall position b=1.47.

Oct. 8-13, 2012, San Diego

Stability diagram with rotation q_plateau = 4.1

ω, γ

Infernal mode features:

- Frequency is independent of wall position
- Growthrate is independent of rotation frequency

Mode frequency is close to the rotation frequency at pedestal top

FIG. 7: Eigen frequency and growth rate for the case with q-plateau = 4.1.



Eigen modes with rotation q_plateau = 4.1



FIG. 9: Real eigenfunction for the case with q-plateau = 4.1.

FIG. 10: Imaginary eigenfunction for the case with q-plateau = 4.1.

Stability diagram with rotation q_plateau = 3.96

- It is not as typical of infernal mode as the q_p = 4.1 case, due to peeling mode coupling --- q=4 surface is close to the plasma-vacuum interface.
- Infernal mode is still predominant:

— Frequency is independent of wall position

— Growthrate is independent of rotation frequency



FIG. 8: Eigen frequency and growth rate for the case with q-plateau = 3.96.

Mode frequency/growthrate drops

Eigen modes with rotation q_plateau = 3.96



FIG. 11: Real eigenfunction for the case with q-plateau = 3.96.

FIG. 12: Imaginary eigenfunction for the case with q-plateau = 3.96.

Numerical results by AEGIS code

Infernal mode features:

Mode frequency is linearly counter-matched with rotation frequency, while growthrate is about independent of rotation frequency



FIG. 13: Eigen frequency and growth rate vs rotation frequencies.

Localized mode theory

• Singular layer equation with $\omega_D = \omega + n\Omega$

$$\frac{d}{dx}\left(s^2x^2\frac{d}{dx}E_0\right) - \frac{r}{R}\alpha_p\left(1 - \frac{1}{q^2}\right)E_0 - D_\Omega E_0 - \frac{d}{dx}\left(\frac{q^2\mathcal{M}}{m^2}\frac{\omega_D^2}{\gamma_A^2}\frac{d}{dx}E_0\right) = 0$$

Mercier criterion – no shear stabilization at q_{max}

$$\frac{s^2}{4} + \frac{r}{R} \alpha_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{q^2} \right) + D_{\Omega} > 0.$$

 Inertia energy for explanation of mode frequencies being proportional to toroidal mode number: n

$$\delta W_{inertia} \propto \int d^3 x (\omega - n\Omega)^2 \left| \frac{dE_0}{dx} \right|^2$$

Finite magnetic shear can result in different continuum damping.

Oct. 8-13, 2012, San Diego

24th IAEA FEC, TH/P3-23

Conclusion of Sec. II

Further support for infernal (or low magnetic shear) modes interpretation of EHO/OMs:

 Infernal (or low magnetic shear) modes are more unstable, but less damaging. Hence, they can be observed below ELM threshold, but not lead to loss of pedestal.

 Infernal (or low magnetic shear) modes are localized and tend to decouple from SOL

Mode frequencies are proportional to toroidal mode number n.

Oct. 8-13, 2012, San Diego

Outline

I. Experimental observations of edge harmonic oscillation (EHO)/outer modes (OMs)

— The differences between ELMs and EHO

II. Infernal (or low magnetic shear) modes vs EHO— Numerical results

III. Summary

Magnetic-surface-preserving resonant magnetic perturbations (RMPs)

Magnetic-surface-preserving RMPs





C.E. Kessel et al., Nucl. Fusion 47 (2007) 1274

Burrell et al., Phys. of Plasmas 12, 056121 (2005)

Proposal: to apply RMPs which resonate with q_{max} (or q with low magnetic shear) to pump out energy without causing the coupling to SOL modes

Summary

- We find that there is possible correlation of infernal modes at q extremes or low magnetic shear modes with EHO/OMs observed experimentally.
- II. Application of magnetic-surfacepreserving RMPs can help to mitigate ELMs, without seriously damaging the magnetic surfaces.