AEA TM, July 2020



#### Runaway Electron Studies and Plasma Restart from a RE Beam on TCV

#### <u>U. Sheikh</u><sup>1</sup>, J. Decker<sup>1</sup>, G. Papp<sup>2</sup>, B. P. Duval<sup>1</sup>, S. Coda<sup>1</sup> & the TCV team<sup>3</sup>

1) EPFL, Swiss Plasma Center, CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
 2) Max Planck Institute for Plasma Physics, D-85748 Garching, Germany
 3) See author list of S. Coda et al 2019 Nucl. Fusion 59 112023
 Email: umar.sheikh@epfl.ch

#### **EPFL** Presentation Overview

#### Overview of current TCV internal RE research program

- TCV capabilities
- Baseline scenario for RE generation
- Scan of injection gas species
  - Natural current decay rates

#### Explore heating of background plasma ("plasma restart")

- Promote Ohmic current carrying channel
- Secondary D<sub>2</sub> injection
  - Heat background plasma
- Restart from clean RE beam (primary D<sub>2</sub> injection)
- Preliminary modelling

- Full current conversion RE beams
  - Range of shaping
    - Neg. triangularity, elongations up to 1.5
    - Limited or diverted configurations

- Full current conversion RE beams
  - Range of shaping
    - Neg. triangularity, elongations up to 1.5
    - Limited or diverted configurations
  - Low density target plasmas
    - ne<1e19m<sup>-3</sup>
  - High pre-disruption electric field
    - ~20-40x classic critical electric field
    - Generate RE seed population
    - Disruptions induced by MGI



U. Sheikh

- Full current conversion RE beams
  - Range of shaping
    - Neg. triangularity, elongations up to 1.5
    - Limited or diverted configurations
  - Low density target plasmas
    ne<1e19m<sup>-3</sup>
  - High pre-disruption electric field
    - ~20-40x classic critical electric field
    - Generate RE seed population
    - Disruptions induced by MGI
- Consistently generate 200kA RE beams with over 1s of steady beam duration
- Tokamak magnetic configuration maintained by I<sub>p</sub>



- Mature control system
  - RE beam in control down to 10kA
  - Position control of RE beam
    - z-movement of beam (Hoppe 2020)
  - Fixed I<sub>p</sub> or dI<sub>OH</sub>/dt
    - RT triggers to switch
- Versatile MGI system
  - 5 fast opening/closing valves
    - Multiple injections
    - Variations in species and quantity
    - Same location
  - D<sub>2</sub>, He, Ne, Ar, Kr or Xe possible



Diagnostics for this presentation

- Thomson scattering system (red squares)
  - 3 lasers that can operate in "burst"
  - Temperatures down to 6eV
- FIR interferometry (14 vertical chords) (green lines)
- Ex-vessel hard X-ray measurements
  - Min. photon energy: 150keV
- Filtered soft X-ray diodes for core T<sub>e</sub> (xT<sub>e</sub>)
  - 0.1ms temporal resolution



EPFL

8

# n Gas

## Scan of Injection Gas Species

Natural Decay Rates

#### **EPFL** Variation of Gas Species

- I<sub>OH</sub> set constant at disruption
  - No external energy introduced to system
  - Measure natural current decay rate ( $\tau_{CD}$ )
- Dataset includes He, Ne, Ar, Kr, Xe
  - Fewer injected particles for higher Z





mjecuc	Gas	Particles		$l_{CD}$ (60-20%) (S)	$l_{CD}$ (190-100KA) (S)
He (2)		5.70E+19	2.35E+00	0.927	0.452
Ne (10)		5.63E+18	2.33E-01	0.459	0.364
Ar (18)		4.81E+18	1.99E-01	0.281	0.282
Kr (36)		2.10E+18	8.67E-02	0.413	0.406
Xe (54)		1.83E+18	7.57E-02	0.398	0.342

200/1/01

#### **Variation of Injection Amount** EPFL

- $\tau_{CD}$  and  $n_e$  proportional to amount injected
  - HXR photons doubled for doubled Xe
- Strong correlation of  $\tau_{CD}$  with injection amount and Z

0.413

0.215

0.398

0.190

Modelling on-going

Particles

mbar L

2.10E+18 8.67E-02

4.20E+18 1.73E-01

1.83E+18 7.57E-02

3.66E+18 1.51E-01



**Injection Gas** 

Kr (36)

Xe (54)

Kr (36) x2

Xe (54) x2

EPFL

# Secondary D<sub>2</sub> Injection

U. Sheikh

#### **EPFL** Neon Flushed With Second D<sub>2</sub> Injection

- Stable RE beam already created (Ne)
  - $I_p @150 kA$  for stability
  - Bulk of current carried by REs



#### **EPFL** Neon Flushed With Second D<sub>2</sub> Injection

- Stable RE beam already created (Ne)
  - $I_p @150 kA$  for stability
  - Bulk of current carried by REs
- D<sub>2</sub> injection (~20x Neon injection pcls)
  - Background plasma disappears
  - Remaining  $T_e < 1eV$



#### **EPFL** Neon Flushed With Second D<sub>2</sub> Injection

- Stable RE beam already created (Ne)
  - $I_p @150 kA$  for stability
  - Bulk of current carried by REs
- D<sub>2</sub> injection (~20x Neon injection pcls)
  - Background plasma disappears
  - Remaining  $T_e < 1eV$
- Background plasma reheats after 50ms
  - Pre-D<sub>2</sub> injection regime achieved
  - High generation of REs expected
    - Increase in dl<sub>OH</sub>/dt
    - Sharp "drops" in I<sub>p</sub>
  - High RE losses inferred from HXR
- Bulk of current still carried by REs



#### **EPFL** Increased D<sub>2</sub> Injection Maintains Low Density

- Sufficient D<sub>2</sub> injection prevents ionisation
- Background plasma disappears
  - T<sub>e</sub> below 1eV maintained
- dl<sub>OH</sub>/dt remains low
  - Low  $E_{\Phi}$  maintained
  - RE formation reduced
- HXR reduced and maintained
- Bulk of current still carried by REs
  - Low  $\rm T_{e}$  and  $\rm n_{e}$  in background plasma

Injection Gas	Particles	mbar L
Neon	5.63E+18	0.23
D2 (Red)	9.90E+19	4.11
D2 (Green)	2.97E+20	12.33
D2 (Blue)	4.95E+20	20.55



#### **EPFL** Background Plasma Heated With NBH

- 800kW injected into cold, low n<sub>e</sub> plasmas
  - Poor absorption expected
- Goal: Heat/ionise a background plasma
  - Promote as current carrying channel
- $n_e$  and  $T_e$  increase
  - Some power coupled
- Loss of REs, drop in I<sub>p</sub>
  - High dl<sub>OH</sub>/dt heats background plasma
- Radiation losses quickly cool plasma after beam
  - Similar n<sub>e</sub>, dI<sub>OH</sub>/dt and HXR to pre-D<sub>2</sub> injection levels
  - Bulk of current still carried by REs
- Similar results with Ar and He flushing



EPFL

17

# **Primary D<sub>2</sub> Injection**

#### **EPFL** Primary D<sub>2</sub> Injection Creates RE Beam and Restart

- D<sub>2</sub> injection => disruption @0.47s
  - Low temperature background plasma
  - HXR emission signalling RE ejection



### **EPFL** Primary D<sub>2</sub> Injection Creates RE Beam and Restart

- D<sub>2</sub> injection => disruption @0.47s
  - Low temperature background plasma
  - HXR emission signalling RE ejection
- Large HXR event at 0.52s
  - Expulsion of RE
  - Background plasma heated
- Low HXR and  $n_e \sim 0.5e19$  maintained
  - V<sub>loop</sub> remains below 1



## **EPFL** Primary D<sub>2</sub> Injection Creates RE Beam and Restart

- D<sub>2</sub> injection => disruption @0.47s
  - Low temperature background plasma
  - HXR emission signalling RE ejection
- Large HXR event at 0.52s
  - Expulsion of RE
  - Background plasma heated
- Low HXR and  $n_e \sim 0.5e19$  maintained
  - V<sub>loop</sub> remains below 1
- Higher  $n_e$  and  $dI_{OH}/dt$  for high fuelling
  - Injection from standard fuelling valve
- OH spike @1.15s (TCV specificity)



- No T<sub>e</sub> measurements during RE phase
  - Standard spectroscopy too slow
  - Temperature too low for TS and xTe
    - TS suggests T<sub>e</sub> < 5eV</li>



IAEA TM, July 2020



- No T<sub>e</sub> measurements during RE phase
  - Standard spectroscopy too slow
  - Temperature too low for TS and xTe
    TS suggests T<sub>e</sub> < 5eV</li>
- HXR burst @0.52s => l<sub>p</sub> drops 20%
- Plasma temperature measurable
  - xTe (assumes Maxwellian distribution)
    - Good match with TS
  - Background plasma heating in 5-10ms
    - Flux surfaces already established



- No T<sub>e</sub> measurements during RE phase
  - Standard spectroscopy too slow
  - Temperature too low for TS and xTe
    TS suggests T<sub>o</sub> < 5eV</li>
- HXR burst @0.52s => l<sub>p</sub> drops 20%
- Plasma temperature measurable
  - xTe (assumes Maxwellian distribution)
    - Good match with TS
  - Background plasma heating in 5-10ms
    - Flux surfaces already established
- Plasma current recovers and HXR emissions remain low
- Potential for current to be carried by background plasma - modelling



EPFL

25

## **Preliminary Modelling**

## **EPFL** Modelling with LUKE

- LUKE : relativistic guiding-center Fokker-Planck code (Decker 2008)
  - Current diffusion equation not solved
  - Only valid in quasi-steady phases
- Pre-disruption: suprathermal electrons (including REs) drive 80% of I<sub>p</sub>
  - Towards slideaway regime?
- Post-disruption: Ohmic contribution is 4x higher with high fueling
  - Slightly higher T<sub>e</sub>, much higher V<sub>loop</sub>
  - Similar to pre-disruption Ohmic contribution with low fueling
- Higher n<sub>e</sub> => lower RE generation vs transport => higher V<sub>loop</sub> => larger Ohmic contribution
- Ongoing modelling to characterize RE population



#### EPFL Summary

- Confined RE beams reliably created on TCV via MGI
- Natural decay rates with He, Ne, Ar, Kr, Xe covered
- Flushing and background plasma heating demonstrated
- D<sub>2</sub> primary injection led to RE beam followed by background plasma reestablished at 1keV
  - LUKE modelling predicts high post-disruption Ohmic contribution to Ip
- Only a small subset of full TCV RE database
  - Data available for model validation and collaboration

U. Sheikh





 École polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne