



Theoretical modelling of non-hydrogenic plasma wall interaction experiments in ASDEX Upgrade and the GyM linear device

C.Tuccari^a, G. Alberti^a, F. Mombelli^a, L.Bana^a, D.Dellasega^{a,b}, A. Uccello^b, M. Pedroni^b, A. Cremona^b, F.Cani^b, J. Romazanov^c, A. Kirschner^c, A. Hakola^d, M. Passoni^{a,b}, The GyM team, The ASDEX Upgrade team and the EUROfusion tokamak exploitation team

> ^a Dipartimento di Energia, Politecnico di Milano, Via Ponzio 34/3, 20133 Milan, Italy ^b Istituto per la Scienza e Tecnologia dei Plasmi, ISTP-CNR, Via R. Cozzi 53, 20125 Milan, Italy ^c Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH, Jülich, Germany ^d 4VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland, VTT Espoo, Finland



MoD-PMI 2025, 26-28th May, IAEA Headquarters, Vienna

Motivations and aims

- Heavier non-hydrogenic plasma species, e.g. helium (He) ash, argon (Ar) seeding, may influence plasma-wall interaction (PWI)
- Linear plasma devices (LPDs) are used to perform dedicated PWI experiments in a controlled environment, to complement the more complex tokamak experiments
- Modelling PWI processes allows a deeper understanding of these phenomena and offers support for experiment interpretation
- Global SOLPS-ITER [1] and ERO2.0 [2] coupling allows self-consistent simulation of erosion and impurity transport processes, both in tokamaks and in linear devices [3]

Aims

- > Present an overview of erosion modelling activities with non-hydrogenic plasmas in different environments
- > Design an erosion and migration experiment in the GyM linear device [4] and validate ERO2.0 simulations with experimental results

ERO2.0 code

- 3D Monte Carlo code for erosion and impurity migration simulation
- Global and self-consistent description in whole machine volume
- Test particles approximation: traced impurities do not influence background plasma parameters



The GyM linear device





Motivations

Si catchers Samples Mo mask Linear device with lowly ionized plasma and stainless steel vessel \blacktriangleright PWI experiments with ion fluxes ~ CX neutrals on ITER first wall

Sample-holder

- Used to expose samples
- Negatively Biased to tune ion impact energy

Bfield	0.13 T	Ion flux	10 ²¹ ions m ⁻² s ⁻¹
Working pressure	10 ⁻³ Pa	Ion fluence	10 ²⁵ ions m ⁻² (~7h)
Electron density	<10 ¹⁷ m ⁻³	Diameter	0.25 m
Electron temperature	<15 eV	Length	2.1 m
Ion temperature	0.1 eV	Working gases	H ₂ , D ₂ , N ₂ , He , Ar , mixtures



Catchers

• Introduced for modelling validation purposes • Installed in proximity of lateral wall, able to rotate around the screw

mask (~ 3x4 cm²)

• Aimed at providing measurable deposition layers from sputtered impurities

ASDEX Upgrade He campaign

- > 2022 He plasma campaign aimed at
- observing fuzz formation on W divertor tiles
- > 14 consecutive discharges: 8 H-mode and 6 L-mode
- > H-mode and L-mode strike points separated by few centimeters to distinguish divertor regions
- > 150-250 nm erosion after 3.4x10²⁴ m⁻² fluence observed on polished W samples near the H-mode OSP [5]





Background plasma to simulate inter-ELM phase of H-mode discharges produced with SOLPS-ITER.

Benchmarked with Langmuir probes measurements at outer midplane (OMP) and outer strike point (OSP)

--- Experimental results

Experiment design and ERO2.0 validation in GyM





Conclusions and perspectives

Conclusions

> PWI experiments with non-hydrogenic plasmas were modelled through SOLPS-ITER and ERO2.0, highlighting the different role of higher charge states in a linear device and in a tokamak

 \blacktriangleright Mostly He²⁺ farther in the SOL (see Fabio Mombelli et al. poster)



ERO2.0 results

Outer divertor erosion in inter-ELM phase estimated for different He ions modelling:

- Full He²⁺ plasma
- Full He²⁺ ion fluxes at divertor with Z_{eff} distribution in the volume
- SOLPS-ITER distribution of ion fluxes with Z_{eff} in the volume
- \blacktriangleright Net erosion peak observed in proximity of max T_e

Z_{eff} distribution affects impurity transport, slightly increasing erosion > Real fluxes distribution has minor influence on erosion, i.e. assuming a full He²⁺ flux is a good approximation. Possibly because T_a is close to threshold value



increases with

60

40

GyM

Large Cr samples and catcher installation near the SH were chosen through preliminary ERO2.0 modelling First experimental measures in good agreement with ERO2.0 predictions

GyM

comparison with ERO2.0 modelling

diagnostics in GyM PWI experiments

Future use of catchers as backup

ASDEX Upgrade

- > He H-mode discharges successfully modelled with SOLPS-ITER
- Estimated OD erosion in inter-ELM phase and studied the influence of ion flux charge state composition

Perspectives

ASDEX Upgrade

- > Further analysis on deposited layers to Investigate the impact of foreign light determine thickness and refine the impurities on erosion
 - Develop a strategy to model intra-ELM erosion and improve the comparison with experimental erosion measures

References

- [1] X. Bonnin, et al, Plasma Fusion Res. 11, 1403102 (2016)
- [2] J. Romazanov, et al., Phys. Scripta 2017.T170, 014018 (2017)
- [3] F. Mombelli, et al., Nucl. Fusion 65, 026023 (2025)
- [4] A. Uccello, et al. Front. Phys. 11, 1108175 (2023)
- [5] M. Rasinski, et al., Nucl. Mat. Energy 37, 101539. (2023)
- [6] Manuscript submitted to Nuclear Fusion



This work has been carried out within the framework of the EUROfusion Consortium (WP-PWIE), partially funded by the European Union via the Euratom Research and Training Programme (Grant Agreement No 101052200—EUROfusion). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be held responsible for them. Part of this work is funded by Eni S.p.A, in the framework of the Contract N. 4400010490.

