

Critical Gradient Model (CGM) *predicts* the same trend for neutron losses vs time as in NSTX elevated q_{\min} discharges

Multiple TAE discharge is chosen for CGM validations

$n=1-7$ are observed.

$n=2-6$ are used in NOVA-K for normalization.

Rotation is included and important for CGM model ion Landau damping, drive.

Drive/dampings are not large, $\gamma/\omega < 5\%$.

CGM model shows reasonable agreement for NSTX analyzed plasma, but underestimate losses for DIII-D

We believe the perturbative treatment is appropriate for NSTX as the drive and dampings are small,

whereas in DIII-D plasma AEs could be strongly unperturbative.

High a/R in NSTX may be the reason for agreement of perturbative linear analysis of CGM with the neutron fluxes. Drive increases towards the avalanche event.

Avalanche at ~ 480 msec may include more complicated nonlinear physics beyond CGM.

