

Home Search Collections Journals About Contact us My IOPscience

Modeling of lithium granule injection in NSTX using M3D-C1

This content has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text.

View the table of contents for this issue, or go to the journal homepage for more

Download details:

IP Address: 198.125.231.54 This content was downloaded on 12/04/2017 at 19:26

Please note that terms and conditions apply.

You may also be interested in:

High frequency pacing of edge localized modes by injection of lithium granules in DIII-D H-mode discharges A. Bortolon, R. Maingi, D.K. Mansfield et al.

Non-linear MHD modelling of ELM triggering by pellet injection in DIII-D and implications for ITER S. Futatani, G. Huijsmans, A. Loarte et al.

Enhanced confinement scenarios without large edge localized modes in tokamaks: control, performance, and extrapolability issues for ITER R. Maingi

Reduction of ELM energy loss by pellet injection for ELM pacing N. Hayashi, N. Aiba, T. Takizuka et al.

First observations of ELM triggering by injected lithium granules in EAST D.K. Mansfield, A.L. Roquemore, T. Carroll et al.

Integrated exhaust scenarios with actively controlled ELMs P.T. Lang, A. Kallenbach, J. Bucalossi et al.

Investigation of pellet-triggered MHD events in ASDEX Upgrade and JET P.T. Lang, K. Lackner, M. Maraschek et al.

ELM pacing and high-density operation using pellet injection in the ASDEX Upgrade all-metal-wall tokamak

P.T. Lang, A. Burckhart, M. Bernert et al.

Nucl. Fusion 57 (2017) 056040 (7pp)

https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-4326/aa66b1

# Modeling of lithium granule injection in NSTX using M3D-C1

## A. Fil<sup>1</sup>, E. Kolemen<sup>1</sup>, N. Ferraro<sup>2</sup>, S. Jardin<sup>2</sup>, P.B. Parks<sup>3</sup>, R. Lunsford<sup>2</sup> and R. Maingi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08540, United States of America

<sup>2</sup> Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Princeton, NJ 08543, United States of America

<sup>3</sup> General Atomics, PO Box 85608, San Diego, CA 92186, United States of America

#### E-mail: afil@pppl.gov

Received 16 December 2016, revised 26 February 2017 Accepted for publication 14 March 2017 Published 6 April 2017



#### Abstract

In this paper, we present simulations of pedestal control by lithium granule injection (LGI) in NSTX. A model for small granule ablation has been implemented in the M3D-C1 code (Jardin *et al* 2012 *Comput. Sci. Discovery* **5** 014002), allowing the simulation of realistic lithium granule injections. 2D and 3D simulations of Li injections in NSTX H-mode plasmas are performed and the effect of granule size, injection angle and velocity on the pedestal gradient increase is studied. The amplitude of the local pressure perturbation caused by the granules is found to be highly dependent on the solid granule size. Adjusting the granule injection velocity allows one to inject more particles at the pedestal top.

3D simulations show the destabilization of high order MHD modes whose amplitude is directly linked to the localized pressure perturbation, which is found to depend on the toroidal localization of the granule density source.

Keywords: ELM, lithium, LGI, NSTX, tokamak, fusion, control

(Some figures may appear in colour only in the online journal)

#### 1. Introduction

ITER will have to keep the pedestal free of edge-localized-modes (ELMs) to prevent large heat fluxes potentially damaging for the device. At the same time, ITER must maintain very high plasma performance to reach its goals. To achieve this, real-time pedestal control will need to be used in ITER as well as in future fusion reactors. NSTX and other devices have already developed and tested many different control schemes in order to adjust and regulate the pedestal pressure and density. The aim is to change the pedestal parameters to mitigate ELMs. For example, gas puffing injects fuel or impurities at the plasma edge to control the plasma pedestal density, 3D magnetic perturbations [2, 3] create an edge stochastic layer increasing the transport (which lowers the pedestal pressure gradient), lithium granule injections (LGI) [4] induce pressure perturbations triggering ELMs and can thus change the ELM frequency and their impact on the plasma facing components (PFCs). NSTX-U is currently planning additional tests of these methods, in particular for LGI. The next step would be to combine all these methods into an adaptive and automatic pedestal control algorithm for tokamaks. Such a capability could allow one to explore new innovative scenarios such as the super H-mode [5] or lithium induced ELM-free regimes [6]. To build such a control algorithm, simplified models must be derived based on our understanding of the physics and on how the different control actuators affect the pedestal. This is especially important in order to evaluate applicability to future reactors, e.g. ITER.

In this paper, we focus on the LGI technique only and present numerical simulations of granule induced perturbations to the plasma with the code M3D-C<sup>1</sup>. M3D-C<sup>1</sup> [1] is a stateof-the-art 3D full-MHD code with realistic geometry and is being developed to study the non-linear plasma response when several actuators are triggered (gas puffing, 3D magnetic perturbations and LGI). Few high frequency Li granule injections have been performed experimentally in DIII-D [7] and EAST and a LGI system has recently been installed on NSTX-U. As it is using non-fuel, non-recycling materials, LGI allows a decoupling of ELM control from plasma fueling. DIII-D experiments have demonstrated a robust



Figure 1. Initial NSTX pressure and density profiles (before firing a lithium granule). These are experimental profiles within an inter-ELM time interval.

ELM-pacing and a triggering efficiency higher than 80% for 0.9 mm lithium granules, but some concern exists because of the variability of triggered-ELM sizes. In particular, in high density, low-torque ITER baseline scenarios, an increase of the ELM frequency by LGI-pacing did not directly translate in ELM size mitigation [8]. Modeling with  $M3D-C^1$  investigates these phenomena by simulating the non-linear, 3D dynamic evolution of a realistic tokamak equilibrium subject to a triggered ELM. For this study, ablation models for lithium granules have been implemented in M3D-C<sup>1</sup>. Studies of LGI with M3D-C<sup>1</sup>, whose first steps are detailed in this paper, improve our physical understanding of this method and will allow us to build reduced models for control applications. First, we present the implementation of granule ablation models in M3D- $C^1$ . We will then present the results of 2D NSTX LGI simulations investigating the pressure perturbation triggered by different granule sizes, injection angle and velocity. Finally, we will present 3D simulations investigating the MHD activity triggered by LGI.

## 2. Implementing ablation models for lithium granules in M3D-C<sup>1</sup>

Two models have been implemented in M3D-C<sup>1</sup> to calculate the ablation rate of the lithium granule. The first one [9, 10] is a Neutral Gas Shielding Model calibrated on DIII-D experimental measurements of the lithium granule ablation rates. The second one [11] is valid for small size granules (sub-mm) where the contribution of plasma ions to the granule ablation is not negligible. In this second model, the ablation flow is treated as an expanding monoatomic gas with spherical symmetry, and a realistic Maxwellian distribution function for incident fast electrons is used. It also accounts for slowing down and pitch-angle scattering collisions of these fast electrons with cloud atoms. The granule is then modeled as a varying density source that is a Gaussian multiplied by the normalized ablation rate  $A_{\rm r}$ . The realistic granule radius  $r_{\rm p}$  is multiplied by an arbitrary parameter to give the width of the density source. Indeed, experimentally an ablation cloud is observed around the granule and this parameter is used to mimic the experiment. Note that this is the only 'free' parameter of the granule model and that experimentally its value is difficult to measure accurately (between 5 and 100 times the solid granule radius). Its impact on the simulations will be discussed further when presenting the results.

At each time-step, the granule ablation rate is calculated as  $A_{\rm r} = C(n_{\rm e}, T_{\rm e}, r_{\rm p}) \times X_{\rm m}$ , where  $r_{\rm p}$  is the granule radius and  $(n_{\rm e}, T_{\rm e})$  are the particle density and temperature of the background plasma at the granule position.  $A_r$  is given in g s<sup>-1</sup>, as well as  $X_{\rm m}$ .  $C(n_{\rm e}, T_{\rm e}, r_{\rm p})$ , the non-dimensional ablation coefficient, depends on the species parameter and is determined by solving the gas dynamic equations for the ablation flow for each set of  $(n_e, T_e, r_p)$ . A function fitting these results is used in M3D-C<sup>1</sup>. The granule radius  $r_p$  and thus the source width decreases as the granule is ablated by the plasma, as  $\delta r_{\rm p}/\delta t = -C(n_{\rm e}, T_{\rm e}, r_{\rm p}) \times X_{\rm p}$ .  $X_{\rm m}$  and  $X_{\rm p}$  embody the dominant similarity law for the strongly shielded cryogenic pellets and depends on the granule radius, the plasma density and temperature, the atomic mass of the granule and functions describing the interaction between incident plasma electrons and the granule ablation cloud. For example,  $X_{\rm m}$  is calculated as  $X_{\rm m} = k(\gamma - 1)^{1/3} f_{\rm L}^{1/3} W^{2/3} r_{\rm p}^{4/3} n_{\rm e}^{1/3} T_{\rm e}^{11/6} B(Z, \text{Te})^{2/3}$ , where  $k = 8.1468 \times 10^{-9}$ , Z is the atomic number of the atomic species comprising the granule, W is the atomic mass of this species (in amu),  $\gamma$  is the effective ratio of specific heats of the ablation cloud,  $f_{\rm L}$  is the flux limiter,  $r_{\rm p}$  is the instantaneous granule radius (in cm), ne is the host plasma particle density (in cm<sup>-3</sup>) and T<sub>e</sub> is the host plasma electron temperature (in eV). More details on the model can be found in [10, 11].

#### 3. LGI simulations with M3D-C<sup>1</sup>

The simulations presented in the following start from NSTX experimental profiles (particle density and temperature). The target plasma is an ELMy H-mode (plasma discharge 129015) [6] with reliable temperature measurements during the inter-ELM period (see figure 1 showing the input profiles). The main parameters of this discharge are BT = 0.44 T, Ip = 0.785 MA, a = 0.627 m. The simulation is initiated within an inter-ELM time interval, at 0.4 s from the beginning of the discharge. The



**Figure 2.** Electron density contours in the poloidal plane. The density increase is due to the injection of a 0.8 mm granule in NSTX. Separatrix is also drawn in red. The sketch of the LGI system shows that the injection is done at midplane with a variable injection velocity.

Table 1. Range of granule input parameters used in the simulation.

<i>r</i> <sub>p</sub> (in mm)	Inj. velocity (in m $s^{-1}$ )	Source width (in cm)	Inj. angle (in degree)
0.2–1	50-200	1–5	-75 to +75

separatrix is at R = 1.48 m and the top of the pressure pedestal is initially at R = 1.46 m (see figure 2).

In M3D-C1, we use a single-fluid resistive MHD model that assumes fast equilibration with anisotropic thermal conduction. Braginskii temperature-dependent values are used for resistivity, isotropic viscosity and thermal conductivity.

2D simulations are performed with granule injections of different granule radius, initial speed, injection angle and size of the ablation cloud, as summarized in table 1.

Typical meshes sizes used in the simulations are 1-5 mm and the time step is between  $10^{-8}$  and  $10^{-7}$  s. The mesh is also refined around the separatrix and where the granule is injected.

In these simulations, the granule starts propagating inward at R = 1.5 m with a constant velocity. In the 2D simulations, we assume a fast-toroidal equilibration of the density perturbation created by the granule injection. This way, the simulations can be run for more than 10ms and we can study the value of the ablation rate for the full ablation process. This assumption will be relaxed in the 3D simulations where the toroidal dynamic of the density perturbation will be simulated and its impact on the MHD will be studied. As soon as the granule reaches the pedestal, a large and localized plasma particle density increase is generated (see figure 2). Note here that there is no equation solved for the impurity density and that the source is a source of electrons. Electron conduction along the field lines reheats the localized region of high density, leading to a large increase of the plasma pressure. Figure 3 shows successive pressure profiles after the injection of a 0.8 mm granule and the maximum pressure perturbation is reached when the ablation rate of the granule is maximal. An increase of pressure also occurs in the scrape-of-layer (SOL), which is associated to the boundary conditions used in the open field lines region (constant density and pressure on the boundary).

#### 3.1. Impact of the granule size

The granules are totally ablated in 0.2–3 ms, depending on their sizes and injection velocities. Those values are consistent with experiments [7]. Comparing to previous L-mode simulations the penetration depth and the ablation time is up to one order of magnitude shorter due to the higher particle density and temperature in this H-mode case.

Figure 4 shows the positions in the plasma where the granules reach their maximum ablation rate and where the granules are totally ablated (penetration depth). The larger granules achieve a significantly larger penetration depth, up to 5.4 cm for 1 mm granules at 100 m s<sup>-1</sup>, i.e. 3.4 cm inside the pedestal top.

The large granules inject a higher number of particles at the pedestal top but they also inject a non-negligible number of particles inside the separatrix. It is preferable for ELM triggering as it leads to a higher localized pressure perturbation.



Figure 3. Successive pressure profiles in the poloidal plan where the granule is injected. A large increase of the pedestal pressure is observed.



Figure 4. Positions where the granules are at maximum ablation and where the granules are completely ablated, for different granule initial sizes and a velocity of 100 m s<sup>-1</sup>. Distance is given in cm inside the separatrix (at r = 0 cm) and the position of the pedestal top (at r = -2 cm) is given.

However, a granule which is too large can lead to a degradation of confinement. A compromise has to be found between the efficiency of ELM pacing and the plasma fueling resulting from large granules.

#### 3.2. Impact of the granule injection velocity

For a specific granule, changing the injection velocity also changes the penetration depth and the deposition of particles, as can be seen on figure 5. For this specific discharge, granules launched with a velocity of 50 m s<sup>-1</sup> deposit more particles in the pedestal region and lead to a smaller increase of density (and temperature decrease) within the hot plasma region bounded by the pedestal top, compared to granules at 100 m s<sup>-1</sup> and 200 m s<sup>-1</sup>. Moreover, the particle deposition is spread and its maximum is a few centimeters inside for the fast granules compared to slower ones. It results in a

lower pressure perturbation for the fast granules compared to the pressure perturbation induced by slower ones, as can be seen on figure 6. This result shows the importance of the injection velocity and one should choose this velocity to maximize the deposition in the pedestal region. Note that in the current model the granule velocity is assumed constant and that effects that may decelerate the granule are not included (for example the impact the non-uniformity of the magnetic field on the granule ablation cloud). Such effects will be included and tested in future work.

Different angles of injection have also been tested in the simulations, all using a 1 mm granule. The results are that there seems to be no differences between upward and downward injections and that injecting with an angle  $\alpha$  with a velocity *V*inj is also very similar to injecting with no angle at a velocity of  $\cos(\alpha)$  *V*inj. However, the simulations did not consider the plasma rotation that may impact this result.





R position of the granule (in m)

**Figure 5.** Number of ablated atoms injected when the granule is penetrating into the plasma. 0.4 mm granules with different velocities are injected. The top of the pressure pedestal is at R = 1.46 m for this NSTX discharge.



Major radius (in m)

Figure 6. Pressure profiles for different injection velocities (at maximum ablation).

### 3.3. Impact of the ablation cloud toroidal size in 3D simulations

Finally, the impact of the size of the ablation cloud has been tested in 3D simulations. Three simulations have been done, injecting granules of the same size (i.e. same number of particles and ablation rate) but with a wider source, i.e. larger ablation cloud. The range of values is constrained by the memory limitations of the computational resources that prevent us from using even finer meshes. The lower radius currently achievable for the ablation cloud is 1 cm. The radial width of the source can be varied between 1 and 5 cm and has a small impact (few %) on the maximum induced pressure perturbation. However, the toroidal width of the source has been varied in 3D simulations and has a significant impact. These simulations start from the same NSTX equilibrium and the same number of particles

injected. They typically include 16-32 toroidal planes. The source is varied from a quasi-axisymmetric source to one with a toroidal extension of  $72^{\circ}$ . The toroidal extension of the source is characterized by the parameter dpsi, which is the half width of the Gaussian in the toroidal direction.

The localized density and pressure increase is found to be much larger as the toroidal width of the source decreases. This 3D localized pressure structure is responsible for the destabilization of MHD modes, potentially leading to an ELM. In comparison, simulations done without the LGI source show no significant increase of magnetic energies in this time frame.

With the LGI source, high-order pressure-driven modes are quickly destabilized right after the Li injection (see figure 8). Simulations include all toroidal harmonics up to n = 8 but only modes n = 0-4 are shown on figure 7 (n = 5-8 magnetic

10

10

10

10

200

Time (in microseconds)

Magnetic energy (a.u)



n = 3 dpsi=0.6
n = 4 dpsi=0.6

**Figure 7.** Magnetic energies of harmonics n = 0–8 for 3D simulations of LGI in a NSTX H-mode plasma. Only the toroidal width of the source is varied between the two simulations.



Figure 8. Pressure perturbation between the start of the LGI and after 100  $\mu$ s.

energies are orders of magnitude lower in these simulations). When the source width is decreased, the pressure localized peaking is higher and the magnetic energy increases faster and higher. Interestingly, the dominant magnetic mode that is destabilized is not the same for different toroidal source width. It is found to be n = 1 for the  $120^{\circ}$  case (dpsi = 1) and n = 4 for the 72° case (dpsi = 0.6). Numerical convergence studies have been done to validate this results. In particular, these simulations have been run with a higher number of toroidal planes and show the same results. With such extreme local parameters, one can expect new variants of peeling-ballooning modes. It is however too soon to conclude as current memory limitations on Princeton computers prevent us from modeling further this case and to reach the highly-localized sources that are presumably required to trigger ELMs. Current priority is thus to continue these simulations on the Cori or Edison supercomputers (NERSC) with higher poloidal and toroidal resolutions.

#### 4. Discussion and perspectives

These simulations show that the local pressure perturbation at the pedestal induced by LGI increases with granule size and decreases with velocity. To avoid an undesirable decrease of the temperature inside the separatrix, one can inject granules with a larger injection angle or by decreasing the injection velocity. Such granules are thus more favorable for ELM pacing. Moreover, an LGI system has been installed on NSTX-U and synthetic diagnostics (line integrated measurement of density from interferometry, heatflux footprint in vicinity of the strike-points) are currently being implemented in M3D-C<sup>1</sup>. This will allow a comparison of the predicted density increase at the edge to the measured values.

Granules with a high injection velocity are not found to be always beneficial. A fast granule might increase the pedestal pressure gradient very quickly, but to values below the ELM-triggering threshold, when slower granules might increase the pedestal gradient above this threshold for the same number of injected particles and thus be more efficient for ELM pacing. 3D simulations are on going to specify quantitatively this threshold and the impact of granule parameters on ELM properties (ELM mode number, heat flux on the divertor plates). These simulations aim at finding an effective compromise between fast ELM-pacing and high confinement. 3D simulations already show the impact of the toroidal localization of the density source on the amplitude of the magnetic energy, in particular for highorder modes. Current effort aims at further increasing the source toroidal localization via mesh packing techniques and adaptive meshing.

#### Acknowledgments

This manuscript is based upon work supported by the US Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Fusion Energy Sciences, and has been authored by Princeton University under Contract Number DE-AC02-09CH11466 with the US Department of Energy. The digital data for this

paper can be found in http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/ dsp018p58pg29j.

#### References

- [1] Jardin S.C. *et al* 2012 *Comput. Sci. Discovery* **5** 014002
- [2] Nazikian R. et al Paper Presented at 25th IAEA Int. Fusion Energy Conf. (St Petersburg, Russia, October 13–18 2014) (www-naweb.iaea.org/napc/physics/FEC/FEC2014/ fec2014-slides/205\_EX11.pdf)
- [3] Hawryluk R.J. et al 2015 Nucl. Fusion 55 053001
- [4] Mansfield D.K. et al 2013 Nucl. Fusion 53 113023
- [5] Solomon W.M. et al 2014 Phys. Rev. Lett. 113 135001
- [6] Maingi R. et al 2009 Phys. Rev. Lett. 103 075001
- [7] Bortolon A. et al 2016 Nucl. Fusion **56** 056008
- [8] Bortolon A. et al 2016 Preprint: 26th IAEA Fusion Energy Conf. (Kyoto, Japan, 21 October 2016) (https://conferences. iaea.org/indico/event/98/session/24/contribution/661/ material/slides/1.pdf)
- [9] Lunsford R. et al 2016 Fusion Eng. Des. 112 621-7
- [10] Parks P.B. et al 1994 Nucl. Fusion 34 417
- [11] Parks P.B. private communication