

NBI heating scenarios with flexible heating mix

O. P. Ford, M. Beurskens, S. Bozhenkov, S. Lazerson

J. Alcusón, A. Alonso, S. Bannmann, C. Beidler, H. Braune, K.J. Brunner, G. Fuchert, D. Hartmann, J. Knauer, T. Kremeyer, A. Langenberg, H.P. Laqua, S. Marsen, P. McNeely, N. Pablant, E. Pasch, V. Perseo, N. Rust, E.R. Scott, H. Smith, T. Stange, Y. Turkin, L. Vanó, P. Xanthopoulos, D. Zhang

E3 Retreat 2021, adapted from Talk at 47th EPS Plasma Physics conference, 2020/1, Sitges, Spain











Gas-fuelled ECRH discharges



- Flat or slightly peaked density profiles despite outward neoclassical thermo-diffusion: An anomalous pinch required to counteract ^[C D Beidler et al 2018 PPCF 60 105008]



Gas-fuelled ECRH discharges



- Flat or slightly peaked density profiles despite outward neoclassical thermo-diffusion: An anomalous pinch required to counteract ^[C D Beidler et al 2018 PPCF 60 105008]

- Flat impurity profiles despite neoclassical pinch: High turbulent impurity diffusion shown by LBO injection experiments ^[B. Geiger et al 2019 Nucl. Fus. 59 046009]



- Several cases show density gradient turbulence supression:





- Several cases show density gradient turbulence supression:
- Post-pellets [Bozhenkov, ...]
- TESPEL Pellet / LBO impurity injection ^[D.Zhang, A von Stechow EPS2019]





- Several cases show density gradient turbulence supression:
- Post-pellets [Bozhenkov, ...]
- TESPEL Pellet / LBO impurity injection ^[D.Zhang, A von Stechow EPS2019]
- Boron power dropper reducing edge gradients [R. Lunsford, EPS2021]





- Several cases show density gradient turbulence supression:
- Post-pellets [Bozhenkov, ...]
- TESPEL Pellet / LBO impurity injection ^[D.Zhang, A von Stechow EPS2019]
- Boron power dropper reducing edge gradients [R. Lunsford, EPS2021]
- Low power long-duration discharges.



3.0



 $T_e = T_i$

Pellets

Normal ECRH

2.00

- 1.75

- Several cases show density gradient turbulence supression:
- Post-pellets [Bozhenkov, ...]
- TESPEL Pellet / LBO impurity injection ^[D.Zhang, A von Stechow EPS2019]
- Boron power dropper reducing edge gradients [R. Lunsford, EPS2021]
- Low power long-duration discharges.



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk

3.0



 τ_{ei}/τ_E

 $T_e = T_i$

Pellets

Normal ECRH

2.00

- 1.75

- Several cases show density gradient turbulence supression:
- Post-pellets [Bozhenkov, ...]
- TESPEL Pellet / LBO impurity injection ^[D.Zhang, A von Stechow EPS2019]
- Boron power dropper reducing edge gradients [R. Lunsford, EPS2021]
- Low power long-duration discharges.
- NBI core fuelling.



Neutral Beam Injection: Confinement





O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk

Neutral Beam Injection: Confinement







- NBI mostly supplementary to moderate-high ECRH power.











 $T_e = T_i$

Normal ECRH

 τ_{ei}/τ_E

2.00

- NBI mostly supplementary to moderate-high ECRH power.
- Highest τ_E plasmas at zero or low ECRH power.
- Scaling changes around $P_{\rm ECRH} \sim 1 {\rm MW}$



3.0



 $T_e = T_i$

Pellets

Normal ECRH

 τ_{ei}/τ_E

2.00

- 1.75

- NBI mostly supplementary to moderate-high ECRH power.
- Highest τ_E plasmas at zero or low ECRH power.
- Scaling changes around $P_{ECRH} \sim 1 \text{MW}$
- Highest stationary T_i above clamping with NBI + 1MW ECRH.



3.0



1: ECRH startup, switch to NBI only. Initial NBI phase shows moderate density peaking. 2: Density rise in ρ < 0.5 accelerates.



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk



1: ECRH startup, switch to NBI only. Initial NBI phase shows moderate density peaking. 2: Density rise in ρ < 0.5 accelerates.



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk



- 1: ECRH startup, switch to NBI only. Initial NBI phase shows moderate density peaking.
- 2: Density rise in *ρ* < 0.5 accelerates. Strong impurity pinch consistent with turbulence supression to order neoclassical level ^[L. Vanó et. al. EPS2019]





- 1: ECRH startup, switch to NBI only. Initial NBI phase shows moderate density peaking.
- 2: Density rise in *ρ* < 0.5 accelerates. Strong impurity pinch consistent with turbulence supression to order neoclassical level ^[L. Vanó et. al. EPS2019]



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk



- 1: ECRH startup, switch to NBI only. Initial NBI phase shows moderate density peaking.
- 2: Density rise in *ρ* < 0.5 accelerates. Strong impurity pinch consistent with turbulence supression to order neoclassical level ^[L. Vanó et. al. EPS2019]



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk

- 1: ECRH startup, switch to NBI only. Initial NBI phase shows moderate density peaking.
- 2: Density rise in *ρ* < 0.5 accelerates. Strong impurity pinch consistent with turbulence supression to order neoclassical level ^[L. Vanó et. al. EPS2019]
- 3: Add 1MW O2-mode ECRH raises temperature, slightly reduces density peaking and flattens impurity profile in deposition region.



- Particle flux reduces to neoclassical level inside mid-radius at onset of peaking.
 - --> indicates strong suppression of turbulent flux in plasma core.
- Anomalous particle flux increases again as density gradient builds.
- Both neoclassical and anomalous increase with addition of ECRH, which stops density rise.





- NBI heat and particle source from

- Particle flux reduces to neoclassical level inside mid-radius at onset of peaking.
 - --> indicates strong suppression of turbulent flux in plasma core.
- Anomalous particle flux increases again as density gradient builds.
- Both neoclassical and anomalous increase with addition of ECRH, which stops density rise.







- NBI heat and particle source from

- Particle flux reduces to neoclassical level inside mid-radius at onset of peaking. --> indicates strong suppression of turbulent flux in plasma core. - NBI heat and particle source from - Anomalous particle flux increases again as density gradient builds. Beams3D code [S. Lazerson, this conference] - Both neoclassical and anomalous increase with addition of 10P_{ECRH} ECRH, which stops density rise. P_{NBI} $[10^{17}m^{-3}]$ 8 $n_{\rm C}$ [10¹⁷ m^{-3}] 20181009.034 t=2.23 20181009.034 t=3.76 $< n_e > [10^{19}m^{-3}]$ S_e (beams3D) S_{e} (beams3D) $\Gamma_{exp} = S_e - dn_e/dt$ $\Gamma_{exp} = S_e - dn_e/dt$ P [MW], n_C Γ_α NC Γ_α NC 5 anom Fanom dn_e/dt dn_/dt 2 **ECRH Total flux** 3.5 Г S_ .,i [10²⁰s $\Gamma_{exp} = S_e - dn_e/dt$ 3.0 Γ_ρ NC 2.5 П **Total flux**







- The onset time of the reduced particle and impurity anomalous fluxes varies between shots.
- No external events, no changes observed at plasma edge.
- Onset appears to occurs when a/Ln_e reaches ~0.85 (tentative)



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk



- Separation of ion and electron energy fluxes requires determination of power exchange term.
- At high collisionality ($n_e \sim 10^{20}$), this requires O(10eV) accruacy of ($T_e T_i$) profile, which has not yet been achieved.
- Best analysis so far for highest T_i gives range from: **A)** large Q_e with $Q_i \sim Q_i^{NC}$ to **B)** $Q_i \sim Q_e \gg Q^{NC}$.
- $Q_e >> Q_i \sim Q_{NC}$ would be consistent with with post-pellets experiments.
- However, neoclassical electron energy fluxes not supported by measurements.
 - --> Next campaign: Improvements in T_i profiles + heat wave measurements.





- Separation of ion and electron energy fluxes requires determination of power exchange term.
- At high collisionality ($n_e \sim 10^{20}$), this requires O(10eV) accruacy of ($T_e T_i$) profile, which has not yet been achieved.
- Best analysis so far for highest T_i gives range from: **A)** large Q_e with $Q_i \sim Q_i^{NC}$ to **B)** $Q_i \sim Q_e \gg Q^{NC}$.
- $Q_e >> Q_i \sim Q_{NC}$ would be consistent with with post-pellets experiments.
- However, neoclassical electron energy fluxes *not* supported by measurements.
 - --> Next campaign: Improvements in T_i profiles + heat wave measurements.



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk



- Separation of ion and electron energy fluxes requires determination of power exchange term.
- At high collisionality ($n_e \sim 10^{20}$), this requires O(10eV) accruacy of ($T_e T_i$) profile, which has not yet been achieved.
- Best analysis so far for highest T_i gives range from: **A)** large Q_e with $Q_i \sim Q_i^{NC}$ to **B)** $Q_i \sim Q_e \gg Q^{NC}$.
- $Q_e >> Q_i \sim Q_{NC}$ would be consistent with with post-pellets experiments.
- However, neoclassical electron energy fluxes *not* supported by measurements.
 - --> Next campaign: Improvements in T_i profiles + heat wave measurements.



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk



- Separation of ion and electron energy fluxes requires determination of power exchange term.
- At high collisionality ($n_e \sim 10^{20}$), this requires O(10eV) accruacy of ($T_e T_i$) profile, which has not yet been achieved.
- Best analysis so far for highest T_i gives range from: **A)** large Q_e with $Q_i \sim Q_i^{NC}$ to **B)** $Q_i \sim Q_e \gg Q^{NC}$.
- $Q_e >> Q_i \sim Q_{NC}$ would be consistent with with post-pellets experiments.
- However, neoclassical electron energy fluxes *not* supported by measurements.
 - --> Next campaign: Improvements in T_i profiles + heat wave measurements.



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk



- Separation of ion and electron energy fluxes requires determination of power exchange term.
- At high collisionality ($n_e \sim 10^{20}$), this requires O(10eV) accruacy of ($T_e T_i$) profile, which has not yet been achieved.
- Best analysis so far for highest T_i gives range from: **A)** large Q_e with $Q_i \sim Q_i^{NC}$ to **B)** $Q_i \sim Q_e \gg Q^{NC}$.
- $Q_e >> Q_i \sim Q_{NC}$ would be consistent with with post-pellets experiments.
- However, neoclassical electron energy fluxes *not* supported by measurements.
 - --> Next campaign: Improvements in T_i profiles + heat wave measurements.



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk



- Separation of ion and electron energy fluxes requires determination of power exchange term.
- At high collisionality ($n_e \sim 10^{20}$), this requires O(10eV) accruacy of ($T_e T_i$) profile, which has not yet been achieved.
- Best analysis so far for highest T_i gives range from: **A)** large Q_e with $Q_i \sim Q_i^{NC}$ to **B)** $Q_i \sim Q_e \gg Q^{NC}$.
- $Q_e >> Q_i \sim Q_{NC}$ would be consistent with with post-pellets experiments.
- However, neoclassical electron energy fluxes *not* supported by measurements.
 - --> Next campaign: Improvements in T_i profiles + heat wave measurements.



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk



- High collisionality leads to large P_{ei} with small $O(\sim 10 \text{ eV})$ differences in T_e , T_i profiles.

- Data shows $Q_e >> Q_e^{NC}$ but could support $Q_i \sim Q_i^{NC}$. However, $Q_e \sim Q_i >> Q^{NC}$ also possible within uncertainty.



- High collisionality leads to large P_{ei} with small $O(\sim 10 \text{ eV})$ differences in T_e , T_i profiles.
- Data shows $Q_e >> Q_e^{NC}$ but could support $Q_i \sim Q_i^{NC}$. However, $Q_e \sim Q_i >> Q^{NC}$ also possible within uncertainty.
- Total energy fluxes are anomalous dominated at all times but (neo)classical fluxes + radiation loss not insignificant.





- High collisionality leads to large P_{ei} with small $O(\sim 10 \text{ eV})$ differences in T_e , T_i profiles.
- Data shows $Q_e >> Q_e^{NC}$ but could support $Q_i \sim Q_i^{NC}$. However, $Q_e \sim Q_i >> Q^{NC}$ also possible within uncertainty.
- Total energy fluxes are anomalous dominated at all times but (neo)classical fluxes + radiation loss not insignificant.





- High collisionality leads to large P_{ei} with small $O(\sim 10 \text{ eV})$ differences in T_e , T_i profiles.
- Data shows $Q_e >> Q_e^{NC}$ but could support $Q_i \sim Q_i^{NC}$. However, $Q_e \sim Q_i >> Q^{NC}$ also possible within uncertainty.
- Total energy fluxes are anomalous dominated at all times but (neo)classical fluxes + radiation loss not insignificant.
 Anomalous fluxes increase with ECRH addition.



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk



- Density gradient builds during pure NBI phase. $T_{e,i}$ gradients limited by 2.6MW input power.



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk



- Density gradient builds during pure NBI phase. $T_{e,i}$ gradients limited by 2.6MW input power.
- Radiation limited due to impurity accumulation after ~4s.



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk



- Density gradient builds during pure NBI phase. $T_{e,i}$ gradients limited by 2.6MW input power.
- Radiation limited due to impurity accumulation after ~4s.



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk



- Density gradient builds during pure NBI phase. $T_{e,i}$ gradients limited by 2.6MW input power.
- Radiation limited due to impurity accumulation after ~4s.



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk



- Density gradient builds during pure NBI phase. $T_{e,i}$ gradients limited by 2.6MW input power.
- Radiation limited due to impurity accumulation after ~4s.





- Density gradient builds during pure NBI phase. $T_{e,i}$ gradients limited by 2.6MW input power.
- Radiation limited due to impurity accumulation after ~4s.





- Density gradient builds during pure NBI phase. $T_{e,i}$ gradients limited by 2.6MW input power.
- Radiation limited due to impurity accumulation after ~4s.





- Turbulence supression supported by reduced fluctuations in high *a/Ln_e* plasmas.

Doppler Reflectometer ^[D. Carralero et. al. this conference] Phase contrast imaging ^[Z. Huang et. al. this conference]





- Turbulence supression supported by reduced fluctuations in high *a/Ln_e* plasmas.

Doppler Reflectometer ^[D. Carralero et. al. this conference] Phase contrast imaging ^[Z. Huang et. al. this conference]

- Need to find balance of NBI and ECRH:
 - Too little ECRH:
 - Low total power
 - Impurity accumulation
 - Too much ECRH:
 - Density peaking reduced
 - Return to ITG dominated plasmas with clamped T_i .





- Turbulence supression supported by reduced fluctuations in high *a/Ln_e* plasmas.

Doppler Reflectometer ^[D. Carralero et. al. this conference] Phase contrast imaging ^[Z. Huang et. al. this conference]

- Need to find balance of NBI and ECRH:
 - Too little ECRH:
 - Low total power
 - Impurity accumulation
 - Too much ECRH:
 - Density peaking reduced
 - Return to ITG dominated plasmas with clamped T_i .
- Open questions for 2022/3 campaign:
 - Increase NBI power. What happens to a/Ln_e?
 - Why does *a/Ln_e* decrease with ECRH?
 - Can sufficient *a/Ln_e* be maintained while flushing out impurities?





- No clear correlation of density rise with fuelling rate. Changes dramatically during shots (transport barrier).
- Not yet able to predict asymptotic density or scaling with 4 sources.
- Maybe possible with deeper particle transport analysis.





- No clear correlation of density rise with fuelling rate. Changes dramatically during shots (transport barrier).
- Not yet able to predict asymptotic density or scaling with 4 sources.
- Maybe possible with deeper particle transport analysis.





- No clear correlation of density rise with fuelling rate. Changes dramatically during shots (transport barrier).
- Not yet able to predict asymptotic density or scaling with 4 sources.
- Maybe possible with deeper particle transport analysis.





- No clear correlation of density rise with fuelling rate. Changes dramatically during shots (transport barrier).
- Not yet able to predict asymptotic density or scaling with 4 sources.
- Maybe possible with deeper particle transport analysis.



Initial comparison with LHD

3.0



 $T_e = T_i$

Pellets

Normal ECRH

low P, post B

 τ_{ei}/τ_E

2.00

- 1.75

- Experiments conducted on LHD for NBI vs ECRH power [Lazerson]
- Initial global assessment looks similar but reasons might be different. Different NBI (energy, penetration), density profiles, *T_e/T_i* etc... detailed power balance analysis needed.
 Intention/resources to analyse further?



O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk

Initial comparison with LHD



 $T_e = T_i$

Pellets

Normal ECRH

low P, post B

 τ_{ei}/τ_E

2.00

- 1.75

- Experiments conducted on LHD for NBI vs ECRH power [Lazerson]
- Initial global assessment looks similar but reasons might be different. Different NBI (energy, penetration), density profiles, *T_e/T_i* etc... detailed power balance analysis needed.
 Intention/resources to analyse further?



3.0

O. P. Ford et al. E3 Retreat, July 2021. Adapted from EPS 2021 talk



- Explored and possible NBI/ECRH mixes for OP2.1



- Explored and possible NBI/ECRH mixes for OP2.1



- Explored and possible NBI/ECRH mixes for OP2.1



- Explored and possible NBI/ECRH mixes for OP2.1



- Explored and possible NBI/ECRH mixes for OP2.1



- Explored and possible NBI/ECRH mixes for OP2.1



- Explored and possible NBI/ECRH mixes for OP2.1



10



 $#20181011.012 \rho = 0.45$

- Explored and possible NBI/ECRH mixes for OP2.1
- Begin to examine transport scalings





 $#20181011.012 \rho = 0.45$

- Explored and possible NBI/ECRH mixes for OP2.1





Summary and outlook



- Limited T_i and performance in standard ECRH heated gas fuelled plasmas understood as combination of: limited electron-ion coupling, strong ITG turbulence exacerbated by T_e / T_i ratio.
- Turbulence supression observed in many cases of density gradients:
 - Pellets now well studied and understood, but might be difficult to achieve in steady-state.
 - Spontaneous peaking. Very stable but only in low power ECRH.
 - Edge n_e reduction by boron powder injection.
 - NBI core fuelling and reduced particle flux.

Summary and outlook



- Limited T_i and performance in standard ECRH heated gas fuelled plasmas understood as combination of: limited electron-ion coupling, strong ITG turbulence exacerbated by T_e / T_i ratio.
- Turbulence supression observed in many cases of density gradients:
 - Pellets now well studied and understood, but might be difficult to achieve in steady-state.
 - Spontaneous peaking. Very stable but only in low power ECRH.
 - Edge n_e reduction by boron powder injection.
 - NBI core fuelling and reduced particle flux.
- NBI with low-ECRH plasmas show stable density gradients and favorable gyroBohm like scaling $Q \sim nT^{5/2}$ providing possible steady state scenario with high T_i in W7-X plasmas.
- Strong ECRH reduces gradient and returns to normal performance.

Summary and outlook



- Limited T_i and performance in standard ECRH heated gas fuelled plasmas understood as combination of: limited electron-ion coupling, strong ITG turbulence exacerbated by T_e / T_i ratio.

- Turbulence supression observed in many cases of density gradients:

- Pellets now well studied and understood, but might be difficult to achieve in steady-state.
- Spontaneous peaking. Very stable but only in low power ECRH.
- Edge n_e reduction by boron powder injection.
- NBI core fuelling and reduced particle flux.
- NBI with low-ECRH plasmas show stable density gradients and favorable gyroBohm like scaling $Q \sim nT^{5/2}$ providing possible steady state scenario with high T_i in W7-X plasmas.
- Strong ECRH reduces gradient and returns to normal performance.

```
Strong n_e gradients = turbulence supression = higher T_i.
```

```
Why? ITG, ETG, TEM, iTEM .... --> E5
```

```
How can we best use it?
```

- Why do we get n_e gradients? Why are n_e profiles not hollow? Why does ne peak in NBI/pellets?
- Why does ECRH flatten n_e ? What role does edge fuelling/pumping play?
- Why do low P and boron droper plasmas have low edge n_e ? How can this be used?
- Are all these low/high edge n_e scenarios compatible with detachment?

CXRS OP2 status and upgrades



- Primary measurements: (mostly as OP1.2b)
 - T_i , E_r , $n_C \sim 50$ channels on NI21
 - NBI blips in almost all discharges: 20ms blips at 5Hz for 15s
 - E_r analysis development by PhD student from CIEMAT.
 - 2 variable spectrometers of 40 points on 2 impurities selected from B, C, N, O, Ar, Fe, ...

(Select C for highest resolution --> 160 T_i , n_C , E_r points)

(Gratings not upgraded due to lack of funds - $10k\in$)

- FIDA measurements [Poloskei]

Upgrades:

- 1) **18x high-speed** *T_i* **for** *Q_i* **via heat-pulse-propagation** [Univ. WISC: Geiger].
- 2) 30x extra carbon (T_i , n_c , E_r) measurements [NIFS: Ida, Yoshnuma]
- 3) Upgrade to passive spectrometer for C^{VI}
 - --> Reliable T_i , n_C , E_r measurements in continuous NBI
 - --> Inverted edge T_i , n_C measurements without NBI
- 4) Spectral MSE for *i* profile measurements [E3: Zanini], (15k€ funds for camera uncertain).
- 5) Passive Hα spectrometer for neutral hydrogen profiles [E5: Reimold],

(Currently no camera)

- 6) Coherence imaging of T_i , n_C [Univ. Seville: Viezzer; E4 Perseo]
- 7) Passive FIDA spectrometer... to be considered, no camera (15k€)

		Blips	Continuous NI21
-	Τ _i	< 2 minutes	Poor quality in 2 minutes. Validated on request only.
	n _c	n _e available + 1 minute	
	n _z	n _e available + 1 minute	
	Er	On request	Difficult, special request only

