



LAWRENCE
LIVERMORE
NATIONAL
LABORATORY

Snowflake Divertor Studies in DIII-D and NSTX Aimed at the Power Exhaust Solution for the Tokamak.

V. A. Soukhanovskii

June 26, 2013

40th European Physical Society Conference on Plasma
Physics
Espoo, Finland
July 1, 2013 through July 5, 2013

Disclaimer

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

Snowflake Divertor Studies in DIII-D and NSTX Aimed at the Power Exhaust Solution for the Tokamak

V. A. Soukhanovskii¹, S. L. Allen¹, E. Kolemen², T. H. Osborne³, J. A. Boedo⁴, M. E. Fenstermacher¹, R. J. Groebner³, D. N. Hill¹, A. W. Hyatt³, C. J. Lasnier¹, A. W. Leonard³, M. A. Makowski¹, W. H. Meyer¹, A. McLean¹, T. W. Petrie³, D. D. Ryutov¹, J. G. Watkins⁵, R. E. Bell², A. Diallo², S. P. Gerhardt², R. Kaita², S. Kaye², B. P. LeBlanc², R. Maingi², J. E. Menard², M. Podesta², R. Raman⁶, A. L. Roquemore², F. Scotti²

¹Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, USA

²Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Princeton, NJ, USA

³General Atomics, San Diego, CA, USA

⁴University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA

⁵Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, CA, USA

⁶University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

Introduction A snowflake divertor (SF) configuration [1] is a promising concept for the tokamak divertor power exhaust problem, with increasing experimental support from TCV [2, 3], NSTX [4, 5, 6] and DIII-D tokamaks [7]. The SF magnetic configuration uses a second-order null-point created by bringing two first-order null-points of the standard divertor together [1, 8, 9, 10, 11]. Poloidal magnetic flux surfaces in the region of the exact second-order null have six hexagonal separatrix branches with an appearance of a snowflake. The exact second-order null configuration is topologically unstable [1], therefore, in experiments, two variants of the exact configuration called snowflake-plus and snowflake-minus [8, 9] are often realized in steady-state. The broadened low B_p region surrounding the null(s) (e.g., as shown in Figure 1) has a strong impact on divertor power balance, heat transport and heat deposition on plasma-facing components, via increased divertor plasma-wetted area, additional divertor legs (strike points), increased X-point-to-target connection length and divertor volume [1]. A high β_p region that forms in the SF divertor can also lead to the onset of fast convective heat transport and as a result, increased power sharing between separatrix branches (divertor legs) [10, 11, 12]. Additional insights into the SF divertor physics are being provided by high divertor power-density experiments conducted in NSTX and recently, at DIII-D. Both tokamaks have open divertors with graphite plasma-facing components and divertor heat fluxes of several MW/m². In both tokamaks, greatly reduced divertor heat fluxes between and during ELMs were measured in the SF configuration, compatible with high performance H-mode operation ($H_{98y2} > 1$). In this paper we discuss NSTX and DIII-D results in the context of further SF concept development for future devices, namely, with respect to compatibility with radiative divertor and detachment, and compatibility with cryo-pump density control.

Divertor geometry In both tokamaks, significant geometry benefits were realized in the SF-minus configuration. SF configurations was produced using three standard poloidal field shapes




Figure 1: Plasma equilibria and poloidal field modulus normalized to its outer midplane value $|B_p/B_{pm}|$ in DIII-D discharges with the standard divertor; SF-minus configurations.

	Minor radius a (m)	P_{NBI} (MW)	I_p (MA)	λ_q (mm)	f_{exp} Standard / SF	$L_{ }$ Standard / SF	D (m)
NSTX	0.58	4	0.9	5	10-20 / 30-80	10-12 / 15-60	0.125
DIII-D	0.60	5	1.2	2.5-3	10 / 30-40	50 / 50-150	0.1

Table 1: NSTX and DIII-D parameters in the SF divertor experiments described in this paper.

ing coils in the divertor region. The plasma control systems in both tokamaks are similar, and they were configured to run with pre-programmed divertor coil currents using an algorithm described in [5]. While in both NSTX and DIII-D, the exact SF and the SF-plus configurations were obtained for shorter periods of time, the use of the algorithm enabled only the SF-minus to be sustained for periods comparable with discharge duration (e.g., Figure 1). In both tokamak experiments, the ion ∇B direction was toward the lower divertor. Due to the poloidal field B_p structure in the SF [10, 11], the geometry benefits for the SOL heat flux channel realized in the SF-minus are similar to those of the exact SF configuration when the distance D between nulls satisfies $D \leq a (\lambda_q/a)^{1/3}$ (where a is the minor radius and λ_q is the SOL power width (projected to midplane)). The appropriate parameters from the NSTX and DIII-D experiments are summarized in Table 1. Between-null distance D obtained in the experiments

is within 50 % of the estimated, and indeed, a significant increase (cf. standard divertor) in the plasma-wetted area (poloidal flux expansion f_{exp}), connection lengths $L_{||}$, and divertor volume have been obtained in both NSTX [4, 5] and DIII-D [7]. Shown in Figure 2 are time traces and divertor profiles of two DIII-D H-mode discharges with the standard and the SF-minus divertor and the same density $n_e/n_G \simeq 0.45$ (where n_G is the Greenwald density). The divertor radiated power remained similar in both discharges, as was the confinement, whereas the peak heat flux was reduced by 50-60 % in the SF-minus discharge. Divertor profiles show that heat flux was significantly reduced in the zone affected by very low B_p , and apparently, the reduction was mostly due to the flux expansion. The extent of the zone and its effect on f_{exp} and $L_{||}$ radial profiles are dependent on the location of the secondary null. In NSTX, the second-null location projected to the mid plane radius was at 1-4 mm normalized flux surface (cf. $\lambda_q = 5 - 6$ mm), whereas in DIII-D it was between 1 and 4 mm flux surface (cf. $\lambda_q = 2.5 - 3$ mm [13]), thereby significantly affecting the steady-state SOL heat flow channel in both cases. In future devices, where the SOL width scaling $\lambda_q \sim a/I_p$ is expected [13], the required distance between nulls D may be small and will have to be controlled via the plasma control system. This capability is presently being developed for DIII-D and NSTX-U [14].

Detachment The SF geometry could lead to a facilitated access to the outer strike point (OSP) detachment. Increased volumetric power and ion momentum losses could reduce $q_{||}$, while a higher divertor f_{exp} could lead to a higher degree of "plasma plugging" for recycling neutrals and reduce divertor T_e , thereby further increasing volumetric losses. Results obtained




Figure 2: Comparison of DIII-D H-mode discharges with the standard divertor (black time traces) and SF-minus (red traces, top panel). Bottom panel, same color notation: divertor profiles measured in both discharges at 4.8 s.

in the SF-minus configurations differed in NSTX and DIII-D w.r.t. detachment onset.

In NSTX, the SF-minus formation was always accompanied by a stable partial detachment of the OSP. In the NSTX standard divertor configuration, partial detachment was inaccessible at $P_{SOL} = 3$ MW and $n_e/n_G = 0.6 - 0.8$ unless additional divertor gas puffing was used [15]. In the SF-minus, the between-ELM peak heat flux q_{peak} was reduced from 3-7 MW/m² to 0.5-1 MW/m². As the SF configuration was formed, the q_{peak} reduction factor quickly exceeded the factor by which plasma-wetted area was increased (f_{exp}). However, the available data did not allow a detailed divertor power balance analysis. Questions remained as to whether the detachment was an inherent consequence of the SF formation, and how $q_{||}$ was affected by the increased divertor P_{rad} and $L_{||}$. In spite of the formation of the highly-radiating detached SF region in NSTX, high core confinement was maintained for a full duration of the SF phase 500-600 ms (i.e. up to $10 \times \tau_E$). The peak heat flux reduction in the SF configuration (without gas seeding) was similar to that measured in the radiative divertor experiments conducted using D₂ or CD₄ seeding at $P_{SOL} \sim 3$ MW in the standard divertor configuration. Additional CD₄ or D₂ seeding during the SF phase using a divertor gas injector showed excellent divertor gas screening from the core, increased divertor radiation, and stable MARFE-free operation (unaffected confinement) [16, 17]. In the CD₄-seeded SF divertor, the divertor C III and C IV brightness profiles showed increased radiation, both in the intensity (i.e. due to the dependence of the carbon radiative cooling rate L_C on n_e, T_e), and in the spatial extent, due to the SF divertor high-flux expansion zone [16].

Density control and detachment with the SF divertor were further investigated in the initial SF experiments in DIII-D [7]. A lower divertor cryo-pump was used for particle removal, and gas puffing was used for steady-state density control in the range $(0.40 - 0.75) \times n_e/n_G$. Particle balance and neutrals analysis with the SF divertor are deferred to a future presentation, however, we note that density control was possible with the SF configuration. The cryo-pump entrance in both the standard and the SF discharges was located in the far-SOL, where neutral pressure and divertor T_e were similar.

Radiative divertor and a partial OSP detachment in DIII-D are accessed by increasing the upstream density via gas puffing [18]. The SF divertor, albeit with a significant heat flux reduction, remained attached in 5 MW NBI heated H-mode discharges at lower densities ($n_e/n_G \sim 0.4 - 0.55$). At higher densities ($n_e/n_G \sim 0.55 - 0.75$), a partial OSP detachment was observed in both discharges with the standard and the SF configurations. The partial detachment was




Figure 3: Comparison of DIII-D H-mode discharges with the standard (black traces) and SF-minus (red traces) configurations with D₂ puffing. Top panel: Time traces. Middle panel: divertor profiles measured in both discharges at 2.8 s (Label 1), 3.3 s (Label 2), and 4.8 s (Label 3). Bottom panel: divertor radiated power distribution at 4.8 s in the standard divertor discharge (left) and SF discharge (right).

accompanied by some confinement degradation (e.g., the H89L factor was reduced by 10-15 % cf. the lower density discharge shown in Figure 2). Time traces of two discharges with gas puffing are shown in Figure 3. The SF-minus configuration was formed at 3.0-3.2 s. Divertor heat flux profiles are compared at three times - before gas puffing (Label 1, both standard divertor), after SF formation and before gas puffing (Label 2, only the SF discharge), and during gas puffing (Label 3, standard vs SF-minus). As the SF-minus was formed, peak heat flux was reduced, mostly due to the increased plasma-wetted area (from f_{exp} comparison), and then further reduced due to partial detachment. Peak heat flux was lower in the partially detached SF (cf. partially detached standard divertor). Tomographic reconstructions of divertor radiation showed that radiation was broadly distributed throughout the SF null zone, with occasional peaking in the null-point regions in higher density discharges. More importantly, despite an increase in $L_{||}$ by 50-75 %, MARFE formation was not apparent in the SF configurations with gas seeding. In the partially-detached SF divertor at DIII-D peak divertor heat flux during ELMs was also significantly reduced (Figure 3).

Summary The emerging understanding of ELM and between-ELM divertor heat transport and radiation in the SF divertor from NSTX and DIII-D experiments provides support to the snowflake divertor configuration as a promising concept for divertor heat flux mitigation in future magnetic fusion devices. Near-future experiments are planned at DIII-D to study magnetic feedback control, pedestal evolution and parallel heat flux distribution in the SF configurations. The SF divertor is also being considered as a leading candidate for heat flux mitigation in the NSTX Upgrade tokamak presently under construction at Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory [14, 17].

Supported by the US Department of Energy under Contracts DE-AC52-07NA27344, DE-AC02-09CH11466, DE-FC02-04ER54698, DE-FG02-08ER54989. The data shown in figures is from the DIII-D tokamak.

References

- [1] RYUTOV, D., Phys. Plasmas **14** (2007) 064502.
- [2] PIRAS, F. et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **105** (2010) 155003.
- [3] CODA, S., Nucl. Fusion **51** (2011) 094017.
- [4] SOUKHANOVSII, V. et al., Nucl. Fusion **51** (2011) 012001.
- [5] SOUKHANOVSII, V. A. et al., Phys. Plasmas **19** (2012) 082504.
- [6] SOUKHANOVSII, V. A. et al., J. Nucl. Mater. **438S** (2013).
- [7] ALLEN, S. L. et al., Initial snowflake divertor physics studies on DIII-D, in *Proc. 24th IAEA FEC - IAEA CN-197, San Diego, 8-13 October 2012*, Paper PD/1-2, Slides available at <https://fec2012.iaea.org/>.
- [8] RYUTOV, D. et al., Phys. Plasmas **15** (2008) 092501.
- [9] RYUTOV, D. et al., Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion **52** (2010) 105001.
- [10] RYUTOV, D. D., Contrib. Plasma Phys. **52** (2012) 539.
- [11] RYUTOV, D. D. et al., Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion **54** (2012) 124050.
- [12] RYUTOV, D. et al., in *Proc. 24th IAEA FEC, San Diego, 2012*, Paper TH/P4-18.
- [13] MAKOWSKI, M. A. et al., Phys. Plasmas **19** (2012) 056122.
- [14] MENARD, J. et al., Nucl. Fusion **52** (2012) 083015.
- [15] SOUKHANOVSII, V. et al., Phys. Plasmas **16** (2009) 022501.
- [16] SOUKHANOVSII, V. A. et al., in *Proc. 39th EPS Conf. on Plasma Phys.*, page P5.049, Stockholm, Sweden, 2012.
- [17] SOUKHANOVSII, V. A. et al., in *Proc. 24th IAEA FEC, San Diego, 2012*, Paper EX/P5-21.
- [18] PETRIE, T. et al., Nuc. Fusion **37** (1997) 643.