DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express 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 any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

STABILITY OF ELONGATED CROSS-SECTION TOKAMAKS TO AXISYMMETRIC EVEN POLOIDAL MODE NUMBER DEFORMATIONS

R. Weiner

Max-Planck-Institut für Plasmaphysik
Garching, Germany

and

S. C. Jardin and N. Pomphrey
Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory
P.O. Box 451, Princeton, New Jersey 08543

PPPL--2626

DE89 013401

Abstract

A recent paper by Nakayama, Sato and Matsuoka¹ suggests that elliptical cross section tokamaks with aspect ratio $R/a = 3.2$ and with elongation $\kappa = 2.6$ are unstable to a splitting ($m = 2, n = 0$) instability for plasma $\beta > 5\%$, and that $\kappa \geq 4.0$ plasmas are unstable to splitting for $\beta \geq 1\%$. We have tried to reproduce these results using the MHD evolution code TSC,² but find these configurations to be stable, not even near a stability boundary. Even a $\kappa = 3.7$ plasma with $\beta = 23.0\%$ is stable to the splitting mode. However, the addition of pinching coils at the waist will cause the plasma to split if the current in these coils exceeds a critical value I_c which decreases with increasing β .

MASTER

I. INTRODUCTION

A recent paper¹ presents numerical simulation results which seem to indicate that when the plasma beta in an elliptical cross-section tokamak exceeds a critical value, it becomes unstable to an ideal pressure-driven instability, which causes the ellipse to split into two separate pieces. This result, if true, would appear to contradict previous analytical results³⁻⁵ which say that elliptical cross-section plasmas of all elongations are stable to all even mode number axisymmetric deformations. It would also seemingly contradict results we have obtained over the last several years while performing numerous simulations of the axisymmetric evolution and stability of noncircular cross-section tokamak plasmas using the MHD simulation code TSC.² This code has been extensively verified both by performing convergence studies and comparing test problems against analytic solutions, and by detailed comparison of the simulation results with data from several large experiments including PBX, PBX-M, TFTR, and D-III-D.

II. SPONTANEOUS SPLITTING

To investigate splitting modes in tokamaks, we have utilized the configuration of the proposed TCV tokamak. The vacuum vessel and the external coils of the TCV tokamak⁶ are modelled by single grid conductors as illustrated in the figures and listed in Table I. Additional divertor coils and pinching coils on both sides of the plasma have been introduced to allow the investigation of divertor plasmas and to squeeze the plasma waist in order to produce doublets and induce splitting. The locations and currents in these coils are also listed in Table I.

In order to determine if the plasma spontaneously splits, as suggested by Ref. 1, we produced configuration 1 listed in Table I and shown in Fig. 1, which is a high beta, high elongation reference equilibrium for TCV.⁷ This plasma has $I_p \approx 1.2 MA$, $\beta = 23.6\%$, and an elongation $\kappa = 3.7$. For the initial equilibrium we take the pressure and toroidal field profiles to be of the form $p(\psi) = p_0 \psi^{\alpha_p}$ and $g^2(\psi) = g_0^2 - g_1 \psi^{\alpha_g}$, where ψ is the normalized poloidal flux and $\alpha_p = 1.2$, $\alpha_g = 0.3$. This yields a poloidal beta of $\beta_p \approx 1$ and an internal inductance of $l_i/2 = 0.16$. The TSC code evolves the equilibrium into a resistive steady state.² During the evolution the plasma density was kept at 10 times the Murakami density limit so as to shorten the skin time, allowing steady state to be obtained in a reasonable time. We maintained the β of this configuration at

$\beta = 23.6$ by adding an energy source to force the pressure to keep its analytic profile, and evolved the MHD-Maxwell and transport equations for over two seconds in real time (several skin times), with no signs of splitting. The only feedback systems present in this calculation were a "perfect" OH system, which supplies a toroidal electric field to the boundary as needed to keep the plasma current constant, and a simple radial feedback system which adjusted the current in coils 7 and 8 to keep the outermost flux surface centered.

We conclude that a tokamak plasma of this elongation will not spontaneously split, even at large beta values well above the ballooning mode stability limit.

III. FORCED SPLITTING USING PINCHING COILS

In order to study forced splitting of an elongated diverted tokamak, we have introduced a set of "pinching" coils at the waist of the TCV configuration, and have made a study of the critical current in these coils needed to deform the plasma into either a stable doublet configuration with two magnetic axes, or to split it into two droplets. The configuration we use in the remainder of the studies is similar to that shown in Fig. 2. This has $I_p = 1.2$ MA, $\beta = 11\%$, $\kappa = 3.0$. For this case we used $\alpha_p = 1.2$ and $\alpha_z = 1.24$, which results in a poloidal beta of $\beta_p \cong 0.5$ and an internal inductance of $l_i/2 = 0.2$. The placement of the splitting and divertor coils is also illustrated in Fig. 2. [It is listed as configuration 2 in Table 1.]

To demonstrate splitting in configuration 2, we ramped the current in the pushing coils 10 and 11 from 0 to -200 kA in 20 ms. The other coil currents were held constant except for coils 7 and 8, which are part of the radial control feedback system, and had their currents adjusted in time to keep the outermost flux surface centered. The "perfect" OH system supplied a boundary toroidal electric field to keep the plasma current constant at $I_p = 1.2$ MA. The time history of these currents is shown in Fig. 3.

The time history of the Z -position of the magnetic axis is shown in Fig. 4. At $t = 19$ ms, just about the time the pushing coils reach full power, the plasma transforms into a doublet configuration. This doublet configuration persists, with the separation between the two axes increasing slowly in time, until $t = 70$ ms, at which time the separation increases more rapidly until the doublet splits into two droplets at $t = 72.7$ ms. Three snapshots of the flux surfaces during this

evolution are shown in Fig. 5, and in Fig. 6 we show a summary plot illustrating a superposition of the 99% flux surface locations during the evolution.

Next, we repeated the identical case as just described (configuration 2), but ramped the pushing coil currents only to -175 kA instead of -200 kA and held them at this value. The Z -position of the magnetic axis is shown in Fig. 7. It is seen that a stable doublet configuration is formed, with each magnetic axis located at $Z_{\text{mag}} = \pm 0.145$ m. This configuration remained stationary until the calculation ended at $t = 0.8$ sec, longer than all relevant time scales. The magnetic surfaces of the stable doublet configuration at $t = 0.8$ sec are shown in Fig. 8. The TSC simulation that produced this result used a computational grid with cell size $\Delta X = \Delta Z = 0.0125$ m. The convergence of Z_{mag} as the grid size is varied is shown as the indented plot in Fig. 7. Extrapolation to zero grid size yields $Z_{\text{mag}} = \pm 0.130$ m.

To get the plasma to split into droplets for the -175 kA configuration, we repeated this run, but began increasing the plasma β by increasing the pressure starting at $t = 0.3$ sec. As shown in Fig. 9, the increased β causes the plasma to split at $t = 0.43$, $\beta = 13\%$. Another extreme case, shown after evolving for 1.5 sec in Fig. 10, has $\beta = 25.7\%$ and a pushing coil current of -100 kA. This is again stable, being stationary on all time scales. We have also repeated a simulation with a more peaked pressure profile ($\alpha_p = 2$; $I_{\text{pinch}} = 75$ kA) and have obtained essentially identical results. Thus, we conclude that the effect of a specific profile shape plays a minor role for stability.

IV. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In Fig. 11, we show a summary of the runs described in the text, and some additional cases not described. For each β value considered, up to 36%, there is a critical value of current in the pushing coils that causes the plasma to split. We have *never* seen a tokamak split for any elongation or any beta, unless pinching coils with nonzero current are placed at the waist to force the splitting. The current in these coils necessary to induce splitting does decrease with increasing beta. When no pinching coil currents were applied, we were able to get a stable single magnetic axis equilibrium even with $\kappa = 7$ and $\beta_t = 70\%$.

Below the critical values for splitting, we found a broad range of stable single magnetic axis configurations, and doublets with two magnetic axes, even at high pressure. Figure 11 also indicates the critical limits where the plasma bifurcates

from a singlet to a doublet configuration. Our explanation for bifurcation is that the surrounding coils must be strong enough to produce a saddle point at the original single magnetic axis position. This leads to a reconnection of the innermost flux surfaces and causes the magnetic axis to move off the midplane. After bifurcation the plasma either attains a stable configuration or it splits, depending on the pressure and the pinching coil currents. We conclude that the splitting instabilities are of no concern for presently envisaged advanced tokamaks.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank F. B. Marcus for providing us with a TCV data set for the TSC code and for stimulating discussions. This work is supported by U.S. Department of Energy Contract No. DE-AC02-76CHO3073.

References

- ¹Y. Nakayama, T. Sato, K. Matsuoka, Phys. Fluids **31**, 630 (1988).
- ²S.C. Jardin, N. Pomphrey, J. DeLucia, J. Comput. Phys. **66**, 481 (1986).
- ³G. Laval, R. Pellat, J.S. Soule Phys. Fluids **17**, 835 (1974).
- ⁴R.L. Dewar, R.C. Grimm, J.L. Johnson, E.A. Frieman, J.M. Greene, P.H. Rutherford, Phys. Fluids **17**, 930 (1974).
- ⁵P.H. Rutherford, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory Report PPPL-976 (1973).
- ⁶F.B. Marcus, S.C. Jardin, F. Hofmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 2289 (1985).
- ⁷F.B. Marcus, private communication.
- ⁸S.C. Jardin, *et al.*, Nucl. Fusion **27**, 569 (1987).

Table

TABLE I. Coil Locations and Currents used in Simulations.

Coil	Position		Configuration	
	$R(m)$	$Z(m)$	$I_1^0(kA)$	$I_2^0(kA)$
1	0.475	± 0.100	-322	-277
2	0.475	± 0.300	-216	-215
3	0.475	± 0.500	-313	-280
4	0.475	± 0.700	-215	-183
5	1.300	± 0.750	-29	-40
6	1.300	± 0.600	-153	-164
7	1.300	± 0.300	-66	-66
8	1.300	± 0.150	-212	-167
9*	0.850	± 0.875	0	100
10*	0.600	0.000	0	0 ~ -200
11*	1.150	0.000	0	0 ~ -200

*These coils are not present in the actual TCV experiment.

Figures

FIG. 1. Flux surfaces of $\beta = 23.6\%$, $\kappa = 3.7$ equilibrium which is stable to splitting.

FIG. 2. Flux surfaces of $\beta = 11\%$, $\kappa = 3.0$ diverted equilibrium showing diverter and pinching coils.

FIG. 3. Time history of coil currents used to force splitting.

FIG. 4. Time history of magnetic axis Z -coordinate. Doublet forms at $t = 19$ ms and plasma splits at $t = 70$ ms.

FIG. 5. Magnetic surfaces at the three times marked in Fig. 4 showing tokamak splitting.

FIG. 6. Summary of 99% flux surface location for (a) $0 < t < 0.070$ sec and (b) $0.070 < t < 0.072$ sec.

FIG. 7. Magnetic axis Z -position vs time for stable doublet with $I_{\text{pinch}} = -175$ kA. Also, convergence of Z_{mag} with respect to computational grid size.

FIG. 8. Magnetic flux surfaces for stable doublet at $t = 0.8$ sec in Fig. 7.

FIG. 9. Time history of plasma β and magnetic axis Z -position. Plasma split at $t = 0.43$, $\beta = 13\%$.

FIG. 10. Flux surfaces of stable $\beta = 25.7\%$ case with pushing coil current of -100 kA.

FIG. 11. Critical current in pushing coils as a function of plasma beta.

#89T0023

FIG. 1

FIG. 2

FIG. 3

FIG. 4

FIG. 5

FIG. 6

FIG. 7

FIG. 8

FIG. 9

FIG. 10

FIG. 11

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION IN ADDITION TO UC-420

Dr. Frank J. Pooloni, Univ of Wollongong, AUSTRALIA
 Prof. M.H. Brennan, Univ Sydney, AUSTRALIA
 Plasma Research Lab., Australian Nat. Univ., AUSTRALIA
 Prof. I.R. Jones, Flinders Univ., AUSTRALIA
 Prof. F. Cap, Inst Theo Phys, AUSTRIA
 Prof. M. Heindler, Institut für Theoretische Physik, AUSTRIA
 M. Goossens, Astronomisch Instituut, BELGIUM
 Ecole Royale Militaire, Lab de Phys Plasmas, BELGIUM
 Commission-European, Dg-XII Fusion Prog, BELGIUM
 Prof. R. Boucique, Rijksuniversiteit Gent, BELGIUM
 Dr. P.H. Sakanaka, Instituto Fisica, BRAZIL
 Instituto De Pesquisas Espaciais-INPE, BRAZIL
 Documents Office, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, CANADA
 Dr. M.P. Bachynski, MPB Technologies, Inc., CANADA
 Dr. H.M. Skaragard, University of Saskatchewan, CANADA
 Dr. H. Bernard, University of British Columbia, CANADA
 Prof. J. Teichmann, Univ. of Montreal, CANADA
 Prof. S.R. Sreenivasan, University of Calgary, CANADA
 Prof. Tudor W. Johnston, INRS-Energie, CANADA
 Dr. Bolton, Centre canadien de fusion magnetique, CANADA
 Dr. C.R. James, Univ. of Alberta, CANADA
 Dr. Peter Lukac, Komenského Univ, CZECHOSLOVAKIA
 The Librarian, Culham Laboratory, ENGLAND
 The Librarian, Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, ENGLAND
 Mrs. S.A. Hutchinson, JET Library, ENGLAND
 C. Mouffet, Lab. de Physique des Milieux Ionisés, FRANCE
 J. Radet, CEN/CADARACHE - Bat 506, FRANCE
 Ms. C. Rinni, Librarian, Univ. of Ioannina, GREECE
 Dr. Tom Mui, Academy Bibliographic Ser., HONG KONG
 Preprint Library, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, HUNGARY
 Dr. B. Das Gupta, Sahe Inst of Nucl. Phys., INDIA
 Dr. P. Kaw, Institute for Plasma Research, INDIA
 Dr. Philip Rosenau, Israel Inst. of Tech, ISRAEL
 Librarian, Int'l Ctr Theo Phys, ITALY
 Prof. G. Rostagni, Istituto Gas Ionizzati Del CNR, ITALY
 Miss Clelia De Paic, Assoc EURATOM-ENEA, ITALY
 Dr. G. Grosso, Istituto di Fisica del Plasma, ITALY
 Dr. H. Yamato, Toshiba Res & Dev, JAPAN
 Prof. I. Kawakami, Atomic Energy Res. Institute, JAPAN
 Prof. Kyoji Nishikawa, Univ of Hiroshima, JAPAN
 Director, Dept. Large Tokamak Res. JAERI, JAPAN
 Prof. Satoshi Itoh, Kyushu University, JAPAN
 Research Info Center, Nagoya University, JAPAN
 Prof. S. Tanaka, Kyoto University, JAPAN
 Library, Kyoto University, JAPAN
 Prof. Nobuyuki Inoue, University of Tokyo, JAPAN
 S. Mori, JAERI, JAPAN
 H. Jeong, Librarian, Korea Advanced Energy Res Inst, KOREA
 Prof. D.I. Choi, The Korea Adv. Inst of Sci & Tech, KOREA
 Prof. B.S. Liley, University of Waikato, NEW ZEALAND
 Institute of Plasma Physics, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
 Librarian, Institute of Phys., PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
 Library, Tsing Hua University, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
 Z. Li, Southwest Inst. Physics, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
 Prof. J.A.C. Cabral, Inst Superior Tecnico, PORTUGAL
 Dr. Octavian Petrus, AL I CUZA University, ROMANIA
 Dr. Jam de Villiers, Fusion Studies, AEC, SO AFRICA
 Prof. M.A. Hellberg, University of Natal, SO AFRICA
 C.I.E.M.A.T., Fusion Div. Library, SPAIN
 Dr. Lennart Stenflo, University of UMEA, SWEDEN
 Library, Royal Institute of Tech, SWEDEN
 Prof. Hans Wilhelmson, Chalmers Univ of Tech, SWEDEN
 Centre Phys des Plasmas, Ecole Polytech Fed, SWITZERLAND
 Bibliotheek, Fom-Inst Voor Plasma-Fysica, THE NETHERLANDS
 Metin Durgut, Middle East Technical University, TURKEY
 Dr. D.D. Ryutov, Siberian Acad Sci, USSR
 Dr. G.A. Eliseev, Kurchatov Institute, USSR
 Dr. V.A. Glukhikh, Inst Electrophysical Apparatus, USSR
 Prof. O.S. Padichenko, Inst. of Phys. & Tech. USSR
 Dr. L.M. Kovrizhnykh, Institute of Gen. Physics, USSR
 Nuclear Res. Establishment, Julich Ltd., W. GERMANY
 Bibliothek, Inst. Für Plasmeforschung, W. GERMANY
 Dr. K. Schindler, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, W. GERMANY
 ASDEX Reading Am, c/o Wagner, IPP/Max-Planck, W. GERMANY
 Librarian, Max-Planck Institut, W. GERMANY
 Prof. R.K. Janev, Inst of Phys, YUGOSLAVIA