141
10/10/84
PPPL-2124

UC20 A, F

PPPL-2124

DR-0461-8

I - 17381

(1)

PLASMA-MATERIALS INTERACTIONS DURING RF EXPERIMENTS
IN TOZAMAKS

By

S.A. Cohen et al.

SEPTEMBER 1984

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.

PLASMA
PHYSICS
LABORATORY

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PREPARED FOR THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,
UNDER CONTRACT DE-AC02-76-CHO-3073.

DISSEMINATION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

Plasma-Materials Interactions During RF Experiments
in Tokamaks

S. A. Cohen, S. Bernabei, R. Budny, T. K. Chu, P. Colestock, E. Hinnov,
W. Hooke, J. Hosea, D. Hwang, F. Jobes, D. Manos, R. Motley, D. Ruzic,
J. Stevens, B. Stratton,* S. Suckewer, S. von Goeler, and R. Wilson

Plasma Physics Laboratory, Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08544

PPPL--2124

Abstract

DE85 002116

Plasma-materials interactions studied in recent ICRF heating and lower hybrid current drive experiments are reviewed. The microscopic processes responsible for impurity generation are discussed. In ICRF experiments, improvements in machine operation and in antenna and feedthrough design have allowed efficient plasma heating at RF powers up to 3 MW. No significant loss of energy from the plasma core due to impurity radiation occurs. Lower hybrid current drive results in the generation and maintenance of hundreds of kiloamperes of plasma current carried by suprathermal electrons. The loss of these electrons and their role in impurity generation are assessed. Methods to avoid this problem are evaluated.

*Johns Hopkins University

MASTER

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

I. Introduction

The application of high levels of radio frequency (RF) power to tokamak plasmas has produced major advances towards the realization of a steady-state thermonuclear reactor.¹ The variety of RF waves that may exist in a tokamak and the resonant character of the heating allow control of the energy deposition profile.² Heating of a selected species, for example, electrons or a particular type of ion, is possible. This permits enhanced fusion reactivity, as in a two-component plasma,³ and non-inductive current drive.⁴ Another advantage of RF methods is the availability of high power components, such as power supplies and transmission lines, for several of the most desirable frequency ranges.

The aforementioned and other achievements and benefits of RF methods have not been easily attained. To a large part, this is due to plasma-materials interactions (PMI). When plasmas are irradiated with electromagnetic waves whose energy density is comparable to the plasma's, changes in the particle's distribution functions can lead to increased particle and energy loss rates to the walls and other internal structures. These may, in turn, cause the contamination of the plasma by wall material. This detrimental effect may be inherent to fundamental processes or to aspects of a particular experimental configuration, e.g., antenna shielding. A great effort must be expended to discover this important difference since the former problem is unavoidable while the latter is not.

The diversity of RF experiments makes an exhaustive review of PMI impractical. In this paper we concentrate on PMI during high-power ion-cyclotron-range-of-frequency (ICRF) heating and lower hybrid current drive (LHCD) experiments. Electron cyclotron heating, RF divertors, lower hybrid

heating, fast-wave current drive, etc., although in the future they may prove to be useful ways to ignite, sustain, or cleanse a tokamak reactor, are not discussed here. The main reason for their omission is the relative scarcity of PMI-related data.

The plasma-materials interactions we consider are those that limit the coupling of RF power to the plasma and those that result in impurity generation. The first topic is generally of a technological nature - how can RF components be made to function appropriately in the vicinity of a magnetized plasma? The second topic is concerned with a possible detrimental side effect. Section II discusses PMI during present-day ICRF heating experiments. In II-A the general configuration of an ICRF system is described. Sections II-B and C discuss component design and preparation and impurity generation. In Section III the same subjects are discussed for lower-hybrid current-drive experiments.

II. PMI During ICRF Experiments

A) Experimental parameters and configurations

The toroidal field of the tokamak, the Z_e/m ratio of the resonant ion, and the desired harmonic of the fundamental cyclotron frequency determine the required frequency of the RF generator. The lowest frequency commonly used on large tokamaks is about 25 MHz, which corresponds to H (minority) heating at 17 kG, as in PLT⁵; the highest frequency is about 150 MHz which is required for H (2nd harmonic) heating at 100 kG, as in Alcator C.⁶ The free space wavelengths for these frequencies are 12 and 2 m respectively. Thus, for present-day machines of 1 m typical scale, coaxial transmission lines and

loop antennae are necessary to bring the RF power to the machine. The transmission line is usually pressurized with SF_6 to prevent voltage breakdown problems — the peak voltage being in excess of 20 kV and the peak electric field at the surface of the central conductor being greater than 20 kV/cm. A high-voltage vacuum feedthrough is then required in the proximity of the vacuum vessel. (See Figure 1.) The dimensions of the coaxial transmission line near the vacuum vessel and the feedthrough need to be small because of physical constraints imposed by port sizes and nearby field coils. This raises the required voltage stand-off ability of the feedthrough, which is frequently located near a high-voltage point in the standing wave pattern of the antenna. The maximum current and power density through the feedthrough can exceed 1 kA and 15 kW/cm², respectively. The antennae are metallic strip lines or "loops." The "central" conductor is generally copper while the "return" conductor may be copper or stainless steel, as in the case where the vacuum vessel wall is the return. Antennae configurations which have been used include 1/2-turn end-fed loops on the low field side^{5,7} (large major radius), 1/4-turn center-fed loops on the low field side,⁵ and 1/2-turn and full-turn loops on the "high field side."⁷ The loop is oriented in the poloidal direction for ICRF heating. The plasma is shielded against the toroidal component of the antennae electric fields by Faraday shields. The Faraday shields are supported by ceramic or glass (possibly MACOR) insulators.

B) Component design and preparation

The feedthrough, antennae and Faraday shields are the three components susceptible to plasma-material interactions. Extensive efforts have taken place at PPPL in the design⁸ and testing of feedthroughs. Bench

tests have shown a voltage stand-off capability in excess of 100 kV for the design shown in Fig. 2c. The critical aspect in the design is the proper contouring of the central conductor and the dielectric to avoid high field points at their interface. With this feedthrough over 1 MW of power, the limit of the present generator, has been successfully transmitted to the PLT plasma. It should be noted that in-tokamak antenna conditioning, by pulsing with increasing levels of RF power, appears essential. Several hundred 50 ms duration pulses were applied to each feedthrough and antenna assembly used on PLT.

These feedthroughs are located close to the torus near a high-voltage point. This location was chosen because of the higher gas conductance to the vessel vacuum pumps — gas desorption and surface contamination being suspected mechanisms for arc-over at feedthroughs. The possibility of radiation damage or plasma generation at the feedthrough due to charged or neutral particle or photon bombardment may, in the future, result in the repositioning of the feedthrough to a more distant location, perhaps at a high-current point. This will necessitate a redesign.

Various antennae configurations have been developed and tested at the major laboratories. Although early studies, notably at TFR,⁹ showed low field side (LFS) antennae to be inferior to high field side (HFS) antennae (Fig. 3) with respect to impurity generation, recent results both there¹⁰ and at JFT-2M¹¹ have confirmed the PLT finding¹² that high power RF heating can occur with little plasma contamination even if the antennae are on the low field side. In addition, first results⁵ from PLT have shown little difference in impurity generation between center-fed 1/4-turn and end-fed 1/2-turn LFS antennae. Impurity generation will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

In 1965 Yoshikawa¹³ recognized that Faraday shields were essential to proper antenna operation. They define the electric field vector, thus determining the waves generated in the plasma, and also whether a sheath will form at the antenna due to rectification by the plasma. (The importance of this to impurity generation will be discussed later.) Faraday shields have been constructed of various materials, including stainless steel, titanium and graphite. Their thicknesses range from 0.1 mm to nearly 10 mm. In present experiments, the heat load on the Faraday shields, due primarily to plasma bombardment, still allows them to be uncooled. Future experiments, with several seconds pulse length, will undoubtedly require actively cooled shields. Proper preparation of the shields usually entails mechanical smoothing and rounding of the edges, degreasing, and high-temperature bake-outs (400°C for steel and 1100°C for graphite) in vacuum.

C) Impurity generation processes

Before discussing the mechanisms responsible for impurity generation, it is proper to assess the importance of impurities in present ICRF heating experiments. Although some ICRF experiments had earlier been plagued with impurity problems caused, in part, by inadequate wall and component designs and conditioning techniques and tokamak operating routines, all major experiments have now achieved conditions wherein, for MW heating levels, efficient ion heating is attained, and the radiated power from impurities in the plasma core is less than 10% of the power input to the core. The radiative power loss from the entire plasma is due to contamination by both high and low Z impurities. As shown in Fig. 4, radiation from the plasma is emitted primarily from the periphery⁵ by low z contaminants, and

accounts for about 30% of the total input power. This is generally considered a desirable mode of operation since it distributes the heat load uniformly on the walls and reduces direct localized plasma bombardment of the walls and limiters. The amount of radiated power scales linearly with RF power¹⁴ (Fig. 5). Modelling of the impurity radiation in TFR¹⁰ gives central metal ion densities of $\sim 2 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ and carbon and oxygen ion densities of $\sim 2 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ in a plasma with $n_e(0) = 1.1 \times 10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-3}$. This represents a $Z_{\text{eff}} \sim 2.5$ and a 20% depletion of hydrogenic ions. Both the high Z_{eff} and the deuteron depletion would severely impact a reactor. Thus, although high and low Z impurities do not significantly affect the power balance in the present multi-MW experiments, it is necessary to understand their origins to ensure that future experiments at higher powers and longer pulse are not impeded.

The four primary microscopic processes by which ICRF heating can cause impurity generation are arcing, evaporation, ion sputtering, and charge exchange neutral sputtering. Arcing is judged to be of little consequence in a well-conditioned ICRF system based on the time behavior of the impurity radiation. Indeed, photographic recordings in PLT of the antennae structures during high-power heating show no flashes indicative of arcs. Evaporation, too, is of little consequence except during low density conditions where severe runaway electron bombardment may occur. This situation may not be true in the near future when long-pulse high-power ICRF heating systems are put into operation. Then both the limiter (or divertor) heat removal systems and the antenna structures will require active cooling.

Sputtering by ions has been judged by several groups^{10,11} to be an important cause of impurities. Ions which leave the main body of the plasma impact on the material surfaces nearest the edge plasma. In addition to the limiters, the antennae are placed near the plasma edge because the coupling

between the antenna and the plasma improves as the distance between them is reduced, the scale distance being of order $.1(k_{\perp})^{-1} \approx 5$ cm. Thus ICRF antennae are immersed, of necessity, in the edge plasma at a distance of ~ 5 cm outside the limiter radius. The calculated and experimental loading resistances for the TFR¹⁰ HFS side antenna, shown in Fig. 6, clearly indicate the change in coupling with distance between the antenna and the plasma.

The edge plasma electron temperature and density are shown in Figs. 7 and 8 for ICRF heating of TFR¹⁰ at $\bar{n}_e \sim 1 \times 10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, and $I_p \sim 200$ kA. Both T_e and the density scrape-off distance, λ_{ne} , are seen to double for $P_{rf} \sim 300$ kW. Similar results have been seen on PLT¹⁵ and ATC¹⁶ for $\Delta\lambda_{ne}$, but not ΔT_e . Power dependences of ΔT_e and $\Delta\lambda_{ne}$ have been studied in TFR and JFT-2M and found to be similar. Results from the latter are shown in Fig. 9. For the parameters $\lambda \sim 1$ cm and $T_e \sim 5$ eV, the stored energy in the plasma edge is only $\lesssim 1$ J.

The ions which strike the limiters, RF antennae, and walls impact with an energy equal to the sum of their kinetic energy plus Z times the sheath potential. The sheath potential may be several (typically four) times T_e , or it may reach a substantial fraction of the peak antenna voltage. This latter condition exists if plasma rectification of the RF occurs such as in the absence of grounded Faraday shields. The ions which strike the limiters can be categorized into three classes: thermal hydrogenic, thermal impurities, and suprathermal hydrogenic. Using probes at the limiter radius, the edge plasma ion temperature during earlier experiments has been measured to be 20-200 eV.^{17,18} However, no data have been presented for the highest (3 MW) powers recently attained. Using the TFR edge parameters and assuming $T_i(a) = 50$ eV, a deuterium plasma, an impurity confinement time of 20 ms, sputtering yields for clean metals,¹⁹ and a poloidally uniform flux, TFR estimates the

volume averaged impurity density from a carbon ring limiter to be $5 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, and $5 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ for a steel ring limiter. If $T_i(a) = 175 \text{ eV}$ the carbon density would be $10\times$ higher and the iron density $100\times$ higher. Because of this agreement (factor of 2) between these estimated and the observed impurity levels, and also because of a positive correlation between impurity species and Faraday shield material, the TFR group confirmed the PLT conclusion that thermal hydrogenic ion sputtering of B-normal surfaces, especially the limiter and Faraday shields, is the main cause of their impurities.

The JFT-2M team¹¹ has reached a somewhat different conclusion because of the power dependence of the impurity concentrations and a positive correlation between light (C,O) and heavy (Fe,Ni) impurity levels in ICRF-heated discharges. They describe the influx of metal impurities as being due to the impact of multiply-charged C and O ions. Only at the highest RF power is proton sputtering important. In contrast, the TFR team has purposely contaminated their discharge with Ne in an attempt to see this phenomenon,⁹ but they saw no significant (<10%) change in the metal impurity level.

Manos et al.,²⁰ and Hammett et al.,²¹ have investigated the loss of suprathermal ions from the PLT. In 2nd harmonic H^+ heating they see the loss of $\sim 90 \text{ keV}$ banana trapped ions. No similar losses are observed for minority heating of He^3 in a D plasma. The loss during 2nd harmonic H^+ heating is not poloidally symmetric, but is concentrated at the outside midplane position.²² The direct sputtering by these energetic ions is estimated to be unimportant for impurity generation, both because of the low yield (10^{-4}) and the low flux ($1 \times 10^{18}, 4 \times 10^{19} \text{ s}^{-1}$). However, a synergistic interaction between the heat deposited by these energetic ions and the momentum deposited by thermal ions may cause enhanced evaporative sputtering.²²

The final mechanism possibly responsible for impurity generation is sputtering by neutrals. A low energy neutral atom spectrometer²³ has been used on PLT to study the efflux of charge exchange neutrals during ICRF experiments.¹⁵ The efflux increases at a rate of $\sim 10^{15} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ MW}^{-1}$ during both 2nd harmonic and minority heating. In Fig. 10 one can see that the increase in flux, Δr , is toroidally symmetric. The cause of this efflux is the increase of ion density near the vessel wall, which leads to enhanced neutralization and a higher neutral density. Although the rise in $n_i(a)$ may be due to enhanced transport, another mechanism can also explain the increase in ion density. From ray tracing calculations, we estimate that 1% of the rf power is absorbed in the edge. This increases the electron temperature which increases the ionization rate of neutrals and ion density in that region, quantitatively in agreement with the observed rise in n_i .

The charge exchange measurements show an increase across the entire spectrum, from 20 to 50,000 eV, with the largest percentage increase at the highest energies (Fig. 11). Using the sputtering yields for clean metals, the increase in flux can account for the observed increase in wall material found during ICRF heating. Figure 12 shows a portion of the U.V. spectrum before and during ICRF heating. Increases in Ti and Fe, presumably from the wall, are evident. Increases in C and O, presumably from the limiter, are also seen. The charge exchange efflux may also be responsible for the sputtering of Faraday shield material previously coated around the tokamaks by ion sputtering or evaporation. The charge exchange efflux is observed to have an inverse dependence with plasma current. Ion heating efficiency behaves in an opposite fashion, i.e., in PLT good ion heating only occurs for $I_p \sim 300 \text{ kA}$.

In summary, high power heating of tokamak plasma by ICRF techniques has increased the central ion temperature at a rate between 3 and 6 eV/kW $\cdot 10^{13}$ cm⁻³. To achieve this, major improvements had to be made in feedthrough and antenna designs. Operation with a "good" target plasma is also essential, the main parameter being a high plasma current. The impurity flux into these discharges has not affected the power balance in the plasma core, but does cause enhanced radiation from the plasma periphery and some depletion of the hydrogen ions in the core. The structures which are the sources of these impurities are the limiters, Faraday shields, other objects within a few centimeters of $r=a$, and the walls. The structures close to the plasma are sputtered by thermal ion bombardment and possibly multiply charged impurities. The wall is sputtered by charge exchange neutrals. Figure 13 shows the effects on impurity levels of changing Faraday shield material in PLT.

III. PMI During LHCD Experiments

A) Experimental parameters and configurations

Lower hybrid waves in a plasma may be absorbed by electron Landau damping. This transfer of energy and momentum to electrons which resonate with the lower hybrid waves' phase velocity has enabled the generation²⁴ and sustenance²⁵ of currents in tokamak plasmas. To propagate, the frequency of lower hybrid waves must be above the lower hybrid resonance frequency and below the electron cyclotron and plasma frequencies. For present tokamaks this is in the range 200 MHz + 30 GHz. Powerful generators are available in the middle of this range at $f = 800$ MHz, 1.5 GHz, 2.45 GHz, and 4.6 GHz, at

which frequencies the free space wavelengths are 37, 20, 12, and 6.5 cm respectively. Thus waveguides are appropriate transmission lines to carry the power to the machines, and waveguide launchers are suitable antennae.

The requirement that ~1 MW of RF power must be injected through ~20 cm ports sets the power density at $\leq 10^4$ kW/cm² and the peak electric field at $\leq 4 \times 10^3$ V/cm. The transmission line from the generator to the vicinity of the tokamak is pressurized with dry air to prevent high voltage breakdown. A waveguide window vacuum break is required in place of the coaxial feedthrough used in ICRF. The RF power is finally brought to the vacuum vessel through an array of closely spaced waveguides. Phasing the array allows one to launch the lower hybrid waves predominately in one direction for current drive. Figure 14 shows a schematic of the major components.

The current drive efficiency, as derived by Fisch,²⁶ can be written

$$\frac{I(\text{MA})}{P(\text{MW})} = \frac{.35}{R} \frac{E_{100}}{\bar{n}_{20}},$$

where E is the average energy of the resonant electrons (in units of 100 keV), R is the major radius (in meters), and $\bar{n}_{20}$ is the average density (in units of 10^{20} m^{-3}). Because of this inverse dependence on n and a density limit, n_c , on wave propagation,²⁷ current drive experiments are usually run at lower densities than the peak value attainable in many machines. Present experiments²⁸ indicate that the density limit increases with ω^2 . In PLT, for example, 800 MHz LHCD experiments are carried out below a critical density $\bar{n}_c \approx 8 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}$; in Alcator C, LHCD⁶ is possible at densities up to $n_c = 1 \times 10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ because a frequency of 4.6 GHz is used. At these reduced densities,

both the energy and particle confinement times are also below their peak values. This affects the power loading on the vessel components through both the loss of thermal plasma and the lower-hybrid-generated tail electrons. At the highest powers yet used, 1 MW in Alcator C and ~600 kW in PLT, the central electron temperature was ~1 keV and the energy confinement time was ~10 ms. The average energy of the electron tail was ~100 keV.

B) Component design and preparation

The waveguide array (launcher), the waveguide walls, and the RF window are the main RF components susceptible to plasma-surface interactions. The launcher is immersed in the edge plasma to a position where $\omega < \omega_{pe}$ ($n_e \gtrsim 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ for PLT) in order that a propagating wave be generated. This positions the array about 1-2 cm outside the limiter. The coupling of power to the plasma is critically dependent on this distance, as shown in Fig. 15. The front face of the array is curved to match the minor radius of the plasma. No systematic study of this feature has yet been published. We note that this shaping and the sensitivity to n_e make the plasma position a critical parameter to control.

In a fusion reactor the RF windows will be placed far from the tokamak to avoid radiation damage. (Here commercial high power klystron windows can be used.) This, however, leads to evacuated waveguides passing through regions of low magnetic field where $\omega = \omega_{ce}$. Here the phenomenon of multipactoring, secondary electron amplification, will take place if the secondary electron emission coefficient, δ , of the waveguide walls exceeds unity. This problem has been addressed by several groups. For the present experiments special RF windows have been manufactured both at the major laboratories and private

companies to allow the window array to be as close to the plasma as possible. Multipactoring, although still a problem, is more readily avoided.

Recently the ASDEX team²⁹ has produced a fern-like gold coating with $\delta < 1$ at all energies and all angles of electron impact. The angular dependence of δ is important because non-normal electron impact will occur for cyclotron harmonic multipactoring and for fast (lower hybrid) wave launch. Though δ of solid gold is 1.4, the porous gold structure reduces the probability of secondary electron re-emission (Fig. 16a). A waveguide array has been Au-coated and operated both on a test stand³⁰ and in ASDEX.³¹ The results are excellent. Little in-tokamak conditioning was required to achieve a power throughput of 700 kW.

Different coatings³² were developed earlier at PPPL to handle normal electron incidence. These coatings, either pyrolyzed glyptal or electrophoretically deposited carbon in pyrolyzed glyptal, have $\delta < 1$ at all energies³³ for normally incident electrons (Fig. 15b). In the PLT experimental configuration, the window is in a magnetic field high enough so that cyclotron harmonic multipactoring is unimportant. Thus all electrons hit waveguide surfaces at near normal incidence. The results for this coating are excellent. The difference in reflection coefficient vs power are shown in Fig. 17 for waveguides with and without this coating.

In addition to multipactoring, gas evolution from waveguide walls can result in ionization and cause plasma generation and wave cut-off. The earlier methods to treat this problem had been to apply coatings of clean low- z metals, such as titanium. Scientists at Grenoble³⁴ have developed a variant to coating by using glow discharge cleaning to remove the sorbed gas layers. Their results with both Ti, Cu, and stainless steel waveguides have been

remarkable. Record power densities,³⁵ 12 kW/cm², and electric fields, 10 kV/cm, have been achieved in a test bed. Lowering of δ has also been achieved. This result has been interpreted as being due to increased surface roughness induced by the argon glow discharge.

C) impurity generation processes

The usual effects of impurities in plasmas are to reduce the energy confinement time via radiation and to decrease the hydrogen concentration at constant μ . In present LHCD experiments neither of these is important because of the low density which results in little electron impact excitation and no β limit. However, two important impurity-related effects are observed during LHCD. The first is a decrease in current drive efficiency, possibly due to enhanced ohmic dissipation by the slideaways or to surface losses via collisional damping of the wave. In Alcator C⁶ a 40% lower current drive efficiency is measured for discharges with C or SiC limiters than for those with Mo limiters. The second effect is a complete cessation of current drive when n_e rises above its critical value, such as by the addition of the electrons from the impurities. This latter effect is shown in Fig. 18. A carbon influx raises n_e during this particular experiment. By 450 ms into the discharge, the current ramp-up rate produced by 300 kW net of LH power has decreased to zero. Methods to avoid both of these problems have been recently set forth and will be discussed at the end of this section.

The impurity generation processes to be evaluated for LHCD are the same as for ICRF: arcing, evaporation, ion sputtering, and charge exchange sputtering. Arcing in the main vessel is rarely seen and is not considered a problem. Observations of apparent arcs occurring near the waveguide mouth have been made. The arcs are irreproducible and infrequent.

Evaporation is judged to be a major cause of impurity generation. LHCD results in the formation of an energetic electron tail of 100 keV typical energy (Fig. 19). The confinement of energetic electrons has been measured by Barnes.³⁶ For 0.4-1.0 MeV runaways generated inductively, Barnes finds a confinement time of 2-6 ms (Fig. 20). Preliminary results³⁷ on LH generated tail electrons give a somewhat longer confinement time, about 25 ms. The slowing down time on the background thermal plasma for these electrons is about 20-200 ms. The point, then, is that some energetic electrons will leave the plasma. In addition, acceleration of already energetic electrons may occur in the edge plasma thus increasing the likelihood of the loss of energetic electrons. It has been noted^{36,39} that the higher $v_{\parallel}$ of a species the shorter the scrape-off distance. For electrons of 100 keV parallel energy, the scrape-off distance is about 0.1 mm. The net result is a concentrated heat load by the lost energetic electrons on the material object nearest the plasma edge. In PLT this is generally a carbon limiter. Photographic recordings using standard TV/video and film techniques have clearly shown the formation of an incandescent hot spot on the PLT limiters. The hot spot can be moved from the top to the bottom to the outside midplane limiter by shifting the plasma position appropriately. The surface temperature, T_s , has been estimated from the spot brightness to be $T_s = 2500^{\circ}\text{K}$. At this temperature evaporation can readily cause the observed carbon contamination in the plasma.

Ion sputtering is estimated to be a less important impurity source, both from the limiters and the waveguides. At the low densities and short particle confinement time, these impurity densities should be $\sim 10^2$ times lower than in ICRF-heated discharges. In addition, in test bed experiments^{40,41} the effect of the wave directly in front of the waveguide has been evaluated. The plasma

density has been found to decrease at RF power levels greater than 1 kW/cm^2 . This occurs because the "RF pressure" becomes comparable to the electron pressure. A positive potential also builds up. The net effects should be a decrease in the ion flux to the waveguide and reduced ion sputtering.

Charge exchange sputtering has been evaluated on PLT⁴² using neutral particle diagnostics. For $10^{12} < n_e < 10^{13} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ no large increase in the charge exchange outflux has been observed during LHCD. At these low densities the charge exchange flux is toroidally uniform and has an average energy twice higher than during higher density ($10^{13} < n_e < 10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-3}$) operation. The predicted Fe concentration is $\sim 5 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, giving $Z_{\text{eff}} = 3$.

Thus the two main causes of impurities are evaporation due to energetic electron impact and sputtering due to charge exchange hydrogen bombardment. This latter process will become less important at higher densities, in part because of the drop in average energy with increased plasma opacity, and in part due to the increase in particle confinement time. The first process, though, has been tentatively identified in Alcator C which already operates at the high densities envisioned for reactors. It thus appears that energetic slideaways will be lost from tokamaks with reactor-like parameters.

To reduce the temperature rise on a small area of the limiter, the plasma could be moved thus shifting the tangency point. However, this will alter the LH coupling. The converse, to move the limiter, has recently been suggested and tried on PLT. The limiter shape must be specially tailored so that the tangency point is near the limiter circumference. Then, by rotating the limiter, for example, the heat load can be readily distributed over a larger area. The successful implementation of this concept has been reported.⁴³

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank J. Adam, G. Tonon, M. Keilhacker, D. Eckhardt, J. Jacquinet, and K. Odajima for sending versions of unpublished papers. This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy Contract No. DE-AC02-76-CH0-3073.

References

- ¹ D. Hwang and J. R. Wilson, Proc. IEEE 69, 1030 (1981).
- ² P. Colestock et al., in Proceedings of the 2nd Joint Grenoble-Varenna International Symposium on Heating in Toroidal Devices Como, 1980, (CEC, Brussels, 1981) Vol. I, p. 471.
- ³ J. M. Dawson, H. P. Furth, and F. H. Tenney, Phys. Rev. Lett. 26, 1156 (1971).
- ⁴ N. J. Fisch, Phys. Rev. Lett. 41, 873 (1978).
- ⁵ J. Hosea et al., Proc. Fourth International Symposium on Heating in Toroidal Plasmas, Rome, 1984 (to be published).
- ⁶ M. Porkolab et al., Proc. Fourth International Symposium on Heating in Toroidal Plasmas, Rome, 1984 (to be published).
- ⁷ TFR Group, EUR-CEA-FC-1219 (March 1984) (Internal Report)
- ⁸ D. Hwang et al., J. Vac. Sci. Technol. 20, 1273 (1982).
- ⁹ TFR Group, in Proceedings of the 11th European Conference on Controlled Fusion and Plasma Physics, Aachen, W. Germany, 1983, (Eur. Phys. Soc., Petit-Lancy, Switzerland, 1983) p. 165.

- 10 TFR Group, *Proc. Fourth International Symposium on Heating in Toroidal Plasmas*, Rome, 1984 (to be published).
- 11 K. Odajima et al., *Proc. Fourth International Symposium on Heating in Toroidal Plasmas*, Rome, 1984 (to be published).
- 12 D. Hwang et al., in Plasma Physics and Controlled Nuclear Fusion Research Baltimore, 1982 (IAEA, Vienna, 1983) Vol. II, p.3.
- 13 S. Yoshikawa, M. A. Rothman, and R. M. Sinclair, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 14, 214 (1965); Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory Report No. MATT-373 (1965).
- 14 B. Stratton et al., *Nucl. Fusion* (in press).
- 15 S. Cohen et al., (Unpublished).
- 16 H. Hsuan et al., in *Proceedings of the 3rd Topical Conference on RF Plasma Heating*, Pasadena, 1978 (California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA) p. C8.
- 17 G. Staudenmaier, P. Staib, and W. Poschenrieder, *J. Nucl. Mater.* 93 & 94, 121 (1980); P. Staib, *J. Nucl. Mater.* 111 & 112, 109 (1982).
- 18 S. A. Cohen, H. F. Dylla, W. R. Wampler, and C. W. Magee, *J. Nucl. Mater.* 93 & 94, 109 (1980).

- 19 J. Bohdansky, J. Roth, and H. L. Bey, J. Appl. Phys. 51, 2861 (1980).
- 20 D. Manos, R. Budny, T. Satake, and S. A. Cohen, J. Nucl. Mater. 111 & 112, 130 (1982).
- 21 G. Hammett et al., Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. 28, 1129 (1983).
- 22 D. Manos et al., J. Vac. Sci. Technol. (in press).
- 23 D. E. Voss and S. A. Cohen, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 53, 1696 (1982).
- 24 J. Stevens et al., Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory Report No. PPPL-1977 (1983).
- 25 F. Jobes et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 52 1005 (1984).
- 26 N. J. Fisch, Phys. Rev. A 24, 3245 (1981).
- 27 W. Hooke et al., in Proceedings of the 11th European Conference on Controlled Fusion and Plasma Physics, Aachen, W. Germany, 1983 (Eur. Phys. Soc., Petit-Lancy, Switzerland, 1983) p. 133.
- 28 F. Alladio et al., Proc. Fourth International Symposium on Heating in Toroidal Plasmas, Rome, 1984 (to be published).
- 29 H. Derfler et al., Proc. Fourth International Symposium on Heating in Toroidal Plasmas, Rome, 1984 (to be published).

- 30 F. Leuterer et al., Proc. Fourth International Symposium on Heating in Toroidal Plasmas, Rome, 1984 (to be published).
- 31 D. Eckhardt et al., Proc. Fourth International Symposium on Heating in Toroidal Plasmas, Rome, 1984 (to be published).
- 32 J. Timberlake et al., J. Vac. Sci. Technol. 20, 1309 (1982).
- 33 D. Ruzic et al., J. Vac. Sci. Technol. 20, 1313 (1982).
- 34 G. Rey et al., in Proceedings of the 3rd Joint Varenna Grenoble International Symposium on Heating in Toroidal Devices, Grenoble, 1982 (CEC, Brussels, 1982) Vol. 28, p.1165.
- 35 G. Tonon et al., Proc. Fourth International Symposium on Heating in Toroidal Plasmas, Rome, 1984, (to be published).
- 36 C. W. Barnes, Ph.D. Thesis, Princeton (1981).
- 37 J. D. Strachan, private communication.
- 38 H. Selberg et al., Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. Vol. 28, p. 1092 (1983).
- 39 S. Cohen et al., Nucl. Fusion 21, 233 (1981).
- 40 R. Motley, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77A, 451 (1980).

43. S.A. Cohen et al., Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory Report No. PPPL-2123 (1984)

Figure Captions

1. Schematic of an ICRF 1/2-turn end-fed antenna system. This design, used in PLT, employs ceramic feedthroughs near the vacuum vessel. Faraday shields, typically of stainless steel, cover the central conductor.
2. Cross section of three feedthroughs designed for PLT. The design shown at the bottom has successfully stood off 100 kV in a test stand and transmitted 1 MW of power at 25 MHz into PLT plasmas (Ref. 8).
3. a) View of the TFR 1/2-turn end-fed LFS antenna. b) Details of the cross section. The main improvements in this design are carbon rails (4) which protect the sides of thick Faraday shields (3). The return conductor is indicated as (1) in the Figure (Ref. 9).
4. Total radiated power and Abel inverted profiles during ^3He minority heating at $P_{\text{RF}} \sim 700$ kW. The profiles were taken about 200 ms after the RF was turned on (Ref. 5).
5. Total radiated power and brightness of several impurity lines versus RF power during second harmonic heating at $n_e = 3.8 \times 10^{14}$, $B_T = 14$ kG (Ref. 5).
6. Loading resistance of the JET-TFR antenna versus the distance between the plasma boundary and the central conductor (— theory, O experiment) (Ref. 7).

7. Electron temperature profile measured in the TFR plasma edge with double Langmuir probes (Ref. 7).
8. Electron density profiles in the TFR scrape-off plasma as measured for ohmic and ICRF-heated plasmas. The limiter is at 19.5 cm (Ref. 7).
9. Power dependence of the electron density and temperature in the JFT-2M edge plasma. The background levels for T_e are indicated for both neutral-beam injection (NBI) and ohmic heating (OH) (Ref. 11).
10. Charge exchange D^0 efflux as a function of time for three cases during ICRF minority heating of D-He³ plasmas with $P_{RF} \approx 1$ MW. The flux is integrated over the energy range 25 to 1000 eV. A and B are observations away from the limiters. C is observations near an auxiliary limiter (Ref. 15).
11. Charge exchange flux spectra in PLT for ohmically heated and ICRF-heated ($P_{RF} \approx 1$ MW) plasmas.
12. Spectra of the 110 to 175 Å region before ($t = 400$ ms) and during ($t = 600$ ms) ICRF heating in the H⁺ minority regime at $P_{RF} = 2$ MW in PLT. The antennae had titanium Faraday shields (Ref. 14).
13. A comparison of the total titanium and iron densities before and during ICRF heating in PLT. As indicated, the antennae had either titanium or stainless steel Faraday shields (Ref. 14).

14. Schematic of a typical lower hybrid system. The waveguide section between the generator and the window may be pressurized with dry N_2 or SF_6 to prevent arcing.
15. Calculated reflection for an 8-waveguide array launching $n_1 = 1.8$ spectrum into a plasma with edge density of $6 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm}^{-3}$. The coupling decreases with increasing separation between the launcher and the plasma.
16. Secondary electron yields for (a) porous gold (Ref. 29) and (b) pyrolyzed glyptal (Ref. 33). In (a) Δ - normal incidence and $\alpha = 80^\circ$ from normal.
17. Coupling versus RF power (800 MHz) per waveguide in PLT for a waveguide with stainless steel walls ($\bullet$) and one with stainless steel walls coated with pyrolyzed glyptal ($\circ$, Δ). For the uncoated waveguide R+1 for powers above 60 kW.
18. Time evolution of the electron density, plasma current, and CV radiation during a LHCD discharge in PLT. The RF power was on from 400 to 600 ms. The carbon influx is caused by localized evaporation from a carbon limiter.
19. Spectra of X-ray photon emission from PLT during LHCD experiments. The relative phasing of the waveguide array results in a different energy distribution for the energetic electrons responsible for the X-ray emission.

20. Confinement time versus energy of electrons in PLT (Ref. 36).

81X1085

Fig. 1

Fig. 2

#84X0768

Fig. 3

#84X0386

Fig. 4

Fig. 5

Fig. 6

Fig. 7

Fig. 8

84X0765

Fig. 9

Fig. 10

Fig. 11

Fig. 12

#83X0341

Fig. 13

#84X0708

Fig. 14

Fig. 15

Fig. 16

Fig. 17

84x0704

Fig. 18

Fig. 19

Fig. 20

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION IN ADDITION TO TIC UC-20

Plasma Res Lab, Austro Nat'l Univ, AUSTRALIA
 Dr. Frank J. Paoloni, Univ of Wollongong, AUSTRALIA
 Prof. I.R. Jones, Flinders Univ., AUSTRALIA
 Prof. M.H. Brennan, Univ Sydney, AUSTRALIA
 Prof. F. Cap, Inst Theo Phys, AUSTRIA
 Prof. Frank Verheest, Inst theoretische, BELGIUM
 Dr. D. Palumbo, Dg XII Fuslon Prog, BELGIUM
 Ecole Royale Militaire, Lab de Phys Plasmas, BELGIUM
 Dr. P.H. Sakonaka, Univ Estadual, BRAZIL
 Dr. C.R. James, Univ of Alberta, CANADA
 Prof. J. Teichmann, Univ of Montreal, CANADA
 Dr. H.M. Skarsgard, Univ of Saskatchewan, CANADA
 Prof. S.R. Sreenivasan, University of Calgary, CANADA
 Prof. Tudor W. Johnston, INRS-Energie, CANADA
 Dr. Hannes Bernard, Univ British Columbia, CANADA
 Dr. M.P. Bechynski, MPB Technologies, Inc., CANADA
 Zhengwu Li, SW Inst Physics, CHINA
 Library, Tsing Hua University, CHINA
 Librarian, Institute of Physics, CHINA
 Inst Plasma Phys, Academia Sinica, CHINA
 Dr. Peter Lukac, Komenského Univ, CZECHOSLOVAKIA
 The Librarian, Culham Laboratory, ENGLAND
 Prof. Schatzman, Observatoire de Nice, FRANCE
 J. Radet, CEN-CEP6, FRANCE
 AM Dupes Library, AM Dupes Library, FRANCE
 Dr. Tom Muel, Academy Bibliographic, MONG KONG
 Preprint Library, Cent Res Inst Phys, HUNGARY
 Dr. S.K. Trehan, Panjab University, INDIA
 Dr. Indra, Mohan Lal Das, Banaras Hindu Univ, INDIA
 Dr. L.K. Chavde, South Gujarat Univ, INDIA
 Dr. R.K. Chhajlani, Var Ruchi Marg, INDIA
 P. Kow, Physical Research Lab, INDIA
 Dr. Phillip Rosenau, Israel Inst Tech, ISRAEL
 Prof. S. Cupernan, Tel Aviv University, ISRAEL
 Prof. G. Rostagni, Univ Di Padova, ITALY
 Librarian, Int'l Ctr Theo Phys, ITALY
 Miss Clelia De Palo, Assoc EURATOM-CHEN, ITALY
 Biblioteca, del CNR EURATOM, ITALY
 Dr. K. Yamato, Toshiba Res & Dev, JAPAN
 Prof. M. Yoshikawa, JAERI, Tokai Res Est, JAPAN
 Prof. T. Uchida, University of Tokyo, JAPAN
 Research Info Center, Nagoya University, JAPAN
 Prof. Kyoji Nishikawa, Univ of Hiroshima, JAPAN
 Prof. Sigeru Mori, JAERI, JAPAN
 Library, Kyoto University, JAPAN
 Prof. Ichiro Kawakami, Nihon Univ, JAPAN
 Prof. Setsuichi Itoh, Kyushu University, JAPAN
 Tech Info Division, Korea Atomic Energy, KOREA
 Dr. R. England, Ciudad Universitaria, MEXICO
 Bibliotheek, Fom-Inst Voor Plasma, NETHERLANDS
 Prof. B.S. Lilley, University of Waikato, NEW ZEALAND
 Dr. Suresh C. Sharma, Univ of Calabar, NIGERIA
 Prof. J.A.C. Cabral, Inst Superior Tech, PORTUGAL
 Dr. Octavian Petrus, ALI CLIZA University, ROMANIA
 Prof. M.A. Meilberg, University of Natal, SO AFRICA
 Dr. Johan de Villiers, Atomic Energy Bd, SO AFRICA
 Fusion Div. Library, JEN, SPAIN
 Prof. Hans Wilhelmsson, Chalmers Univ Tech, SWEDEN
 Dr. Lennart Stenflo, University of UMEA, SWEDEN
 Library, Royal Inst Tech, SWEDEN
 Dr. Erik T. Karlson, Uppsala Universitet, SWEDEN
 Centre de Recherches, Ecole Polytech Fed, SWITZERLAND
 Dr. W.L. Waise, Nat'l Bur Stand, USA
 Dr. W.M. Stacey, Georg Inst Tech, USA
 Dr. S.T. Wu, Univ Alabama, USA
 Prof. Norman L. Olsson, Univ S Florida, USA
 Dr. Benjamin Ma, Iowa State Univ, USA
 Prof. Magne Kristiansen, Texas Tech Univ, USA
 Dr. Raymond Askew, Auburn Univ, USA
 Dr. V.T. Tolok, Kharkov Phys Tech Ins, USSR
 Dr. D.D. Ryutov, Siberian Acad Sci, USSR
 Dr. G.A. Eliseev, Kurchatov Institute, USSR
 Dr. V.A. Glukhikh, Inst Electro-Physical, USSR
 Institute Gen. Physics, USSR
 Prof. T.J. Boyd, Univ College N Wales, WALES
 Dr. K. Schindler, Ruhr Universitat, W. GERMANY
 Nuclear Res Estab, Julich Ltd, W. GERMANY
 Librarian, Max-Planck Institut, W. GERMANY
 Dr. H.J. Kaeppeler, University Stuttgart, W. GERMANY
 Bibliothek, Inst Plasmaforschung, W. GERMANY