MASTER

A Mechanism for Major Disruptions in Tokamaks

B. V. Waddell
B. Carreras
H. R. Hicks
J. A. Holmes
D. K. Lee

OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY
OPERATED BY UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION • FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

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.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

Printed in the United States of America. Available from
National Technical Information Service
U.S. Department of Commerce
5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161
Price: Printed Copy \$4.00; Microfiche \$3.00

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, contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, nor assumes any legal liability or responsibility for any third party's use or the results of such use of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed in this report, nor represents that its use by such third party would not infringe privately owned rights.

ORNL/TM-6213
Dist. Category UC-20g

Contract No. W-7405-eng-26

FUSION ENERGY DIVISION

A MECHANISM FOR MAJOR DISRUPTIONS IN TOKAMAKS

B. V. Waddell
B. Carreras
H. R. Hicks
J. A. Holmes
D. K. Lee

Date Published - June, 1978

NOTICE
This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Department of Energy, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or 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.

MASTER

Prepared by the
OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830
operated by
UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION
for the
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

EB

ABSTRACT

We propose a mechanism for the major disruption in tokamaks that involves the nonlinear destabilization of odd m tearing modes by the $m = 2/n = 1$ tearing mode, where m and n denote the poloidal and toroidal mode numbers, respectively. The magnetic islands generated can extend across the plasma cross section. For resistivities of the order of magnitude of those in TOSCA and LT-3, the time scale for their appearance is consistent with the time for the major disruption.

The magnitude of both the current and density in present tokamak discharges is limited by the major disruptive instability,¹⁻⁴ which is characterized by a rapid (100 μ sec) radial expansion of the plasma column. In this letter, we consider a mechanism for the major disruption that involves the nonlinear interaction in three dimensions of tearing modes with different pitch. In cylindrical geometry, we find both analytically and numerically for safety factor profiles flat in the plasma core that the $m = 2/n = 1$ tearing mode can nonlinearly destabilize other modes having odd m on a time scale consistent with the major disruption.

In order to study the nonlinear interaction of modes with different pitch, we employ the reduced set of equations derived in Ref. 6 in the large aspect ratio, low β approximation. In terms of the poloidal flux function and the velocity stream function, the equations are

$$D\psi/Dt = \eta J_{\zeta} - E_{\zeta}^w - \partial\phi/\partial\zeta, \quad (1)$$

$$DU/Dt = -S^2[\hat{\zeta} \cdot (\nabla\psi \times \nabla J_{\zeta}) + \partial J_{\zeta}/\partial\zeta]. \quad (2)$$

The radial, poloidal, and toroidal coordinates are denoted by r , θ , and ζ , respectively; η is the resistivity, and E_{ζ}^w is the electric field at the wall. The toroidal current density J_{ζ} is $J_{\zeta} = \nabla^2\psi/\mu_0$, the velocity $V_{\perp}$ is $V = \nabla\phi \times \hat{\zeta}/B_0$, the vorticity U is $\nabla^2\phi$, and $D/Dt \equiv \partial/\partial t + \underline{V}_{\perp} \cdot \underline{\nabla}$; the subscript $\perp$ means perpendicular to the unit vector in the toroidal direction. The equations are in dimensionless form with all lengths normalized to radius a and all times normalized to the resistive magnetic diffusion time $\tau_R[\mu_0(a^2/\eta)]$, where μ_0 is the vacuum magnetic

permeability, and η is the characteristic value of the resistivity]. The quantity S is the ratio of τ_R and τ_{HP} [$\equiv R_o(\mu_o\rho)^{1/2}/B_T$, where R_o is the major radius, ρ is the constant mass density, and B is the constant toroidal magnetic field]. These equations have been numerically advanced in time employing a grid typically of size 60 (radial) x 30 (poloidal) x 15 (toroidal).

We consider safety factor profiles of the form $q(r) = q(0) [1 + (r/r_o)^{2\lambda}]^{1/\lambda}$ where $q(0)$ is the safety factor at $r = 0$, r_o is the width of the current channel, and λ is the flattening parameter. This profile is the same as the peaked, rounded, and flat profiles in Ref. 7 for $\lambda = 1, 2$, and 4 , respectively. An analysis of this profile for $q(0)$ and $q(1)$ fixed at 1.08 and 4 , respectively, shows that the $3/2$ tearing mode, which is stable for $\lambda = 1$, becomes strongly unstable as $q(0)$ increases; its (single-pitch) saturation width is also an increasing function of λ . Although the $2/1$ mode is already unstable for $\lambda = 1$, its growth rate and saturation width also increase with λ . For instance, if $q(1)$ and λ are held fixed at 4 and 2.5 , respectively, then the growth rates and saturation widths of both the $2/1$ and $3/2$ increase with increasing $q(0)$.

On the basis of this analysis, we conclude that the most interesting profiles are the ones with large λ and $q(0)$ because both the $2/1$ and $3/2$ modes are unstable and have relatively large growth rates and saturation widths. Consequently, we choose profiles with $\lambda = 4$, $q(1) \sim 4$, and several values of $q(0)$. The results that we show in the figures correspond to $q(0) = 1.38$, which is close to the value observed in PLT. This profile was also considered in Ref. 5(c); however, only the $2/1$

mode was studied in Ref. 5(c) because the two-dimensional MASS code was employed. We take $S = 1.3 \times 10^5$ (normalized at $r = 0$), which corresponds to resistivities of the order of those in TOSCA and LT-3. The resistivity is taken to be constant in time and given by $\eta(r) = E_{\zeta}^w / J_{\zeta o}(r)$, where the o subscript denotes equilibrium quantities; of course, for large toroidal current deformations this model is not self-consistent. In a run, both the 2/1 and 3/2 modes are perturbed initially.

The basic results of the 3-D calculations are summarized in Fig. 1, where the instantaneous growth rates of the 2/1 and 3/2 modes are plotted as functions of time (solid lines). The growth rate of the 2/1 mode decreases in the same way that it does in two dimensions when only the 2/1 pitch is present. Although the growth rate of the 3/2 mode also decreases as the mode saturates if only that pitch is present, in this three-dimensional run the 3/2 mode growth rate accelerates substantially and goes through a maximum or peak. Simultaneously, other modes are destabilized, particularly the 1/1 and 5/3 modes.

As the various modes are destabilized, the radial profile of the toroidal current density becomes much more severely deformed than in the two-dimensional case because islands of many different pitches develop as the growth rates peak. In Fig. 2, islands of various pitches are plotted near the end of the run. These flux contours were obtained by projecting from Ψ modes of a given pitch and combining the projection with the $m = 0/n = 0$ piece of Ψ to define a helical flux function for that pitch. It is clear from Fig. 2 that overlapping islands develop, extending essentially from the plasma core to the limiter. Presumably, this island activity will lead to rapid transport of heat from the

plasma center to the limiter because of the large parallel thermal conductivity.

Similar numerical results have been obtained for other flat profiles for which the 2/1 and 3/2 modes are linearly unstable. We have studied several values of S and different initial conditions.

An analytic model has also been constructed. By evaluating the growth rate of the 3/2 and 5/3 modes, including the $m = 0/n = 0$ deformation of the equilibrium by the 2/1 mode, one finds that although the growth rate of the 3/2 increases and the 5/3 mode becomes unstable, the magnitudes of the quasi-linearly corrected growth rates are much smaller than those shown in Fig. 1. Consequently, a model that includes mode coupling as well as quasi-linear theory must be constructed. Our analysis shows that the dominant effect that reduces the growth rate of the 2/1 mode is the quasi-linear evolution of the equilibrium (0/0 perturbation) caused by the 2/1 mode. The 1/1 and 5/3 modes are driven by the coupling of the 2/1 and 3/2 modes. The 3/2 mode is then in turn destabilized by coupling with the 1/1 and 5/3 modes through the 2/1 mode.

If we denote the Fourier components of Ψ by Ψ_{mn} , where m and n are the poloidal and toroidal mode numbers, respectively, and employ the WKB approximation $\Psi_{mn}(t) \approx \Psi_{mn}^0 \exp \left[\int_{t_0}^t dt' \gamma_{mn}(t') \right]$, where Ψ_{mn}^0 is the Fourier component at $t = t_0$, a Fourier analysis of Eqs. (1) and (2) yields the following set of integral equations for the instantaneous growth rates:

$$\gamma_{11}(t) = \gamma_{53}(t) = \gamma_{21}(t) + \gamma_{32}(t) \quad , \quad (3)$$

$$\gamma_{21}(t) = \gamma_{21}^0 + g_1(\psi_{21}^0, \psi_{00}^0) \exp \left[\int_{t_0}^t dt' \gamma_{00}(t') \right] \quad , \quad (4)$$

$$\gamma_{00}(t) = 2\gamma_{21}^0 \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^t dt' [2\gamma_{21}(t') - \gamma_{00}(t')] \right\} \quad , \quad (5)$$

$$\gamma_{32}(t) = \gamma_{32}^0 + g_2[(\psi_{21}^0, \psi_{11}^0) + (\psi_{21}^0, \psi_{53}^0), \psi_{32}^0] \quad .$$

$$\exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^t dt' 2\gamma_{21}(t') \right\} \quad . \quad (6)$$

The quantities g_1 and g_2 are coupling coefficients that depend as indicated on quantities at $t = t_0$, where t_0 is the time when linear eigenmodes have developed.

The analytic solution of Eqs. (3)–(6) is $\gamma_{21}(t) = \gamma_{21}^0 + \{g_1 \exp [2\gamma_{21}^0(t - t_0)]\}/D(t - t_0)$, $\gamma_{00}(t) = \gamma_{21}^0 + \gamma_{21}(t)$, and $\gamma_{32}(t) = \gamma_{32}^0 + \{g_2 \exp [2\gamma_{21}^0(t - t_0)]\}/D(t - t_0)^2$, where $D(t - t_0) = 1 - g_1 \{\exp [2\gamma_{21}^0(t - t_0) - 1]\}/(2\gamma_{21}^0)$. Clearly, a maximum occurs in the expression for the 3/2 growth rate provided $g_1 < 0$ and $g_2 > 0$. The position of the maximum is given by $\Delta t \equiv (t^M - t_0) = [\ln (2\gamma_{21}^0/|g_1|)]/(2\gamma_{21}^0)$ and the value is given by $\Delta\gamma \equiv \gamma_{32}^M - \gamma_{32}^0 = g_2\gamma_{21}^0/(2|g_1|)$, where the M superscript denotes quantities at the peak. Because of the way in which the coupling coefficients scale with the parameters at $t - t_0$, Δt and $\Delta\gamma$ scale in the following fashion for a particular q profile: $(\Delta t)' = (\gamma_{21}^0 \Delta t - \ln \epsilon)/(\gamma_{21}^0)'$ and $(\Delta\gamma)' = (\gamma_{32}^0)' \Delta\gamma/\gamma_{32}^0$, where ϵ denotes the magnitude of ψ_{21} . Rather than compute g_1 and g_2 analytically, which is a difficult task because of the many tearing layers involved, we determined them by using the preceding expressions for Δt and $\Delta\gamma$ to fit the data for one run; then we use the scaling rules for other runs and for large S values that cannot be analyzed with the code because

of the small tearing layer widths involved. But we have preliminary results from a more efficient code which show the same characteristics for $S = 10^6$ at $r = 0$. An analysis of several runs verifies the scaling rules for Δt and $\Delta \gamma$.

The mechanism described here is generally consistent with the experimental data on the major disruption obtained in the LT-3 and PLT devices. For example, in LT-3, the toroidal probes show the presence of $n = 1$ and $n = 2$ modes, the poloidal probes show the presence of $m = 1, 2$, and 3 modes, and the combination $m = 3/n = 2$ has been detected.² In addition, in PLT³ flat profiles are sometimes observed preceding the major disruption. Furthermore, although $m = 2$ precursor oscillations are observed, the disruption itself often exhibits poloidal asymmetry, presumably corresponding to the generation of odd poloidal mode numbers. Finally, during the disruption $m = 1$ oscillations are often observed within the plasma core; this observation might correspond to the generation of the $m = 1$ mode described here.

The most important feature of the major disruption that any model must explain is the rapid time scale. For the mechanism described here, the characteristic time scale for the development of the magnetic islands is the width of the peak in the $3/2$ growth rate. If we define the half width Γ by $\gamma_{32}(t^M \pm \Gamma) - \gamma_{32} = \Delta\gamma/2$, then $\Gamma \approx (\gamma_{21}^0)^{-1}$.

Assuming that the scaling does hold for all values of S , we find that in PLT, Γ according to the resistive MHD theory is approximately 230 sec. If the effect of diamagnetic drifts is included in the expression for γ_{21}^0 , assuming that the electron diamagnetic drift

frequency is given by the observed frequency (2 kHz) of the $m = 2$ precursor oscillations, then $\Gamma \approx 440$ sec. These time scales are consistent with the observed disruption time of 500 sec. A study of several other machines, including LT-3 and TOSCA for which the preceding analysis rigorously applies as far as the magnitude of the resistivity is concerned, also shows that Γ is consistent with the observed disruption time (approximately 10 μ sec).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Research sponsored by the Office of Fusion Energy (ETM), U.S. Department of Energy, under contract W-7405-eng-26 with the Union Carbide Corporation.

REFERENCES

1. E. P. Gorbunov et al., Sov. At. Energy 15, 1105 (1963); L. A. Artsimovich et al., Tokyo IAEA Conf., Nucl. Fusion Suppl., 1 (1974); F. Karger et al., Plasma Physics and Controlled Nuclear Fusion Research 1976, Vol. 1, p. 267 (1977); Equipe TFR, Ibid, p. 279; S. V. Mirnov et al., Ibid, p. 291.
2. (a) I. Hutchinson, Phys. Rev. Lett., 37, 388 (1976); (b) D. B. Albert et al., Nucl. Fusion 17, 863 (1977); (c) D. B. Albert, Research School of Physical Sciences, The Australian National University, P. O. Box 4, Canberra, A.C.T., 2600, private communication (Dec. 1977).
3. N. R. Sauthoff, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. 22, 1057 (1977).
4. (a) M. N. Rosenbluth et al., Phys. Fluids 16, 1894 (1973); (b) M. N. Rosenbluth et al., Phys. Fluids 19, 1987 (1976); (c) R. Y. Dagazian, Nucl. Fusion 16, 123 (1976); (d) B. Kadomtsev, Plasma Physics and Controlled Thermonuclear Fusion Research 1976, Vol. 1, p. 555 (1977); (3) J. M. Finn, Phys. Fluids 20, 1749 (1977).
5. (a) R. B. White et al., Plasma Physics and Controlled Thermonuclear Research 1976, Vol. 1, p. 569 (1977); D. Biskamp et al., Ibid, p. 579; (b) R. B. White et al., Phys. Fluids; (c) R. B. White et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 39, 1618 (1977).
6. H. R. Strauss, Phys. Fluids 19, 134 (1976); H. R. Hicks et al., ORNL/TM-6096, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee (December 1977); D. Biskamp, Max-Planck Institut, Garching bei Munchen, FRG, private communication (1977).
7. H. P. Furth et al., Phys. Fluids 16, 1054 (1973).
8. H. P. Furth et al., Phys. Fluids 6, 459 (1963).

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1. The instantaneous growth rates of the $2/1$ and $3/2$ modes as a function of time.

Fig. 2. Selected magnetic islands (obtained by projecting Fourier components of a given pitch) observed at the end of the run.

Fig. 1.

Fig. 2.

ORNL/TM-6213
Dist. Category UC-20 g

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

1. L. A. Berry	14. B. Carreras
2. J. D. Callen	15. H. R. Hicks
3. R. A. Dandl	16. J. A. Holmes
4. R. A. Dory	17. D. K. Lee
5. G. G. Kelley	18-47. B. V. Waddell
6. H. H. Haselton	48-49. Laboratory Records Department
7. P. N. Haubenreich	50. Laboratory Records, ORNL-RC
8. M. S. Lubell	51. Document Reference Section
9. O. B. Morgan	52-53. Central Research Library
10. H. Postma	54. Fusion Energy Division Library
11. M. W. Rosenthal	55. Fusion Energy Division
12. J. Sheffield	Communications Center
13. D. Steiner	56. ORNL Patent Office

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

57. Bibliothek, Max-Planck Institute für Plasmaphysik, 8046 Garching bei München, Federal Republic of Germany
58. Bibliothèque, Service du Confinement des Plasmas, C.E.A., B.P. No. 6, 92, Fontenay-aux Roses (Seine), France
59. Lung Cheung, Department of Electronics, University Science Center, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong
60. J. F. Clarke, Office of Fusion Energy, G-234, Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20545
61. R. W. Conn, Fusion Technology Program, Nuclear Engineering Department, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706
62. CTR Library, c/o Alan F. Haight, United Technologies Research Laboratory, East Hartford, CT 06108
63. CTR Reading Room, c/o Allan N. Kaufman, Physics Department, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720
64. J. Narl Davidson, School of Nuclear Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332
65. Documentation S.I.G.N., Département de la Physique du Plasma et de la Fusion Contrôlée, Association EURATOM-CEA sur la Fusion, Centre d'Études Nucléaires, B.P. 85, Centre du TRI, 38041 Grenoble, Cedex, France
66. W. R. Ellis, Office of Fusion Energy, G-234, Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20545
67. Harold K. Forsen, Exxon Nuclear Co., Inc., 777 106th Avenue, N.E., C-000777, Bellevue, WA 98009
68. Harold P. Furth, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Princeton University, Forrestal Campus, P.O. Box 451, Princeton, NJ 08540
69. Roy W. Gould, California Institute of Technology, Mail Stop 116-81, Pasadena, CA 91125
70. Robert L. Hirsch, Exxon Research and Engineering, P.O. Box 101, Florham Park, NJ 07932

71. Raymond A. Huse, Manager, Research and Development, Public Service Gas and Electric Company, 80 Park Place, Newark, NJ 07101
72. T. Hsu, Office of Fusion Energy, G-234, Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20545
73. V. E. Ivanov, Physical-Technical Institute of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Sukhumi, U.S.S.R.
74. A. Kadish, Office of Fusion Energy, G-234, Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20545
75. L. M. Kovrizhnikh, Lebedev Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Leninsky Prospect 53, Moscow, U.S.S.R.
76. Guy Laval, Groupe de Physique Théorique, Ecole Polytechnique, 91 Palaiseau, Paris, France
77. Library, Centre de Recherches en Physique des Plasma, 21 Avenue des Bains, 1007, Lausanne, Switzerland
78. Library, Culham Laboratory, United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 3DB, United Kingdom
79. Library, FOM-Institut voor Plasma - Fysica, Rijnhuizen, Jutphaas, Netherlands
80. Library, Institute for Plasma Physics, Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan 464
81. Library, International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy
82. Library, Laboratorio Gas Ionizzati, Frascati, Italy
83. Dsumber G. Lominadze, Academy of Sciences of the Georgian S.S.R., 8 Dzerzhinski St., 38004, Tbilisi, U.S.S.R.
84. Oscar P. Manley, Office of Fusion Energy, G-234, Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20545
85. D. G. McAlees, Exxon Nuclear Co., Inc., Research and Technology Laser Enrichment Department, 2955 George Washington Way, Richland, WA 99352
86. J. E. McCune, School of Engineering, Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Bldg. 37-391, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139
87. Claude Mercier, Service du Theorie des Plasmas, Centre d'Études Nucléaires, Fontenay-aux-Roses (Seine), France
88. K. G. Moses, Office of Fusion Energy, G-234, Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20545
89. D. Pfirsch, Institute for Plasma Physics, 8046 Garching bei München, Federal Republic of Germany
90. Plasma Physics Group, Department of Engineering Physics, Australian National University, P.O. Box 4, Canberra A.C.T. 2600, Australia
91. Robert E. Price, Office of Fusion Energy, G-234, Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20545
92. A. Rogister, Institute for Plasma Physics, KFA, Postfach 1913, D-5170, Jülich 1, Federal Republic of Germany
93. W. Sadowski, Office of Fusion Energy, G-234, Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20545
94. V. D. Shafranov, I. V. Kurchatov Institute of Atomic Energy, 46 Ulitsa Kurchatova, P.O. Box 3402, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

95. Yu. S. Sigov, Institute of Applied Mathematics of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, Miuskaya, Sq. 4, Moscow A-47, U.S.S.R.
96. W. M. Stacey, Jr., School of Nuclear Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332
97. J. B. Taylor, Culham Laboratory, United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 3DB, United Kingdom
98. Thermonuclear Library, Japan Atomic Energy Research Institute, Tokai, Naka, Ibaraki, Japan
99. Francisco Verdaguer, Director, Division of Fusion, Junta de Energia Nuclear, Madrid 3, Spain
100. Director, Research and Technical Support Division, Department of Energy, Oak Ridge Operations, P.O. Box E, Oak Ridge, TN 37830
- 101-276. Given distribution as shown in TID-4500, Magnetic Fusion Energy (Distribution Category UC-20g, Theoretical Plasma Physics)