PPPL-2132

PPPL-2132

UC20-D, F, G

DR-0387-5

I-16915

226
9/17/84 J.S. ①
NOTICE

PORTIONS OF THIS REPORT ARE ILLISIBLE. H
It has been reproduced from the best available
copy to permit the broadest possible avail-
ability.

CURRENT RAMP-UP WITH RF WAVES IN A TOKAMAK

By

N.J. Fisch and C.F.F. Karney

AUGUST 1984

PLASMA
PHYSICS
LABORATORY

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

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

DISTRIBUTION - THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

CURRENT RAMP-UP WITH RF WAVES IN A TOKAMAK

by

PPPL--2132

DE84 017062

N. J. Fisch and C. F. F. Karney

Plasma Physics Laboratory, Princeton University

P. O. Box 451, Princeton, NJ 08544

ABSTRACT

The circuit equations for current-drive in a start-up or ramp-up plasma are derived by finding appropriate response functions in the presence of an electric field. The effect of arbitrary wave-induced fluxes on runaway production and current generation can then be determined. An interpretation of the rather remarkable PLT ramp-up efficiencies, difficult to explain using the steady-state efficiency, is now possible. A parameter regime, available also on reactor-grade devices, is identified wherein quick ramp-up by lower-hybrid waves may be efficient.

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.

MASTER

REPRODUCTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

Recent current-drive experiments on PLT¹ have converted wave energy to poloidal field energy with the remarkable efficiency of 25%. Previous experiments²⁻⁵ have concentrated more on maintaining an rf current than on ramping it up. The PLT ramp-up experiments, however, have been in a new parameter regime, wherein the dc electric field dominates over collisions in influencing the hot, current-carrying electrons. In order to interpret these experiments, and in order to determine whether these auspicious results could be extrapolated to larger tokamak experiments, such as TFCX, it is necessary to solve for the behavior of the plasma in the presence of both intense rf waves and a strong electric field.

The circuit equations that describe the ramp-up include Maxwell's equation, $dLI/dt = -V$, and a constitutive relation, e.g., $V = V(I, P)$, where V is the loop voltage, P is the input power, L is the tokamak inductance, and I is the toroidal current. To find the constitutive relation, which reflects the macroscopic properties of the plasma medium, we distinguish $I = I_B + I_d$, where I_B is independent of the rf power. The driven current, $I_d(t)$, contains the cumulative effects of rf-induced fluxes at time t for all $\tau < t$.

To find I_d , we generalize a previously employed technique.⁶ Let $j(t, \vec{v}, E)$ be the current parallel to magnetic field $\vec{B}$ associated at time t with an electron that has initial velocity space coordinate $\vec{v}$ and is immersed in a dc parallel electric field E . In particular, $j(t, \vec{v}, E) = qv_{\parallel}(t = 0)$, where $v_{\parallel}(t)$ is the electron parallel velocity. In the absence of an electric field, $j \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ due to collisions with the background plasma. In the presence of an electric field large enough to cause the electron to run away, $j \sim t$ for large t , and for $E > 0$, $j \rightarrow -qc$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, where c is the velocity of light.

Suppose that power $P(\tau, \vec{v})$ is expended at time τ in pushing electrons with coordinate $\vec{v}$ in some direction $\vec{S}$ in velocity space to a nearby location. The

current that results at some later time t may be expressed as

$$I_d(t) = \int_0^t \frac{P(\tau, \vec{v})}{2\pi R_T} \frac{\vec{s} \cdot \vec{\nabla} j(t-\tau, \vec{v}, E)}{\vec{s} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \epsilon} d\tau, \quad (1)$$

where the gradient operates in velocity space, where $\epsilon = m v^2/2$ is the energy associated with the initial coordinates of the electrons pushed, and where R_T is the tokamak major radius. The physics of the rf current-drive is contained in the Green's function j , which we shall calculate numerically.

Before embarking on this program, we remark briefly on the major processes we expect to describe. An electron absorbing energy and momentum from a source of rf power may subsequently slow down either by collisional interaction with background plasma, or may be decelerated by the electric field. In the former instance, all the rf input energy eventually goes into plasma energy, so none is converted to poloidal field energy. The conversion efficiency of rf energy to electromagnetic energy, given by the ratio P_{el}/P , where $P_{el} = -VI_d$, is zero. In the latter instance, the electron is decelerated by the field, so all of its energy, including the incrementally added rf energy, must, by energy conservation, go into the field. Evidently, $P_{el}/P \rightarrow 1$. This would be an auspicious regime for ramp-up, except for two further effects that are worrisome.

First, if the electric field is very strong, the decelerated electron may eventually run away in the direction opposite to the one desired for current ramp-up. Such an electron, while initially giving up its initial energy to the field, serves as an immense drain on the field energy when it accelerates in the runaway direction. Second, if the electric field is weak, the rf-driven electrons, being hot and relatively collisionless, tend to accumulate and to form a large, hot, plasma component. The conductivity of this hot

component can be much larger than that of the background plasma. Since it is difficult to change the total plasma current in less than an L/R (inductance/resistance) time, the large, hot conductivity may significantly impede current ramp-up.⁷

It turns out that between the regimes, high field and low field, that contain these unfavorable effects, there exists a regime of intermediate field for which high efficiency is possible. Whether by serendipity or astute design, the remarkable PLT experiment apparently falls in the intermediate regime.

To calculate the efficiency, we need the Green's function j , but it is unwieldy and impractical to solve completely for $j(t, \vec{v}, E)$, whose arguments span a huge parameter space. Instead, by following separately particles with common characteristics (runaway or not), and making appropriate approximations for each group, we can characterize j by several functions of fewer arguments. This approach can be implemented by formulating the normalized Langevin equations^{8,9} for electrons undergoing collisions in the presence of a decelerating electric field, namely

$$\frac{du}{d\tau} = -\frac{1}{u^2} - 1 \quad (2a)$$

$$\frac{du}{d\tau} = -\frac{1+Z}{u^3} u + f(\tau) - \frac{1-u^2}{u} \quad (2b)$$

where $u = v/v_R$. We normalized $\tau = v_R t$, $u = v/v_R$, and defined $v_R^2 \equiv v_t v_{te}^3 / |qE|$, $v_R = v_t v_{te}^3 / v_R^3$, $v_t^2 = T/m$, $v_t = \omega_{pe}^4 \log \Lambda / 4\pi n v_{te}^3$, and Z is the ion charge state. The runaway threshold velocity, v_R , is related to v_b defined by Dreicer⁹ by $v_b = v_R (2+Z)^{1/2}$. At $|v| < v_R$, no electrons run away, and at $v > v_b$, almost all electrons run away (see Fig. 2). The term $f(\tau)$ is a stochastic

source with the property

$$\int_0^{\Delta\tau} f(t') dt' = \left[12 (1 - u^2) (1+2) \Delta\tau / u^3 \right]^{1/2} r, \quad (3)$$

where r is a random number uniformly distributed between $-1/2$ and $1/2$. These equations are equivalent to the Boltzmann equation in the high velocity limit. We can use them to form a moment hierarchy and proceed to solve analytically. This can be done for E small to recover the steady-state efficiency² and the rf-enhanced conductivity.⁷

Note that the solution is determined by the three dimensionless parameters Z , $\mu(0)$, $u(0)$, where 0 denotes initial location. For lower-hybrid current-drive at high phase velocities we may restrict $\mu(0) = \pm 1$, where $+$ corresponds to ramp-up. Introducing a separate bookkeeping for runaway and non-runaway (stopped) electrons, we write

$$j(t, \vec{v}, E) = (1 - R(\vec{v}, E)) j_S(t, \vec{v}, E) + R(\vec{v}, E) j_R(t, \vec{v}, E), \quad (4)$$

where R is the probability that the particle runs away, j_S is the current due to the particles which are stopped by the background plasma ($v \rightarrow 0$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$), and j_R is the current due to particles which run away ($uv \rightarrow \infty$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$). This system of bookkeeping facilitates further simplifications. Specifically, the function $j(t, \vec{v})$ may be adequately characterized by functions independent of time. For example, since stopped electrons contribute to the current within a slowing-down time, which is short compared to other times of interest, an excellent approximation is $j_S(\vec{v}, t) = \chi_S(\vec{v}) \delta(t)$, where

$$\chi_S(\vec{v}) = \int_0^\infty j_S(t, \vec{v}) dt. \quad (5)$$

Similarly, the runaway contribution may be characterized by $j_R = \chi_R \delta(t)$ plus a term describing the free acceleration of these electrons. The acceleration term requires that we define a fourth function, $v^{(0)}(\vec{v})$.

Characterizing the current j by the four time-independent functions R , χ_S , χ_R , $v^{(0)}$ is adequate for the purposes of writing the circuit equations. It is also a great simplification of the problem. These functions are found by a Monte Carlo solution of Eq. (2), using 10,000 electrons at each initial condition. Depending on their time-asymptotic behavior, the electrons are then classified as stopped or runaway. For our purposes here, however, we need only R and χ_S ; a discussion of χ_R and $v^{(0)}$ will be reserved for a more lengthy report. In Fig. 1 we plot $G(u, \mu)/u^2$, where the arguments are now understood to mean initial position and where $G(u, \mu) = v_R \chi_S / q v_R$ is fitted approximately by

$$G(u, \mu=1) = \frac{u^4}{5 + Z + [2u + 2(5+Z)^2/3(3+Z)]u^2/(u^2+1)} \quad (6a)$$

$$G(u, \mu=-1) = -\frac{u^4}{5 + Z} - \frac{2u^6}{3(3+Z)} \quad (6b)$$

For $\mu = 1$, as $u \rightarrow \infty$, $G(u, 1) \rightarrow u^2/2$ and $P_{el}/P \rightarrow 1$, but this efficiency applies only to power absorbed by stopped electrons; for large u , the runaway contribution dominates.

In Fig. 2 we show the runaway fraction $R(u, \mu = \pm 1)$. For ramp-up with $u \rightarrow \infty$, $R \approx 60\%$ for $Z = 1$ and $R \approx 85\%$ for $Z = 5$. Note that $R = 0$ for u less than some threshold and the transition to finite R is abrupt. As pointed out by Valeo and Eder,¹⁰ even if only a small fraction ($R \approx 1\%$) of the resonant electrons run away, there may be a significant diminishing of the efficiency if these electrons are not lost. This can be seen as follows: If there are

many Dreicer times ($1/v_R$) over the duration T of the experiment, then $j_R \approx -qc$ and we may approximate

$$\frac{P_{el}}{P} \approx \frac{-vI}{P} \approx (1-\eta_R) \frac{\frac{1}{2} \dot{S} \cdot \dot{v}G}{\frac{1}{2} \dot{S} \cdot \dot{v}u^2/2} \quad (7)$$

where

$$\eta_R = \frac{c}{v_R} (v_R T) \frac{R}{G}. \quad (8)$$

Successful start-up¹¹ or ramp-up¹ experiments on PLT have been in the regime $v_R T \approx 30$, $c/v_R \approx 3$, and $G \sim 0(1)$. Thus, $R \sim 1\%$ can seriously affect the efficiency if the runaways are confined. If the runaways are lost in time τ_c , where $1 \leq \tau_c v_R \ll T v_R$, then η_R must be reduced in Eq. (7) by about τ_c/T .

Using Figs. 1 and 2, an interpretation of the PLT data is possible. The high efficiency implies that η_R is small, either because the spectrum is restricted to u small or because runaways are not confined. Taking $\eta_R = 0$ in Eq. (6a) gives the following table of efficiencies, P_{el}/P , upon pushing an electron from some location u_1 to u_2 :

$u_1 \rightarrow u_2$	$Z = 1$	$Z = 5$
$1.4 \rightarrow 2$	61%	47%
$1 \rightarrow 1.4$	43%	30%
$0.5 \rightarrow 1$	24%	16%
$0.5 \rightarrow 1.4$	35%	24%

Depending on the assumption concerning runaways, this table reveals two possible interpretations of the data. If runaways are confined, then to explain a 25% efficiency, we must restrict $Z = 1$ and require a spectrum extending from $u \approx 0.5$ to $u \approx 1.4$. On the other hand, if runaways are not

confined, then $Z=5$ is allowed, but the spectrum must extend to $u \sim 2$. Conventional wisdom, which says $Z \approx 1$ is unlikely, should then predict that the runaways are not long confined.

That the PLT experiment, with either explanation, is in the regime $u \approx 1$ comports well with other experimental data. The reported ramp-up of 120kA/sec at a density of $2 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ and at a temperature of about 1 keV corresponds to $6v_t \approx v_R \approx c/4$. A spectrum of parallel phase velocities extending from the electron tail (say $3v_t$) to $c/2$ is consistent both with substantial absorption and with the waveguide phasing. Several theories exist for precisely why the spectrum should be so broad.^{12,13} What is important here, however, is that such a spectrum corresponds exactly to u extending from 0.5 to 2.

Note that the efficiency of converting wave energy to poloidal field energy depends only on u , so that the favorable regime on PLT is available on TFCX or other large experiments if we keep the ratio v_R/v_t constant, and employ a similar spectrum of waves. For example, to ramp the current to 10 MA in 15 seconds, take $E = 0.13 \text{ V/m}$, $n = 9 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, and $T = 1 \text{ keV}$, so that both v_R and v_R/v_t are unchanged from the PLT experiment. Moreover, we take $Z = 1$. Assuming, then, a 33% efficiency, we require an average rf power of about 30 MW. Similarly, ramp-up might be achieved with less power over a longer time, but at lower density, or with faster waves.

In the above calculation, care is taken not to produce runaways. If some method of removing these runaways were possible, then even higher efficiencies might be obtained by taking $\omega/k_{\parallel} v_R \sim 2$.

Note that much of our intuition derived from efficiency calculations in the steady state¹⁴ is not suitable for ramp-up. For example, the steady-state efficiency, I/P , is inversely proportional to the density, whereas for quick ramp-up, a high efficiency is possible at high density; in fact, too low a

density may be undesirable. Also, whereas in the steady state, electron-cyclotron waves are about as efficient in producing current as are lower-hybrid waves,⁶ in ramp-up these waves would appear to be a poor current driver, because little parallel energy flows into the strong electric field.

Although some crude estimates were made here, it is clear that more precision is easily available within the framework of this analysis. At the level of precision attempted here, the PLT results are amenable to interpretation and to extrapolation. TFCX with quick ramp-up appears to be reasonable if the PLT parameter regime of v_R/v_t and $\omega/k_{\parallel} v_R$ is kept.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a pleasure to acknowledge stimulating discussions with A. Boozer, D. C. Eder, F. W. Perkins, and E. J. Valeo. The Lower-Hybrid Heating Group on the Princeton PLT experiment has been enormously helpful in explaining in detail to us their experiment, which provided the impetus for this work.

This work was supported by the U.S. DOE Contract No. DE-ACO2-76-CHO-3073.

REFERENCES

- ¹W. Hooke, Plasma Physics and Controlled Nuclear Fusion 26, 133 (1984).
- ²T. Yamamoto et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 45, 716 (1980).
- ³T. Maekawa et al., Phys. Lett. 85A, 339 (1981)
- ⁴S. C. Luckhardt et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 152 (1982).
- ⁵M. Porkolab et al., in Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Plasma Physics and Controlled Nuclear Fusion, Baltimore, Sept. 1982 (IAEA, Vienna, 1983) Vol. 1, p. 227.
- ⁶N. J. Fisch and A. H. Boozer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 45, 720 (1980).
- ⁷N. J. Fisch, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory Report PPPL-2108 (1984), to be published in Phys. Fluids.
- ⁸S. Chandrasekhar, Rev. Modern Phys. 15, 1 (1943).
- ⁹H. Dreicer, Phys. Rev. 117, 329 (1960).
- ¹⁰E. Valeo and D. Eder, private communication.
- ¹¹F. Jobs et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 52, 1005 (1984).
- ¹²P. T. Bonoli, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Report PFC/RR-84-5 (1984).
- ¹³C. S. Liu et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 1479 (1982).
- ¹⁴N. J. Fisch, Phys. Rev. Lett. 41, 873 (1978).

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1 The function $G(u,1)/u^2$ vs u and $G(u,-1)/u^2$ vs $-u$ for (a) $Z = 1$ and (b) $Z = 5$. The points show the results of the Monte Carlo solution of the Langevin equations, the lines show the analytic fit, Eq. 8. Here, $u < 0$ corresponds to initial conditions with $\mu = -1$.

Fig. 2 The runaway fraction $R(u,1)$ vs u and $R(u,-1)$ vs $-u$ for $Z = 1$ (closed circles) and $Z = 5$ (open circles). The points show the results of the Monte Carlo method, the curves show approximate analytic fits near the "turn-on" region $\mu = 1$, $u \gtrsim 1$. The form of the curves is $R = a [(u-b)^4 - c^4]^{1/4} - c$ for $u > b$, $R = 0$ otherwise. For $Z = (1,5)$ we have $a = (0.12, 0.3)$, $b = (1.4, 1.3)$, $c = 0.4$.

Fig. 1

Fig. 2

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION IN ADDITION TO TIC UC-20

Plasma Res Lab, Austr 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. Pelumbo, Dg XII Fusion Prog, BELGIUM
 Ecole Royale Militaire, Lab de Phys Plasmas, BELGIUM
 Dr. P.H. Sakanaka, Univ Estadual, BRAZIL
 Dr. C.R. James, Univ of Alberta, CANADA
 Prof. J. Teichmann, Univ of Montreal, CANADA
 Dr. M.M. Skarsgard, Univ of Saskatchewan, CANADA
 Prof. S.R. Sreenivasan, University of Calgary, CANADA
 Prof. Tudor W. Johnston, INRS-Energie, CANADA
 Dr. Hannes Barnard, Univ British Columbia, CANADA
 Dr. M.P. Bachynski, MPB Technologies, Inc., CANADA
 Zhengwu Li, SW Inst Physics, CHINA
 Library, Tsing Hua University, CHINA
 Librarian, Institute of Physics, CHINA
 Inst Plasma Phys, Academie Sinica, CHINA
 Dr. Peter Lukac, Komenského Univ, CZECHOSLOVAKIA
 The Librarian, Culham Laboratory, ENGLAND
 Prof. Schatzman, Observatoire de Nice, FRANCE
 J. Redat, CEN-CE6, FRANCE
 AM Dupas Library, AM Dupas Library, FRANCE
 Dr. Tom Mui, Academy Bibliographic, HONG 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. Chavda, 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 Diella De Palo, Assoc EURATOM-CNEN, ITALY
 Biblioteca, del CNR EURATOM, ITALY
 Dr. H. 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. Satoshi Itoh, Kyushu University, JAPAN
 Tech Info Division, Korea Atomic Energy, KOREA
 Dr. R. England, Ciudad Universitaria, MEXICO
 Bibliothek, Fon-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 CUZA University, ROMANIA
 Prof. M.A. Heilberg, University of Natal, SO AFRICA
 Dr. Johan de Villiers, Atomic Energy Bd, SO AFRICA
 Fusion Div. Library, JEN, SPAIN
 Prof. Hans Wilhelmson, 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 of 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. Toik, Kharkov Phys Tech Ins, USSR
 Dr. D.D. Ryutov, Siberian Acad Sci, USSR
 Dr. G.A. Eliseev, Kurchatov Institute, USSR
 Dr. Y.A. Glukhikh, Inst Electro-Physical, USSR
 Institute Gen. Physics, USSR
 Prof. T.J. Boyd, Univ College N Wales, WALES
 Dr. K. Schindler, Ruhr Universität, 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 Plasmeforschung, W. GERMANY