Progress on Modeling the CDX-U Sawtooth with M3D

Josh Breslau Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory

The M3D Code Group: J. Chen, G. Fu, W. Park, H. Strauss, L. Sugiyama

> Stateline, Nevada April 10th, 2005

<u>Outline</u>

I. Motivation

- II. The CDX Device
 - A. Machine parameters
 - B. The $q_0 < 1$ equilibrium
- III. The Benchmark Problem
 - A. Benchmark parameters
 - B. Mesh
- IV. Original Case: $\kappa = 0$
 - A. Linear eigenmodes
 - B. Nonlinear evolution
 - 1. No heat conduction
 - 2. Parallel heat conduction
 - 3. Perpendicular heat conduction stabilizes ballooning modes
- V. Followup Study: $\kappa_{\perp} = 200 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$, κ_{\parallel} on
 - A. Kinetic energy history
 - B. Puncture plots
 - C. Temperature evolution and q profiles
 - D. Fractal dimension of field lines
- VI. Conclusions

Motivation

- Model resistive MHD events in a tokamak plasma using realistic physical values to make quantitative predictions.
 - Large tokamaks have large disparities in spatial and temporal scales to be resolved.
 - Resistive MHD: Current sheet thickness ~ $S^{-1/2}$
 - Two-fluid MHD: ion skin depth ~ $n^{-1/2}$
 - Small tokamaks operate in regimes accessible to presentday codes.

<u>Characteristics of the Current Drive</u> <u>Experiment Upgrade (CDX-U)</u>



- Low aspect ratio tokamak $(R_0/a = 1.4 1.5)$
- Small ($R_0 = 33.5$ cm)
- Elongation $\kappa \sim 1.6$
- $B_T \sim 2300$ gauss
- $I_p \sim 70 \text{ kA}$
- $n_e^{P} \sim 4 \times 10^{13} \text{ cm}^{-3}$
- $T_e \sim 100 \text{ eV} \rightarrow \text{S} \sim 10^4$
- Discharge time ~ 12 ms
- Soft X-ray signals from typical discharges indicate two predominant types of low-*n* MHD activity:
 - sawteeth
 - "snakes"



- Equilibrium taken from a TSC sequence (Jsolver file).
- $q_{\min} \approx 0.922$
- $q(a) \sim 9$

toroidal current density



Baseline Parameters for CDX

Lundquist Number S	$\sim 2 \times 10^4$ on axis.
Resistivity <i>η</i>	Spitzer profile $\propto T_{eq}^{-3/2}$, cut off at 100× η_0
Prandtl Number Pr	10 on axis.
Viscosity µ	Constant in space and time.
Perpendicular thermal	Original study: 0
conduction κ_{\perp}	Followup study: 200 m ² /s (measured value)
Parallel thermal	Original study: 0
conduction (sound	Followup study: $V_{Te} = 6 V_A$
wave)	
Peak Plasma β	~ 3×10^{-2} (low-beta).
Density Evolution	Turned on for nonlinear phase.
Nonlinear initialization	Pure <i>n</i> =1 perturbation such that $\frac{\max(B_{pol}^1)}{\max(B_{\phi}^0)} = 10^{-4}$

Poloidal Mesh for CDX



- 89 radial zones, up to 267 in θ in unstructured mesh
- Linear basis functions on triangular elements
- Conducting wall; current drive applied by adding a source term in Ohm's law.
- Finite differences toroidally; 24 planes

<u>n=1 Eigenmode</u>

Incompressible velocity stream function U





 $\gamma \tau_{\rm A} = 8.61 \times 10^{-3} \rightarrow \text{growth time} = 116 \tau_{\rm A}$

Higher n Eigenmodes





$$\label{eq:main_states} \begin{split} m \geq 5 \\ \gamma \, \tau_{\rm A} &= 1.28 \times 10^{\text{-2}} \end{split}$$

$$\label{eq:main_states} \begin{split} m \geq 7 \\ \gamma \, \tau_{\rm A} &= 1.71 \times 10^{\text{-2}} \end{split}$$

In Absence of Heat Conduction,

Higher n Resistive Ballooning Modes are More Unstable than



Parallel Heat Conduction Reduces Growth Rates But Does Not

Stabilize the Ballooning Modes



High Perpendicular Heat Conduction Stabilizes All Ballooning



Nonlinear Evolution, Heat Conduction On



Nonlinear Evolution, Heat Conduction On



Initial state: *t* = 1266.17

Poincaré plot 1.0 0.5 0.0 -0.5-1.0

1.5

2.0

0.5

1.0





Late in linear phase: *t* = 1630.64

Poincaré plot 1.0 0.5 0.0 -0.5 -1.00.5 1.5 2.0

1.0





<u>Nonlinear phase: *t* = 1795.61</u>

Poincaré plot







During 1st Crash: *t* = 1810.51

Poincaré plot







<u>After 1st Crash: *t* = 1839.86</u>

Poincaré plot







Stochasticity healing: t = 1944.27







Flux surfaces recovered: t = 2094.08

Poincaré plot



v^{0,0} v^{0,0} v^{1,1} v^{1,1}



<u>After 2nd Crash: *t* = 2228.62</u>

Poincaré plot







<u>After 2nd recovery: *t* = 2498.25</u>

Poincaré plot

<u>Characterizing Field Line Structure</u> with Fractal Dimension

- The dimensionality of a field line inside the separatrix of a tokamak provides information relevant to confinement.
 - Lines tracing out irrational surfaces are two-dimensional.
 - Lines tracing out rational surfaces are one-dimensional.
 - Stochastic field lines are space-filling and potentially three-dimensional.
- The extent to which stochastic lines fill space may give an indication of the effect of parallel heat conduction on radial transport.
- A measure of non-integer dimensions in data sets is provided by the Hausdorff-Besicovitch fractal dimension

$$D = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\ln N(\varepsilon)}{\ln(1/\varepsilon)}$$

where $N(\varepsilon)$ is the minimum number of hypercubes of linear size ε necessary to cover all points in the set.

Fractal Dimension: Good Flux Surfaces

Fractal Dimension: Large Islands

Fractal Dimension: High Stochasticity

Fractal Dimension: Moderate Stochasticity

t = 1944.27

Conclusions

- Nonlinear MHD simulation with actual device parameters is capable of tracking evolution through repeated sawtooth reconnection cycles.
- The fractal dimension diagnostic reliably identifies different field line types, but must demonstrate greater sensitivity to degrees of stochasticity if it is to prove more useful than simple inspection of Poincaré plots. Other diagnostics should be considered.
- Quantitative comparisons with experimental data will first require more careful attention to assumptions of the model.
 - Loop voltage (Ohmic) current drive in device vs. current source term in code.
 - Self-consistent Ohmic heating and evolving resistivity profile must be implemented.
 - Inclusion of two-fluid terms is likely to alter time and space scales of the sawtooth reconnection events.