# Nonlinear Gyrokinetic Simulations of the NSTX Spherical Torus J. L. Peterson,<sup>‡</sup> G. W. Hammett, D. Mikkelsen, S. Kaye, E. Mazzucato, D. R. Smith, R. Bell, B. LeBlanc, PPPL, H. Yuh, Nova Photonics, Princeton, NJ 🔯 🔶

American Physical Society Division of Plasma Physics Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia, November 2009

### Abstract

Recent progress in the numerical simulation of plasma turbulence has led to a greater understanding of the mechanisms behind anomalous heat and particle losses in tokamaks. However, the source of turbulent transport in machines with smaller aspect ratios, such as the National Spherical Torus Experiment (NSTX), remains elusive. Leading contenders for explaining transport in spherical tori include turbulence driven by the Electron Temperature Gradient (ETG) mode and microtearing modes. We present here nonlinear GYRO [1] simulations of microturbulence in a variety of NSTX discharges and make comparisons between numerically simulated and experimentally measured levels of electron-scale turbulence.

# **Electron-scale density fluctuations are measured in NSTX plasmas**



NSTX Shot 124948 shows high levels of electron gyro-scale fluctuations d g when the electron temperature gradient is above the GS2-calculated linear stability threshold for ETG turbulence. Fluctuations reduce after the RF pulse ends [2].



**Reversed magnetic shear affects these fluctuations** 



Shots 129347 and 129354 together show reduced high-k [2] activity, despite large electron temperature gradients, during reversed-shear discharges. Reversed magnetic shear could be linked to electron internal transport barriers. NSTX plasmas with strong reversed shear are found to have temperature gradients well above linear ETG critical thresholds [5].

J. Candy, R. E. Waltz, E. A. Belli, G. M. Staebler, General Atomics, San Diego, CA

# **Electron Temperature Gradient Turbulence Simulations**



Above: Nonlinear simulations of NSTX using adiabatic ions show convergence in space and time. Radially, one needs to resolve the electron gyro-radius, while poloidally 14 points per passing particle are necessary, slightly more than required for non-NSTX plasmas [6]. Additionally needed convergence studies include longer time runs, velocity space and box size.





TGLF [7] and NEO [8] show that electron turbulent transport is well above neoclassical levels, and that when high-k activity is lowered, transport is less, but TGLF predictions must be benchmarked against NSTX data and more-detailed GYRO simulations.

Left: Saturated turbulence shows potential fluctuations with electron-scale eddies and peak electron thermal transport in the ETG range during strong high-k activity.





![](_page_0_Picture_27.jpeg)

### **Reversed Magnetic Shear Lowers Transport Levels**

Left: GYRO simulations using Cyclone ETG parameters [1, 9] show reduced electron transport when magnetic shear reverses. Also, lower values of shear help the adiabatic ion model saturate [1].

Below: TGLF simulations of reversedshear discharges show a drop in NSTX electron thermal transport and support the electron-internal transport barrier observations [5].

![](_page_0_Figure_31.jpeg)

## **Conclusions and Open Questions**

 Nonlinear Simulations of NSTX turbulence demonstrate ETG-driven turbulence. TGLF shows increased electron thermal transport during high-k diagnostic activity. • GYRO and TGLF predict decreased electron transport with reversed magnetic shear. Inside regions of reversed magnetic shear, predicted electron transport is low.

- What other factors are important for NSTX turbulence simulations? - How well do TGLF and GYRO agree for NSTX? - What are the steady-state predicted transport profiles for NSTX? - What is the connection between high-k fluctuations and gyrokinetic turbulence?

### References

[1] J. Candy, R. E. Waltz et al., J. Phys. Conf. Ser. 78, 012008 (2007) [2] E. Mazzucato et al., Phys. Rev. Letters **101**, 075001-4 (2008) [4] W. Dorland et al., Phys. Rev. Letters 85, 5579 (2000) [6] J. Candy and R. E. Waltz, Phys. Plasmas **13**, 032310-11 (2006) [7] G. M. Staebler et al., Phys. Plasmas 14, 055909 (2007) [8] E. A. Belli and J. Candy, Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion 51, 075018 (2009)