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Abstract

For some divertor aspects, such as detached plasmas or the private flux zone, it is not clear that the controlling physics has been fully identified. This is a particular concern when the details of the plasma are likely to be important in modeling the problem — for example, modeling co-deposition in detached inner divertors. An empirical method of “reconstructing” the plasma based on direct experimental measurements may be useful in such situations. It is shown that a detached plasma in the outer divertor leg of DIII-D can be reconstructed reasonably well using spectroscopic and probe data as input to a simple onion-skin model and the Monte Carlo hydrogenic code, EIRENE. The calculated 2D distributions of $n_e$ and $T_e$ in the detached divertor were compared with direct measurements from the divertor Thomson scattering system, a diagnostic capability unique to DIII-D.
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I. Introduction

Interpretive codes such as TRANSP provide a useful method for analyzing the plasma inside the separatrix by taking experimental radial profiles of \(n_e, T_{e,i}\), etc. as input, and extracting information such as \(\chi_\perp(r)\) through evaluation of radial particle, momentum and energy balances. It would be valuable to have an equivalent interpretive analysis method for the region outside the separatrix. Such an empirical “re-construction” of the edge plasma could be used to extract cross-field transport information, as for the main plasma. It could also be used to help unravel the complicated atomic physics processes that are always important in the edge: the “background plasma” could be employed as input to the powerful Monte Carlo (MC) neutral hydrogen codes, such as EIRENE, and MC impurity codes such as DIVIMP.

Unfortunately, it will probably be a long time before the exact analogue of TRANSP will be achievable for the edge: (a) the edge region is 2D–3D instead of 1-1/2D, and (b) the spatial coverage of edge diagnostics is typically rather limited. In the meantime, however, a mixed approach can be used to achieve an empirical re-construction of the background plasma, where simple 1D “onion-skin” models/prescriptions [1] are used along with the direct specification of the plasma from experimental data (as much as possible) in order to generate 2D “fields” of the edge plasma quantities, \(n_e, T_{e,i}, v_\parallel\), etc. The versatile MC codes can then be applied to this background plasma to produce comparisons with additional edge experimental data, such as spectroscopic line emissivities and line shapes, neutral pressure gauge readings, etc. — constituting further constraints on the plasma re-construction.

DIII-D’s divertor Thomson scattering (DTS) system [2] provides a unique opportunity to directly measure \(n_e\) and \(T_e\) in a divertor plasma, even for strongly detached plasma conditions. When combined with magnetic sweeping of the X-point, 2D fields of \(n_e\) and \(T_e\) are produced over substantial regions of the divertor. DTS data are particularly valuable for empirical plasma re-construction. Unfortunately, on most tokamaks DTS is not available and even on
DIII-D, DTS access to the (generally detached) inner leg is very limited. Since the inner leg is the key region for some of the most critical edge processes — for example, the co-deposition trapping of tritium [3] — there is a strong incentive to develop a method for empirically reconstructing detached divertor plasmas in the absence of DTS. In contrast with DTS, Langmuir probe (measuring $I_{sat}^+$) and spectroscopic measurements are usually available.

The objective of this paper is to establish the basic methodology of empirically reconstructing a detached outer leg in DIII-D using only Langmuir probe and spectroscopic data (no DTS). The measure of success is the level of agreement between the reconstructed plasma and the DTS data.

II. Experiment

Low power L-mode [Simple-as-possible plasma (SAPP)] conditions were used with $n_e = 4.4 \times 10^{19}$ m$^{-3}$ where the outer divertor leg was weakly detached (shots 105516–9). These SAPP shots are from the same set of experiments as the low density (attached) shots (105500–9), where $n_e = 2.5 \times 10^{19}$ m$^{-3}$, that were analyzed in Ref. [4]. Please see that paper for further details of these shots and of the DIII-D edge diagnostic set that was available.

Two different versions of the Onion-skin method Eirene Divimp edGE (OEDGE) code [1,4] were used in these studies. In the earlier attached-plasma SAPP study of simple (L-mode) attached divertor plasmas, an OSM model that solves the standard fluid conservation equations (particles, momentum, energy) was successfully applied. However, for other divertor operational modes and regions — such as detached plasmas or the private flux zone (PFZ) — it appears that the controlling physics has only been partly identified. This is a particular concern when the details of the plasma are likely to be important in modeling a problem — as appears, for example, to be the situation when trying to model co-deposition in detached inner divertors [1]. In this case, it is appropriate to use a more empirical OSM
version that attempts to reconstruct the plasma from the available experimental data. An example of the application of this approach to the C-Mod PFZ can be found in Ref. [5]. We undertake the same type of analysis here, using the high density SAPP data set — which appears to be the most extensive such set assembled for these simple detached conditions, on any tokamak, and thus provides the best opportunity available to test this method.

III. Empirical Reconstructive Modeling of the Detached Plasma

The Onion-Skin Modeling (OSM) section of OEDGE contains a number of different OSM models and prescriptions. The one used here is called SOL28 and its features are shown in the schematic, Fig. 1. The starting point is to establish the $T(s_\parallel)$ profile for each individual flux tube in the scrape-off layer (SOL), which is done partly by direct prescription from experiential data, and partly by simple modeling. Next, with the $T(s_\parallel)$ now available as input, the standard 1D particle and momentum conservation equations are solved for $n_e(s_\parallel), v_e(s_\parallel)$, etc. for each flux tube. The limited data on $T_i$ is from HeII CER temperature just outside the separatrix, near outside midplane, and it shows $T_e \sim T_i$. In the absence of any other $T_i$ data, $T_e = T_i$ was assumed for all locations. $S_u$ is the upstream location where the upstream $T_e (T_u)$ and $n_e (n_u)$ are specified from experiment — the main Thomson and reciprocating probe for each flux tube. $S_{rs}$ is the start of the “radiation zone”, which can be estimated, e.g. from the CIII “cloud” in the toroidal view camera picture, or from 2D bolometric reconstructions; it turned out that the solution was insensitive to $S_{rs}$, and so it was put at the X-point for simplicity. $S_{re}$ is the end of the “radiation zone”, which is assumed to occur where $T_e$ has dropped to 5 eV. The location of $S_{re}$ could be assigned as for $S_{rs}$ but here it was assigned from the $D_\gamma$ toroidal camera view. For detached conditions the $D_\gamma$ emission is strongly influenced by recombination and the $D_\gamma$ “cloud” is assumed to extend upward from the target to $S_{re}$, where $T_e \sim 5$ eV. The peak of the $D_\gamma$ emission is taken to define $S_c$, where $T_e$ has dropped so low that parallel heat convection then carries the remaining power and $T_e$ stays constant at
value $T_t$ to the target, at $S_t$. Between $S_c$ and $S_{nc}$, $T_e$ was just smoothly connected from the $T_i$ value to the 5 eV value.

A simple model is applied to the “radiation region” between $S_{rs}$ and $S_{re}$: the power flux density entering each flux tube is calculated from the standard 2 Point Model relation, $q_{\parallel} = 2\kappa_o T_u^{7/2}/7L$, where $L$ is the flux tube length. It is assumed that 90% of $q_{\parallel}$ is radiated uniformly in $s_{\parallel} \in [S_{rs}, S_{re}]$ and that parallel heat transport is purely conductive.

The ionization source, $S_{ion}$, is specified to be rectangular in spatial shape, centered at $S_{re}$, and of total strength equal to the ionic sink rate to the target for each flux tube — taken from the target Langmuir probe $I_{sat}^-$ value. The DIII-D SAPP data set included shots for three densities, $n_e \approx 2.5, 3.5, 4.4 \times 10^{19}$ m$^{-3}$. The $I_{sat}^+$ values were ~ same for the two higher densities, indicating that the highest density plasma (analysed here) was in the “roll over” condition, just entering detachment. Volume recombination is neglected in this initial treatment given the mild level of detachment. All other particle sources/sinks — such as cross-field transport and drifts — have also been ignored. The applied momentum loss term, $S_{mom}$, was also rectangular in shape, extends from $S_{re}$ to the target, with its magnitude assigned for each flux tube on the basis of the measured pressure ratio, upstream/target.

The target temperature was assigned by a search process: with the foregoing prescription and assuming some value for $T_i$ typical of detached conditions, say 1 eV, the 2D plasma can be solved for, and then EIRENE applied to the resulting “plasma background”. It turns out that the $D_\alpha$, $D_\beta$, $D_\gamma$ emissivity for detached plasmas is a very sensitive $T_e$ thermometer, making it possible to establish the value of $T_t$ with some accuracy.

Figure 2(a,b) shows $T_{eu}$ and $n_{eu}$. The Thomson and (midplane) reciprocating profiles were of the same shape but were shifted relative to each other — evidently due to uncertainties in the separatrix location (a known problem for the Thomson in particular). The lines shown in Fig. 2 are the average of the Thomson and probe profiles. Figure 2(d) gives the Langmuir
probe $I_{sat}^{-}$ profile across the outer target. The upstream and target (total) pressures are shown in Fig. 2(c). The target pressure requires that a value of $T_{et}$, which was set based on comparisons with experimental $D_\alpha$, $D_\beta$, $D_\gamma$ emission across the target that were obtained from the absolutely calibrated filerscopes and multichord divertor spectrometer, Fig. 3. Different values for $T_{et}$ were assumed as input to the OSM and EIRENE then calculated the emissivities (integrated along the appropriate lines of sight, top inset, Fig. 3), lines in Fig. 3. As can be seen, these hydrogenic lines are very sensitive indicators of $T_e$ for detached conditions, establishing that $T_{et} = 0.7–0.9$ eV. In this first simple analysis, $T_{et}$ was taken to be constant across the target.

This then completes the required input to constrain the OSM model used here. The code-calculated $n_e(s)$ and $T_e(s)$ profiles for each of the computational “rings” for which there were DTS data are shown in Fig. 4 as lines, with the DTS data shown as points. Ring No. 14 is adjacent to the separatrix and ring 21 is furthest out. The agreement is generally to within the scatter of the data. It is therefore concluded that this first test has been successful and justifies proceeding to further improvements. The latter will include use of toroidally-viewing camera data in $D_\alpha$ light, the use of 2D bolometric reconstructions to identify the radiative-loss region, assignment of individual $S_c$, $S_{rs}$, and $S_{re}$ values for each flux tube (here the same values were assigned to every flux tube), evaluation of $T_{et}$ for individual flux tubes, inclusion of volume recombination (calculated by EIRENE) iteratively in the plasma solver.

**IV. Conclusions**

It has been shown that a moderately detached plasma can be “reconstructed” fairly well using spectroscopic and probe data (target and upstream) to constrain a simple detachment model (momentum loss and $T_e < 5$ eV convection region near the target). The method has been tested by comparing the plasma solution with direct measurements from DIII-D’s unique divertor Thomson scattering system. The 2D spatial distributions of the plasma conditions in
detached divertor plasmas can thus be generated even when DTS data are not available – assuming the available probe and spectroscopic data set is similar to the one employed here – and can then be used with Monte-Carlo codes to model processes such as carbon-tritium co-deposition.
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Figure Captions

Fig. 1. Schematic of the empirical modeling method used here to reconstruct the plasma in the detached outer divertor of DIII-D. “s” denotes the distance along the field line, with s=0 at the target.

Fig. 2. The upstream $T_{eu}$ (a) and $n_{eu}$ (b) obtained by averaging the data from the (midplane) reciprocating Langmuir probe (+) and the (main) Thomson scattering system (■). The upstream and target (total) plasma pressure assuming 1 eV at the target, (c), assuming $p_e = p_i$. The $I_{sat}^+$ profile across the outer target measured by the built-in Langmuir probes, (d). The vertical dashed libes indicate the region of the outer SOL for which DTS data is available.

Fig. 3. The line-of-sight profiles across the outer target of absolutely calibrated $D_\alpha$, $D_\beta$, $D_\gamma$ emission. Measurements (points) from the filterscopes and multichord divertor spectrometer. EIRENE code (lines) assuming different values for $T_e$ at the target. It is thus established that $T_{ei} = 0.7–0.9$ eV.

Fig. 4. OSM-calculated $n_e(s_||)$ and $T_e(s_||)$ profiles (lines) for each of the “rings” in the computational grid, for which there were DTS data (points). Ring 14 ($\Psi_n = 1.0015$) is closest to separatrix and increasing $\Psi_n$ indicates rings further out, toward wall (Ref. [2]). $\Psi_n$ is the normalized flux radial coordinate.
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