
EFDA–JET–CP(07)03/60

V. Petrzilka, J. Mailloux, M. Goniche, K. Rantamäki, G. Corrigan, V. Parail,
P. Belo, A. Ekedahl, K. Erents, P. Jacquet, K. Kirov, J. Ongena, J. Spence
and JET EFDA contributors

Near LH Grill Density Variations as a Function of Gas Puff and LH power

"This document is intended for publication in the open literature. It is made available on the understanding that it may not be further circulated and extracts or references may not be published prior to publication of the original when applicable, or without the consent of the Publications Officer, EFDA, Culham Science Centre, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 3DB, UK."

"Enquiries about Copyright and reproduction should be addressed to the Publications Officer, EFDA, Culham Science Centre, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 3DB, UK."

Near LH Grill Density Variations as a Function of Gas Puff and LH power

V. Petrzilka¹, J. Mailloux², M. Goniche³, K. Rantamäki⁴, G. Corrigan²,
V. Parail², P. Belo⁵, A. Ekedahl³, K. Erents², P. Jacquet², K. Kirov², J. Ongena⁶,
J. Spence² and JET EFDA contributors*

¹Association EURATOM-IPP.CR, Za Slovankou 3, 182 21 Praha 8, Czech Republic

²EURATOM-UKAEA Fusion Association, Culham Science Centre, OX14 3DB, Abingdon, OXON, UK

³Association EURATOM-CEA-Cadarache, DRFC, 13108 Saint Paul-lez-Durance, France

⁴Association Euratom - Tekes, VTT, P.O.Box 1000, FI-02044 VTT, Finland

⁵Association Euratom-IST, Centro de Fusao Nuclear, Lisboa, Portugal

⁶Plasma Physics Laboratory, RMA, Ass. EURATOM – Belgian State, Brussels, Belgium

* See annex of M.L. Watkins et al, "Overview of JET Results",
(Proc. 21st IAEA Fusion Energy Conference, Chengdu, China (2006)).

Preprint of Paper to be submitted for publication in Proceedings of the
34th EPS Conference on Plasma Physics,
(Warsaw, Poland 2nd - 6th July 2007)

We present numerical modeling of near Lower Hybrid (LH) grill Scrape-off-Layer (SOL) plasma density variations $n_{e,SOL}$ as a function of gas puff and LH power with the fluid code EDGE-2D. The computational grid was created for the JET Pulse No: 66972[1]. The gas ionization is difficult to model because it is a 3D problem, the antenna, first wall components and gas pipe have finite dimensions in the toroidal direction, but a 2D poloidal – radial model can provide useful insights. The code includes direct SOL ionization by the LH wave [2]. It is assumed that the ionization by the LH wave is produced due to the local SOL electron heating by the wave. A fraction of power lost in SOL increases the SOL T_e , which in turn increases ionisation in the SOL. Locally generated fast particles can also participate in the heating process. EDGE-2D [2] is modified so that it can model a SOL up to 10cm or more. Modelling of the private space in front of the grill needs to introduce limiter-like features into EDGE-2D. This is attempted in the present contribution. The poloidal limiters are modeled as spatially localized sinks, where the recombination is artificially strongly enhanced. The 2D modeling with poloidal limiters acting as sinks allows to distinguish the private space of the grill between the poloidal limiters in the modeling. In this way, it is possible to investigate the impact of parameters such as gas puffing rate, gas puffing poloidal location, LH power dissipated in the SOL and radial location of the LH dissipated power (e.g., radially near the grill mouth, or further away from the grill mouth), separately on the $n_{e,SOL}$ in the private launcher SOL and in the private RCP (Reciprocating Probe) SOL space. However, the gas puff location in the 2D modeling is always magnetically connected to the LH grill private space, Fig.1. It is therefore impossible to distinguish between magnetically connected and not-connected gas puffing. Similarly, the RCP location is always connected to the LH grill private space. Obviously, there is a need for a 3D modeling code, to obtain a more quantitative description of the trends obtained by the 2D model.

Figure 2 then shows $n_{e,SOL}$ in LH private SOL as a function of the limiter boundary location (changing the distance limiter – wall d_{LW} is similar to changing the distance launcher-limiter) Gas puff is 10^{22} el/s near the Outer Mid-Plane (OMP), i.e., by “GIM6”. Heating in front of the grill is 150kW. The assumed profile of the LH SOL dissipation used in this contribution is shown as profile “D” on the bottom figure. The upper figure shows the $n_{e,SOL}$ in the OMP (between limiters acting as a sink) in the launcher private SOL. The next Figure 3 shows $n_{e,SOL}$ in the limiter sink (top figure) and at the RCP location (bottom figure) as a function of the limiter boundary location. Gas puffing and heating is the same as in Fig.2. Figure 4 shows $n_{e,SOL}$ in the OMP (upper figure) as a function of the heating and puff rates, with $d_{LW} = 4.75$ cm; on the bottom figure there are neutrals profiles in the OMP. Let us note that joined heating and gas puffing tend to flatten the $n_{e,SOL}$ profile, cf. the cyan curve. It can be demonstrated that the flatness of the $n_{e,SOL}$ profile depends also on the assumed profile of the LH wave dissipation. The nearer to the grill the LH power is dissipated, the flatter the $n_{e,SOL}$ profile is. Figure 5 shows $n_{e,SOL}$ in the OMP in grill private SOL, as a function of the gas puffing location, $d_{LW} = 1.25$ cm, with heating in front of the grill = 150kW.

MAIN RESULTS

Both gas puffing and heating/ionization are important in raising the density in the far SOL. Although OMP seems to be the best location for gas puffing, the other two gas puffing locations (near RCP, at the top) also give an increase in $n_{e,SOL}$ with heating. This is important for ITER, where top gas puffing is currently planned. The modeling shows the flattening of the far $n_{e,SOL}$ profile, which is observed in experiments [1].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Petrzilka acknowledges partial support by the Czech Grant GACR 202/07/0044.

REFERENCES

- [1]. M. Goniche et al., this Conference; K. Rantamäki et al., 17th USA RF Conference 2007.
- [2]. V. Petrzilka et al., submitted into Nuclear Fusion.




Figure 1. Schematic representation of the 2D and 3D configuration of the LH grill and RCP.




Figure 2: Left figure: Effects of the limiter boundary location. x- axis: distance from separatrix in m. Right figure: Profile “D” of the LH field dissipation (a.u.)” Series 1 (blue diamonds): $d_{LW} = 4.75\text{cm}$ (grill $\sim 3\text{cm}$ behind the limiter), series 2 (magenta rectangles): $d_{LW} = 2.75\text{cm}$ (grill $\sim 1\text{cm}$ behind the limiter), and series 3 (yellow triangles): $d_{LW} = 1.25\text{cm}$ (grill is \sim flush with the limiter).




Figure 3: Profiles of $n_{e,SOL}$ near limiters and in the RCP private SOL.




Figure 4: Upper figure: $n_{e,SOL}$ as a function of the heating and puff rates, at the bottom figure there are corresponding neutrals profiles in the OMP. Blue diamonds: 0 heating, 0 puff, magenta rectangulars: 0 heating, puff = $1e22$ el/s, yellow triangles: heating = 150 kW, 0 puff, Cyan circles: heating = 150 kW, puff = $1e22$ el/s.




Figure 5: Profile of $n_{e,SOL}$ in the OMP in grill private SOL, as a function of the gas puff location. Blue diamonds: 0 heating, 0 puff, magenta rectangulars: gas puff $1e22$ el/s near OMP, yellow triangles: gas puff near RCP, cyan circles: gas puff at the top.