Potentials, $E \times B$ drifts, and fluctuations in the DIII-D boundary
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Abstract

Reciprocating Langmuir probes are used to investigate the structure of electrostatic potentials, $E \times B$ drifts, and fluctuations in the edge ($q < 1$), scrape-off layer (SOL) and divertor of single null diverted discharges in the DIII-D tokamak. These measurements demonstrate that the X-point geometry suppresses potential fluctuations in the drift wave range of frequencies ($20 \text{ kHz} \leq f \leq 300 \text{ kHz}$) as predicted by theory [N. Mattr and R.N. Cohen, Phys. Plasmas 2 (1995) 4042], and suppresses quasi-coherent modes in the edge of H-modes. Consequently, edge turbulence and ballooning mode stability calculations, such as those used in L–H transition and H mode pedestal theories, must incorporate realistic X-point magnetic geometry to quantitatively reproduce experimental results. In the divertor plasma, root-mean-square potential fluctuations $\phi_{r}$, are found to be larger in H mode than in L mode, and in detached versus attached divertor plasmas. These measurements have been used to benchmark turbulence simulations with two unique codes that incorporate realistic X-point magnetic geometry: the 3-D boundary turbulence code BOUT and the BAL shooting code with high-$n$ ballooning formalism. © 1999 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved.
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1. Introduction

Despite several decades of research, our understanding of edge turbulence and transport remains incomplete. For example, the unstable modes, drives and dissipation mechanisms have not yet been conclusively identified [1]. In addition, the effects of conditions such as neutral pressure, radiation, and magnetic shear are not yet completely understood. Significant progress has nonetheless been possible due to the generality of the $E \times B$ shear suppression mechanism, which permits turbulent transport to be controlled without the need to identify the underlying modes or drives. Recent theoretical work has focused on the complex issues associated with coupling of the core to the SOL across the H-mode pedestal region, including the effects of neutral pressure [2], neoclassical SOL currents [3], and edge microturbulence [4–7]. Systematic study of the plasma profiles and fluctuations in the boundary is needed to test these increasingly more complex theories.

In this paper, we present measurements of electron pressure $P_e = n_e K T_e$, plasma $\phi_{pl}$ and d.c. floating $\phi_{dc}$ potential profiles and potential fluctuations $\phi_{r}$ at three poloidal locations in the DIII-D tokamak: the outboard midplane, the lower divertor, and the bottom of upper single null discharges — analogous to the ‘top’ of lower single null divertor plasmas, as shown in Fig. 1. Measurements are obtained with two reciprocating Langmuir probe arrays [8,9] capable of scanning the SOL/
divertor plasma up to and just inside the separatrix. The probe array in the lower divertor, the ‘X-point probe’, provides simultaneous measurements of $n_e$ and $T_e$, the main ion flows parallel to the magnetic field [10], and the d.c. and fluctuating floating potential $\phi_{\text{fl}}$ and $\phi_{\text{df}}$. These measurements are compared with the same quantities measured simultaneously at the outboard midplane and with the results of simulations using the BOUT 3-D boundary turbulence code [11] and of calculations using the BAL shooting code with high-$n$ ballooning formalism [12]. These codes have the unique capability to handle realistic X-point magnetic geometry, which is critical for reproducing the experimental results.

2. Poloidal variation of potential fluctuations

Data have been acquired in two sets of single null divertor L mode discharges: lower and upper single null. Significant changes to the inside of the DIII-D vessel, including installation of the upper outer divertor baffle plate and cryopump [13], occurred between the time that the lower and upper single null data were acquired. To account for these variations, the data from the lower divertor chamber are compared against simultaneous outboard midplane measurements in each case. Typical measurements in the SOL at the ‘top’ of the discharge (a) and in the vicinity of the X-point (b) are shown in Fig. 2. In Fig. 2(a), the electron pressure $P_e$ profile at the ‘top’ (●) is similar in shape to the midplane profile (Δ), indicating that $P_e$ is nearly poloidally symmetric, to within the uncertainty in the flux surface mapping. Both the plasma potential $\phi_{\text{pl}}$ and the rms potential fluctuation amplitude $\phi_{\text{fl}}$ map well from the ‘top’ to the outboard midplane. $T_e$ profile differences lead to a reduction in the normalized rms amplitude from 30% on the outboard midplane to 20% at the ‘top’. For the set of discharges in Fig. 2(b), the X-point was located just inboard of the vertical stroke of the X-point probe, pro-
viding access to the X-point vicinity but limiting the amount of data obtained in the outer SOL [Fig. 1(a)]. The data in the outer SOL and plasma core (∝) near the X-point cover a limited range in the normalized poloidal flux coordinate \( \Psi_n \): 0.998 \( \leq \Psi_n \leq 1.002 \), although the spatial extent is 5 cm (outer SOL) and 4 cm (core); see Fig. 5. Near the X-point, the local \( P_e \) and \( \phi_{pl} \) have strong poloidal variations which complicate comparisons with the midplane measurements. However, it is clear that: (1) \( P_e \) near the X-point exceeds the midplane value, (2) a strong gradient in \( \phi_{pl} \) exists across the separatrix between the private flux and SOL regions [14], and (3) the rms amplitude \( \bar{\phi}_n \) is a factor of 2 or more lower near the X-point than on the same \( \Psi_n \) surface at the outboard midplane.

These conclusions are confirmed by analysis of the potential fluctuations at a fixed \( \Psi_n \) in the frequency domain, as shown in Fig. 3. In Fig. 3(a), the potential autopower spectrum \( P_{\phi \phi}(\omega) \) (proportional to \( \bar{\phi}^2 \)) at the “top” of the plasma near the separatrix (\( \Psi_n = 1.01 \) corresponding to 0.5 cm outside the separatrix on the outboard midplane) is comparable to the midplane spectrum across the frequency range associated with the turbulent particle transport \( I(\omega) \). In contrast, \( P_{\phi \phi}(\omega) \) near the X-point [Fig. 3(b)] is substantially reduced in the frequency range 20 \( \leq f \leq 300 \text{ kHz} \) where most of the turbulent particle transport \( I(\omega) \) occurs. Similar results are obtained up to \( \Psi_n = 1.01 \) into the SOL (2 cm in effective midplane radius). Together, these measurements indicate that electrostatic fluctuations due to \( E \times B \) drift wave like modes in the frequency range 20 kHz \( \leq f \leq 300 \text{ kHz} \) are suppressed in the vicinity of the X-point, as predicted by Mattor et al. [15].

In Fig. 4(a), \( P_{\phi \phi}(\omega) \) on the outboard midplane is compared to \( P_{\phi \phi}(\omega) \) near the X-point in a ELM-free H-mode phase. The L-mode spectrum is also shown for reference. These spectra show that the rms amplitude \( \bar{\phi}_n \) obtained by integrating \( P_{\phi \phi}(\omega) \) over \( \omega \) is larger near the X-point in H-mode than in L-mode due to an increase in \( P_{\phi \phi}(\omega) \) in the drift wave range of frequencies that were strongly suppressed in L-mode. However, \( P_{\phi \phi}(\omega) \) at the X-point remains lower than the midplane value in the drift wave range of frequencies due to the lack of strong quasi-coherent mode activity which is seen just inside the separatrix at the midplane in these H-modes. In Fig. 4(b), the autocorrelation functions corresponding to the H-mode midplane and X-point power spectra in Fig. 4(a) are compared. The midplane potential autocorrelation function shows a clear signature of strong coherent activity (the periodic oscillations in the wings of the autocorrelation function), while this feature is far less pronounced (but not completely absent) in the X-point data. These measurements indicate the quasi-coherent mode, which dominates the potential (and density, not shown here) power spectra at the midplane, is also greatly suppressed near the X-point.

3. Divertor potentials and fluctuations: L versus H mode

Although it is common to measure fluctuation suppression right after the L–H transition, fluctuations can...
rise inside the $E_r$ shear layer/H-mode pedestal region in established H-modes due to increased turbulence drive, particularly for potential fluctuations [16]. In Fig. 5, changes in the vicinity of the X-point between established L and ELM-free H-modes (just prior to ELM onset) are shown. Although the local density is essentially unchanged, $T_e$ rises significantly in both the outer SOL and in the core near the X-point. There is a corresponding drop to a more negative $\phi_{dc}$. The rms potential fluctuations $\phi_{fl}$, however, are a factor of 2 higher across the outer leg of the divertor and into the core near the X-point in H-mode. This measurement contrasts with measurements at the outboard midplane, where the electrostatic fluctuation amplitudes are higher only inside the separatrix, not in the SOL [16]. The result is that the normalized rms amplitude remains nearly constant, although there is considerably more ‘jitter’ at low frequency ($f \lesssim 10$ kHz; Fig. 4(a)) in the L-mode phase. This jitter may be related to the fact that most low power L-modes, like those reported here, are either partially or fully detached in DIII-D.

4. Potentials and fluctuations in detached divertor plasmas

In Fig. 6(a), we compare the divertor conditions for attached (●) and detached (△), slowly ELMing H-mode discharges. For these probe plunges, the outer strike point was over the penetration in the divertor floor for the probe, and the probe traveled nearly within a flux surface, yielding profiles that rise rapidly to the maximum value and remain nearly constant thereafter. Consistent with detachment, $n_e$ is 2–4× higher and $T_e$ 2–3× lower in the outer leg of the divertor. Note that in detached plasmas, the swept double probe yields values
for $T_e$ that are systematically 2–3 times higher than $T_e$ from divertor Thomson scattering [17] so that the values of $\phi / T_e$ reported here for detached plasmas are lower bounds. This difference arises primarily due to the distortion of the probe I–V characteristics by the large amplitude, low frequency (1 kHz $\leq f \leq$ 15 kHz) fluctuations [10] which are strongly enhanced in detached divertor plasmas, as shown in Fig. 6(b). Note also that attached plasmas generally have $\phi_{dc} < 0$ [Fig. 5(a); Fig. 6(a)]. When the divertor detaches, the floating potential rises above 0, but is transiently carried negative during each ELM. This behavior suggests that some ELMs transiently reattach the divertor plasma. It was previously reported [17] that ELMs transiently enhanced $\phi / T_e$ by a factor of 2 in attached divertors, and a factor of 2–10 in detached divertors. In Fig. 6(a), it is clear that the rms amplitude $\phi_{\text{rms}}$ is increased a factor of 2 in detachment even between the slow ELMs. Combined with the decrease in $T_e$, this leads to an increase in the normalized amplitude $\phi / T_e$ by a factor 2–4 between ELMs, and much more during the ELMs [note the logarithmic scale in Fig. 6(a)]. Later in these discharges, the neutral beam power was increased to produce rapidly ELMing H-modes. Similar results were obtained in those rapidly ELMing phases.

5. Discussion

The data presented here have been used to ‘benchmark’ simulations of the boundary (edge and SOL) turbulence [11] with the BOUT code [18]. The BOUT code simulates $E \times B$ drift resistive ballooning-like modes in realistic DIII-D magnetic geometry. The code has, for turbulence codes, the unique ability to model the X-point geometry properly. For the discharges presented here, the BOUT code calculates that the broadband turbulence is due to drift resistive ballooning-like modes with toroidal mode number $n$ between 200 and 400. The resulting density fluctuation power spectra and frequency resolved particle flux $I(\omega)$ are qualitatively consistent with the spectra measured at the outboard midplane, including a significant range of $f^{-1}$ dependence [11]. The BOUT simulations also show that the
unstable modes associated with the turbulence do not extend into the X-point region, consistent with the experimental data.

Myra et al. have modeled the appearance of a strong quasi-coherent feature in the ELM-free H-mode with BAL, a shooting code with high-ν ballooning formalism [12], which also incorporates the X-point magnetic geometry. Using the high-ν ballooning formalism, the code finds modes that are robustly unstable for n < 50 and are near the ideal MHD stability boundary. The code yields instability for this class of modes only in the H-phase of the discharge. The corresponding eigenmodes balloon in the bad curvature region and are small in the X-point and divertor region [19]. These calculations are consistent with the experimental observations in Section 2.

Watkins et al. have determined that the probability distribution for T_e at the target plates in detached divertor plasmas is strongly skewed from a low of 1–2 eV to 10 eV due to the presence of energetic electrons in the pulse associated with the ELM [20]. Such an energetic (nonthermal) electron pulse would effect on the floating potentials, driving the d.c. potential negative as observed during the ELMs. While this observation explains the large excursions of T_e in L-mode and between ELMs in detached H-mode conditions. In these detached divertor plasmas, the X-point region is dynamically very active, appearing to “flicker” between a detached state and an attached state spontaneously triggered by the ELM heat and/or energetic electron pulses burning through the radiating zone.

6. Summary

Electrostatic fluctuations in the DIII-D boundary are found to be suppressed in the vicinity of the X-point relative to both the outboard midplane and the ‘top’ of the SOL. Strong quasi-coherent mode activity inside the separatrix in H-modes (inside the E_r shear layer) is also strongly suppressed near the X-point. These observations are consistent with modeling of the broadband turbulence (BOUT) and the quasi-coherent modes (BAL) in the full X-point geometry. These results stress the importance of incorporating realistic magnetic geometry into turbulence and MHD stability codes such as those routinely used to evaluate L–H transition models [7].

The rms fluctuation amplitude \( \tilde{\phi}_\theta \) in the divertor increases in H mode relative to L mode due to a broadening of the fluctuation power spectrum. The spectral broadening raises the mean frequency above the 5–10 kHz typically seen in L mode divertor plasmas to values closer to those at the midplane and top of the SOL. The low mean frequency and narrow power spectra in L mode are similar to those in detached, ELMing H-mode discharges, most likely due to the tendency of low power L modes like those studied here to be partially or fully detached in DIII-D. The low frequency fluctuations lie outside the frequency range of \( \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B} \) drift wave-like modes where most of the anomalous perpendicular transport occurs, and are quite different in character from broadband turbulence (e.g. \( \phi/T_e \) and \( \phi/T_e > 1 \)). The data present a picture of the X-point region of detached diverted discharges as dynamically very active, in contrast to having a well-defined “equilibrium” about which there are relatively small turbulent oscillations.
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