



HAL
open science

Safety factor impact on the radial electric field in gyrokinetic simulations

R Varennes, M Peret, L. Vermare, X Garbet, Y Sarazin, V Grandgirard, G Dif-Pradalier, P Gendrih, P Donnel

► **To cite this version:**

R Varennes, M Peret, L. Vermare, X Garbet, Y Sarazin, et al.. Safety factor impact on the radial electric field in gyrokinetic simulations. TSVV1 Progress Workshop 2022 - Theory, Simulation, Validation, Verification - Physics of the L-H Transition and Pedestals Progress workshop, Sep 2022, Garching, Germany. hal-03923022

HAL Id: hal-03923022

<https://hal.science/hal-03923022>

Submitted on 4 Jan 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

DE LA RECHERCHE À L'INDUSTRIE



www.cea.fr

Safety factor impact on the radial electric field in gyrokinetic simulations

R. Varennes¹

Acknowledgments:

L. Vermare², X. Garbet¹, Y. Sarazin¹, V. Grandgirard¹, G. Dif-Pradalier¹, P. Gendrih¹, P. Donnel¹, M. Peret²

¹IRFM, CEA, 13108 Saint-Paul-lez-Durance, France

²LPP, CNRS, Ecole polytechnique, 91128 Palaiseau, France

D2.5	Report including statements on the relative impact of some separate ingredients playing a role in the radial electric field formation (orbit losses, ripple, turbulence, neutrals, limiter...)	report or paper submitted, conference contribution	X. Garbet, R. Varenes, L. Vermare, G. Falchetto, P. Donnel	12/2022
------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

[R. Varenes – PRL 2022]

[R. Varenes – PPCF in resubmission]

+ presented in 8 conferences



M2.9	Study the development of a radial electric field in response to key parameters such as injected power, collisionality and safety factor, using the GYSELA and ORB5 codes including simplified limiter/SOL - comparison with fluid code results	L. Vermare, X. Garbet, R. Varenes, P. Donnel	06/2022
------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------	---------

Strong impact of plasma current on edge radial electric field in experiment

- ❖ Plasma current I_P scan performed in WEST discharges
- ❖ $I_P \propto 1/q$
- ❖ $|E_r| \nearrow$ at the edge when $I_P \nearrow$ (observed in Tore Supra and MAST)
- ❖ Effect more significant in USN compared with LSN

[P. Hennequin – EPS 2010]

[H. Meyer – JPCS 2008]



3


What are the mechanisms at play ?

- GYSELA: kinetic code solving

Fokker-Planck: $\frac{dF}{dt} = C(F)$

Poisson: $\epsilon_R \nabla^2 \phi = -\sum_{\text{species}} e \int F d^3v$

GYSELA-X code
PRACE simulation 2020
HPC IRENE-ROME / TGCC-France:
20 days on 12,000 cores
= ~ 6 millions of hours
→ Several Tbytes of data




[V. Grandgirard – CPC 2016]

Does GYSELA contains enough physical ingredients to retrieve the deepening of E_r when q decreases ?

- ❖ Reference simulation $q_{1.0}$ close to Tore Supra #45511 discharge
- ❖ → Supplementary simulations $q_{0.5}$ / $q_{1.5}$ to **isolate only the effect of the safety factor**
- ❖ As in WEST experiments, **same magnetic shear** in all simulations


Safety factor profile used in simulations



Same trend as the experiment retrieved on the radial electric field

- ❖ Simulations run for $\sim 150\,000 \omega_c^{-1}$
→ in a saturated turbulent state
- ❖ Thermodynamical gradients similar for each case
- ❖ $|E_r|$ observed to increase with I_p near the edge → qualitatively **similar to experiment**


Radial electric field E_r profiles



The turbulence intensity increases with the safety factor


- ❖ Turbulent intensity \nearrow with q
 - Expected from theory/experiment
- [T. Dannert – PoP 2005] [C.C Petty – PoP 2004]
- ❖ Non linear evolution → saturation
 - [R.E. Waltz – PoP 1997]
- ❖ Effect of turbulence less important in low q case ?
 - Neoclassical effect prevails ?

Turbulent intensity profiles



- ❖ Same simulations performed with artificially killing all turbulent modes
- ❖ No significant effect of q on these neoclassical simulations

Temporal evolution of the flux-averaged electric potential ϕ_{00}
Average between $0.75 < r/a < 0.85$




However, synergy between neoclassic and turbulent effect may still matter

❖ Neoclassical effects can modify the turbulent drive


$$\partial_t V_P = \underbrace{-\nabla \cdot \Pi_{r\theta}}_{\text{Turbulent}} - \underbrace{v_\theta}_{\text{Neoclassical}} (V_P - V_{neo}) \quad \rightarrow \quad V_{P,eq} = \frac{-\nabla \cdot \Pi_{r\theta}}{v_\theta} + V_{neo} \sim E_r/B$$

[T.A. Giannakon - PoP 2002]



- ❖ Observed in simulations:
 - At low q : static zonal structures
 - At high q : high frequency events

Spatio-temporal evolution of E_r




Turbulence feeds Zonal Flows and GAMs differently depending on q

- ❖ Zonal Flows are quasi-static poloidal flows generated by turbulence
- ❖ GAMs \rightarrow oscillations of ϕ due to toroidal curvature ... that can be driven by turbulence

[P. Angelino - PPCF 2006]


[N. Miyato - PoP 2004]

[G.D. Conway - NF 2022]



- ❖ E_r frequency spectra in the range $0.75 < r/a < 0.85$
- ❖ Same “available” energy in each simulation
- ❖ GAMs → strongly **driven by turbulence** in the high q case
- ❖ **Low q** : weak turbulent intensity & weak GAM drive → energy has to aliment ZF ?


Profiles of frequency spectra



The location of zonal flow source coincide with the E_r well

- ❖ $\nabla \cdot \Pi_{r\theta} \rightarrow$ Turbulent source
- ❖ Zonal Flows and GAMs \nearrow with $\nabla \cdot \Pi_{r\theta}$
- ❖ **Low q** \rightarrow Turbulence feeds ZF
- ZF responsible for internal **transport barriers** that reduce turbulence
- ❖ **High q** \rightarrow Turbulence feeds GAMs
- GAMs less efficient to quench turbulence

[K. Miki - NF 2011]



- ❖ Experiments on WEST show that **edge E_r** when $I_p \nearrow$ so when $q \searrow$
- ❖ This effect is **retrieved** qualitatively **with gyrokinetic simulations**
- ❖ **Neoclassical processes are negligible** regarding the E_r well formation
- ❖ Main effect seems to be the **turbulent energy transfer** that favor either the **zonal flows** or the **GAMs** depending on the safety factor value
- ❖ Further study \rightarrow 'advanced' signal processing tools (bicoherence...)

The work in ongoing ...

! Work in progress !

- ❖ 0D model from Miki & Diamond → energy transfer between turbulence/GAMs/ZF
[K. Miki – NF 2011]
- ❖ Exploratory model → simplified version ... but with main q dependences
- ❖ Lot of unknown parameters set ah-hoc → not for precise quantification

Turbulent energy: $\partial_t I = II_L - I^2 - C_0 I \mathcal{E}_0 - C_G I \mathcal{E}_G$

ZF energy: $a_0 \partial_t \mathcal{E}_0 = \mathcal{E}_0 I - \mathcal{E}_0 I_0 - \mathcal{E}_0^2$

GAM energy: $a_G \partial_t \mathcal{E}_G = \mathcal{E}_G I - \mathcal{E}_G I_G - \mathcal{E}_G^2$

❖ 4 types of stationary solutions

!! Work in progress !!

- ❖ No flows $I \neq 0$, $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_G = 0$
- ❖ ZF only $I \neq 0$, $\varepsilon_0 \neq 0$, $\varepsilon_G = 0$
- ❖ GAMs only $I \neq 0$, $\varepsilon_0 \neq 0$, $\varepsilon_G = 0$
- ❖ Mixed ZF/GAM $I \neq 0$, $\varepsilon_0 \neq 0$, $\varepsilon_G \neq 0$


❖ Only accounted dependence with safety factor

- ❖ Normalized growth rate $I_L = \bar{I}_L \sqrt{q}$ (Observed in simulations)
- ❖ ZF damping rate $I_0 = \bar{I}_0 q$ (Neoclassical friction)
- ❖ GAMs damping rate $I_G = \bar{I}_G q^5 \exp\left(-\frac{11}{4} q^2\right)$ (Collisionless prediction)


- ❖ With the scaling $\bar{I}_0 \ll \bar{I}_L \ll \bar{I}_G$, the simulations behavior is retrieved
- ❖ Lot of assumptions in the model ... but still encouraging

!/\ Work in progress !/\

ZF energy



GAM energy



Turbulent energy

