

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT • OPEN ACCESS

## Exploring fusion-reactor physics with high-power Electron-Cyclotron-Resonance Heating (ECRH) on ASDEXUpgrade

To cite this article before publication: Joerg Stober *et al* 2019 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* in press <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6587/ab512b>

### Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Accepted Manuscript is “the version of the article accepted for publication including all changes made as a result of the peer review process, and which may also include the addition to the article by IOP Publishing of a header, an article ID, a cover sheet and/or an ‘Accepted Manuscript’ watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by IOP Publishing and/or its licensors”

This Accepted Manuscript is © **Max-Planck-Institut fuer Plasmaphysik**.

As the Version of Record of this article is going to be / has been published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY 3.0 licence, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY 3.0 licence immediately.

Everyone is permitted to use all or part of the original content in this article, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the licence <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>

Although reasonable endeavours have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on IOPscience once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions may be required. All third party content is fully copyright protected and is not published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY licence, unless that is specifically stated in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

# Exploring Fusion-Reactor Physics with High-Power Electron-Cyclotron-Resonance Heating (ECRH) on ASDEX Upgrade

J. Stober<sup>1</sup>, M. Reisner<sup>1</sup>, C. Angioni<sup>1</sup>, A. Bañón Navarro<sup>1</sup>, V. Bobkov<sup>1</sup>, A. Bock<sup>1</sup>, G. Denisov<sup>2</sup>, E. Fable<sup>1</sup>, R. Fischer<sup>1</sup>, G. Gantenbein<sup>6</sup>, L. Gil<sup>3</sup>, T. Görler<sup>1</sup>, V. Igochine<sup>1</sup>, W. Kasparek<sup>4</sup>, F. Leuterer<sup>1</sup>, A. Litvak<sup>2</sup>, R. McDermott<sup>1</sup>, A. Meier<sup>5</sup>, F. Monaco<sup>1</sup>, M. Munich<sup>1</sup>, V. Nichiporenko<sup>7,†</sup>, B. Plaum<sup>4</sup>, U. Plank<sup>1</sup>, E. Poli<sup>1</sup>, L. Popov<sup>7</sup>, Th. Pütterich<sup>1</sup>, Th. Scherer<sup>5</sup>, M. Schubert<sup>1</sup>, W. Suttrop<sup>1</sup>, E. Tai<sup>7</sup>, M. Thumm<sup>6</sup>, D. Wagner<sup>1</sup>, H. Zohm<sup>1</sup>, MST1 team<sup>8</sup> and the ASDEX Upgrade team<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Max-Planck-Institut für Plasmaphysik, Garching, Germany

<sup>2</sup> Institute of Applied Physics, Nizhny Novgorod, Russia

<sup>3</sup> IPFN, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade Lisboa, Portugal

<sup>4</sup> IGVP, Universität Stuttgart, Germany

<sup>5</sup> IAM, Karlsruhe Institute for Technology, Germany

<sup>6</sup> IHM, Karlsruhe Institute for Technology, Germany

<sup>7</sup> GYCOM Ltd, Nizhny Novgorod and Moscow, Russia

<sup>8</sup> Ses: B. Labit et al., 2019 Nucl. Fusion 59 086020

e-mail: Joerg.Stober@ipp.mpg.de

**Abstract.** The ECRH system of ASDEX Upgrade has been upgraded over the last 15 years from a 2 MW, 2 s, 140 GHz system to an 8 MW, 10 s, dual frequency system (105/140 GHz). The power exceeds the L/H power threshold at least by a factor of two even for high densities, and roughly equals the installed ICRF power. The power of both RF heating systems together ( $> 10$  MW in the plasma) is about half of the available NBI power, allowing significant variations of torque input, of the shape of the heating profile and of  $Q_e/Q_i$  even at high heating power. For applications at low magnetic field an X3 heating scheme is routinely in use as it is now foreseen also for ITER to study the first H-modes at one third of the full field. This versatile system allows addressing important issues fundamental to a fusion reactor: H-mode operation with dominant electron heating, accessing low collisionalities in full metal devices (also related to ELM suppression with resonant magnetic perturbations), influence of Te/Ti and rotational shear on transport, and dependence of impurity accumulation on heating profiles. Experiments on all these subjects have been carried out over the last years and will be presented in this contribution. The adjustable localized current drive capability of ECRH allows dedicated variations of the shape of the q-profile and studying their influence on non-inductive tokamak operation (so far at  $q_{95} > 5.3$ ). The ultimate goal of these experiments is to use the experimental findings to refine theoretical models such that they allow a reliable design of operational schemes for reactor size devices. In this respect, recent studies comparing a quasi-linear approach (TGLF) with fully non-linear modeling (GENE) of non-inductive high beta plasmas will be reported.

## *Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG*

### **1. Introduction**

The invited EPS talk, to which this paper is assigned, had mostly the character of an overview on ECRH results from ASDEX Upgrade (AUG). So the main purpose of the paper is to summarize the presented material together with a short historical review and an extensive list of references, in this case strongly biased towards AUG. Additionally some points of relevance especially for ITER and beyond are described and discussed in more detail.

A key point of the paper is to illustrate the interplay between technical possibilities of mm-wave heating on one side and the demands from the experiment on the other side, which themselves continue to develop as the heating system is routinely, reliably and successfully applied in the experiments. In order to give the paper a readable structure this interplay has to be disentangled: section 2 starts describing the evolution of the EC system of AUG using forward references to the studies of fusion reactor physics described in the following section 3 and vice versa. In the last subsection of section 3 the interpretation of high  $\beta$  experiments aiming at non-inductive operation of a reactor will be compared for quasi-linear and fully-non-linear gyrokinetic modeling, especially with the relevance to ExB flow shearing. The paper closes with a general discussion also including the consequences of the findings presented here on control of burning fusion plasmas using EC.

This introduction closes with some basics on EC application used in all sections. For more details see [1]. Here we treat only the case of waves propagating on one of the two branches of the dispersion relation which include vacuum propagation as the zero density limit, such that the antennas can be located safely far away from the plasma on the low field side, in contrary to wave-heating applications using lower frequencies. The branches are orthogonally polarized, called O-mode and (fast) X-mode. Free-space wavelengths on AUG are  $\lambda \approx 2\text{-}3$  mm. EC radiation is transported as beams with cross sections of  $d \approx 10\text{-}100 \times \lambda$  either purely quasi-optically (using refocusing mirrors) or using highly over-sized waveguides. Typically, launchers (antennas) are quasi-optical sections focusing the beam close to the plasma center with the last mirror able to rotate around two axes allowing poloidal and toroidal steering of the beam. Two flat mirrors in the beam line are typically grooved and may be rotated around their surface normals to set any polarization state, which has to match the desired polarization (X or O) at the plasma edge. It is in general elliptical and depends on the angle between  $\vec{k}$  and  $\vec{B}$ . Absorption is significant at  $\omega \approx n \omega_{ce}$  with  $n=2,3$  for X-mode and  $n=1,2$  for O-mode. The highest optical depth has X2 followed by O1, X3 and O2. The choice of the heating scheme depends on the available frequencies, the desired magnetic field and potential cutoffs ( $\omega_{pe}$ ,  $\omega_{RH}$ ) for O- and X-mode. These density limitations depend on the size and aspect ratio of a tokamak. They do limit O1 and very high density X2 operation on AUG, but will not hamper operation at ITER at all, since the crucial quantity  $B^2/n_e$  is much larger in ITER. Indeed, ITER can use its 170 GHz systems with O1 at full magnetic field, X2 at half field and X3 at one third field. For perpendicular launch in AUG the optical thickness of central X2 heating exceeds 100 by far and the beam is fully absorbed within a few mm close to the resonance. Given a beam diameter of  $\approx 3$  cm in AUG, the power of 1 MW is deposited within less than  $10 \text{ cm}^3$ . If that volume would be filled with water it would

### *Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG*

be evaporated within less than 30 ms. Still, for machines of the size of AUG and bigger, non-linear effects do hardly play any role and beam absorption is well described by linear theory. Beam propagation and absorption are typically handled by ray- or beam-tracing models taking into account refraction by gradients in the refractive index  $N$  and (de)focusing. These models also handle EC current drive (ECCD) which occurs for toroidally inclined launch. Variations of the poloidal angle are typically used to vary the absorption location across flux surfaces. Work on AUG generally relies on TORBEAM [2] as beam tracing code. EC waves interact in the linear regime only with electrons and deliver pure electron heating.

## **2. Evolution of the EC system and EC heating-schemes for ASDEX Upgrade**

ECRH on AUG started in 1992 with the construction of a 140 GHz system with 4 beam lines based on GYCOM gyrotrons in collaboration with IAP Nizhny Novgorod, IPF Uni Stuttgart and KIT Karlsruhe. Each gyrotron was capable to operate either 2 s at 0.5 MW or 1 s at 0.7 MW with about 20% loss in transmission. Details can be found in [3] and references therein. Highlights in plasma research were studies of non-linearities of heat transport using heat-pulse analysis [4, 5], effects of EC on density peaking depending on collisionality [6], stabilization of neoclassical tearing modes (NTM) [7, 8] and sawtooth (de)stabilization with ECCD [9, 10, 11]. The system was operated only with the X2-scheme, and the frequency was chosen for central heating at  $B_t = 2.5$  T corresponding to  $q_{95} > 3.5$ , having in mind also off-axis CD applications at the high-field side at lower  $B_t$ . Driven by the successful proof-of-principle experiments on NTM stabilization a new EC system was planned [12] with the key requirements of sufficient power ( $4 \times 1$  MW) and pulse length (10 s) and launcher-mirror movements on time scales well below an energy confinement-time in order to establish real-time NTM control. In order to make the system more versatile with respect to the choice of  $B_t$ , multi-frequency gyrotrons and a broadband transmission line were pioneered by the same partnership as for the first system. The first long-pulse high-power 2-frequency gyrotron (105/140 GHz) was operated on AUG in 2006 [13], but only in 2014 the system was completed as a 2f-system [14]. Major difficulties were the windows for step-tunable operation (beyond the single-disk Fabry-Perot effect, unresolved so far), but also issues related to body voltage insulation, cryo-magnets or cathode coating, which were solved and taken into account for the design of the Russian ITER gyrotrons. Despite of the infancy problems of the system, gyrotron operation at two distinct frequencies fulfilling the Fabry-Perot condition  $d = n \frac{\lambda}{2}$  ( $d$ : thickness of window disk) has proven to be very robust from the very beginning. Its full potential was demonstrated for the Japanese ITER gyrotron using a triode gun [15]. This option was originally not included in the ITER EC but is now one of the options for operation of ITER at 1/3 of the full magnetic field [16]. Real-time NTM control of (3,2) and (2,1) NTMs was demonstrated in 2014 [17]. This control and its further evolution is not part of this paper.

Regular plasma operation with the first gyrotron of the new system started when all plasma facing components of AUG were fully tungsten(W)-coated (2007). As discussed in section 3.1, centrally deposited EC turned out to help preventing W accumulation. In this

### *Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG*

context X3 and O2 schemes were implemented in order to either allow operation at lower magnetic field (similar to the low-field ITER case) or at densities above the X-mode cutoff. Both scenarios were developed for regular use [18] supported by the protective sniffer-probe arrays and additional machine hardening [19]. Extensive operational experience is available in these applications with incomplete single pass absorption including the usage of refocusing holographic reflectors for an effective usage of the power not absorbed in the first pass [20, 21].

Driven by the need to avoid W-accumulation, EC was recognized by the team as a basic system necessary for operation rather than being a tool for specialists. Already in 2010 it was discussed to further upgrade the EC system for AUG. As an additional physics application, high power EC was envisaged as a tool to study advanced tokamak physics, i.e. to study especially the plasma performance for non-standard current profiles as discussed in section 3.3. The layout of this second upgrade was close to that of the first upgrade also aiming for similar performance ( $4 \times 1$  MW, 2 freq.). Major technical innovations were the use of cryogen-free magnets and newly-developed semi-conductor based body-voltage modulators together with FuG, Rosenheim, Germany. For the main (cathode) power supplies, equipment from the dismantled HERA storage ring from DESY could be reused, requiring to continue using tetrode-based fast high-precision series-modulators. The decision to finance the system was taken in 2012. The worldwide call for tender for the gyrotrons with all magnets was won by GYCOM Ltd with JASTEC Inc, Japan as a subcontractor for the super-conducting magnets. Plasma experiments with 2 new beamlines started in 2017, two more followed in 2018. The system uses the launching positions of the original EC system from 1992, which was dismantled by the end of 2015. The launcher optics had to be modified to replace large boron-nitride windows by smaller diamond windows. To allow real-time control of the launcher movements on the time scale of current diffusion, the gearings have been revisited and rebuilt together with gearing experts (FZG, TU Munich). Planning with movements not faster than that time scale allowed to stay with the small size and position of the rotary feed-throughs, which limit the torque but allow a modular transition from the old to the new gearings. For movements on the time scale of the energy confinement time, as necessary for NTM stabilization, the 4 dedicated launchers of the first upgrade shall be used.

Summing up, AUG now has an EC system of 8 beam lines with a nominal installed power of 8 MW at 140 GHz or 6.4 MW at 105 GHz. Due to power limitations on some gyrotrons of the first upgrade and including 13% losses in beam preparation and transmission, the maximum expected power in the plasma at 140 GHz is  $\approx 6.5$  MW. Regularly reached are so far 5.4 MW, limited mainly by arcing in the air-filled transmission lines. As described in [22] several hardening measures allowed us to reach regularly long pulses with the nominal power in one upgraded beam-line such that operation above the 6 MW level seems feasible after upgrading the others later this year. In the context of this paper there is no space to discuss passive and active measures of machine protection against EC operation errors or excessive stray radiation. For AUG these are described in [23, 24]. The physics studies reported in section 3 made partially use of a replacement algorithm of the discharge control system (DCS) managing an abundance of operation-ready gyrotrons. A predefined waveform on the number

### *Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG*

5

of required gyrotrons is used by the DCS to request active gyrotrons according to a priority list. DCS sends requests directly to the fast timing systems of all allocated gyrotrons, which have to be preset to listen to external control. The fast timing systems send availability signals to DCS, which may indicate the encounter of a non-recoverable failure of a gyrotron during a pulse. In such an event, DCS will replace that gyrotron proceeding in the priority list. This is a relatively simple example of actuator management, which is actually developed further by the CODAC group of AUG [25].

### **3. ECRH/CD as a tool to test fusion-reactor physics**

In the following some EC applications on AUG are discussed creating specific plasma states which allow us to answer open questions of reactor physics. We start this section mentioning that many cases discussed below require a mix with Neutral Beam Injection (NBI) heating (on AUG up to 20 MW) and Ion Cyclotron Resonance heating (IC). In AUG, IC is typically applied as H-minority heating, regularly with powers above 4 MW in the plasma.

Most of the H-mode studies available worldwide today were done using dominantly NBI with energies below 130 keV limited by the neutralization efficiency of the accelerated  $H^+$  ions. Confinement- and L/H-threshold scalings are possibly biased by this heating method which leads to dominant ion heating typically at low collisionalities, with many high performance plasmas being characterized by  $T_i > T_e$ . In ITER it cannot be expected that  $T_i > T_e$  since most of the heating is applied to the electron channel ( $\alpha$ -heating and 1 MeV NBI). It is therefore crucial to study the influence of  $T_e/T_i$  experimentally and theoretically to validate the codes used for the experimental planning in ITER. Additionally in a reactor plasma one has to keep in mind the shifted balance between radial energy fluxes characterized by the time scale  $\tau_E$  and the local heat exchange terms between electrons and ions characterized by the time scale  $v_{ei,E}^{-1}$ ‡. The dimensionless number  $\tau_E \times v_{ei,E}$  is a coarse measure to compare the effect of equilibration fluxes (assuming self similar kinetic and heating profiles). As a consequence, the distribution of the plasma heating between the electron and the ion channel does much less effect for example the ratio  $T_e/T_i$  in a reactor, which will stay close to unity, than in a plasma of similar collisionality in a smaller machine. This is at least the case during the burn phase of ITER, when H-mode will be reached and  $\tau_E v_{ei,E}$  will be at maximum, but not necessarily for operation in L-mode with low plasma currents as it will occur at the beginning and end of all discharges and in particular in the commissioning phases of a new machine (ITER PFPO-1 in 2028) [16].

Another significant difference between typical NBI heated plasmas of today and future reactors is the ratio of torque (due to NBI) and moment of inertia being much smaller for the future reactors such that a much smaller rotational shear is expected. This shear is known to reduce the strength of micro-turbulence (see discussion in section 3.3). On AUG wave heating schemes offer momentum-free heating for comparison. (Another route has been chosen by DIII-D using balanced NB, which comes with increased fast ion losses for those injected with

‡ The collisionality  $v_{ei,E}$  is smaller than the collisionality for the momentum exchange  $v_{ei}$ , related to a  $90^\circ$  deflection of the electron velocity due to collisions with ions. The ratio is  $m_e/m_i$  making  $v_{ei,E}$  isotope dependent.

## *Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG*

6

a velocity component opposite to the plasma current [26]. The corresponding effects need to be separated carefully.)

Apart from delivering highly localized pure electron heating with no torque, EC has the possibility to drive toroidal electric current. The direction can be changed modifying the toroidal launcher angle (co-ECCD, ctr-ECCD). In this article we deliberately exclude the effect of very localized ECCD close to resonant surfaces as used to influence macroscopic MHD-modes, although at least the stabilization of (2,1)-NTMs is considered a major application of EC in a reactor in order to stay away from disruptions. The remaining questions in that field address rather matters of technical realizations, diagnostics and algorithms than matters of fundamental physics. Much less understood is the effect of non-standard current-profiles on tokamak operation, i.e. deviating from the shape determined by the profiles of ohmic and bootstrap current combined with quasi-periodic redistribution due to the saw-tooth instability inside the  $q = 1$  surface. Non-standard current profiles are typically achieved by applying external current drive with NBCD, ECCD and also Lower Hybrid waves (LHCD) [27]. An ultimate goal is the fully non-inductive reactor operation based only on bootstrap current and (as little as possible) external current drive. Such a plasma state is dominated by a coupled non-linear interplay of locally reduced transport in the ion and/or electron channel, the corresponding bootstrap current, the dependence of the externally driven current profile on the kinetic profiles, the dependence of the local transport and the plasma stability ( $\beta$ -limit) on details of the  $q$ -profile (which is determined by the current profile), the  $\alpha$ -particle heating which depends on the kinetic profiles, and the ohmic transformer itself which acts as a buffer for excessive or missing current drive. Not to speak about effects of the plasma shape, like for example triangularity.. While it may be interesting from a control point of view to access exactly this operational point in present day devices, one should consider that there is no way to mimic a future reactor in a dimensionless way in today's devices similar to the discussion of  $\tau_E \times v_{ei,E}$  above. Low collisionality is a general prerequisite for efficient external current drive. As a consequence, strong ECCD in small machines increases the ratios of  $T_e/T_i$ , and NBCD based on acceleration of positive ions reduces this ratio. The profiles of driven currents are very different for both systems and the ratio  $T_e/T_i$  can have a strong effect especially on the ion transport [28]. This leads to a coupling of external current drive and ion transport which will be much weaker in a reactor. A similar mechanism may be driven via the effect of NBCD and ECCD on rotational shear, which also affects ion transport. The only reliable way to use present day experiments to predict reactor performance is to develop, challenge and optimize models for the underlying physics as close as possible to first principles. The topics discussed below should be regarded as incomplete examples.

### *3.1. Transport of energy and particles*

As mentioned in the introduction, already the first EC system of AUG was used to study energy and particle transport focusing on heat-pulse propagation and variations of the density profile in L-mode. With more EC power these experiments could be extended to H-modes [29, 28]. The Trapped Gyro Landau Fluid code TGLF [30, 31] was successfully used to model

### *Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG*

7


discharges with varying heating mix and thus significant variation in  $T_e/T_i$  and rotational shear [32, 33], indicating that energy and electron transport well inside the H-mode barrier is reasonably well understood on a first principle basis. More uncertain is the quantitative description/prediction of rotation and impurity profiles. Trends of the variation of the rotation profile with the heating mix and torque input were reproduced correctly and were related to the dominant instabilities [34, 35]. The focus on ECRH studies with impurities was enforced by the W-programme of AUG, which culminated in the first operation of a diverted high-power plasma with completely W-coated first wall surfaces. Empirically, it was found that ECRH was essential to prevent collapses due to central W-accumulation particularly for cases with low gas puff and low safety factor [36]. The plans to use W or its alloys as first wall material for ITER and future reactors motivated studies on W-transport not only on AUG but also on JET or other machines which covered some high erosion surfaces with W. It turned out that the good localization of electron heating in the center together with a source-free penetration of the heating power across the plasma edge were key elements to prevent W accumulation with EC. The latter point made the essential difference to IC until new IC-antennas were developed minimizing oscillating electric fields at the antenna frames, which by sheath rectification lead to the acceleration of light impurities such as Oxygen or Nitrogen to energies sufficient to sputter W from the limiters [37]. Using the new IC antennas, it could be shown that electron heating by IC had similar effects on the peaking of the W-profile as EC [38]. Only for strong, highly localized central EC differences were observed, possibly due to effects of the localized power on MHD-modes, as described in [39]. A mainly theoretical paper on W-transport in AUG and JET is [40]. With respect to ITER, it helps that the ratio of neoclassical to turbulent transport reduces strongly with machine size. Since the inward transport of W is dominantly a neoclassical effect, it is reduced significantly in ITER such that no W accumulation is expected [41]. EC would have been inadequate as a tool to increase central electron heating strongly since  $\alpha$ - and NBI-heating are the dominant sources. Experimentally, on AUG  $\approx 2$  MW of central EC are sufficient in order to suppress W accumulation, so the EC upgrade was not strictly necessary to extend the operational range with respect to  $q_{95}$  or minimum gas puff, but it allows a further variation of the heating profiles also for those conditions. A general problem for W-transport studies is to obtain a good resolution of the W-profile by spectroscopy [42]. This is easier for lighter impurities which exhibit distinct excited states after charge exchange with fast deuterium ions from NBI. The CXRS diagnostic can be tuned to deliver profiles for such impurities. It turned out that boron is well suited for such studies as it can be introduced into the machine via boronisation and its influx can be modulated by varying the ICRF power. The technique is described in [43]. Such experiments with varying amounts of EC have been carried out and compared to theory [44].

### *3.2. H-mode access and ELM-free operation*

These two topics are of crucial interest for ITER which aims to access H-mode as early as possible to develop scenarios of H-mode operation without ELMs. As described above, these plasmas shall be run at a third of the full magnetic field and current, thus at rather low densities



*Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG*




**Figure 1.** Power ramp running 2 gyrotrons with reduced cathode and body voltages at 200 kW (in plasma) and the other six at 600 kW (AUG #35970). Gyrotron on/off wave forms are set in the discharge program, power levels have to be preset by the EC operators.

either in Hydrogen or Helium and heated only by ECRH which shall be the first of the three heating systems (NB, IC, EC) to be available. A first question relates to the minimum density above which the usually used scaling for the L/H transition [45] can be considered as valid. A model for this minimum density has been developed at AUG [46], relating the L/H transition to the heat flux in the ion channel. Such a model can of course only be developed if the heat flux in both channels can be varied significantly. Recent experiments with high power EC strongly support this model: at very low densities ( $1 \times 10^{19} \text{ m}^{-3}$ ) where coupling between electrons and ions is very low, L-modes can be heated with more than 5 MW without a sign of L/H transition, which exceeds the minimum power by more than a factor of three (required at the lowest density for which the scaling is valid, i.e.  $4 \times 10^{19} \text{ m}^{-3}$ ). The complete EC system of 8 gyrotrons allows to run fine-tuned power ramps to study threshold behavior (figure 1). Running two gyrotrons with reduced cathode- and body-voltages at 200 kW and the others at 600 kW, the system can be ramped in 20 steps or 0.2 MW up to 4 MW. §

With ramps like this the dependence of the L/H- threshold power on the ion mix has been studied for H/D and H/He mixtures. These studies were triggered by similar experiments at JET [48], in which it was found that small additions of He or D to Hydrogen-Plasmas did reduce the L/H power-threshold significantly, which would be helpful for early H-mode access in Hydrogen in the non-nuclear phase of ITER. On AUG, the threshold power also shows a non-linear dependence. However, in contrast to JET, small additions have essentially no effect, but changes occur in a small window of intermediate mixtures as discussed at this conference in [49]. The EC power-ramps were also used in combination with gas puff

§ This does not mean that all beams are absorbed exactly at the same value of  $\rho$ , which would require iterative tuning or online control of the launching angles [47]. For so-called 'central-heating' at  $B_t = 2.45\text{-}2.55 \text{ T}$  a standard set of launching angles is used which results for the vast majority of AUG plasmas in heat deposition inside  $\rho_{tor} < 0.2$ , sufficient to prevent W-accumulation.

Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG<sup>9</sup>


**Figure 2.** Kinetic profiles for AUG discharge 35450,  $I_p=0.8$  MA,  $B_t=2.5$  T,  $P_{EC} = 1.6$  MW,  $P_{OH} = 0.3$  MW,  $\tau_E = 180$  ms,  $n/n_{GW}=0.85$ .

ramps to characterize H-mode operation just above the L/H-transition where according to the H-mode confinement scalings [50]  $\tau_E$  is largest as it decreases with increasing additional power. Not surprisingly the ITER operational point is close to this threshold. As a result of these scans, a new EC-only ELM-free H-mode regime with stationary pedestal was found, seemingly stabilized by a density fluctuation in the pedestal region of several 10 kHz, resembling of the Enhanced D- $\alpha$  (EDA-)mode of Alcator C-Mod with its quasi coherent mode [51]. As figure 2 shows, for this purely electron heated H-mode,  $T_e$  and  $T_i$  are identical outside  $\rho_{tor} > 0.4$  and in the center  $T_i$  is only 20% lower. The density reaches 85% of the Greenwald limit  $n_{GW}$  as planned for ITER. Due to the high  $\tau_E = 0.18$  s which is about 1/20 that of ITER ( $Q=10$ ) and a collisionality about 20 times higher than in ITER the product  $\tau_E v_{ei,E}$  is rather close for these discharges to the ITER  $Q=10$  scenario. In [52] TGLF has been used to model the ITER  $Q=10$  scenario applying fictive 40 MW of EC as only additional heating, in order to check the effect of pure EC heating in ITER on  $T_e/T_i$ , yielding a similarly  $T_i(0) \approx 0.8T_e(0)$ . TGLF modeling of these new data is planned. For further discussion of this new ELM-free regime see [53].

At ITER, for the H-mode attempts in PFPO1 with 1/3  $B_t$  (1.8 T), it would be cost efficient to use the 170 GHz system under construction at the 3rd harmonic, i.e. X3 heating starting after ohmic current ramp up [54]. As mentioned above, absorption especially at low temperatures is very poor, but increases quadratically with  $T_e$ . A kind of bootstrap process can be expected if the radial energy transport is small enough. Assuming or modeling this

## Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG

10



**Figure 3.** X3-heating in AUG (# 35553) without NBI (on error). The phase of interest here ends at 1.5 sec when RMP coils affect the H-mode pedestal, where the EC is dominantly absorbed. The reduction of pedestal pressure leads to incomplete absorption and EC is switched off due to excessive stray radiation.  $T_e(0)$  from ECE (blue) and Thomson scattering (TS) (green),  $T_{e,ped}$  from TS (orange).

radial transport, the minimum power to be absorbed at the X3 location to trigger such a process can be calculated as function of the initial temperature. An X3-heating scenario is regularly run on AUG to support the ELM-suppression experiments with coils generating resonant magnetic perturbations (RMPs) [55] with central electron heating at low  $q_{95}$ , but in contrast to the ITER case the plasma is pre-heated with NBI. The results are well in line with the expectations from TORBEAM. Under these circumstances, single pass absorption is well around 80% and exceeds 90% as the central electron temperature reaches 4 keV, without the need of modifications of the electron energy distribution by lower frequency EC sources heating at X2 as reported from TCV [56]. In the data base, a case was found without NBI with close to 2 MW of EC shown in figure 3. Under the specific conditions of AUG the X2 resonance is still in the plasma on the high field side (HFS) and the power passing the X3 resonance is absorbed there. The X3 single pass absorption is here  $\approx 10\%$ . The edge temperature rises by a factor of 4 also because the first EC beam immediately triggers the L/H-transition. So this is not yet the real ITER case, but a safe test bed to study initially the bootstrap process with up to 5.5 MW. Systematic studies and validation of the model used for ITER are planned in the frame of the ITER-IOS group. In ITER, such a safe operation using X3 with an X2 dump on the HFS would require  $B_t \geq 2.1T$ . That choice would also shift the X3 power-deposition more on axis where  $T_e$  is highest and would reduce the volume of the flux surface where the power is deposited, i.e. would significantly increase the power density as a function of  $\rho$ , but of course comes with a potential increase of the L/H-threshold by 17%. It may still be an interesting option for initial verification of models.

### 3.3. Non-inductive operation with co-ECCD


In AUG, H-mode operation with low gas puff had to be reestablished over several years after all plasma facing components were covered with W. Aside from applying sufficient EC, this optimization included development of plasma shapes with high wall clearance, modification of the gas puff to compensate for the difference of fuel retention of graphite and W and optimization of NB and EC time traces in order to pass between decoupling of electrons and ions (too much EC) and W accumulation [57]. Having mastered these issues, the collisionality was low enough to use EC as a versatile tool for current drive. Using half of the actual EC power, close to non-inductive H-modes were obtained at  $q_{95} = 5.3$ , which is already close to the values foreseen for ITER non-inductive operation ( $q_{95} = 5.0$ ) or DEMO ( $q_{95} = 4.5$ ). Performance was limited by ideal modes at  $\beta_N \approx 2.8$  [58, 59]. After redirecting one gyrotron closer to the axis in order to become less dependent on wall conditions and W accumulation the beta limit increased to 3.0 indicating a high sensitivity to details of the current profile. A further increase to 3.2 was achieved [60], minimizing dynamic error fields by an optimized setting of the RMP coils using the CAFE code [61]. A steepening of the ion temperature inside  $\rho_{tor} \approx 0.5$  at high  $\beta$  was essential for high bootstrap current. Initial modeling with TGLF could not reproduce this steepening, triggering analysis using the gyrokinetic code GENE. With GENE it was found that the effect of  $\beta$  of the fast ions and to a similar degree  $\beta$  of the thermal plasma contributed significantly to the steepening of  $\nabla T_i$  [62]. Colleagues from EAST re-analyzing the AUG data found in contrary good agreement with TGLF [63]. The contradiction was resolved and the modification to the effect of the rule handling the stabilizing effect of ExB shear [64] could be identified as the dominant effect (changing from  $\alpha_{quench}$  to  $\alpha_e$ ) [65]. This goes in line with older results which identified the ExB-shear as a major ingredient to steepen  $\nabla T_i$  [5] also backed by GS2 calculations and with ctr-NBI experiments at DIII-D [66] compared to GLF23. In contrast, further GENE analysis for the non-inductive AUG-discharges discussed here, did not show significant reaction of  $\nabla T_i$  on the variation of ExB shear. In order to resolve this experimentally, NB heating in these discharges was partially replaced by IC, which in AUG has a heating mix close to that of NB, avoiding the negative effects of very strong EC heating on ion transport as discussed above. As shown in figure 4 essentially all central NB heating was replaced by IC, keeping on the two off-axis beams, which drive 40% of the total current. This strong reduction of the central torque reduces the ExB shear by 60% in the radial range of the steep  $\nabla T_i$ . The figure shows as well that  $T_i(\rho = 0) - T_i(0.3)$  hardly changes for the two indicated intervals at with constant  $\beta$ . This seems to support the GENE analysis. Still, IC and central NB have different deposition profiles, thus the absolute values of the heat fluxes changed in the plasma center. A detailed analysis of the new data with TGLF and GENE is necessary to draw conclusions. More details will be presented in [65].

### 3.4. q-profile tailoring with ctr-ECCD

A major goal of the AUG program to be tackled by doubling the installed EC power from 4 to 8 MW, is the study of stationary H-modes with elevated q-profiles with variable degrees

## Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG

12




**Figure 4.** AUG discharge #35938, over 90% non-inductively driven H-mode similar to [58]. The NB is running under  $\beta$ -control. The frame at the top shows the heating powers. IC is feed-forward controlled and as it sets in at 4 s, NB is reduced to keep  $\beta$  constant until towards the end  $\beta$  is ramped up. The lower two traces show the effect on toroidal rotation and ExB shear at  $\rho_{tor} = 0.3$ . The two frames in the middle show time traces of  $T_e$  and  $T_i$  at  $\rho_{tor} = 0$  and  $= 0.3$ . The grey vertical bars indicate the time intervals to be compared, taking into account overshoots of the  $\beta$ -control. During these phases  $\beta$  ( $2^{nd}$  from top) is close to equal but the shear is significantly different. The horizontal lines are meant to facilitate comparison of the data.

of inversion towards the axis. For the collisionalities and electron temperatures in AUG, ECCD in the outer half of the plasma radius is rather inefficient. Such type of co-current drive would be necessary to elevate and invert the  $q$ -profile, since it basically means to shift current from inside of the envisaged  $\rho(q_{min})$  to larger radii. The situation may be facilitated by the formation of internal transport barriers, which lead to localized off-axis bootstrap current and low bootstrap current in the plasma center. On the other hand such ITBs often also reduce impurity transport leading to central accumulation of heavy ions. The low central current density reduces the confinement of fast ions in the plasma center. Additionally, strong pressure gradients and wide or even hollow current profiles are prone to MHD-instabilities. The connection between  $q$ -profile shape, in particular  $q$ -profile inversion and ion-transport which

is often used to model the self-sustainment of ITBs by the bootstrap current they generate is empirically by far not as well documented as it is for electron ITBs at very low density with central ctr-ECCD [67]. AUG shall focus first on the relation between the  $q$ -profiles, ion-transport and MHD-stability, which has to be treated correctly in any model addressing non-inductive reactor operation. With ECCD this can be done most efficiently applying broad ctr-ECCD profiles in the inner part of the plasma, leading to an increased ohmic current across the whole radius. This ohmic current is overcompensated by ctr-ECCD in the inner part. In other words we use a large part of the ctr-ECCD to drive ohmic current effectively off-axis and use only a small part of the ctr-ECCD for the central inversion of the  $q$ -profile. This is definitely not the way such profiles shall be generated in a non-inductively running reactor, but a way forward to generate such profiles over several current diffusion times in AUG such that terms related to time derivatives shall ring down to reduce the unknowns entering the interpretation. Still this concept comes with some potential incompatibilities which require optimization: Since strong central ECCD comes with strong central electron heating it will lead to the formation of electron ITBs if the density and/or the ion heating are too low. In AUG such a behavior was found for 600 kA, 2.5 T discharges, for which inverted  $q$ -profiles with  $q_{min} \approx 3$  were achieved with  $T_e \gg T_i$ . Higher plasma current increases  $\tau_E$  and the density and thus strongly the coupling between electrons and ions. The drawbacks are less current drive efficiency (and higher total current) and smaller achievable  $\beta_{pol} \propto \beta_N B_t / I_p$  for fixed  $\beta_{N,max}$  and  $B_t$ . This leads to less bootstrap current and would reduce any beneficial effects of high  $\beta_{pol}$  on ion confinement. Thus the current has to be minimized such that operation without electron ITBs is possible close to the  $\beta$ -limit with full ctr-ECCD. The corresponding value of  $q_{95}$  should be close to the values foreseen for ITER and DEMO, i.e. 4.5-5.0. Experiments have so far been carried out also with 800 kA ( $q_{95} = 5.0$ ) and 1 MA ( $q_{95} = 4.0$ ). For 800 kA difficulties have been encountered with strong (2,1) MHD, violently appearing during  $q$ -profile evolution. For this plasma current, the  $q$ -profile shows a rather flat shear close to  $q = 2$ . The working hypothesis is that the (2,1) mode is triggered as the flat shear region crosses the  $q = 2$  surface during current profile evolution. As a consequence, the 1 MA scenario was developed, applying external current drive after an ohmic  $q$ -profile at full current was formed. This allows us to approach the equilibrated  $q$ -profile, which has  $q_{min} < 2$  from the low  $q_{min}$  side.. During this development it was important to have a reliable diagnostic for the current profile, since the actual current profile is a small difference of large numbers due to the use of ctr-ECCD. In [68] this is described in detail. Here we note that as internal measurements polarimetry [69] and imaging MSE [70] are used and the result is well in line with NBCD calculations from RABBIT [71], ECCD calculations from TORBEAM, and the neoclassical current diffusion. These discharges are typically free of large scale MHD instabilities, except for the ELMs, the violent (2,1) modes mentioned above and the ideal modes which set the limit for  $\beta_N$ . Figure 5 shows the status achieved so far for the 1 MA case. As the time traces indicate,  $T_e$  is in the center always higher than  $T_i$ . The  $T_e$  profile is strongly peaked towards the center and does hardly change as the  $q$ -profile evolves (profile plots B,C on the right).  $T_i$  clearly changes, it steepens and approaches  $T_e$  except for the very center. The discharge at this high  $\beta_N \approx 2.7$  has an H98(y,2) factor of 1.25 which is similar to that of

## Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG

14



**Figure 5.** AUG # 36087: Ctr-ECCD combined with mainly off-axis NBCD in order to elevate and broaden the  $q$ -profile. Frames B, C show profiles at the beginning and the end of the constant  $\beta$  phase as marked on the left. The profiles marked 'IDA' result from integrated data analysis [73], fitting a  $n_e$ -profile to Lithium bean and interferometry data, which is then used to fit a  $T_e$ -profile to the ECE data. The NB is operating under  $\beta$ -control as in figure 4, a beta ramp starts at 6s as seen on the  $W_{mhd}$ -trace.

improved H-modes stabilized by (3,2) NTMs with the same current, field and  $\beta_N$  not using any ECRH [72]. Towards the end of the discharge the  $\beta$  request is increased leading to MHD stabilities. Options for further improvement are the increase of triangularity (and thus density) or to widen the ECCD profile in the center or to reduce the plasma current in order to test if the increase in ion heating and  $\beta_{pol}$  has a steepening effect on the ion temperature. For this discharge the ECCD profile and the driven current profile as well as an error discussion can be found in [68]. Comparisons with TGLF are planned, after the discrepancies with TGLF and GENE are analysed, as discussed in section 3.3.

#### 4. Summary and conclusions

The EC system of AUG has become a central element of the tokamak operation, essential to study a wide spectrum of physics questions, which could be addressed here only in examples not in completeness. The necessity to understand and model the underlying physics has been stressed as the key tool to extrapolate plasma behavior in existing devices to reactors. With respect to EC, caution has to be taken to all effects involving changes of the  $T_e$ -

profile, of the ratio  $T_e/T_i$  or of rotation. The corresponding effects will be much smaller in a reactor dominantly heated by  $\alpha$ -particles with marginal torque input and large  $\tau_E v_{ei,E}$  than in today's NB heated low collisionality plasmas. This should also be considered for control studies driven by the urgent needs of ITER to suppress instabilities leading to disruptions, confinement loss or fast particle losses. As an example, EC has been proposed for control of Alfvén-Eigenmodes [74]. A detailed analysis has meanwhile shown that the initially observed effects on these modes were due to changes in  $T_e$  and are thus not transferable to a reactor [75]. The same is true for W-accumulation as discussed in section 3.1. Any actuator will only be effective if it has the potential to significantly change the quantity to be controlled. For EC in the burning ITER plasma, besides its general heating potential, these specific potentials are the dominating very narrow local current drive capability of the upper launchers to be used for NTM control, and, especially for the non-inductive scenario, the variability of the ECCD capability of the equatorial launcher which may be used to fine-tune the q-profile as discussed above for AUG.

## Acknowledgement

This work has been carried out within the framework of the EUROfusion Consortium and has received funding from the Euratom research and training programme 2014-2018 and 2019-2020 under grant agreement No 633053. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the European Commission.

## References

- [1] Prater R 2004 *Phys. Plasmas* **11** 2349–2376 URL <https://aip.scitation.org/doi/10.1063/1.1690762>
- [2] Poli E, Bock A, Lochbrunner M, Maj O, Reich M, Snicker A, Stegmeir A, Volpe F, Bertelli N, Bilato R, Conway G, Farina D, Felici F, Figini L, Fischer R, Galperti C, Happel T, Lin-Liu Y, Marushchenko N, Mszanowski U, Poli F, Stober J, Westerhof E, Zille R, Peeters A and Pereverzev G 2018 *Computer Phys. Comm.* **225** 36 – 46 ISSN 0010-4655 URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S001046551730423X>
- [3] Leuterer F, München M, Brandl F, Brinkschulte H, Grünwald G, Manini A, Monaco F, Ryter F, Schütz H, Stober J, Wagner D, Kasperek W, Gantenbein G, Empacher L, Lechte C, Kumric H, Schüller P, Litvak A, Chirkov A, Denisov G, Fix A, Illin V, Malygin S, Miasnikov V, Nichiporenko V, Popov L, Tai E and Zapevalov V 2009 *Fusion Sci. Tech.* **55** 31–44 (Preprint <https://doi.org/10.13182/FST09-A4051>) URL <https://doi.org/10.13182/FST09-A4051>
- [4] Ryter F, Angioni C, Peeters A G, Leuterer F, Fahrbach H U, Suttrop W and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2005 *Physical Review Letters* **95** 085001–1 URL [http://publish.aps.org/abstract/PRL/v95/p085001\\_1](http://publish.aps.org/abstract/PRL/v95/p085001_1)
- [5] Manini A, Angioni C, Peeters A G, Ryter F, Jacchia A, Maggi C F, Suttrop W and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2006 *Nuclear Fusion* **46** 1047–1053 URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0029-5515/46/1047>
- [6] Angioni C, Peeters A G, Ryter F, Jenko F, Conway G D, Dannert T, Fahrbach H U, Reich M, Suttrop W and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2005 *Physics of Plasmas* **12** 040701–1 URL <http://link.aip.org/link/?php/12/040701/ab&agg=sfx>
- [7] Gantenbein G, Zohm H, Giruzzi G, Günter S, Leuterer F, Maraschek M, Meskat J, Yu Q, ASDEX Upgrade Team and ECRH Group 2000 *Physical Review Letters* **85** 1242–1245 URL <http://link.aps.org/abstract/PRL/v85/p1242>



*Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG* 16

- [8] Maraschek M, Gantenbein G, Yu Q, Zohm H, Günter S, Leuterer F, Manini A, ECRH Group and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2007 *Physical Review Letters* **98** 025005 URL [http://publish.aps.org/abstract/PRL/v98/p025005\\_1](http://publish.aps.org/abstract/PRL/v98/p025005_1)
- [9] Mück A, Goodman T P, Maraschek M, Pereverzev G, Ryter F, Zohm H and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2005 *Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion* **47** 1633–1655 URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0741-3335/47/1633>
- [10] Manini A, Maraschek M, Cirant S, Gantenbein G, Leuterer F, Zohm H and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2006 Optimisation of MHD stability using ECCD in ASDEX Upgrade *Proc. of 14th Joint Workshop on Electron Cyclotron Emission and Electron Cyclotron Heating (EC-14)* proc. of. 14th Joint Workshop on Electron Cyclotron Emission and Electron Cyclotron Heating (EC-14), Santorini, 2006 URL <http://www.hellasfusion.gr/ec14/papers/15.pdf>
- [11] Igochine V, Chapman I T, Bobkov V, Günter S, Maraschek M, Moseev D, Pereversev G, Reich M, Stober J and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2011 *Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion* **53** 022002 URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0741-3335/53/i=2/a=022002>
- [12] Leuterer F, Kirov K, Monaco F, München M, Schütz H, Ryter F, Wagner D, Wilhelm R, Zohm H, Franke T, Voigt K, Thumm M, Heidinger R, Dammertz G, Koppenburg K, Gantenbein G, Hailer H, Kasperek W, Müller G, Bogdashov A, Denisov G, Kurbatov V, Kuftin A, Litvak A, Malygin S, Tai E and Zapevalov V 2003 *Fusion Eng. Design* **66-68** 537–542 ISSN 0920-3796 22nd Symposium on Fusion Technology URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0920379603001005>
- [13] Wagner D, Grünwald G, Leuterer F, Manini A, Monaco F, München M, Schütz H, Stober J, Zohm H, Franke T, Thumm M, Gantenbein G, Heidinger R, Meier A, Kasperek W, Lechte C, Litvak A, Denisov G G, Chirkov A V, Tai E M, Popov L G, Nichiporenko V O, Myasnikov V E, Solyanova E A, Malygin S A, Meo F and Woskov P 2008 *Nuclear Fusion* **48** 054006 URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0029-5515/48/054006>
- [14] Wagner D, Stober J, Leuterer F, Monaco F, Müller S, München M, Rapson C, Reich M, Schubert M, Schutz H, Treutterer W, Zohm H, Thumm M, Scherer T, Meier A, Gantenbein G, Jelonnek J, Kasperek W, Lechte C, Plaum B, Litvak A, Denisov G, Chirkov A, Popov L, Nichiporenko V, Myasnikov V, Tai E, Solyanova E, Malygin S and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2014 *Infrared, Millimeter, and Terahertz waves (IRMMW-THz), 2014 39th International Conference on* 1–2
- [15] Ikeda R, Oda Y, Kobayashi T, Kajiwara K, Terakado M, Takahashi K, Moriyama S and Sakamoto K 2017 *Journal of Infrared, Millimeter, and Terahertz Waves* **38** 531–537 ISSN 1866-6906 URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10762-016-0348-8>
- [16] ITER Organization 2018 ITER research plan within the staged approach (level III provisional version) Tech. Rep. ITR-18-003 Appendix G URL [https://www.iter.org/doc/www/content/com/Lists/ITER Technical Reports/Attachments/9/ITER-Research-Plan\\_final\\_ITR\\_FINAL-Cover\\_High-Res.pdf](https://www.iter.org/doc/www/content/com/Lists/ITER%20Technical%20Reports/Attachments/9/ITER-Research-Plan_final_ITR_FINAL-Cover_High-Res.pdf)
- [17] Reich M, Barrera L, Behler K, Buhler A, Bock A, Eixenberger H, Fietz S, RFischer, Gianone L, Lackner K, Lochbrunner M, Maraschek M, McCarthy P, Monaco F, Mlynek A, Poli E, Preuss R, Rapson C, Sauter O, Schubert M, Stober J, Treutterer W, Volpe F, Wagner D, Zohm H and ASDEX Upgrade team 2014 Real-time control of NTMs using ECCD at ASDEX Upgrade *Fusion Energy, 25th. Int. Conf., St. Petersburg* (IAEA) pp PPC/P1–26 URL [http://www-naweb.iaea.org/napc/physics/FEC/FEC2014/fec2014-preprints/430\\_PPCP126.pdf](http://www-naweb.iaea.org/napc/physics/FEC/FEC2014/fec2014-preprints/430_PPCP126.pdf)
- [18] Höhnle H, Stober J, Herrmann A, Kasperek W, Leuterer F, Monaco F, Neu R, Schmid-Lorch D, Schütz H, Schweinzer J, Stroth U, Wagner D, Vorbrugg S, Wolfrum E and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2011 *Nuclear Fusion* **51** 083013 URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0029-5515/51/i=8/a=083013>
- [19] Wagner D, Stober J, Kircher M, Leuterer F, Monaco F, München M, Schubert M, Zohm H, Gantenbein G, Jelonnek J, Thumm M, Meier A, Scherer T, Strauss D, Kasperek W, Lechte C, Plaum B, Zach A, Litvak A G, Denisov G G, Chirkov A, Popov L G, Nichiporenko V O, Myasnikov V E, Tai E M, Solyanova E A, Malygin S A and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2016 Extension of the multi-frequency ECRH system at ASDEX upgrade 2016 *41st International Conference on Infrared, Millimeter, and Terahertz waves (IRMMW-THz)* pp 1–2

*Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG*

17

- [20] Schubert, Martin, Stober, Jörg, Herrmann, Albrecht, Kasperek, Walter, Leuterer, Fritz, Monaco, Francesco, Petzold, Bernhard, Plaum, Burkhard, Vorbrugg, Stefan, Wagner, Dietmar, Zohm, Hartmut and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2017 *EPJ Web Conf.* **157** 03047 URL <https://doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/201715703047>
- [21] Schubert M, Plaum B, Stober J, Herrmann A, Kasperek W, Lechte C, Leuterer F, Monaco F, Petzold B, Poli E, Vorbrugg S, Wagner D and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2019 *EPJ Web of Conferences* **203** 2009 URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/201920302009>
- [22] Wagner D, Stober J, Kircher M, Leuterer F, Monaco F, Mnich M, Schubert M, Zohm H, Gantenbein G, Jelonnek J, Thumm M, Meier A, Scherer T, Strauss D, Kasperek W, Lechte C, Plaum B, Zach A, Litvak A G, Denisov G G, Chirkov A, Malygin V, Popov L G, Nichiporenko V O, Myasnikov V E, Tai E M, Solyanova E A and ADSEX Upgrade Team 2019 Completion of the 8 MW multi-frequency ECRH system at ASDEX upgrade 2019 *44th International Conference on Infrared, Millimeter, and Terahertz waves (IRMMW-THz)* pp 1–2
- [23] Schubert M, Honecker F, Monaco F, Schmid-Lorch D, Schütz H, Stober J, Wagner D and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2012 *EPJ Web of Conferences* **32** 02013 URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/20123202013>
- [24] Schubert M, Herrmann A, Monaco F, Rohde V, Schütz H, Stober J, Vierle T, Vorbrugg S, Wagner D, Zsche D, Zehetbauer T, Zeidner W and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2015 *EPJ Web of Conferences* **87** 02010 URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/20158702010>
- [25] Kudlacek O, Treutterer W, Janky F, Sieglin B and Maraschek M 2019 *Fusion Engineering and Design* ISSN 0920-3796 URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0920379619302017>
- [26] Solomon W M, Politzer P A, Buttery R J, Holcomb C T, Ferron J R, Garofalo A M, Grierson B A, Hanson J M, In Y, Jackson G L, Kinsey J E, La Haye R J, Lanctot M J, Luce T C, Okabayashi M, Petty C C, Turco F and Welander A S 2013 *NUCLEAR FUSION* **53** ISSN 0029-5515
- [27] Gormezano C, Challis C D, Joffrin E, Litaudon X and Sips A C C 2008 *Fusion Sci. Tech.* **53** 958–988
- [28] Ryter F, Angioni C, Dunne M, Fischer R, Kurzan B, Lebschy A, McDermott R, Suttrop W, Tardini G, Viezzer E and and M W 2019 *Nucl. Fusion* **59** 096052 URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-4326/ab3061>
- [29] Angioni C, McDermott R, Fable E, Fischer R, Pütterich T, Ryter F, Tardini G and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2011 *Nuclear Fusion* **51** 023006 URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0029-5515/51/i=2/a=023006>
- [30] Staebler G M, Kinsey J E and Waltz R E 2005 *Phys. Plasmas* **12** 102508
- [31] Staebler G M, J C, Howard N T and Holland C 2016 *Phys. Plasmas* **23** 062518
- [32] Sommer F, Stober J, Angioni C, Fable E, Bernert M, Burckhart A, Bobkov V, Fischer R, Fuchs C, McDermott R, Suttrop W, Viezzer E and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2015 *Nuclear Fusion* **55** 033006 URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0029-5515/55/i=3/a=033006>
- [33] Fable E, Angioni C, Bobkov V, Stober J, Bilato R, Conway G D, Goerler T, McDermott R M, Puetterich T, Siccino M, Suttrop W, Teschke M, Zohm H and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2019 *Nucl. Fusion* **52** 076042
- [34] Angioni C, McDermott R M, Casson F J, Fable E, Bottino A, Dux R, Fischer R, Podoba Y, Pütterich T, Ryter F, Viezzer E and ASDEX Upgrade Team (ASDEX Upgrade Team) 2011 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**(21) 215003 URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.215003>
- [35] McDermott R, Angioni C, Conway G, Dux R, Fable E, Fischer R, Pütterich T, Ryter F, Viezzer E and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2014 *Nuclear Fusion* **54** 043009 URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0029-5515/54/i=4/a=043009>
- [36] Gruber O, Sips A C C, Dux R, Eich T, Fuchs J C, Herrmann A, Kallenbach A, Maggi C F, Neu R, Pütterich T, Schweinzer J, Stober J and ASDEX Upgrde Team 2009 *Nuclear Fusion* **49** 115014 URL <http://www.iop.org/EJ/abstract/0029-5515/49/11/115014/>
- [37] Bobkov V, Aguiam D, Bilato R, Brezinsek S, Colas L, Faugel H, Fünfgelder H, Herrmann A, Jacquot J, Kallenbach A, Milanesio D, Maggiora R, Neu R, Noterdaeme J M, Ochoukov R, Potzel S, Pütterich T, Silva A, Tierens W, Tuccilo A, Tudisco O, Wang Y, Yang Q, Zhang W, ASDEX Upgrade Team and EUROfusion MST1 Team 2017 *Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion* **59** 014022 URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0741-3335/59/i=1/a=014022>

*Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG* 18

- [38] Angioni C, Sertoli M, Bilato R, Bobkov V, Loarte A, Ochoukov R, Odstrcil T, Pütterich T, Stober J and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2017 *Nuclear Fusion* **57** 056015 URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0029-5515/57/i=5/a=056015>
- [39] Sertoli M, Angioni C, Odstrcil T, ASDEX Upgrade Team and EUROfusion MST1 Team 2017 *Physics of Plasmas* **24** 112503 (Preprint <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4996412>) URL <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4996412>
- [40] Angioni C, Bilato R, Casson F, Fable E, Mantica P, Odstrcil T, Valisa M, ASDEX Upgrade Team and JET Contributors 2017 *Nuclear Fusion* **57** 022009 URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0029-5515/57/i=2/a=022009>
- [41] Loarte A *et al.* Evaluation of tungsten transport and concentration control in ITER scenarios 26th IAEA Fusion Energy Conf., 2016, Kyoto URL [https://nucleus.iaea.org/sites/fusionportal/SharedDocuments/FEC\\_2016/fec2016-preprints/preprint0506.pdf](https://nucleus.iaea.org/sites/fusionportal/SharedDocuments/FEC_2016/fec2016-preprints/preprint0506.pdf)
- [42] Pütterich T, Neu R, Dux R, Whiteford A, O'Mullane M, Summers H and the ASDEX Upgrade Team 2010 *Nuclear Fusion* **50** 025012 (9pp) URL <http://www.iop.org/EJ/abstract/0029-5515/50/2/025012/>
- [43] Bruhn C, McDermott R M, Angioni C, Ameres J, Bobkov V, Cavedon M, Dux R, Kappatou A, Lebschy A, Manas P, Ochoukov R and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2018 *Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion* **60** 085011 corrigendum in preparation URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0741-3335/60/i=8/a=085011>
- [44] McDermott R M, Manas P, Angioni C *et al.* 2019 Validation of low-Z impurity transport theory using charge exchange recombination spectroscopy at ASDEX Upgrade 46<sup>th</sup> EPS Conference on Plasma Physics, Milano, invited talk I2.105
- [45] Martin Y R, Takizuka T and the ITPA CDBM H-mode Threshold Data Group 2008 *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **123** 012033 URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/123/1/012033>
- [46] Ryter F, Orte L B, Kurzan B, McDermott R, Tardini G, Viezzer E, Bernert M, Fischer R and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2014 *Nuclear Fusion* **54** 083003 URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0029-5515/54/i=8/a=083003>
- [47] Reich M, Bilato R, Mszanowski U, Poli E, Rapson C, Stober J, Volpe F and Zille R 2015 *Fusion Engineering and Design* **100** 73–78 ISSN 0920-3796 URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0920379615002537>
- [48] Hillesheim J C *et al.* Implications of JET-ILW L-H transition studies for ITER 27th IAEA Fusion Energy Conf., 2018
- [49] Plank U, Pütterich T, Angioni C, Cavedon M, Kappatou A, McDermott R M, Schneider P A and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2019 H-mode power threshold studies at ASDEX Upgrade in mixed ion species plasmas *Europhysics Conference Abstracts (Proc. of the 46th EPS Conference on Controlled Fusion and Plasma Physics, Milano, 2019)* p O2.111
- [50] ITER Physics Basis 1999 *Nucl. Fusion* **39** 2204
- [51] Greenwald M, Boivin R, Bonoli P, Fiore C, Goetz J, Granetz R, Hubbard A, Hutchinson I, Irby J, Lin Y, Marmor E, Mazurenko A, Mossessian D, Sunn Pedersen T, Rice J, Snipes J, Schilling G, Taylor G, Terry J, Wolfe S and Wukitch S 2000 *Plasma Phys. Controlled Fusion* **42** A263–A269
- [52] Stober J, Sommer F, Angioni C, Bock A, Fable E, Leuterer F, Monaco F, Müller F, Mnich S, Petzold B, Poli E, Schubert M, Schütz H, Wagner D, Zohm H, ASDEX Upgrade Team, Kasparek W, Plaum B, Meier A, Scherer T, Strau D, Jelonnek J, Thumm M, Litvak A, Denisov G G, Chirkov A V, Tai E M, Popov L G, Nichiporenko V O, Myasnikov V E, Soluyanov E A and Malygin V 2015 *EPJ Web of Conferences* **87** 02004 URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/20158702004>
- [53] Gil L, Silva C, Happel T, Birkenmeier G, Cavedon M, Conway G, Guimaraes L, Pütterich T, Santos J, Schubert M, Seliunin E, Silva A, Stober J, Stroth U, Trier E, Wolfrum E, ASDEX Upgrade Team and EUROfusion MST1 Team 2019 Stationary ELM-free H-mode in ASDEX Upgrade *Europhysics Conference Abstracts (Proc. of the 46th EPS Conference on Controlled Fusion and Plasma Physics, Milano, 2019)* p O2.110
- [54] Micheletti D, Farina D and Figini L 2019 *EPJ Web of Conferences* **203** 2009 URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/201920301007>

*Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG*

19

- [55] Suttrop W, Kirk A, Bobkov V, Cavedon M, Dunne M, McDermott R, Meyer H, Nazikian R, Paz-Soldan C, Ryan D, Viezzer E, Willensdorfer M, ASDEX Upgrade Team and MST1 Team 2018 *Nuclear Fusion* **58** 096031 URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0029-5515/58/i=9/a=096031>
- [56] Alberti S, Goodman T, Henderson M, Manini A, Moret J M, Gomez P, Blanchard P, Coda S, Sauter O, Peysson Y and Team T 2002 *Nuclear Fusion* **42** 42–45 URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/0029-5515/42/1/306>
- [57] Stober J *et al.* Advanced tokamak experiments in full-W ASDEX Upgrade 26th IAEA Fusion Energy Conf., 2016, Kyoto URL <https://nucleus.iaea.org/sites/fusionportal/Shared Documents/FEC 2016/fec2016-preprints/preprint0799.pdf>
- [58] Bock A, Fable E, Fischer R, Reich M, Rittich D, Stober J, Bernert M, Burckhart A, Doerk H, Dunne M, Geiger B, Giannone L, Igochine V, Kappatou A, McDermott R, Mlynek A, Odstrčil T, Tardini G, Zohm H and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2017 *Nuclear Fusion* **57** 126041 URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0029-5515/57/i=12/a=126041>
- [59] Bock A, Doerk H, Fischer R, Rittich D, Stober J, Burckhart A, Fable E, Geiger B, Mlynek A, Reich M, Zohm H and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2018 *Physics of Plasmas* **25** 056115 (*Preprint* <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5024320>) URL <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5024320>
- [60] Voltolina D, Bettini P, Igochine V, Marrelli L, Pigatto L, Piron L, Zammuto I, ASDEX Upgrade Team and MST1 Team 2019 Vacuum estimation of error field correction on ASDEX Upgrade *Europhysics Conference Abstracts (Proc. of the 46th EPS Conference on Controlled Fusion and Plasma Physics, Milano, 2019)* p P4.1099
- [61] Bettini P, Finotti C, Grando L, Marchiori G and Specogna R 2017 *Fusion Engineering and Design* **123** 518 – 521 ISSN 0920-3796 proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Fusion Technology (SOFT-29) Prague, Czech Republic, September 5-9, 2016 URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0920379617307019>
- [62] Doerk H, Bock A, Siena A D, Fable E, Görler T, Jenko F, Stober J and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2018 *Nuclear Fusion* **58** 016044 URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0029-5515/58/i=1/a=016044>
- [63] Jian X, Chan V S, Chen J, Bock A, Zohm H, Fable E, Reisner M, Guo W and Zhuang G 2019 *Nucl. Fusion* Submitted
- [64] Staebler G, Candy J, Waltz R, Kinsey J and Solomon W 2013 *Nuclear Fusion* **53** 113017 URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/0029-5515/53/11/113017>
- [65] Reisner M, Stober J, Fable E, Bock A, Rittich D, Navarro A B, Sienna A D, McDermott R, Fischer R, Chan V, Chen J, Jian X and ASDEX Upgrade Team H-mode workshop, Shanghai, 2019, to be submitted to *Nuclear Fusion*
- [66] Politzer P, Petty C, Jayakumar R, Luce T, Wade M, DeBoo J, Ferron J, Gohil P, Holcomb C, Hyatt A, Kinsey J, Haye R L, Makowski M and Petrie T 2008 *Nuclear Fusion* **48** 075001 URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/0029-5515/48/7/075001>
- [67] Bottino A, Sauter O, Camenen Y and Fable E 2006 *PLASMA PHYSICS AND CONTROLLED FUSION* **48** 215–233 ISSN 0741-3335
- [68] Fischer R, Bock A, Burckhart A, Reisner M, Stober J, Ford O, Giannone L, Gude A, Rampp M, Weiland M, Willensdorfer M and ASDEX Upgrade Team 20119 Current profile tailoring with the upgraded ECRH system at ASDEX Upgrade *Europhysics Conference Abstracts (Proc. of the 46th EPS Conference on Controlled Fusion and Plasma Physics, Milano, 2019)* p P1.1100
- [69] Mlynek A, Casali L, Ford O, Eixenberger H and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2014 *Review of Scientific Instruments* **85** 11D408 URL <http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/rsi/85/11/10.1063/1.4890574>
- [70] Burckhart A 2015 Design of the new imaging motional stark effect diagnostic at ASDEX Upgrade *Europhysics Conference Abstracts (CD-ROM, Proc. of the 42th EPS Conference on Plasma Physics, Lisbon, Portugal, 2015) (ECA vol 39E)* ed Bingham R, Suttrop, Atzeni S, Foest R, McClements K, Goncalves B, Silva C and Coelho R (Geneva: European Physical Society) p P1.143 URL <http://ocs.ciemat.es/EPS2015PAP/pdf/P1.143.pdf>
- [71] Weiland M, Bilato R, Dux R, Geiger B, Lebschy A, Felici F, Fischer R, Rittich D, van Zeeland

1  
2  
3 *Fusion-Reactor Physics with high-power EC on AUG* 20

- 4 M, ASDEX Upgrade Team and Eurofusion MST1 Team 2018 *Nuclear Fusion* **58** 082032 URL  
5 <http://stacks.iop.org/0029-5515/58/i=8/a=082032>
- 6 [72] Stober J, Sips A C C, Angioni C, Forest C B, Gruber O, Hobirk J, Horton L D, Maggi  
7 C F, Maraschek M, Martin P, McCarthy P J, Mertens V, Na Y S, Reich M, Stähler A,  
8 Tardini G, Zohm H and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2007 *Nuclear Fusion* **47** 728–737 URL  
9 <http://stacks.iop.org/0029-5515/47/728>
- 10 [73] Fischer R, Fuchs C J, Kurzan B, Suttrop W, Wolfrum E and ASDEX Upgrade Team 2010 *Fusion Science*  
11 *and Technology* **58** 675–684 URL <http://epubs.ans.org/?a=10892>
- 12 [74] Zeeland M V, Heidbrink W, Sharapov S, Spong D, Cappa A, Chen X, Collins C, García-Muñoz M,  
13 Gorelenkov N, Kramer G, Lauber P, Lin Z and Petty C 2016 *Nuclear Fusion* **56** 112007 URL  
14 <https://doi.org/10.1088/0029-5515/56/11/112007>
- 15 [75] Sharapov S E, Garcia-Munoz M, Zeeland M A V, Bobkov B, Classen I G J, Ferreira J, Figueiredo  
16 A, Fitzgerald M, Galdon-Quiroga J, Gallart D, Geiger B, Gonzalez-Martin J, Johnson T, Lauber  
17 P, Mantsinen M, Nabais F, Nikolaeva V, Rodriguez-Ramos M, Sanchis-Sanchez L, Schneider  
18 P A, Snicker A and and P V 2017 *Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion* **60** 014026 URL  
19 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6587/aa90ee>
- 20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60