# Alpha Particle Confinement and Losses in JET's Tritium Campaign

P. J. Bonofiglo<sup>1</sup>, V. Kiptily<sup>2</sup>, M. Podestà<sup>1</sup>, Ž. Štancar<sup>2,3</sup>, V. Goloborodko<sup>4</sup>, C. D. Chalis<sup>2</sup>, J. Hobirk<sup>5</sup>, A. Kappatou<sup>5</sup>, E. Lerche<sup>2,6</sup>, I. S. Carvalho<sup>7</sup>, J. Garcia<sup>8</sup>, J. Mailloux<sup>2</sup>, C. F. Maggi<sup>2</sup>, A.G. Meigs<sup>2</sup>, and JET Contributors\*

<sup>1</sup> Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Princeton, New Jersey 08534, USA

<sup>2</sup> UKAEA, CCFE, Culham Science Centre, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 3DB, UK

<sup>3</sup> Jožef Stefan Institute, Ljubljana, Slovenia

<sup>4</sup> Kyiv Institute for Nuclear Research, Kyiv, Ukraine

<sup>5</sup> Max-Planck-Institut für Plasmaphysik, Garching, Germany

<sup>6</sup> LPP-ERM-KMS, Association EUROFUSION-Belgian State, TEC Partner, Brussels, Belgium

<sup>7</sup> Instituto de Plasmas e Fusão Nuclear, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal

<sup>8</sup>CEA, IRFM, F-13108 Saint Paul Lez Durance, France

\*See author list of J. Mailloux 2022 Nucl. Fusion, doi:10.1088/1741-4326/ac47b4

## **Experimental Discharge and Fast Ion Loss Measurements**

This work investigates alpha transport and losses in a tritium plasma due to low frequency MHD activity. Understanding the alpha response to MHD modes is paramount for model validation and analysis of T, DT, and ITER scenarios. This paper utilizes two fast ion loss detectors on JET, an array of Faraday cups which provide spatial information on losses [1] and a scintillator-photomultiplier tube (PMT) probe array which is more sensitive to particle pitch and energy [2], for alpha confinement analysis. The reference discharge for analysis is JET pulse 99151 from the recent tritium campaign ( $I_p = 2.3$  MA,  $B_0 = 3.4$  T,  $n_e = 7 \times 10^{19}$  m<sup>-3</sup>,  $T_e = 8.5$  keV, 95% tritium with trace deuterium and hydrogen). The neutral beams are fueled with tritium resulting in TT beam-thermal and thermonuclear fusion reactions which produce MeV-scale alpha particles (see Figure 2). The pulse has an average of 20-25MW of NBI+RF injected power shown in Figure 1 (a.) and contains a variety of low frequency MHD activity evident in subplot (b.). In particular, a long-lived n = 2 mode at ~ 30 kHz and ELM bursts (not visible in Figure 1) give rise to measureable fast ion losses.

Figure 3 shows example signals from one of the lost Faraday cup foils and one of the scintillator probe PMTs. Both show strong losses associated with the long-lived n = 2 mode which has been labeled a neoclassical tearing mode (NTM) based on soft x-ray phase analysis and frequency mathcing to the charge-exchange rotation measurements. The Faraday foil and PMT channels correspond to losses of high energy ions (in excess of 1 MeV). TRANSP [3] produced fast ion distributions show that these energies are dominated by alpha particles (see Figure 2)





Figure 1: External heating power for JET pulse 99151, (a.), and a spectrogram from an edge-magnetic coil, (b.).



Figure 2: Normalized alpha particle distribution as a function of energy calculated from TRANSP.

originating from reactions of RF-heated tritons (distribution not shown).

Edge-localized mode (ELM) induced losses measured with the scintillator probe are presented in Figure 4 and show the inverse trend. Namely, the ELMs strongly interact with lower



Figure 3: A spectrogram from Faraday foil 134, (a.), and a spectrogram from scintillator PMT 10, (b.) showing coherent n = 2 mode losses.

Time (s)

Figure 4: ELM induced losses in the scintillator probe present in the low energy PMT channel 4 and absent in the high energy PMT channel 10.

energy particles (i.e. the beam-born tritons) and largely ignore the MeV alpha particles.

The poloidal and radial fast ion loss deposition is presented in Figures 5 and 6, respectively, summed at the n = 2 frequency from 7.8-9 s across all foils. Figure 5 shows that the losses initially decrease as one looks down from the midplane but then increase (point at  $\sim 20^{\circ}$  is suspected to be broken foil). Evidenced in Figure 6, the fast ion losses appear to peak closer to the LCFS. It is theorized that this may be due to the relatively large alpha particle Larmour radius ( $\sim$ 11-13 cm) relative to cup spacing (2.5 cm). Simulations are ongoing to confirm this.



Figure 5: Integrated fast ion loss signal as a function of poloidal position as measured from the Faraday cups.



Figure 6: Integrated fast ion loss signal as a function of radial position for the Faraday cups closest to the midplane poloidally. Cup 1 is closest to the plasma while cup 3 is closest to the wall (2.5 cm between cups).

# **Fast Ion Modeling Results**

The ORBIT-kick model [5] has been used to examine the triton and alpha particle transport associated with the n = 2 NTM. An analytic form [6] was taken for the NTM mode structure while a reasonable estimate of  $\delta b/B \sim 10^{-5}$  was used for the mode amplitude. The effect of the mode was calculated for 200,000 tritons and alphas. The resulting RMS-energy spread for each species at varied energy is shown in Figure 7. The high energy alphas exhibit a strong interaction with the mode while the beam-born tritons interact weakly. It was found that 6.7% of the modeled alphas were lost while the tritons were highly confined with only 0.02% losses. The strongest interactions are with the trapped particle region which agrees with the detectors.

#### **Summary and Ongoing Work**

A JET tritium discharge has exhibited fast ion losses associated with a long-lived NTM mode and ELM bursts. The energy and spatial dependence has been revealed with JET's fast ion loss detectors. Low energy ions, i.e. beam-born tritons, are impacted by ELM bursts while



Figure 7: ORBIT calculated RMS-energy interaction with the n = 2 mode for 110 keV tritons, (a.), 340 keV tritons, (b.), 200 keV alphas, (c.) and 1900 keV alphas, (d.). Magenta lines denote topological orbit boundaries. The red labels denote the orbit types within the respective boundaries.

high energy ions, i.e. TT-born alpha particles, are strongly transported by the NTM mode. The experimental observations have been confirmed with initial ORBIT-kick modeling which reveal that trapped alpha particles exhibit the strongest interaction with the mode.

Comparisons among the measured and simulated spatial losses is ongoing. Additionally, the measurements are being further constrained against realistic, synthetic, losses produced within ORBIT [7]. Supporting measurements with line-integrated neutron signals are being sought as well. Lastly, the investigation and comparison to low frequency MHD induced alpha particle losses in the recent JET DT-campaign is also underway. The present analysis contributes to the validation of EP models that will be used to assess the role of MHD on alpha particle losses in DT. This analysis can then be extrapolated to ITER scenarios to predict alpha transport and losses in reactor relevant plasmas.

### Acknowledgements

This material is based upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Fusion Energy Sciences, under contract number DE-AC02-09CH11466. This work has been carried out within the framework of the EUROfusion Consortium, funded by the European Union via the Eurotean Research and Training Programme (Grant Agreement No 101052200 - EUROfusion). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be held responsible for them.

#### References

- [1] P. J. Bonofiglo et al. 2020 Rev. Sci. Instrum. 91 093502
- [2] S. Baeumel et al. 2004 Rev. Sci. Instrum. 75 3563
- [3] B. Joshua, G. Marina, P. Francesca, S. Jai, P. Alexei, and P. Gopan 2018 TRANSP Software USDOE Office of Science (SC), Fusion Energy Sciences (FES) (https://doi:10.11578/dc.20180627.4)
- [4] P. J. Bonofiglo et al. "Lost Alpha Faraday Cup Foil Noise Characterization During JET Plasma Post-Processing Analysis" *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* (Under Review)
- [5] M. Podesta et al. 2017 Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion 59 095008
- [6] M. Gobbin et al. 2009 Nucl. Fusion 49 095021
- [7] P. J. Bonofiglo et al. 2022 Nucl. Fusion 62 026026