Comparison of Measured and Simulated MSE Signals of a Tearing Mode

M.A. Makowski, M. Downes, C.T. Holcomb, R.J. Jayakumar, R. LaHaye, and D. Brennan





Spatial Resolution of the MSE Diagnostic Influences the Measured Pitch Angle

- The finite spatial resolution of the MSE diagnostic can modify the measured pitch angle of both the static equilibrium fields and dynamic tearing mode fields
- Effect is greatest on the radial array which has the poorest spatial resolution
- For tearing modes, the effect is more pronounced for smaller islands
- This helps explain why tearing modes are not always observed on the MSE diagnostic under many conditions when a mode is present





Each MSE array on D3D Has a Different Spatial Resolution



- Three systems on 30lt beam
 - 315 R0, δR ~ 50 120 mm
 - 15 R0, δR ~ 150 250 mm
 - 45 R0, δR ~ 10 50 mm
- Two new systems being built on 210rt beam
 - 195 R0 upper,
 δR ~ 10 50 mm
 - 195 R0 lower,
 δR ~ 40 70 mm
- 15 R0 array has the poorest resolution due to its radial view





Spatial Resolution of the MSE Diagnostic Influences the Measured Pitch Angle

• Full 3D geometry used

- Beam intensity, I_b
- Sightline defines integration volume: dr³
- Magnetic field components: B_r , B_{ϕ} , B_z
- Viewing coefficients: A₁, A₂, A₃, A₄
- All quantities weighted by the spatially varying beam intensity

$$\left\langle \tan \gamma_m \right\rangle = \frac{\int \left(\frac{A_1(\mathbf{r})B_z(\mathbf{r})}{A_2(\mathbf{r})B_\phi(\mathbf{r}) + A_3(\mathbf{r})B_R(\mathbf{r}) + A_4(\mathbf{r})B_z(\mathbf{r})} \right) I_b(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}^3}{\int I_b(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}^3}$$
$$I_b(x, y, z) = I_0 \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{w_x^2} - \frac{y^2}{w_y^2} - \lambda z\right)$$





Geometry is Defined Primarily by the Beam and Viewing Sightline



Integration volume is defined by

- The particular sightline
- The beam profile

Fields depend on

- The equilibrium
- The phase and radial location of the island





Simple Cylindrical Plasma Equilibrium is Used



Currently, use a cylindrical plasma equilibrium

- Will eventually upgrade to handle arbitrary EFIT equilibria
- Even this simple model is sufficient to demonstrate the issue
- Parameters:
 - a = 0.67 m
 - R0 = 1.76 m

$$- B_{\phi 0} = 1.0 T$$

$$- q_{lim} = 6$$





Effect of Spatial Averaging Is Most Pronounced on Array with Poorest Resolution



- The 15 R0 array has the poorest spatial resolution and the largest difference between the local and average values of the measured pitch angle
- The 45 R0 array shows virtually no difference
- The sign of the difference for the 15 R0 array changes across the axis
- The difference will cause a systematic error in the calculation of the q-profile





Corrections to the Plasma Pitch Angle Are as Large as 0.5°







Tearing Modes Are Observed with the Fast MSE Data Acquisition System







Slab Model of Tearing Mode Island Contains Essential Features of the Physics



- Slab model of a tearing mode is used in the calculations
- Model incorporates a modulating B_x and B_z
- Model captures essential features of the tearing mode

$$B_{x,island}(x,z) = B_{x1}(x)\sin(k_z z - \Omega t)$$
$$B_{z,island}(x,z) = B'_{z1}x + \frac{1}{k_z}B'_{x1}(x)\cos(k_z z - \Omega t)$$

 Ω = rotation angular frequency





Spatial Averaging Reduces the Amplitude of All Quantities



- Here, island full width is 6 cm
- B_z has the largest amplitude
- Phase of γ_m tracks that of B_z
- B_R makes a negligible contribution to the pitch angle
- No B_{ϕ} in slab model





Spatial Averaging Smears the Mode Structure





- Amplitude reduction is array dependent
 - 315° Array: 50%
 - 45° Array: 10%
 - 15° Array: 75%

- Spatial averaging reduces the detected amplitude of the field, in this case by a factor of ~ 2
- Spatial averaging also smears the radial structure of the mode
- γ_m tracks the spatially averaged value of B_z





The Pitch Angle Fluctuation Results Entirely from δB_z

- The pitch angle fluctuation results predominantly from $\delta \textbf{B}_z$
- Since $\delta B_{\phi} \sim \delta B_z$, $\delta B_{\phi}/B_{\phi} << \delta B_z/B_z$
- Also, the contribution from δB_R is small both because $\delta B_R << \delta B_z$ and because this factor is multiplied by tan(γ_m) ~ 0.1

$$\delta \gamma_m = \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\gamma_m \left[\frac{\delta B_z}{B_z} \left(1 - \frac{A_4}{A_1} \tan \gamma_m \right) - \frac{\delta B_{\phi}}{B_{\phi}} - \frac{A_3}{A_1} \frac{\delta B_R}{B_z} \tan \gamma_m \right]$$
$$\left\langle \frac{\delta \gamma_m}{\gamma_m} \right\rangle \approx \left\langle \frac{\delta B_z}{B_z} \right\rangle$$

- Estimate of $\delta\gamma_m$ from above equation is consistent with value derived from the calculated spatial average
- The above result implies that the detected fluctuation amplitude is small, being of the order of ~ 0.1°





NIMROD Results Confirm Conclusions Obtained with the Slab Model



- NIMROD used to simulate a 2/1 tearing mode
- $\delta B_z \sim \delta B_{\phi} >> \delta B_R$
- Moderate size island with a full width of ~ 3 cm
- Spatial structure of the mode is complex
- δB_z will give the predominant contribution to the pitch angle fluctuation as

$$\frac{\delta B_z}{B_z} >> \frac{\delta B_\phi}{B_\phi}, \frac{\delta B_R}{B_R}$$





NIMROD Simulation Reveals Detailed Structure of the Tearing Mode







Conclusions

- Effect of spatial averaging of the equilibrium fields is important
 - Plan to implement a correction in EFIT
- Effect is most significant on the radial channels
- Effect of spatial averaging of island fields is also important, particularly for small islands
 - Observed island mode structure is smeared
 - Inferred amplitude is reduced significantly
 - Is array dependent with the 15 array having the greatest reduction in amplitude
- Only $\delta \textbf{B}_z$ contributes significantly to the measured fluctuation in pitch angle
- Estimate that typically $\delta B_z \sim 0.1^\circ$





Spatial Average of the Equilibrium Fields

Column Header





Spatial Average of the Tearing Mode Fields

Column Header



