## Time Evolution of H-mode Pedestal Characteristics in Type I ELM Discharges on DIII-D

by T.H. Osborne, P.B. Snyder, R.J. Groebner, S.P. Smith, H. Stoschus, D.M. Thomas

Presented at the 54<sup>th</sup> Annual APS Meeting Division of Plasma Physics Providence, Rhode Island

October 29 — November 2, 2012







#### Summary

- Improved diagnostics allow tracking of pedestal evolution between ELMs
- Peeling-ballooning mode instability drive builds continuously during inter-ELM period reaching the stability limit at ELM crash
- Pedestal evolution is generally consistent with KBM constraint in the EPEP1.0 model
- The pedestal can evolve to higher pressure at higher collisionality possibly due to effects of v<sub>\*e</sub> on stability



Computed with ELITE Code



### High Spatial and Temporal Resolution TS and CER Systems Allow Between ELM Pedestal Evolution Studies



- In 2011, 10 additional TS spatial points (D. Eldon, B. Bray) in pedestal + improved temporal resolution (2x50 Hz + 4x20 Hz lasers)
- In 2012 improvements in TS calibration, analysis techniques, ... (B. Bray, T. Carlstrom, TS Team). Improvements in CER analysis
- At low ELM frequency (τ<sub>ELM</sub>≥100 ms) can follow time evolution over a single inter-ELM period

### Pedestal Current Density Profile Computed from Neoclassical Models Using Kinetic Profiles

- j<sub>PED</sub> = j<sub>BS</sub> + j<sub>DRIVE</sub> + j<sub>OH</sub> computed from kinetic profiles
- **j**<sub>BS</sub> dominates **j**<sub>PED.</sub> Computed from NC models (Sauter, XGC0)  $J\downarrow BS \approx -L(f\downarrow T, Z, \nu\downarrow *e)\partial P/\partial \psi$ L increase with  $f\downarrow T$ , decrease with  $\nu\downarrow *e$

 $v \downarrow * e \sim q Z \downarrow eff n/T^{\uparrow}2$ 

- **j**<sub>DRIVE</sub> from NUBEAM
- j<sub>OH</sub> assumed fully relaxed. Transients at ELM dissipate quickly (<~10ms).</li>
- EFIT j matched to j<sub>PED</sub> in pedestal and MSE in core
- Recent improvements in the LiBeam system should soon allow direct measurement of j<sub>PED</sub>





# Pedestal Evolution Under the EPED Model<sup>[1]</sup> Set by Edge Stability Constraints

- In EPED model kinetic ballooning mode, KBM, provides pedestal transport constraint while peeling ballooning mode, PBM, provides ELM stability limit
  - KBM expected to survive  $V'_{ExB}$  and produce strong transport and so act as a limit on p'
  - EPED1.0 model predicts p<sup>PED</sup> at ELM within 20% over a range of tokamak sizes and discharge conditions as the intersection between the KBM and PBM limits



- EPED1.0: Empirical fit to a constant KBM p' scaling coefficient,  $c_{\alpha}$   $w(\psi \downarrow N) = 0.076 (\beta \downarrow Pol^{\uparrow})$   $\uparrow PED )\uparrow 1/2 \Rightarrow$   $\alpha = a\downarrow 0 / L\downarrow i 1/(B\downarrow P\uparrow 2) \partial p/\partial$  $\psi \downarrow N = c\downarrow \alpha w$
- EPED1.6<sup>[1]</sup>: Parametric dependence of c<sub>α</sub> derived using n=∞ ideal ballooning mode to estimate KBM limit

$$\alpha = c \downarrow \alpha \ (\nu \downarrow * e \dots) w$$

#### Under EPED Pedestal Pressure at the ELM Should Increase with Increasing Pedestal Collisionality



### Pressure Profile Evolution from I<sub>P</sub> Scan Experiment in General Agreement with EPED1.0 Model Predictions

- In all cases ELMs occur at pressures close to EPED1.0 model predictions.
- Inter-ELM evolution consistent with KBM constraint except possibly at early times
- Correlation of w-w<sub>EPED1</sub> with  $v_{*e}$  suggests w may track KBM even early in EFP



### A Range of Pedestal Pressures are Obtained in ITER Baseline Scenario Similarity Discharges

- Pedestal pressure increase associated with wider ETB and higher n<sub>e</sub><sup>PED</sup>
- ETB width > EPED1 scaling late in inter-ELM period at low f<sub>ELM</sub>
- At low f<sub>ELM</sub>
  - Higher  $v_{*e}$ , Z<sub>eff</sub>
  - larger  $\Delta W_{\text{ELM}}$  despite higher  $\nu_{*e}$
  - High Z impurity accumulation
- ITER Baseline
- ITER Shape
- I<sub>P</sub>=1.2 MA, B<sub>T</sub>=1.6 T
- $q_{95} = 3.1$
- 1.6 <  $\beta_N$  < 2.2,  $\beta_N$  feedback





168-12/THO/rs

# ITER Baseline Cases that Reach High P<sup>PED</sup> Exceed the EPED1.0 KBM Width Scaling

- As in the  $I_P$  scan width contracts in early part of inter-ELM period (<20%)
- Lower w shots track up the EPED1.0 KBM limit and ELM at the PBM limit
- Cases reaching high P<sup>PED</sup> exceed the EPED1.0 KBM scaling but still generally agree with predicted PBM threshold





9

# ITER Baseline Discharge at $\beta_{\text{N}}$ =1.6 Goes ELM Free, Reaching Very Large Width

- Lowest  $\beta_N$ =1.6 ITER baseline shot goes ELM free and returns to L-mode due to high radiation from accumulated high Z impurities
- Width grows to 8% of minor radius greatly exceeding w<sub>EPED1.0</sub> but moves away from PBM boundary and so does not reach high P<sup>PED</sup>





# Correlation of Large Widths with Collisionality Possibly Due to $v_{*e}$ Destabilizing Effect on KBM

#### • w - w<sub>EPED1.0</sub> increases with $v_{*e}$

11

- Consistent with what would be expected for the effect of reduced  $j_{\text{BS}}$  at higher  $\nu_{*e}$  on KBM stability
- EPED1.6 predicts substantially higher pressure but exceeds measured values
  - Improved handling of ion dilution needed in EPED



#### Summary, Conclusion

- Improvements in pedestal profile measurements have allowed detailed studies of the pedestal evolution between Type I ELMs
- The EPED model, combining PBM and KBM stability limits to determine the pedestal pressure at the ELM is supported by results of pedestal evolution studies
- At increased collisionality PBM threshold is increase in peeling limited regime and KBM limit is reduced also allowing higher P<sup>PED</sup> at the ELM stability limit
  - This may provide a path to improved performance
  - Large pedestal also associated with large ELMs



