

HOT ELECTRON GENERATION FOR FAST IGNITION

by

**R.B. STEPHENS, K.U. AKLI, T. BARTAL, F.N. BEG, S. CHAWLA,
C.D. CHEN, H. CHEN, E.A. CHOWDHURY, R. FEDOSEJEVS,
R.R. FREEMAN, E.M. GIRALDEZ, D.S. HEY, D. HIGGINSON,
M.H. KEY, A.J. LINK, T. MA, A.G. MacPHEE, H.S. McLEAN,
D. OFFERMANN, V.M. OVCHINNIKOV, P.K. PATEL, Y. PING,
D.W. SCHUMACHER, Y.Y. TSUI, L.D. van WOERKOM,
M.S. WEI, B. WESTOVER and T. YABUUCHI**

FEBRUARY 2011

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

HOT ELECTRON GENERATION FOR FAST IGNITION

by

R.B. STEPHENS, K.U. AKLI, T. BARTAL,¹ F.N. BEG,¹ S. CHAWLA,¹
C.D. CHEN,² H. CHEN,³ E.A. CHOWDHURY,⁴ R. FEDOSEJEVS,⁵
R.R. FREEMAN,^{1,2,6} E.M. GIRALDEZ, D.S. HEY,³ D. HIGGINSON,¹
M.H. KEY,³ A.J. LINK,⁴ T. MA,¹ A.G. MacPHEE,³ H.S. McLEAN,³
D. OFFERMANN,⁴ V.M. OVCHINNIKOV,⁴ P.K. PATEL,³ Y. PING,³
D.W. SCHUMACHER,⁴ Y.Y. TSUI,⁵ L.D. van WOERKOM,⁴
M.S. WEI,¹ B. WESTOVER¹ and T. YABUUCHI¹

This is a preprint of a paper to be presented at the 23rd IAEA
Fusion Energy Conference, October 11–16, 2010 in Daejeon,
Republic of Korea and to be published in Proceedings.

¹Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, University of California San Diego,
La Jolla, California

²Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts

³Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California

⁴Department of Physics, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

⁵Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering, University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta Canada

⁶Department of Applied Science, University of California-Davis, Livermore, California

Work supported in part by
the U.S. Department of Energy
under DE-FG02-05ER54834
and DE-AC52-07NA27344

GENERAL ATOMICS ATOMICS PROJECT 30247
FEBRUARY 2011



The basic idea for the Fast Ignition (FI) approach to Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) is straightforward in concept: The fuel capsule is imploded onto the outer tip of a hollow cone; a short pulse laser is focused through the cone to relativistic electrons; these electrons travel through the cone tip and into the assembled DT [1]. However, the actual realization of the technique, and particularly the injection of the hot electrons, requires laser-plasma interactions at an extreme of intensity and resulting currents only recently accessible, and their complexities not completely understood. Early analysis [2] of the process using laser-generated hot electrons concluded that one must deposit hot electron energy, $E_{\text{ign}} \sim 10\text{-}20$ kJ, within $\tau_{\text{ign}} \sim 30$ ps. More recent, detailed simulations [3] show the strong sensitivity of the energy requirement on details of the laser-generated electrons: Conversion efficiency, energy spectrum, and divergence. Those parameters depend sensitively on details of the laser-plasma interface (LPI), but the connection between interface and the resulting electrons, let alone control of their parameters, is not well understood because of both the influence of the laser pulse on the interface, and difficulty of making electron measurements inside dense plasmas.

Experimental campaigns to rectify this situation have been carried out at the Titan laser facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) that take advantage of the improved laser pulse diagnostics [4] allowing characterization of the (vacuum) laser focus and prepulse on every shot. Experiments have been performed to study: 1) *in situ* electron spectrum, 2) laser-to-electron coupling dependence on pre-plasma, 3) cone geometry affecting electron divergence.

In-situ electron spectrum. Electron energies are related to incident laser intensity by scaling relations that vary with the scale-length of the plasma gradient at the critical plasma density [5]. Simulations suggest a short scale-length plasma at the LPI allows higher laser intensity ($\sim 10^{20}$ W/cm²) to produce the 1-3 MeV electrons that are optimum for core heating [3]. Measurement of the coupling efficiency into this energy range has been indirect (vacuum electron spectrometers [6], Cu- K_{α} spectrometry [7]). Bremsstrahlung radiation from a series of experiments on flat foils has been used to determine *in situ* electron conversion efficiency [8]. Results indicate $I = 10^{19-20}$ W cm⁻² as a useful intensity, higher than previously expected, but still, because of the Titan prepulse (~ 10 mJ), not as high as predicted for a sharp interface.

Laser-to-electron coupling dependence on pre-plasma. Conversion in gold cones of photon energy to useful electrons has been characterized using 1 mm long, 40 μm ϕ copper wires to extract the forward-going electrons for analysis [7]. Results show their number substantially decreasing with increasing pre-plasma in the cone. The effect already noticeable at Titan intrinsic <10 mJ prepulse, and numbers decreasing by 10 $\times$ with prepulse increasing to ~ 1 J. This is consistent with PIC simulations showing the laser-plasma interface becoming increasingly more stochastic, resulting in increasing divergence, with added prepulse, and that this effect is much more severe in a narrow cone than on a flat surface [9]. This data will define contrast required of the ignition beam in integrated experiments.

Cone geometry affecting electron divergence. Experimental characterization of the electron divergence from inside a cone tip requires removal of extraneous barriers. Unlike the cone-wire targets described above, electrons created by the ignition pulse at the tip of a reentrant cone FI target can escape the cone into the surrounding plasma blown off from compressing the capsule. A “buried cone” target (conical hole in a block of Al) was designed to simulate that condition. Fluorescing layers buried in the aluminum block beyond the cone tip show the electron divergence in this case to be the same as previously observed for flat foils ($\sim 40^\circ$) only if the cone tip is $90\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ ϕ ; it is much larger for $30\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ ϕ . Refining that data, and determining its sensitivity to pre-existing plasma ($\sim 10\text{ mJ}$ for this experiment), will put constraints on the point design cone geometry.

In conclusion, we have developed techniques for more direct, *in situ*, characterization of laser-produced electron parameters and are using them to understand their sensitivity to the laser-plasma interface, particularly as affected by the laser-prepulse. We find that the ignition-laser-prepulse-induced modification of the laser plasma interface has a strong influence on the parameters of laser-produced hot electrons. Even small amounts (of order 10 mJ) cause the electron spectrum to be hotter and more divergent than otherwise. And the geometry of a narrow cone tip increases those effects.

This work was supported by the US Department of Energy under DE-FG02-05ER54834 and DE-AC52-07NA27344.

- [1] M. Tabak, *et al.*, Phys. Plasmas **1**, 1626-1634 (1994).
- [2] S. Atzeni, Phys. Plasmas **6**, 3316-3326 (1999).
- [3] J.J. Honrubia and J. Meyer-ter-Vehn, Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion **51**, 014008 (2009).
- [4] A.G. MacPhee, Rev. Sci. Instrum. **79**, 10F302 (2008).
- [5] A.J. Kemp et al., Phys. Rev. E **79**, 066406 (2009).
- [6] H. Chen et al., Phys. Plasmas **16**, 020705 (2009).
- [7] J.A. King et al., Phys. Plasmas **16**, 020701 (2009).
- [8] C.D. Chen et al., Rev. Sci. Instrum. **79**, 10E305 (2008).
- [9] A.G. MacPhee et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 055002 (2010).