The Influence of the Radial Density and Temperature Profiles on the Mean Power Density in a Tokamak

K. Borraß

IPP 4/140

June 1976



MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT FÜR PLASMAPHYSIK

8046 GARCHING BEI MÜNCHEN

MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT FÜR PLASMAPHYSIK

GARCHING BEI MÜNCHEN

The Influence of the Radial Density and Temperature Profiles on the Mean Power Density in a Tokamak

K. Borraß

IPP 4/140

June 1976

Die nachstehende Arbeit wurde im Rahmen des Vertrages zwischen dem Max-Planck-Institut für Plasmaphysik und der Europäischen Atomgemeinschaft über die Zusammenarbeit auf dem Gebiete der Plasmaphysik durchgeführt. IPP 4/140

The Influence of the Radial Density and Temperature Profiles on the Mean Fusion Power Density in a Tokamak

K. Borraß

June 1976

Abstract

The influence of the density and temperature profiles on the mean fusion power density \overline{Q}_N in a circular Tokamak is considered. For fixed $\beta_{\mathcal{A}}$ and q(a) peaking of the density and temperature enlarges \overline{Q}_N . If for q(a) the smallest value compatible with the condition $q(r) \geq 1$ is taken, peaking of the density remains favourable but peaking of the temperature diminishes \overline{Q}_N considerably.

We consider a 50 - 50 deuterium-tritium tokamak plasma with circular cross-section. The cylinder approximation is used.

The fusion power density is given by

1:
$$Q_N = \frac{n_i^2}{4} \langle 6 V \rangle E_{\alpha}^{1}$$

In the following we shall use the approximate expression [1]

2:
$$\langle 6 \vee \rangle E_{\lambda} = 2.08 \cdot 10^{-17} \frac{e^{-\frac{19.94}{T_{i}^{1/3}}}}{T_{i}^{2/3}}$$

In a Tokamak there is an upper limit for the poloidal β , given by [2][3]

3:
$$\beta_{\mathcal{A}} = \frac{8\pi}{B_{\mathcal{A}}^{2}(0)} V^{-1} \int olt \left(n_{e} T_{e} + n_{i} T_{i} \right)$$

$$= 4.02 \cdot 10^{-14} \frac{R^{2} g^{2}(0)}{0!^{2} B_{\varphi}^{2}} \frac{2}{0!^{2}} \int_{0}^{0} olr \cdot r \left(n_{e} T_{e} + n_{i} T_{i} \right)$$

$$\left(q(r) = \frac{r \, B\varphi}{R \, B_{\mathcal{U}}(r)}\right)$$

All quantities are in cgs units, except T, which is in keV, and B, which is in kG, in formulae with decimal coefficients.

If the impurity concentration is not too high, one can assume that ne = ni = n. Furthermore, for not too high temperatures Te and Ti do not widely differ in a fusion plasma.

Hence we set Te = Ti = T.

We shall regard profiles of the form

$$n = n_o \left[o, 9 \left(1 - \left(\frac{r}{o} \right)^{2d} \right)^{\beta} + o, 1 \right] ; T = T_o \left[o, 9 \left(1 - \left(\frac{r}{o} \right)^{2\delta} \right)^{\delta} + o, 1 \right]$$

for the density and temperature respectively. With these profiles one gets from 1: and 2: for the mean nuclear energy production rate $\bar{Q}_{_{\rm N}}$

4:
$$\overline{Q}_{N} = V^{-1} \int d\tau \ Q_{N} = 5, 2 \cdot 10^{-18} \frac{n_{o}^{2}}{T_{o}^{2/3}} e^{-\frac{19,94}{T_{o}^{1/3}}} I(T_{o}, \lambda, \beta, \delta, \delta)$$

$$I = \int_{0}^{1} d\tau \ e^{-\frac{19,94}{T_{o}^{1/3}} \left\{ \frac{1}{[0,9(1-Z^{*})^{\delta}+0,1]} - 1 \right\}} \frac{[0,9(1-Z^{*})^{\beta}+0,1]^{2}}{[0,9(1-Z^{*})^{\delta}+0,1]^{2/3}}$$

(obviously I = 1 if n and T are independent of r)

and for Bul

5:
$$\beta_{N} = 8,04 \cdot 10^{-14} \frac{A^{2}}{B_{\varphi^{2}}} q^{2}(01) n_{o} T_{o} J(\alpha,\beta,\delta,\delta)$$

 $(A = {}^{R}/a \text{ the aspect ratio})$

(obviously J = 1 if n and T are independent of r).

From 5: and 4: we elimininate n_0 to express \bar{Q}_N for fixed $\beta_{\mathcal{N}}$:

6:
$$\overline{Q}_{N} = 8,04.10^{8} \frac{\beta_{N}^{2} \beta_{\varphi}^{4}}{A^{4} q^{4}(\alpha)} \frac{e^{-\frac{19,94}{T_{o}^{1/3}}}}{T_{o}^{8/3}} \frac{\Gamma(T_{o}, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)}{T^{2}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)}$$

Up to now we have not yet taken into account that there exists a lower limit for q(a) in 6:, because of the condition $q(r) \ge 1$ for $0 \le r \le 0$, which depends on the density and temperature profiles. To determine the minimal q(a) which is compatible with this constraint, we consider Ampere's law:

7:
$$\frac{1}{F} \frac{\partial}{\partial F} (F B \mathcal{L}) = \frac{4 \pi}{C} J_{\parallel}$$

 \mathcal{J}_{μ} is related to the toroidal electric field by Ohm's law:

We shall assume E_{ii} to be independent of r and η to obey the classical formula

9:
$$\gamma = \zeta \frac{Ne^{\frac{3}{2}}}{n_i Z_{eff}^2}$$

we can now write

10:
$$\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r B_{\ell}) = \frac{4\pi}{c} \frac{J_{ii}}{\eta^{o}} \gamma(r)$$

where γ^o and j_{\parallel}^o are peak values of γ and j_{\parallel} respectively. Integration of 10: yields

11:
$$B \mathcal{A} = \frac{4\pi}{C} \frac{\dot{j}_{ii}}{\eta^{o}} \frac{1}{r} \int_{0}^{r} dr' \dot{r} \eta(\dot{r}) + \frac{K}{r}$$

The condition $q(r) = \frac{F B \varphi}{R B \varrho} \ge 1$ for $0 \le F \le 0$ requires that K = 0.

It then follows that

12:
$$q(t) = \frac{B_{\ell} r^{2} c \eta^{\circ}}{4\pi R j_{\parallel}^{\circ}} \frac{1}{\int_{0}^{r} dr' r' \eta(r')}$$

Taking into account 9: and the specified form of the profiles, one immediately sees that q(r) is an increasing function of r. The requirement that q(r) takes its minimal value q(0) = 1, when applied to 12:, gives the following condition for \int_{u}^{0} :

13:
$$f''_{\parallel} = \frac{\beta \varphi \cdot \zeta}{2 \pi R}$$

From 13: and 12: follows that

14:
$$\frac{1}{q(\alpha)} = \frac{4\pi R}{B_{\psi} C_{0}^{2}} \frac{B_{\psi} C}{2\pi R_{0}} \int_{0}^{0} dr' r' \left[o_{,9} \left(1 - \left(\frac{r}{O} \right)^{2} \right)^{\delta} + o_{,1} \right]^{\frac{3}{2}}$$

$$= \int_{0}^{1} dz \left[o_{,9} \left(1 - Z^{\delta} \right)^{\delta} + o_{,1} \right]^{\frac{3}{2}}$$

where q(a) is now the minimal value such that $q(r) \ge 1$ is fulfilled. Evidently stronger peaking enlarges q(a).

In deriving 14:, Zeff was assumed to be independent of r.

If the neoclassical correction in the expression for γ had been taken into account, the result would be still more unfavourable.

We shall now regard three types of profiles for n and T:

profile	A	В	С	
4/8	1	1	1	
β/8	0	1	4	

For a graphic representation see Fig. 1.

The constant profile A serves as a reference profile. C is the most peaked one.

To study the influence of the profiles, we compute

$$f = \frac{I}{J^2}$$
 and $F = \frac{e^{-\frac{19.94}{T_0 V_3}}}{V_0 V_3} \frac{f}{Q^4(Q)}$, with q(a)

determined according to 14:, for various combinations of profiles A - C. f gives the enhancement of \bar{Q}_N for fixed β_N and q(a) relative to its value for constant density and temperature.

F is proportional to $\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathrm{N}}$ for a given system (fixed B ϕ , A) and fixed β_{N}

f allows the influence of profile variation on \bar{Q}_N to be studied if $\beta_{\mathcal{A}}$ and q(a) are kept fixed.

F gives the influence if βl is kept fixed but q(a) has the minimal value compatible with $q(r) \ge 1$.

Figure 2 shows f as a function of the peak temperature To. f increases with increasing To. For given To stronger peaking of T as well as of n enhances f.

If allowance is made for the enhancement of the minimal q(a) compatible with $q(r) \ge 1$ that is due to peaking, the situation rapidly changes.

Since q(a) is independent of the density in our approximation, peaking of n remains favourable. On the other hand, the enhancement of f is by far compensated by the enhancement of q(a) for peaked temperature profiles.

To visualize this influence of the profile dependence of q(a), we plotted F(To) for some typical profiles in Fig. 3. It can be seen that peaking of T strongly diminishes F.

Usually \overline{Q}_N is computed with constant n and T, but taking some reasonable q(a) (say q(a) = 2.5) instead of q(a) as determined according to 14:. The corresponding F is given by the dotted curve in Fig. 3.

It is seen that F for the most peaked profile is almost one order of magnitude smaller, even in the case of the most favourable density profile.

Profiles of type C for n and T are not unrealistic.

Profiles of similar shape have been found by Conn et al.

[3] by 1-dimensional simulation of a reactor-like plasma.

References

- [1] S. Glasstone and R. Lovberg: Controlled thermonuclear reactions, New York 1960
- [2] V.S. Mukhovatov and V.D. Shafranov: Nucl. Fus. 11 (1971)
- [3] H.P. Furth: Nucl. Fus. 15 (1975)
- [4] J. Kesner and R.W. Conn: To be published in Nucl. Fus.





