



# Uncertainty of medium-weight and heavy element line power coefficients

Stuart Henderson and the ADAS team

19<sup>th</sup> ADAS Workshop 2015, INAF – Osservatorio Astrofisico di Catania 1<sup>st</sup> October 2015

## Motivation

Focus in magnetic fusion and astrophysics is moving towards medium-weight and heavy elements

- This talk will focus on tokamak related aspects (see other talks for astrophysics overview)

- Wall materials in tokamaks (e.g. Fe, Mo, W) often migrate into the plasma
  - Conditions for 'burning' tokamak plasmas are highly dependent on ion power functions -  $P_{\alpha} = P_{loss} = P_{trans} + P_{rad} = P_{trans} + N_e^2(f_zL_z)$
  - Future tokamak designs (i.e. DEMO) are exploring the concept of using seeded impurities (e.g. Ar, Kr, Xe) to dissipate the large exhaust heat loads through radiation
    - Main modelling uncertainty in current DEMO design systems is from power functions
    - There must exist some uncertainty on the derived atomic data inputs

## Moving to a new baseline in ADAS

- Currently ADAS provides high precision GCR data for ions up to neon
  - Above-baseline quality data available only for a selection of ions
  - Expand GCR data to medium-weight and heavy elements

#### The ADAS GCR data will form the new baseline in ADAS, replacing the current baseline (89) data

- Now using Autostructure with intermediate coupling (ic) level resolution
- Possibility of R-matrix (resonances), DW (spin changing transitions) and PWB cross-section calculations are key to Autostructure's usage
- In addition, we aim to provide a 'worst-case' uncertainty of the derived atomic coefficients

What are the main sources of uncertainty associated with the derived atomic coefficients within ADAS?



#### **Power function overview**

#### Ionisation balance uncertainties:

- Ionisation rates
- Recombination rates
- Focus of other talks

#### Line power P<sub>LT</sub> uncertainties:

- Configuration selection
- Atomic structure and energy levels
- Collisional excitation cross-sections
- Focus of *this* talk



## **Configuration selection**

#### The main complexity in a structure calculation is usually the *correct* selection of configurations

- limited by the size of the calculation
- ideally capturing as much of the radiated power as possible

#### For the low levels of the ion, we require a set of optimal configurations for each ion

- define the configurations in terms of promotion rules for each driving configuration
- pick rule sets that produce highest  $\Delta P_{LT}$  /  $\Delta N_{Levels}$

#### Optimisation method built on previous Ph.D. work by Adam Foster

- now using Autostructure
- combining (and further optimising) configuration sets from metastable driving configurations

٠

٠

### **Promotion rules for configuration sets**

A set of rules defining the promotion of electrons from a driving configuration can be used to generate a configuration set



## **Promotion rules and optimisation**

1. Define list of promotion rule changes, e.g.

ID	Description	ID	Description
1	$\Delta n_{v1}^{max}$ +1	8	$\Delta l_{v2}^{min}$ -1
2	$\Delta n_{v1}^{min}$ -1	9	$\Delta n_{cl}^{max}$ +1
3	$\Delta I_{v1}^{max}$ +1	10	$\Delta n_{cl}{}^{min}$ -1
4	$\Delta l_{v1}^{min}$ -1	11	$\Delta I_{cl}^{max}$ +1
5	$\Delta n_{v2}^{max}$ +1	12	$\Delta I_{cl}^{min}$ -1
6	$\Delta n_{v2}^{min}$ -1	13	Ground complex
7	$\Delta I_{v2}^{max}$ +1	14-19	Extra options

- 2. Start from a driving configuration (usually the ground) and cycle through each rule change
- 3. On each iteration, calculate the CA  $P_{LT}$  for one  $T_e$  and  $N_e$  and store 'figure of merit' ratio  $-\,\Delta P_{LT}$  /  $\Delta N_{Levels}$
- 4. Rule change with highest ratio is set as reference scenario, and step 2 is repeated
- 5. Loop continues until the number of configurations/levels is greater than pre-defined limits

## **Optimisation example**



#### Fe-like Zn<sup>4+</sup>; Ground 3d<sup>8</sup>; 500 level limit

Note: Different rule changes used for first iteration to force dipole transitions

## **Optimisation example**



## **Optimisation example**



## Multiple driving configurations

#### We now have a set of configurations for *each* driving configuration

- But an ion may have a number of driving configurations (i.e. metastables)
- The final configuration set should be based on all driving configurations

Further optimisation required using GCR model with ion-impact collisional excitations (see talk by *M Bluteau*) to determine relative populations of metastable configurations

#### Further optimisation steps:

- 1. Combine configurations from each driving configuration (removing any duplicates)
- 2. Distinguish between the metastable and promoted configurations
- 3. Systematically remove each promoted configuration in turn
- 4. Remove configurations with lowest values of  $\Delta P_{LT} / \Delta N_{Levels}$  until limits satisfied

## Multiple driving configurations



## **Case study: Krypton**

- Perform analysis P<sub>LT</sub> uncertainty analysis for Kr iso-nuclear sequence
  - ions in the range 1<Z<15
- Atomic structure uncertainty
  - compare Autostructure vs. Cowan using PWB ic resolution
- Collisional excitation cross-section uncertainty
  - compare DW vs. PWB using Autostructure in *ic* resolution
- Compare P<sub>LT</sub> with previous (89) ADAS baseline

#### **Uncertainties from atomic structure**

![](_page_13_Figure_1.jpeg)

Near neutral ions are a problem case, where further optimisation of Autostructure scaling parameters is required – currently in development

٠

#### **Uncertainties from atomic structure**

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

Comparison of Autostructure vs. Cowan (*ic* PWB) PLT at ionisation potential

Near neutral ions are a problem case, and therefore further optimisation of Autostructure scaling parameters is required – currently in ADAS development

٠

#### **Uncertainties from collisional excitation cross-sections**

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **Uncertainties from collisional excitation cross-sections**

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

## **Kr power function**

![](_page_17_Figure_1.jpeg)

Note: results require further testing and analysis – for visualisation purpose only

## **Summary & Discussion**

ADAS baseline moving to Autostructure, DW and *ic* resolution for medium-weight and heavy elements

- Configuration sets optimised to power using promotion rules
  - secondary optimisation step for multiple driving configurations
- Uncertainty on P<sub>LT</sub> from atomic structure and collisional excitation cross-sections typically below 30%
  decreases with ion charge

#### **Discussion**

٠

•

How are uncertainties propagated and stored in ADAS?