transport model with different canonical profiles for ions and electrons

Dnestrovskij Yu.N., Danilov A.V., Dnestrovskij A.Yu., Klyuchnikov L.A., Lysenko S.E., Melnikov A.V., Nurgaliev M.R., Soloviev N.A., Subbotin G.F., Sushkov A.V., Cherkasov S.V.

NRC “Kurchatov Institute”, Moscow, Russia, Dnestrovskiy\_YN@nrcki.ru

The canonical profiles transport model was described in [1]. It was supposed there that the canonical profiles for electron *Te* and ion *Ti* temperatures are the same. However, in recent years, it has been possible to conduct systematic measurements of the ion temperature profiles and to compare the temperature profiles in different discharges [2]. Analysis of experimental data for ohmic and ECR-heated discharges have shown that normalized temperature profiles for ions, , are much flatter than the ones for electrons, , Fig. 1. For a quantitative estimation of the profile shape, we introduce the peaking factor of temperature profile: *pT*=*T*(0)/*T*(*a*/2), where *T*(0) and *T*(*a*/2) are temperatures in the centre and at mid-radius of plasma column. As an example, we consider shot No. 73197 (current *I*=0.23 MA, magnetic field *B*=2.2 T, density *n*=1.3 
1019 m–3). The ECR heating is performed by three gyrotrons, two of which (A and C with a total power of 1.7 MW) deposit the power at = *a*/2, while the gyrotron B with a power of 0.5 MW  at = *a*/6. In the ohmic phase (OH), *pTe*=1.67, *pTi*=1.33, λ = *pTe*/*pTi* = 1.26. Similar values of  are typical for the ECR heating phase. So, we may unambiguously conclude that in our transport model, the canonical profiles for *Ti* should be flatter than ones for *Te*. In the model [1], the boundary condition at =0 for the function μ(ρ)=1/*q*() is as follows: . Usually, in calculations, 0=1, and for flatter profiles, 0<1. Figure 2 shows the canonical profiles of temperature with 0=1 and 0.5. Figure 3 compares the calculation results (solid curves) and experiment (dashed lines) for the electron and ion temperatures in shot No. 73197 with heating by all three gyrotrons ABC. Here, 0*e*= 0.6, 0*i*= 0.55, although  = 1.14 > 1. For the ohmic stage, the calculation gives μ0*e*=1 and μ0*i*=0.55. The *Te* profile after transition from OH to ABC phase is strongly flattened due to sawtooth oscillations and non-central heating by the A and C gyrotrons. Figure 3 shows that the model reasonably describes discharges with strong ECR heating (errors *d*2*T* < 8%) that allows us to use it for prediction the plasma parameters in future devices.
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