D. Oh<sup>1</sup>, G.W. Baek<sup>1</sup>, D. Kim<sup>1</sup>, Y. Jung<sup>1</sup>, B.K. Jung<sup>2</sup>, and C. Sung<sup>1\*</sup> *1Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Daehak-ro, Yuseong-gu, Daejeon, South Korea 2Q-BEAM SOLUTION, 160, Daehwa-ro, Daedeok-gu, Daejeon, South Korea*

## NQe 원자력 및 양자공학과



**KAIST Nuclear & Quantum Engineering** 

### n, 160, Daehwa-ro, Daedeok-gu, Daejeon, South Korea **Fusion and Plasma Dynamics Laboratory**<br>\*E-mail: choongkisung@kaist.ac.kr

# **Development of Radiative Divertor Simulator Using Magnetic Mirror Device at KAIST**

**Computer-aided design model of the KAIMIR chamber**

#### **Development of Radiative Divertor Simulator Expander gas feed**



<sup>[4]</sup> Choe, M., et al. "Development of a diamagnetic loop in KAIMIR." *Review of Scientific Instruments* 95.7 (2024). This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Korea government (Ministry of Science and ICT) (RS 2023 00212124, RS 2022 00155956).

- Divertor component is utilized to protect plasma facing material and control impurities from the wall in closed field systems
- A comprehensive understanding of the divertor region is required to satisfy the thermoengineering limits of the plate, preventing damages caused by high heat and particle flux
	- Since the magnetic field in divertor region is open, simulation in open field device can be more efficient than in overall system, which is much more complex
- Heat flux on the divertor can be reduced by puffing main ion or impurity species near the target in the **radiative divertor**, which induces **radiative power dissipation**
- **Magnetic mirror device** (KAIMIR) [2] was employed to simulate radiative divertor
	- Valid for test bed of divertor region to study divertor physics with low cost and similar geometry
	- Produces **~4–6 eV, ~1018–20 m-3 Helium plasma** for **~12 ms** using a plasma gun [3]

 **Differential pressure** between the chambers was observed **with the skimmer** Generates **~60 ms time delay** of the pressure evolution in the chambers that gas was not fed •  $P_{source}$  < ~9 mTorr &  $P_{expander}$  < ~30 mTorr while pressure at the other chamber < 1 mTorr

Skimmer at the entrance of expander blocks gas flow between chambers → **Sustain the pressure difference** during the discharge

**Diverted plasma configuration in a tokamak and schematics showing mitigation of heat flux with gas puffing [1]**

- The increase was stronger when the gas was fed at the expander, since overall volume is smaller
- Confirmed that the **pressure difference** was **sustained** during the discharge (0 12 ms)

**Verification of the independent pressure control of each chamber**

 $T_{\text{inj.}} = -100$ – 0 ms,  $Q_{\text{inj.}} = 13 \text{ s/m}$  (Dataset low-pass filtered by  $f_c = 10 \text{ kHz}$ )

- Variations in the  $I_{sat}$  at the center were negligible (<10%), while  $I_{sat}$  at the expander region slightly increased (~30%) until  $P_n = 16$  mTorr  $\bullet$   $I_{\text{sat}}$  at the expander decreased with increasing pressure when  $P_n > 16$  mTorr  $\bullet$   $I_{\text{sat}}$  at the center stayed at similar level despite the increased neutral pressure at the center chamber **Changes at the central region** 0 10 20 30 0  $1x10^{20}$  $2x10^{20}$  $\longrightarrow$ n<sub>e</sub> (Center  $-$  T $_{\circ}$  (Center  $P_n$  (expander) (mTorr)  $n_{\rm e}$   $\rm (m^{-3})$ 0 5 10 Electron density ( $n_e$ ) and temperature ( $T_e$ ) with pressure at expander  $\vdash$  $\left(\overline{e}\right)$ 0 10 20 30 0.00 0.05  $\overrightarrow{\ge}$  0.10 (ີ⊆ <sup>0.15</sup><br>⊃\_(<br>≶ 0.10 0.20 0.25 Stored energy per length (W/L) with pressure at expander  $P_n$  (expander) (mTorr) —■— W/L 0 10 20 30 0 5  $\widehat{\mathsf{H}}$  10 15 —<del>—</del> Expander  $-$  Center  $P_n$  (expander) (mTorr)  $\mathsf{I}_{\mathsf{sat}}\left(\mathsf{Expader}\right)$  (mA) 0 50 100 150  $\mathsf{I}_{\mathsf{sat}}$  (Center) (mA)
- Gradual decrease of  $T_e$  and increase of  $n_e$  were observed with the steady particle flux
- Reduction in the stored energy per length, measured by DL, was also consistent
- Cooling of the expander can reduce energy at the center and degrade the energy





Independent control of each chamber pressure is required to induce





#### **Expander gas feeding with the differential pumping system**



 $\mathsf \Omega$ 

 $_{n}$  (mTorr)

 $\bullet$   $|T_{\text{feed}}| > 60 \text{ ms } \rightarrow P_{n}$  (center) increased significantly



- The density increased due to higher ionization rate with the increased neutral density
- Frequent collisions with neutrals may reduce the electron temperature as observed
- Reduced flux when  $P_n > 16$  mTorr will be the result from the increased neutral pressure in | both expander and center chambers
	- Axial profile of the compensated  $I_{\text{sat}}$ with pressure at expander
	- 100 Skimmer I
- Change of the cross-section area of the plasma  $(A_{pl})$ compensated by dividing the field intensity ( $|B|$ )
- Particle flux, Γ can increase even with constant particle flow rate, S, due to  $BA_{pl}$  = Const. ( $\Gamma \sim SA_{pl} \propto I_{sat}/|B|$ )
- $\bullet$  In P<sub>n</sub> < 16 mTorr, little change in axial profile of

confinement at the central region, which should be investigated in the future

#### **Changes at the expander region**

- **Effects to the particle flux**
- Ion saturation current  $(I<sub>sat</sub>)$  at the expander and center
- with pressure at expander