Turbulence and Transport in Negative and Positive Triangularity



M.J. Pueschel



#### J. Ball, J.M. Duff, & S. Coda

Many thanks to G. Snoep & A. Balestri

TSVV2 Workshop, November 30, 2022

## Pushing the PT/NT Boundaries



- NT has large outboard region with constant curvature  $\mathcal{K} \Rightarrow \gamma$  insensitive to  $\theta \sim k_x$
- PT produces strongly varying  $\mathcal{K}(z) \Rightarrow \text{localized } \gamma(k_x)$

## Turbulence at Extreme $\delta$

Nonlinearly,

- reduced flux at  $|\delta| \gtrsim 0.7$
- PT: strong zonal flow
- NT: enhanced NL transfer



Do these results carry over to realistic situations?

## Pushing $\delta$ at TCV I

RT07 TCV campaign: only  $\delta \approx \pm 0.3$  achievable at r/a = 0.7 $\Rightarrow$  extrapolate using Miller (ignores edge- $\delta \approx 0.6$ ,  $\rho^*$  effects)CHEASE geometryPT,NTMiller geometry



- at experimental gradients, stiff TEM, ITG growth
- confirms idealized ITG case, finite- $k_x$  contribution at  $\delta > 0$
- TEM:  $\gamma(\delta < 0)$  insensitive to  $k_x$  like ITG,  $\delta > 0$  TEM dominated by  $k_x \approx 0$

## Pushing $\delta$ at TCV II

Are the nonlinear Duff ITGae flux trends recovered?

1.4

u 0.8 0.6 0.4 0.2 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0



- substantial zonal flows
- near ITG/TEM thresholds; approx. matches Q<sub>e</sub><sup>exp</sup>
- quasilinear modeling: need to include finite k<sub>x</sub>?
- Q<sub>e</sub>: like γ, slight shift to higher k<sub>x</sub> at δ < 0</p>

04

0.6

k.p.

0.8

1.0

 extreme δ can be highly beneficial; too low |δ| in TCV core

0.2

# High- $\beta$ in PT/NT

Now, TCV shots studied in TSVV2, #69515 (PT), #69340 (NT) At r/a = 0.72, 0.8, well-matched gradients,  $\beta$ , except  $R/L_{Ti}$ 

Useful to look at *flipped gradients* scenario (PT geometry)



nonlinearly, fluxes peak near  $k_y = 0.4$ 

 $u_{\rm ei}$  makes enormous difference nonlinearly, reduces Q

## **Electromagnetic Effects**

Increasing normalized electron pressure  $\beta$  affects instabilities **Kinetic Ballooning Mode** (KBM): kinetic sibling of IBM



- ITG  $\beta$ -stabilized, TEM unaffected  $\Rightarrow$  here, hybrid mode
- PT has higher  $\beta_{crit}^{KBM}$  than NT, only due to lower gradients
- PT-flipped: lower threshold than NT
- more substantial increase in  $\beta_{\rm crit}^{\rm KBM}$  for more negative  $\delta$

## Nonlinear $\beta$ Scans

PT, NT approximately match  $Q_e$ , but higher  $Q_i$  in NT (higher  $R_0/L_{Ti}$ ); fluxes from GENE match experimental fluxes Mixed ITG-TEM; moderate zonal flow, substantial zonal field



- flipped: NT geometry produces less flux
- strong **nonlinear**  $\beta$  **stabilization** possible
- **saturation fails at**  $\beta \approx 2\beta_{exp}$ , far below  $\beta_{crit}^{KBM}$

 $\Rightarrow$  **Non-Zonal Transition**, very restrictive at steep gradients

# **RMP Impact on PT/NT Turbulence**

Gu NF 2022: analysis of PT experiments (DIII-D, AUG, EAST)  $\Rightarrow$  *RMP impact weaker as*  $\delta$  *is increased* 

*Here*, **add RMP** (Williams PoP 2017, NF 2020) **to PT vs. NT** shots at  $k_v \rho_s = 0.1$ 



very little impact on transport (low |δ|: ~ 10% − 30%)
at very high B<sup>RMP</sup><sub>x</sub>, PT ≈ NT flux

# Summary

- extreme triangularity  $|\delta| \gtrsim 0.6$  promising from turbulence standpoint, *but is it realistic in reactors?*
- KBM threshold increased for negative triangularity
- β factor two below non-zonal transition threshold, shaping optimization may mean NZT limits gradients
- RMP impact rather comparable for PT, NT
- Next steps:
  - compare QL vs. NL for  $\beta$  scan; test  $\tau$ -improved QL
  - determine how saturation mechanisms are impacted by NT
  - look at large- $|\delta|$  reactor, including fast ions



This work has been carried out within the framework of the BLROKusion Consortium, funded by the European Union via the Eurotom Research and Training Programmer (Sant Argenerer No 101025200 – BLROKusion), Wess and opinions expressed are however those of the authoridy only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Commission Neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be held responsible for them.

