

## CHCRUS

This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

## Observation of Efficient Lower Hybrid Current Drive at High Density in Diverted Plasmas on the Alcator C-Mod Tokamak

S. G. Baek, G. M. Wallace, P. T. Bonoli, D. Brunner, I. C. Faust, A. E. Hubbard, J. W. Hughes, B. LaBombard, R. R. Parker, M. Porkolab, S. Shiraiwa, and S. Wukitch Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 055001 — Published 3 August 2018 DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.055001

1 2 3	Observation of Efficient Lower Hybrid Current Drive at High-Density in Diverted Plasmas on the Alcator C-Mod Tokamak
4 5	S. G. Baek, G. M. Wallace, P. T. Bonoli, D. Brunner, I. C. Faust*, A. E. Hubbard, J. W. Hughes, B. LaBombard, R. R. Parker, M. Porkolab, S. Shiraiwa, S. Wukitch
6	MIT Plasma Science and Fusion Center, Cambridge, MA, USA
7	*Max Planck Institute for Plasma Physics, Munich, Bavaria, Germany
8	Abstract: Efficient lower hybrid current drive (LHCD) is demonstrated at densities up to
9	$\bar{n}_e \approx 1.5 \times 10^{20} \text{ m}^{-3}$ in diverted plasmas on the Alcator C-Mod tokamak by operating at
10	increased plasma current and therefore reduced Greenwald density fraction. This density
11	exceeds the nominal "LH density limit" at $\bar{n}_e \approx 1.0 \times 10^{20}$ m <sup>-3</sup> reported previously, above
12	which an anomalous loss of current drive efficiency was observed. The recovery of
13	current drive efficiency to a level consistent with engineering scalings is correlated with a
14	reduction in density shoulders and turbulence levels in the far scrape-off-layer.
15	Concurrently, RF wave interaction with the edge/scrape-off-layer plasma is reduced, as
16	indicated by a minimal broadening of the wave frequency spectrum measured at the
17	plasma edge. These results have important implications for sustaining steady state
18	tokamak operation and indicate a pathway forward for implementing efficient LHCD in a
19	reactor.

20 PACS number: 52.55.-s, 52.35.Hr, 52.35.Mw, 52.55.Wq

The attractiveness of a tokamak for steady-state power production depends on 21 demonstrating a means to efficiently generate non-inductive toroidal plasma current. Of 22 the available means, lower hybrid current drive (LHCD) is the most efficient process in 23 which lower hybrid (LH) waves Landau damp on electrons at a relatively high parallel 24 (along the magnetic field) phase velocity of  $v_{ll} \sim 3 v_{te}$ , where  $v_{te} = \sqrt{2T_e/m_e}$ . As a result, 25 both momentum transfer and an asymmetric plasma resistivity contribute to LHCD [1,2]. 26 For this reason, research on lower hybrid current drive has been vigorously pursued with 27 the expectation that it will ultimately play a crucial role in attaining fully non-inductive 28 operation – augmenting the edge bootstrap current with efficient off-axis current drive 29 30 and providing access to high confinement regimes with the formation of an internal transport barrier by tailoring the current profile [3]. 31

However, one of the biggest challenges since the beginning of the LHCD experiments in the 1970s [4] has been to understand and overcome the so-called "LHCD density limit"– an anomalous loss of efficiency observed at a density below the classical wave accessibility limit [5]. The effect has been attributed to an anomalous wave power loss or excessive broadening in the launched wavenumber due to undesirable wave interactions occurring at the plasma edge, such as parametric decay instabilities [6,7]. Based on the 1 frequency scaling of this limit behaviour [4], early experiments established a rule of 2 thumb limit of  $\omega_0/\omega_{LH}(0) > 2$  for efficient current drive, where  $\omega_0$  is the source frequency and  $\omega_{LH}$  (0) is the plasma lower hybrid frequency at the plasma center, in predicting 3 current drive performance. Nevertheless, recent experiments on various tokamaks have 4 exhibited poorer than expected current drive efficiencies at densities below this limit 5 6 (FTU [8], Tore Supra [9], EAST [10], and Alcator C-Mod [11]). The PDI onset, which can be considered as a proxy for the anomalous efficiency loss, is found to be generally 7 initiated when  $\omega_0/\omega_{\text{LH}}(0) \approx 3 \sim 4$ . 8

Furthermore, a more restrictive limit was observed in diverted configurations on C-Mod. 9 While no apparent density limit behavior was observed for inner-wall limited plasma up 10 to the accessibility limit [12], efficient current drive was observed only up to  $\bar{n}_{e} \approx 1 \times 10^{20}$ 11 m<sup>-3</sup> in diverted discharges, corresponding to  $\omega_0/\omega_{\text{LH}}(0) \approx 3.2$  with  $n_e(0) \approx 1.4 \times 10^{20}$  m<sup>-3</sup> 12 and  $B_t(0) = 5.4$  T. Because of this unfavorable result, experimental exploration of 13 diverted scenarios with high bootstrap current fraction at reactor relevant densities was 14 15 restricted. For those plasmas exhibiting the anomalous density limit behavior on C-Mod, increasing the edge pedestal temperature up to 1 keV resulted in only a modest 16 improvement of the current drive efficiency [12]. This was in clear contrast to results 17 obtained from a limiter configuration on FTU [8]: the regime of effective current drive 18 was reported to be extended with the increase in edge temperature associated with special 19 20 wall-conditioning and pellet injection. A key difference between the diverted and limited configurations is the behavior of the scrape-off layer (SOL), whose impact on wave 21 propagation has not been carefully examined until recently [11]. In a reactor, a divertor 22 configuration will most likely be required in order to accommodate the extreme levels of 23 24 heat and particle exhaust. Therefore, it is crucial to determine if an approach may exist to extend the compatibility of efficient LHCD to diverted scrape-off layers operating at 25 reactor level densities. 26

In the course of our research on C-Mod [13–15] we came to realize that diverted plasmas 27 which showed this limit behavior typically had plasma currents set at a low value ( $I_p < 1$ 28 MA). The aim of choosing the low current was to maximize the non-inductive current 29 30 fraction due to LHCD. On the other hand, from tokamak boundary physics [16], it is known that SOL plasmas exhibit broad shoulders and increased levels of blobby 31 turbulence at low plasma current, in particular when the Greenwald density fraction 32  $[\bar{n}_e/n_G]$ , where  $n_G = I_p/(\pi a^2)$  is greater than  $\bar{n}_e/n_G \approx 0.2$ . From the wave physics point of 33 view, these edge conditions have recently been identified to cause a number of parasitic 34 interactions with the boundary plasma. For example, by doubling the plasma current 35  $(0.55 \text{ MA} \rightarrow 1.1 \text{ MA})$  [13] and reducing the density in the far SOL by about half, parasitic 36 37 wave interaction was found to be reduced with a concurrent increase in LHCD effectiveness. 38

1 In this Letter, we present an experimental observation of efficient lower hybrid current 2 drive above the anomalous lower hybrid density limit in a diverted configuration. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first unambiguous report of efficient generation of non-3 inductive current above  $\bar{n}_e \approx 1 \times 10^{20}$  m<sup>-3</sup> in this configuration. Our approach in the latest 4 experimental campaign was to explore LHCD at high densities near the accessibility limit 5 but at minimal Greenwald fraction. This was done by raising the plasma current further 6 up to 1.4 MA under otherwise identical conditions. No special wall-conditioning was 7 found necessary to recover values of LHCD efficiency at high density that are consistent 8 with the engineering efficiency scaling evaluated at low density. 9

The experiment presented in this Letter was carried out on Alcator C-Mod [17] (major 10 radius, R = 67 cm, and minor radius a = 22 cm). We focus on the LH density limit 11 observed in the L-mode plasmas without any additional heating schemes. Both the 12 magnetic field (B<sub>t</sub> = 5-8 T) and density ( $\bar{n}_e < 1.5 \times 10^{20}$  m<sup>-3</sup>), which govern the wave and 13 boundary physics, correspond to those anticipated for a reactor. The lower hybrid current 14 drive system [18] injects a high frequency RF wave ( $f_0 = 4.6$  GHz) at power levels of up 15 to 1 MW (injected). The interaction of the injected wave with the boundary plasma was 16 monitored by measuring the wave frequency spectra with internal RF probes distributed 17 around the tokamak. In particular, the inner-wall probe is ideally suited to observe a 18 19 wave-field that has undergone various wave-edge interactions on its first pass across the tokamak from the low field side to the high field side. Non-thermal electron cyclotron 20 emission (ECE) and hard X-ray (HXR) Bremsstrahlung emission are used to monitor fast 21 22 electron generation by LHCD. The HXR diagnostic system [19] has 32 sightlines that view the poloidal cross-section of the plasma with a detector at the outer midplane, 23 providing information on the fast electron generation profile. 24

25

Figure 1 shows an example of a low Greenwald fraction plasma with LHCD ( $\bar{n}_e/n_G =$ 26 0.16 with  $I_p = 1.2$  MA) at a density above the nominal density limit. The line-averaged 27 density was  $\bar{n}_e = 1.3 \times 10^{20} \text{ m}^{-3}$ . A net LH power of 600 kW was coupled to the plasma for 28 400 msec. The peak parallel refractive index launched was  $n_{1/2} = 1.9$ . As shown in Figure 29 1(c), current drive is evidenced by reduction in loop voltage with the application of LH 30 power, as the inductive drive required to maintain the prescribed plasma current is 31 reduced in the presence of the fast electron tail<sup>1</sup>. This indicates that the LH power was 32 effectively replacing a part of the ohmic power, and the plasma current was partially 33 driven non-inductively. The central electron temperature remained at  $T_{e,0} \approx 3$  keV, 34 indicating that the change in loop voltage is not due to the change in resistivity. Figure 35 1(d) shows the correlated response of the edge non-thermal ECE with LHCD. Under 36 similar conditions at low plasma current, the non-thermal emission is negligible. 37

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Note that the current relaxation time [20] for the given plasma is  $\tau_{CR} = 1.4a^2 T_e^{3/2}/Z_{eff} = 230$  msec for a = 0.22 m,  $T_e = 3$  keV and  $Z_{eff} = 1.5$ . Therefore, the current profile was not expected to be fully relaxed due to the tripping in the injected power.

1 The observed drop in the loop voltage is consistent with the RF current drive efficiency 2 previously inferred on C-Mod. In our experiment, the fractional loop voltage drop is observed to be  $\Delta V/V = 0.17$  with the injected power  $x \equiv P_{LH}/(n_{e,19} I_p R_0) = 0.056$  (MW m<sup>-</sup> 3 <sup>2</sup> MA<sup>-1</sup>). This pair is found to be in line with the data set (Fig. 5 in [21]) that was used to 4 evaluate the current drive efficiency in a low-density regime. In that study,  $\Delta V/V$  was 5 scanned as a function of the LH power, and was fitted to a functional form [22] of  $\Delta V/V$ 6 =  $(\eta_{0+} \eta_1) x / (1 + \eta_1 x)$  to infer the RF current drive efficiency:  $\eta_0 = n_e I_p R_0 / P_{LH} \approx 2.5 \pm 0.2$ 7 (10<sup>19</sup> MA MW<sup>-1</sup> m<sup>-2</sup>), and the hot conductivity term due to the presence of the DC field: 8  $\eta_1 = 0.4 \pm 0.5$ . Thus, the observed loop voltage drop consistent with the previous 9 experimental dataset shows that the experiment was limited by the injected power only. 10

Clear evidence for reduced parasitic wave-edge plasma interaction in this low Greenwald 11 fraction plasma is provided by measurements of the frequency spectrum by an inner-wall 12 probe. Figure 2 compares the LH frequency spectra in low- and high- Greenwald fraction 13 plasmas (0.16 vs. 0.36) at fixed  $\bar{n}_e = 1.3 \times 10^{20}$  m<sup>-3</sup> under otherwise identical conditions. 14 The lower current (higher Greenwald fraction) discharges typically show a pump-wave 15 amplitude that is lower by about 10 dB [13] at this location, suggesting that first pass 16 losses might be an important player in the LH density limit behavior. The symmetrically 17 broadened frequency components around the source frequency indicate a role of 18 turbulence scattering [23] and/or ion sound PDIs [24]. In addition, the harmonics of the 19 sideband below the source frequency evidences the onset of ion cyclotron PDIs [6]. 20

On the other hand, in a low Greenwald fraction plasma that exhibits a good current drive 21 efficiency, experimental signatures of parasitic wave-edge interactions are largely 22 23 eliminated despite exhibiting the same line-averaged density. A level of pump broadening is noticeably reduced, which can be attributed to a reduction in blobby transport 24 25 occurring in the SOL. It is previously reported [25] that the effective particle diffusion coefficient (D<sub>eff</sub> =  $\Gamma$ /  $\nabla n_e$  where  $\Gamma$  is the particle flux) in the near SOL is reduced 26 significantly below  $\bar{n}_e/n_G \approx 0.2$  with corresponding reduction in density shoulder in the 27 far SOL. Under this condition, the launched wave is not expected to undergo significant 28 scattering interactions with the background turbulence. 29

Furthermore, the suppressed PDI sidebands indicate that the non-linear wave scattering 30 process is also below the threshold condition, consistent with a homogeneous PDI 31 analysis [26]. The reasoning for this is as follows: based on a previous SOL profile 32 measurements [13], the SOL density at such a low Greenwald fraction plasma quickly 33 falls to below  $n_e \approx 0.3 \times 10^{20} \text{ m}^{-3}$  outside the separatrix without forming a shoulder 34 structure even at  $\bar{n}_e = 1.3 \times 10^{20}$  m<sup>-3</sup>. At this local density, a PDI analysis shows that the 35 convective threshold condition ( $\gamma \Delta t > \pi$ ) is not satisfied for the most unstable ion mode 36 of  $n_{1/2} \sim 20$  in the limit of perpendicular coupling. Here,  $\gamma$  is the growth rate, and  $\Delta t = \Delta y / 2$ 37

1  $v_{g\perp}$  is the residence time of the excited sideband LH wave within the pump wave 2 resonance cone determined by the height of a single grill structure ( $\Delta y = 6$  cm) and the 3 sideband perpendicular group velocity ( $v_{g\perp} \approx \frac{\omega}{k_{\parallel}} \frac{\omega}{\omega_{pe}}$ ). Note that SOL temperature is not 4 found to be a strong function of the Greenwald fraction. It is also a weak function of the 5 power to the SOL ( $T_e \sim P_{SOL}^{2/7}$ ). Therefore, the edge/SOL density and its associated 6 density fluctuation level are found to be an important parameter to control parasitic wave 7 interactions at the plasma edge.

8 Fast electron generation is found to be increased by more than two orders of magnitude in the high current plasmas compared to the lowest current cases (0.55 MA). Figure 3 9 summarizes hard X-ray (HXR) count rate observations as a function of the line-averaged 10 density at different currents. The HXR emission may be taken as a proxy for fast electron 11 generation. The count rates are summed from 16 central viewing chords out of 32 chords 12 13 in the energy range from 60 to 240 keV. While previous experimental results at lower plasma current exhibit an exponential decay of HXR emission with increasing density, 14 the count rates at Ip > 1 MA are substantially higher for  $\bar{n}_e > 1 \times 10^{20}$  m<sup>-3</sup>. The loop 15 voltages in these plasmas remain similar at about 1.0 V, eliminating a possibility that a 16 higher DC electric-field could have accelerated the fast electrons more in a high-current 17 plasma. 18

Figure 4 compares the HXR count rates versus the channel number in between the low-19 current and high-current plasmas. In the low current cases, the profile is peaked at the 20 21 central chord. This feature was proposed to be caused by the modification in the launched 22 spectrum due to wave-edge plasma interactions [14,27], which is in line with our experimental observation of the increased wave interaction with the edge plasma with 23 increased Greenwald fraction at the fixed line-averaged density. In the high current cases, 24 the fast electron generation profile is not peaked, indicating the broadening of wave 25 power deposition. While such a broadening with increasing current is generally attributed 26 27 to the increase in core temperature and an increased level of poloidal up-shift, our result suggests that this current dependence might not be fully isolated from the change in the 28 29 edge/SOL plasma with the decrease in the Greenwald fraction.

The increased level of the HXR count rates observed is in reasonable agreement with 30 preliminary steady-state GENRAY/CQL3D model calculations [28,29] shown in Figure 3, 31 which includes a simple exponentially-decaying SOL for the temperature and density 32 profiles outside the separatrix with a fixed scale length normalized to minor radius of 33  $\lambda$ =0.022. About 20% of the LH power is found to be collisionally lost in the model. 34 Because of the known sensitivity of the simulated total driven current to the DC electric 35 field [30], two simulations with and without the DC electric field were conducted. First, 36 37 the DC electric field is assumed to have a 1/R dependence with the on-axis value of  $E_0 =$ 0.234 V/m, consistent with the measured loop voltage of 1 V. The predicted total current 38 (1.23 MA) is found to agree well with the experimental current (1.2 MA), while the 39

predicted hard X-ray count rates  $(=3.3 \times 10^6 \text{ } \text{#/s})$  are higher by a factor of three than the 1 experimental measurement (Fig. 3). The second simulation result without the DC electric 2 field predicts the count rates of  $0.69 \times 10^6$  #/s, which is below the experimental count rates. 3 The RF driven current is predicted to be 86 kA. Since the experimental count rates are in 4 between the two modelling results, it is concluded that the ray-tracing/Fokker-Planck 5 6 model can reasonably reproduce the observed experimental level of the HXR emission. Note that this standard model is found to significantly over-predict the count rates in the 7 low current case (e.g., 800 kA), as shown in Figure 3. It has been reported [11,14] that a 8 proper modelling of the diverted SOL plasma (e.g., the shoulder structure) and associated 9 10 parasitic wave interactions is crucial in reproducing the strong reduction in the count rates observed in the low current cases. An agreement found in the high current case 11 supports that wave parasitic losses in the boundary plasma are largely eliminated in the 12 low Greenwald fraction plasma. Further investigations are necessary in modelling the fast 13 electron population in the presence of a strong DC electric field. 14

15 In summary, efficient lower hybrid current drive is recovered on the Alcator C-Mod tokamak up to the accessibility limit when  $\bar{n}_e/n_G < 0.2$ . The dependence of SOL 16 parameters on Greenwald density fraction is identified as an important tool that can be 17 used to control edge/SOL plasma conditions and attain efficient LHCD above the 18 nominal LH density limit. The observed change in the loop voltage is in line with the 19 20 efficiency evaluated at a low density. Several orders of magnitude increase in the fast electron generation is indicated by HXR observations, which is consistent with initial 21 ray-tracing/Fokker-Planck synthetic-diagnostic analysis. The frequency 22 spectra measurements detect parasitic wave interactions with the edge plasma, whose 23 24 suppression is correlated with the improvement in LHCD efficiency.

25 Further work remains to identify more clearly the dominant mechanisms for the observed loss of efficiency in plasmas with increased Greenwald fraction. In particular, an 26 experiment in a strong single-pass damping regime would be particularly helpful for this 27 purpose in order to assess the loss occurring on the first pass. A high temperature in a 28 reactor is expected to suppress collisions and PDIs. The insight that SOL conditions play 29 30 such a key role suggests a number of pathways forward to attain efficient LHCD in reactor – akin to the realization that the Greenwald density limit itself may be overcome 31 by proper tailoring of the edge and pedestal density profiles [31-33]. Unlike our 32 experiments, the Greenwald fraction in a fusion reactor is fixed and cannot be lowered. 33 34 However, high-field tokamak reactors that can operate at a moderate Greenwald fraction [34] may provide a favorable SOL condition for wave penetration. Furthermore, 35 a placement of the launcher at the high-field-side (HFS) of the tokamak in a double null 36 configuration [35] may offer another important optimization approach via magnetic 37 balance control. In this magnetic configuration, the HFS SOL becomes disconnected 38 39 from the LFS SOL, and density shoulders and blobby transport phenomena are expected to be absent there, as indicated by the HFS SOL profile measurements on Alcator C-40

- 1 Mod [36]. In this situation, parasitic wave interactions may be avoided even at high
- 2 Greenwald fraction.
- 3 The authors thank the entire Alcator C-Mod team for their support in carrying the LHCD
- 4 experiment. This research was conducted on Alcator C-Mod, which is a DOE Office of
- 5 Science User Facility supported at MIT by DOE Contract No. DE-FC02-99ER54512.

## 6 References

- 7 [1] N. J. Fisch, Phys. Rev. Lett. 41, 873 (1978).
- 8 [2] N. J. Fisch and A. H. Boozer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 45, 720 (1980).
- 9 [3] P. T. Bonoli, Phys. Plasmas **21**, 061508 (2014).
- 10 [4] W. Hooke, Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion **26**, 133 (1984).
- 11 [5] M. Brambilla, Nucl. Fusion **19**, 1343 (1979).
- [6] M. Porkolab, S. Bernabei, W. M. Hooke, R. W. Motley, and T. Nagashima, Phys. Rev. Lett.
  38, 230 (1977).
- [7] Y. Takase, M. Porkolab, J. J. Schuss, R. L. Watterson, C. L. Fiore, R. E. Slusher, and C. M.
  Surko, Phys. Fluids 28, 983 (1985).
- 16 [8] R. Cesario, L. Amicucci, A. Cardinali, C. Castaldo, M. Marinucci, L. Panaccione, F. Santini,
- 17 O. Tudisco, M. L. Apicella, G. Calabrò, and others, Nat. Commun. 1, 55 (2010).
- [9] M. Goniche, V. Basiuk, J. Decker, P. K. Sharma, G. Antar, G. Berger-By, F. Clairet, L.
   Delpech, A. Ekedahl, J. Gunn, and others, Nucl. Fusion 53, 033010 (2013).
- [10]B. J. Ding, E. H. Kong, M. H. Li, L. Zhang, W. Wei, M. Wang, H. D. Xu, Y. C. Li, B. L.
   Ling, Q. Zang, and others, Nucl. Fusion 53, 113027 (2013).
- [11]G. M. Wallace, R. R. Parker, P. T. Bonoli, A. E. Hubbard, J. W. Hughes, B. L. LaBombard,
  O. Meneghini, A. E. Schmidt, S. Shiraiwa, D. G. Whyte, and others, Phys. Plasmas 17,
  082508 (2010).
- [12]G. M. Wallace, A. E. Hubbard, P. T. Bonoli, I. C. Faust, R. W. Harvey, J. W. Hughes, B. L.
  LaBombard, O. Meneghini, R. R. Parker, A. E. Schmidt, and others, Nucl. Fusion 51, 083032
  (2011).
- [13]S. G. Baek, R. R. Parker, P. T. Bonoli, S. Shiraiwa, G. M. Wallace, B. LaBombard, I. C.
  Faust, M. Porkolab, and D.G. Whyte, Nucl. Fusion 55, 043009 (2015).
- [14]S. Shiraiwa, S. G. Baek, I. Faust, G. Wallace, P. Bonoli, O. Meneghini, R. Mumgaard, R.
  Parker, S. Scott, R. W. Harvey, and others, in *AIP Conf. Proc.* (AIP Publishing, 2015), p.
  030016.
- [15]I. C. Faust, D. Brunner, B. LaBombard, R. R. Parker, J. L. Terry, D. G. Whyte, S. G. Baek, E.
  Edlund, A. E. Hubbard, J. W. Hughes, and others, Phys. Plasmas 23, 056115 (2016).
- [16]B. Labombard, J. W. Hughes, N. Smick, A. Graf, K. Marr, R. McDermott, M. Reinke, M.
  Greenwald, B. Lipschultz, and J. L. Terry, Phys. Plasmas 15, 056106 (2008).
- [17] M. Greenwald, A. Bader, S. Baek, M. Bakhtiari, H. Barnard, W. Beck, W. Bergerson, I.
  Bespamyatnov, P. Bonoli, and D. Brower, Phys. Plasmas 21, 110501 (2014).
- [18] P. T. Bonoli, R. Parker, S. J. Wukitch, Y. Lin, M. Porkolab, J. C. Wright, E. Edlund, T.
  Graves, L. Lin, and J. Liptac, Fusion Sci. Technol. 51, 401 (2007).
- [19] J. Liptac, R. Parker, V. Tang, Y. Peysson, and J. Decker, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 77, 103504
   (2006).
- 43 [20] D. R. Mikkelsen, Phys. Fluids B Plasma Phys. 1, 333 (1989).
- [21] P. T. Bonoli, J. Ko, R. Parker, A. E. Schmidt, G. Wallace, J. C. Wright, C. L. Fiore, A. E.
  Hubbard, J. Irby, E. Marmar, and others, Phys. Plasmas 15, 056117 (2008).
- 46 [22]G. Giruzzi, E. Barbato, S. Bernabei, and A. Cardinali, Nucl. Fusion **37**, 673 (1997).
- 47 [23]P. L. Andrews and F. W. Perkins, Phys. Fluids **26**, 2546 (1983).
- 48 [24] Y. Takase and M. Porkolab, Phys. Fluids **26**, 2992 (1983).

- 1 [25]B. LaBombard, R. L. Boivin, M. Greenwald, J. Hughes, B. Lipschultz, D. Mossessian, C. S.
- 2 Pitcher, J. L. Terry, S. J. Zweben, and A. Group, Phys. Plasmas 8, 2107 (2001).
- 3 [26] M. Porkolab, Phys. Fluids **20**, 2058 (1977).
- [27]Y. Peysson, J. Decker, E. Nilsson, J. F. Artaud, A. Ekedahl, M. Goniche, J. Hillairet, B. Ding,
   M. Li, P. T. Bonoli, and others, Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion 58, 044008 (2016).
- 6 [28] A. Smirnov, R. Harvey, and K. Kupfer, Bull Amer Phys Soc **39**, 1626 (1994).
- [29] R. W. Harvey and M. C. McCoy, in *Proc IAEA Tech. Comm. Meet. Adv. Simul. Model. Thermonucl. Plasmas* (IAEA, Vienna (1993), 1992), p. 527.
- [30]F. M. Poli, P. T. Bonoli, M. Chilenski, R. Mumgaard, S. Shiraiwa, G. M. Wallace, R. Andre,
  L. Delgado-Aparicio, S. Scott, and J. R. Wilson, Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion 58, 095001
  (2016).
- [31]P. T. Lang, W. Suttrop, E. Belonohy, M. Bernert, R. M. Mc Dermott, R. Fischer, J. Hobirk, O.
   Kardaun, G. Kocsis, and B. Kurzan, Nucl. Fusion 52, 023017 (2012).
- [32] T. H. Osborne, A. W. Leonard, M. A. Mahdavi, M. Chu, M. E. Fenstermacher, R. La Haye,
  G. McKee, T. W. Petrie, E. Doyle, and G. Staebler, Phys. Plasmas 8, 2017 (2001).
- [33] H. Zohm, C. Angioni, E. Fable, G. Federici, G. Gantenbein, T. Hartmann, K. Lackner, E.
   Poli, L. Porte, and O. Sauter, Nucl. Fusion 53, 073019 (2013).
- 18 [34]B. N. Sorbom, J. Ball, T. R. Palmer, F. J. Mangiarotti, J. M. Sierchio, P. Bonoli, C. Kasten, D.
- A. Sutherland, H. S. Barnard, C. B. Haakonsen, and others, Fusion Eng. Des. 100, 378 (2015).
- 20 [35]B. LaBombard, E. Marmar, J. Irby, J. L. Terry, R. Vieira, G. Wallace, D. G. Whyte, S. Wolfe,
- 21 S. Wukitch, S. Baek, and others, Nucl. Fusion **55**, 053020 (2015).
- 22 [36]B. LaBombard, J. E. Rice, A. E. Hubbard, J. W. Hughes, M. Greenwald, J. Irby, Y. Lin, B.
- 23 Lipschultz, E. S. Marmar, C. S. Pitcher, and others, Nucl. Fusion 44, 1047 (2004).
- 24



25

Fig. 1: Time traces of au 1.2 MA plasma with lower hybrid current drive: (a) lineaveraged density, (b) injected LH power, (c) loop voltage, (d) non-thermal electron cyclotron emission.

1

2 3

> LH Frequency Spectra 0  $\overline{n} = 1.3 \times 10^{20} \text{ m}^{-3}$  $\overline{n}_{e}/n_{g} = 0.16 (1.2 \text{ MA})$ -10  $\bar{n}_{c}/n_{c} = 0.36 (0.55 \text{ MA})$ -20 (dB) -30 -40 -50 -100 -80 -60 -40 -20 0 20 40 f-f0 (MHz)





4





Fig. 3. Hard X-ray line-integrated count rates as a function of  $\bar{n}_e$  at different currents: 0.55 MA (star), 0.8 MA (inverted triangle), 1.1 MA (circle), 1.2 MA (square), and 1.4 MA (triangle). Data are calibrated against the detector shielding thicknesses and the coupled LH powers. Two unfilled square (inverted triangle) symbols denote the modeled count rates of the 1.2 MA (0.8 MA) discharge with and without the DC electric field.



1

Fig. 4. (a) Hard X-ray count rates, and (b) the normalized count rates to the total count rates as a function of the channel number. The profile in blue (green) is measured in a plasma with  $I_p = 0.55$  MA at  $\bar{n}_e \approx 0.9 (1.05) \times 10^{20} \text{ m}^{-3}$ . The profile in purple (red) is measured in a plasma with  $I_p = 1.2 (1.4)$  MA and  $\bar{n}_e \approx 1.3 (1.4) \times 10^{20} \text{ m}^{-3}$ . The inset figure shows the 32 sightlines of the HXR diagnostic system with the LCFS of the 1.2 MA discharge overlaid in red. The increasing count rates observed for the channels greater than #28 cases could be due to thick target bremsstrahlung emission outside the LCFS [12].

10