

# Validation of equilibrium tools on the COMPASS tokamak

J. Urban<sup>a</sup>, L.C. Appel<sup>b</sup>, J.F. Artaud<sup>c</sup>, B. Faugeras<sup>d</sup>, J. Havlicek<sup>a,e</sup>, M. Komm<sup>a</sup>, I. Lupelli<sup>b</sup>, M. Peterka<sup>a,e</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Institute of Plasma Physics AS CR, v.v.i., Za Slovankou 3, 182 00 Praha 8, Czech Republic*

<sup>b</sup>*CCFE, Culham Science Centre, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, UK*

<sup>c</sup>*CEA, IRFM, F-13108 Saint Paul Lez Durance, France*

<sup>d</sup>*Laboratoire J.A. Dieudonné, UMR 7351, Université de Nice Sophia-Antipolis, Parc Valrose, 06108 Nice Cedex 02, France*

<sup>e</sup>*Department of Surface and Plasma Science, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University in Prague, V Holešovičkách 2, 180 00 Praha 8, Czech Republic*

---

## Abstract

Various MHD (magnetohydrodynamic) equilibrium tools, some of which being recently developed or considerably updated, are used on the medium-size COMPASS tokamak [R. Pánek et al., Czech J Phys 56, B125, 2006]. MHD equilibrium is a fundamental property of the tokamak plasma, whose knowledge is required for many diagnostics and modelling tools. Proper benchmarking and validation of equilibrium tools is thus key for interpreting and planning tokamak experiments. We present here benchmarks and comparisons to experimental data of the EFIT++ reconstruction code [L.C. Appel et al., to be submitted to Nucl. Fusion], the free-boundary equilibrium code FREEBIE [J.-F. Artaud, S.H. Kim, EPS 2012, P4.023], and a rapid plasma boundary reconstruction code VacTH [B. Faugeras et al., PPCF 2014, accepted]. We demonstrate that FREEBIE can calculate the equilibrium and corresponding poloidal field (PF) coils currents for given plasma parameters. Both EFIT++ and VacTH can reconstruct equilibria generated by FREEBIE from synthetic diagnostic data (including an artificial noise) and hence might be suitable for real-time control. Optimum reconstruction parameters are estimated; in addition, possible enhancements using more diagnostics are discussed and simulated using synthetic diagnostics. FREEBIE can also calculate the temporal evolution of the poloidal field coils currents for a whole plasma scenario.

**Keywords:** tokamak, equilibrium, COMPASS

**PACS:** 52.55.Fa, 07.05.Kf, 07.05.Hd

---

## 1. Introduction

We report here on validation and verification of tokamak equilibrium tools used for the COMPASS tokamak [1]. We particularly focus on fundamental global plasma parameters and the shapes of magnetic flux surfaces, which are crucial in diagnostics interpretation and other analyses. EFIT++ [2] is used for routine equilibrium reconstruction on COMPASS. FREEBIE [3] is a recent free-boundary equilibrium code; FREEBIE enables predictive equilibrium calculation consistent with the poloidal field (PF) components of the tokamak. In this study, FREEBIE is used in the so-called inverse mode, which predicts PF coils currents from a give plasma boundary and profiles. The third code employed in this study is VacTH [4], which provides a fast reconstruction of the plasma boundary from magnetic measurements using a toroidal harmonics basis.

In order to verify and validate the aforementioned tools, we analyse EFIT++ and VacTH reconstructions of equilibria constructed with FREEBIE. Synthetic diagnostics (e.g., magnetic probes or flux loops) with optional artificial errors provide inputs for the reconstructions.

## 2. Verification and validation procedure

Reliable MHD equilibrium reconstruction is very important for tokamak exploitation. Numerous diagnostics and subse-

quent analyses require as inputs equilibrium properties such as flux surface geometry, magnetic field, stored energy, internal inductance etc. We have set up a set of benchmarking tasks, which verify and validate equilibrium tools that are currently employed on COMPASS. The procedure is fundamentally following:

1. Equilibrium reconstruction of selected experimental cases using EFIT++.
2. Recalculate the equilibria using FREEBIE in inverse mode.
3. Optionally alter the equilibria in FREEBIE using e.g. experimental pressure profiles.
4. Reconstruct FREEBIE equilibria using EFIT++ and VacTH with various parameters and artificial input noise.

The first step employs a routine EFIT++ set-up for COMPASS with heuristically tuned parameters. In addition to the total plasma current  $I_p$  and the currents in individual PF circuits, 16 partial Rogowski coils and 4 flux loops are employed in this reconstruction and  $p'$  and  $FF'$  are assumed to be linear functions of the poloidal flux  $\psi$ . In the second step, FREEBIE inputs  $I_p$ ,  $p'(\bar{\psi})$  and  $FF'(\bar{\psi})$  profiles, the plasma boundary coordinates and an initial guess for the PF coils currents. Here,  $p$  is the plasma pressure,  $F = RB_\phi$  and  $\bar{\psi}$  is the normalized poloidal magnetic flux ( $\bar{\psi} = 0$  on the magnetic axis and  $\bar{\psi} = 1$

on the plasma boundary).  $p'$  comes either from the EFIT++ reconstruction or from Thomson scattering pressure profile  $p_{TS} = 1.3n_e p_e$ . FREEBIE then seeks a solution to the Grad-Shafranov equation, including the PF coils currents, which minimizes the given plasma shape constraint. (This regime is called the inverse mode.) FREEBIE can naturally output arbitrary synthetic diagnostics. We use here additional 24 poloidally and 24 radially oriented partial Rogowski coils (which are actually mounted on COMPASS) and an artificial set of 16 flux loops located at the same positions as the basic magnetic probes. Hereafter, the number of magnetic probes and flux loops are denoted  $n_{mp}$  and  $n_{fl}$ .  $n_{mp} = 16$ ,  $n_{fl} = 4$  refers the basic set of magnetic measurements,  $n_{mp} = 64$  refers to a set of all presently mounted partial Rogowski coils on COMPASS and  $n_{fl} = 16$  implies artificial flux loops positioned at the same locations as the basic magnetic probes. In the optional third step, an artificial random noise is added to the calculated values of  $I_p$ , magnetic probes and flux loops. In particular, for a given noise level  $\epsilon$ ,  $\tilde{X} = (1 + U(-\epsilon, \epsilon)^T)X$ , where  $X$  is a row vector of the synthetic diagnostics data and  $U(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$  is a random vector of the same shape as  $X$  with a uniform distribution on  $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ .

The final fourth step consists of reconstructing the equilibria from synthetic FREEBIE data using EFIT++ and VacTH. The reconstructions are then compared to the original equilibrium, focusing on global parameters and geometry. VacTH does not provide a full equilibrium but the plasma shape only (the target of VacTH is to provide such reconstructions in real time for a feedback control). Scans are performed over noise levels ( $\epsilon$ ) and selected code parameters:  $p'$  and  $FF'$  polynomial degrees in EFIT++ ( $n_{p'}$ ,  $n_{FF'}$ ) and the number of harmonics ( $n_P$ ,  $n_Q$ ) in VacTH. The following quantities are used for the comparison.

$R_{ax}, Z_{ax}$	$R, Z$ coordinates of the magnetic axis
$R_{in}, R_{out}$	inner/outer $R$ coordinate of LCFS at $Z = Z_{ax}$
$Z_{min}, Z_{max}$	minimum/maximum $Z$ coordinate of LCFS
$\kappa = \frac{(Z_{max} - Z_{min})}{(R_{out} - R_{in})}$	elongation
$l_i = \bar{B}_p^2 / B_a^2$	normalized internal inductance
$\beta_p = 2\mu_0 \bar{p} / B_a^2$	poloidal beta
$W = \int_0^V \frac{3}{2} p dV'$	stored plasma energy
$q_0, q_{95}$	safety factor at $\bar{\psi} = 0, 0.95$

Here,  $\bar{x} = \int_0^V x / V dV'$  is a volume average,  $V$  is the total plasma volume,  $B_a = \mu_0 I_p / l_a$ ,  $l_a$  is the poloidal LCFS perimeter. We also define absolute differences  $\Delta x = |x - x_0|$  and relative differences  $\delta x = |x - x_0| / |x_0|$ , where  $x$  is an arbitrary reconstructed quantity and  $x_0$  its target value.

### 3. Results

We have selected five time slices from COMPAS shots 4275 and 6962 (i.e. 10 cases in total) for the analysis. These cases include circular, elongated and diverted plasmas with different currents.

#### 3.1. Example cases

A comparison of plasma shapes for shot 4275 is shown in Fig. 1. Numerical values of reconstruction errors are presented

in Table 1. We can observe a very good agreement between the original equilibrium and the reconstructed shapes. In this case, FREEBIE was using linear  $p'$  and  $FF'$  polynomials so that the EFIT++ model agrees with the target data. VacTH uses 8 magnetic probes and 16 flux loops. As we discuss later, flux loops are essential for reliable VacTH results. Even global kinetic properties are well reconstructed in EFIT++; the largest error around 10 % is in  $l_i$  (i.e. basically in the toroidal current density profile).

The second shot for the comparison is 6962, which has been chosen because Thomson scattering (TS) profiles are available. In Fig. 2 we show reconstructions for more realistic equilibria and an artificial noise in the synthetic diagnostic signals. TS pressures were used in FREEBIE equilibria, which course no longer feature linear  $p'$  and  $FF'$  profiles. It is apparent that the reconstruction is not as good as in the previous case. Nevertheless, the plasma shape is well reconstructed with EFIT++ and VacTH, except for the last time slice in which VacTH yields too large plasma in the upper part.  $n_P = n_Q = 4$  is used in this case as these values are minimum for reasonable VacTH results, while higher values are too sensitive to the input noise. Expectedly, EFIT++ reconstruction with magnetic data only cannot reliably reconstruct kinetic plasma parameters, such as the stored energy or  $q_0$ . Rather unexpected is a relatively good agreement of  $l_i$ . However, this agreement is compensated by a large error of  $\beta_p$  so that the quantity  $\beta_p + l_i/2$  remain within a 10 % error bar. Notable are large errors (up to 40 %) in the stored energy, which are mainly caused by incompatible pressure profiles.

#### 3.2. Statistical analysis

In order to get a global overview of EFIT++ and VacTH reconstruction properties on COMPASS, we perform a scan over major code parameters and signal noise levels. In particular,  $n_{p', FF'} = 1, 2$ ,  $(n_{mp}, n_{fl}) = (16, 4), (64, 4), (8, 16)$ ,  $\epsilon = 0, 0.02, 0.04, 0.06$ ,  $n_{P, Q} = 4, 5, 6$ . The same cases as above (time slices of shots 4275 and 6962) are used as target equilibria. For shot 6962, equilibria with TS pressure profiles and with linear  $p'$  and  $FF'$ . This means there is 15 different target equilibria in total.

Absolute errors of the reconstructed LCFS extents for convergent cases from the scan are shown in Fig. 3. We can observe that the LCFS reconstructed with EFIT++ for target linear  $p'$  and  $FF'$  profiles (selection 1) are within 1 cm errors. There are, however, cases with up to 3 cm errors in  $Z_{min}$  for the more realistic TS pressure profiles (selection 2) if  $n_{p'} = 1$  is used. This error can be reduced by using  $n_{p'} = 2$ . Input errors do not pose major difficulties for EFIT++.

VacTH is performing reasonably well for its most favourable diagnostic set of 8 magnetic probes and 16 flux loops and  $n_P = n_Q = 4$ . With a higher number of harmonics or with less flux loops, VacTH becomes unreliable and yields significant errors. Unfortunately, only 4 flux loops are currently available on COMPASS. In fact, it is easier for VacTH to fit magnetic probes than flux loops while magnetic probes do not fully determine the magnetic flux. This is also apparent in  $E_{mp}$  and  $E_{fl}$  values in Tables 1 and 2. An additional optimization of the

code	time	$\Delta R_{in}$	$\Delta R_{out}$	$\Delta Z_{min}$	$\Delta Z_{max}$	$\delta\kappa$	$E_{mp}$	$E_{fl}$	$\delta W$	$\delta l_i$	$\delta\beta_p$	$\delta q_0$	$\delta q_{95}$
EFIT++	0.97	0	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.003	0.001	0.0009	0.04	0.09	0.03	0.03	0.007
EFIT++	0.99	4e-05	9e-05	0.001	0.001	0.004	0.001	0.0006	0.04	0.09	0.04	0.02	0.005
EFIT++	1.02	0.0005	0.0002	0.002	0.002	0.008	0.002	0.002	0.02	0.1	0.02	0.02	0.009
EFIT++	1.05	0.001	0.0008	4e-05	0.0003	0.004	0.003	0.005	0.01	0.07	0.02	0.01	0.009
EFIT++	1.1	0.001	0.0005	0.005	0.0002	0.005	0.004	0.002	0.04	0.09	0.03	0.02	0.05
VacTH	0.97	0	0.001	0.0006	0.0002	0.002	8e-07	7e-05	—	—	—	—	—
VacTH	0.99	4e-05	0.0004	0.001	0.0008	0.004	4e-07	0.0001	—	—	—	—	—
VacTH	1.02	0.002	0.0008	0.005	0.002	0.01	2e-06	0.002	—	—	—	—	—
VacTH	1.05	0.006	0.002	5e-05	0.002	0.01	3e-06	0.02	—	—	—	—	—
VacTH	1.1	0.005	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.02	2e-06	0.003	—	—	—	—	—

Table 1: Errors for the same cases as in Fig. 1.




Figure 1: Contours of  $\bar{\psi} = (0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1)$ , reconstruction from FREEBIE data, shot 4275. EFIT++ parameters:  $n_{mp} = 16$ ,  $n_{fl} = 4$ ,  $n_{p'} = n_{FF'} = 1$ . VacTH parameters:  $n_{mp} = 8$ ,  $n_{fl} = 16$ ,  $n_P = n_Q = 5$ .  $E_{mp,fl}$  is the relative error of the reconstructed magnetic probes and flux loops values, respectively.




Figure 2: Pressure profiles and contours of  $\bar{\psi} = (0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1)$ , reconstruction from FREEBIE data, shot 6962 with Thomson scattering pressure profiles. EFIT++ parameters:  $n_{mp} = 16$ ,  $n_{fl} = 4$ ,  $n_{p'} = n_{FF'} = 1$ . VacTH parameters:  $n_{mp} = 8$ ,  $n_{fl} = 16$ ,  $n_P = n_Q = 4$ .

code	time	$\Delta R_{in}$	$\Delta R_{out}$	$\Delta Z_{min}$	$\Delta Z_{max}$	$\delta\kappa$	$E_{mp}$	$E_{fl}$	$\delta W$	$\delta l_i$	$\delta\beta_p$	$\delta q_0$	$\delta q_{95}$
EFIT++	980	0	0.005	0.001	8e-06	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.4	0.03	0.4	0.2	0.0008
EFIT++	1014	0.003	0.006	0.02	0.01	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.3	0.008	0.3	0.2	0.08
EFIT++	1080	0.007	0.002	0.005	0.002	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.3	0.01	0.3	0.2	0.02
EFIT++	1147	0.008	0.008	0.01	0.006	0.06	0.03	0.02	0.3	0.06	0.3	0.3	0.05
EFIT++	1214	0.0002	0.008	0.002	0.001	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.2	0.06	0.1	0.01
VacTH	980	0	0.01	0.01	0.007	0.02	0.0001	0.01	—	—	—	—	—
VacTH	1014	0.006	0.0002	0.01	0.007	0.03	3e-05	0.01	—	—	—	—	—
VacTH	1080	0.009	0.0007	0.003	0.0007	0.02	3e-05	0.01	—	—	—	—	—
VacTH	1147	0.02	0.007	0.0009	0.002	0.01	5e-05	0.01	—	—	—	—	—
VacTH	1214	0.03	0.009	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.0002	0.02	—	—	—	—	—

Table 2: Errors for the same cases as in Fig. 2.




Figure 3: Absolute errors in LCFS extents for convergent cases. EFIT++ results in the first row, VacTH in the second row. Selection 1 means linear  $p'$  and  $FF'$  in EFIT++ as well as FREEBIE, selection 2 means TS pressure profiles in FREEBIE and  $n_{p'} = n_{FF'} = 1$  in EFIT++, selection 3 means TS pressure profiles in FREEBIE and  $n_{p'} = 2$  in EFIT++. Input error is calculated as an average of  $I_p$ , magnetic probes and flux loops values. Zero input error data are scattered for a better visibility.




Figure 4: Internal plasma parameters relative errors for EFIT++ reconstructions using  $n_{p'} = n_{FF'} = 1$  in the top row and more optimized  $n_{p'}$  in the bottom row. Zero input error data are scattered for a better visibility.




Figure 5: Ratio of converged cases to all cases, shot 6962, TS profiles. Opt refers to optimized code parameters.

fitting weights or algorithm is probably needed. This can be demonstrated by an exercise reconstruction with 64 magnetic probes and 16 flux loops, whose result is significantly worse than with only 8 magnetic probes and 16 flux loops.

EFIT++ internal plasma parameters reconstruction results are shown in Fig. 4. It shows that purely magnetic reconstruction with  $n_{p'} = n_{FF'} = 1$  introduces (except for  $I_p$ ) a systematic error for realistic pressure profiles, i.e. for plasmas that do not have the same profile parametrization. It is known that magnetic reconstruction with EFIT is difficult for limited plasmas (without additional constraints, particularly the store energy) [5]. This suggests that using  $n_{p'} = 1$  for limited plasmas and  $n_{p'} = 2$  for diverted plasmas might lead to better results. This is demonstrated in the bottom row of Fig. 4. These optimized reconstructions do not suffer from the systematic error; however, they generally increase the error bars for target equilibria with linear  $p'$  and  $FF'$ , especially for  $q_0$ . It is also notable that  $\delta l_i \cong 0.1$  for all  $n_{p'} = n_{FF'} = 1$  reconstructions.

Another important property is the converged cases ratio, shown in Fig. 5. EFIT++ converges in almost all cases with any of the tested configurations and in 100 % cases in the optimized configuration.  $n_p = n_Q = 4$  must be used in VacTH unless the number of non-converged cases is too large.

## References

- [1] R. Pánek, O. Bilyková, V. Fuchs, M. Hron, P. Chráska, P. Pavlo, J. Stöckel, J. Urban, V. Weinzettl, J. Zajac, F. Žáček, Reinstallation of the COMPASS-D tokamak in IPP ASCR, Czechoslovak Journal of Physics 56 (2006) B125–B137.
- [2] L. Appel, G. Huysmans, L. Lao, P. McCarthy, D. Muir, E. Solano, J. Storrs, D. Taylor, W. Zwingmann, A unified approach to equilibrium reconstruction, Europhysics Conference Abstracts 30I (2006) P2.184.
- [3] J. F. Artaud, S. Kim, A new free-boundary equilibrium evolution code, FREEBIE, in: EPS Conference on Plasma Physics, p. P4.023.
- [4] B. Faugeras, J. Blum, C. Boulbe, P. Moreau, E. Nardon, 2D interpolation and extrapolation of discrete magnetic measurements with toroidal harmonics for equilibrium reconstruction in a Tokamak, Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion (2014) accepted.
- [5] L. L. Lao, H. Stjohm, R. D. Stambaugh, A. G. Kellman, W. Pfeiffer, Reconstruction of current profile parameters and plasma shapes in tokamaks, Nuclear Fusion 25 (1985) 1611–1622.