

# Gyrokinetic Turbulence Simulations

---

W Dorland, Imperial College

Culham Laboratory  
7 Nov, 2001

# Overview

---

1. General geometry, coordinates
2. Flux tube vs. global
3. GK equations
4. Higher order effects
5. Numerical issues
6. Outstanding near-term problems
  - (a) Second microstability
  - (b) Finite  $\beta$  effects on secondary instabilities, transport
  - (c) Basics of electron energy transport in the absence of ITG modes
  - (d) Testing simulation predictions of multi-channel transport
  - (e) Testing simulation predictions in unconventional settings (ST, dipole, stellarator)
  - (f) Dissipation/coupling of waves to particles (natural plasmas)

# General Geometry

---

- Metric coefficients for general geometry calculations are well known. Given a Clebsch representation of the magnetic field:

$$\mathbf{B} = \nabla\alpha \times \nabla\psi$$

and an axisymmetric magnetic field defined by

$$\mathbf{B} = I(\Psi)\nabla\phi + \nabla\Psi \times \nabla\phi,$$

we use `June4` (available on-line) to calculate all needed quantities.

- In the field-line-following (ballooning) limit, perturbed quantities are represented by

$$A = \hat{A}(\theta) \exp(iS)$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \nabla S = 0$ . This takes into account the fact that the perturbations tend to be slowly varying along the field line, and allows for rapid variation across the field line.

- To make contact with the ballooning approximation and with field-line following coordinates, choose

$$S = n_0 (\alpha + q\theta_0),$$

where  $n_0$  is an integer,  $\theta_0$  is the ballooning parameter,  $q(\Psi) = d\Psi_T/d\Psi$ ,  $\Psi_T = (2\pi)^{-2} \int_V d\tau \mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla\phi$  is the toroidal flux, and  $d\tau$  is the volume element.

# General Geometry Coordinates

---

- The coordinate  $\alpha$  is defined by

$$\alpha = \int_0^\theta d\theta \frac{\mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \phi}{\nabla \theta \times \nabla \Psi \cdot \nabla \phi}$$

where  $\theta$  is the poloidal angle and  $\phi$  is the toroidal angle.

- Use arbitrary flux surface label  $\rho = \rho(\Psi)$ .
- In some cases, it is convenient to replace the  $\theta$  coordinate with a new coordinate  $\theta'$ , which measures the arc length. The operator  $\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \nabla$  is then

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \nabla \rightarrow \frac{2\pi}{L_{\text{arc}}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta'}$$

- The Jacobian is  $J = (d\Psi/d\rho) (L_{\text{arc}}/2\pi B)$ . The flux surface average of a quantity  $\Gamma$  is

$$\langle \Gamma \rangle = \lim_{\Delta\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{\int \Gamma J d\theta' d\alpha d\rho}{\int J d\theta' d\alpha d\rho}$$

- **The flux surface average of a radially directed quantity** (such as **the radial heat flux**) is given by

$$Q_{\text{sim}} = \frac{\langle \mathbf{Q} \cdot \nabla \rho \rangle}{\langle \nabla \rho \rangle}$$

which will appear in the transport equation as

$$\frac{3}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \langle nT \rangle + \frac{1}{V'} \frac{d}{d\rho} A Q_{\text{sim}} + \dots = 0,$$

where the surface area  $A = 2\pi \langle |\nabla \rho| \rangle \int J d\theta'$ .

# General Geometry Operators

---

- The linear part of the  $\nabla B$  drift is given by

$$\frac{v_{\perp}^2}{2} \frac{1}{\Omega B^2} \mathbf{B} \times \nabla B \cdot \nabla S = \left( \frac{k_{\theta} \rho_i}{2} \right) \frac{v_{\perp}^2}{2} \left[ \omega_{\nabla B} + \omega_{\nabla B}^{(0)} \theta_0 \right],$$

where

$$\omega_{\nabla B} = \frac{2}{B^2} \frac{d\Psi}{d\rho} \hat{\mathbf{b}} \times \nabla B \cdot \nabla \alpha, \quad \omega_{\nabla B}^{(0)} = \frac{2}{B^2} \frac{d\Psi}{d\rho} \hat{\mathbf{b}} \times \nabla B \cdot \nabla q.$$

- Similarly, the curvature drift is given by

$$\omega_{\kappa} = \omega_{\nabla B} + \frac{8\pi}{B^2} \frac{dp}{d\rho}.$$

- The only remaining geometric dependence occurs in  $|\nabla S|^2$ :

$$|\nabla S|^2 = \frac{n_0^2}{a^2} |\nabla (\alpha + q\theta_0)|^2$$

which is calculated in straightforward fashion:

$$|\nabla S|^2 = k_{\theta}^2 \left( \frac{d\Psi}{d\rho} \right)^2 \left| \nabla \alpha \cdot \nabla \alpha + 2\theta_0 \nabla \alpha \cdot \nabla q + \theta_0^2 \nabla q \cdot \nabla q \right|.$$

# Flux-Tube *vs.* Global

---

- Flux-tube

- Simulation domain has a “small” perpendicular cross-section:

*The simulation domain should be at least a few turbulent correlation lengths long in each direction.*

- The variation of the gradient scale lengths across the simulation domain is assumed to be small.
- The energy, momentum and/or particle sources and sinks inside the flux-tube are assumed to be small.
- Radial periodicity prevents artificial flattening of driving gradients.
- For small  $\rho/a$ , flux tube assumptions reduce the total simulation volume significantly.

- Global

- Change in scale lengths across the simulation domain not assumed small. *Equilibrium shear may be treated non-perturbatively.*
- Radial periodicity not assumed, but sources are needed.
- Large devices cannot be simulated with existing computers, particularly when small scales are important (such as  $\rho_e$  or  $c/\omega_{pe}$ ).

# Gyrokinetic Equation

---

- Gyrokinetic equation appropriate if

$$\frac{\omega}{\Omega} \sim \frac{k_{\parallel}}{k_{\perp}} \sim \frac{\delta f}{f} \sim \frac{e\delta\Phi}{T} \sim \frac{\delta B}{B} \sim \frac{\rho}{L} \ll 1$$

- Gyrokinetic equation describes evolution of perturbed distribution function  $h = h_s(\rho, \alpha, \theta, \epsilon, \mu; t)$ . For  $F_0 = F_0(\epsilon, \Psi)$ :

$$\left( \frac{d}{dt} + v_{\parallel} \hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \nabla + i\omega_d + C \right) h = i\omega_*^T \chi - q \frac{\partial F_0}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial t}.$$

- The total derivative is

$$\frac{dh}{dt} = \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \frac{c}{B} \{ \chi, h \}.$$

- The drift frequency  $i\omega_*^T = n_0 c \partial F_0 / \partial \Psi$ , where  $n_0$  is the toroidal mode number of the perturbation and  $\Psi$  is the equilibrium poloidal magnetic flux enclosed by the magnetic surface of interest.
- The perpendicular drifts (curvature, grad-B) are

$$\omega_d = \mathbf{k}_{\perp} \cdot \mathbf{B}_0 \times \left( m v_{\parallel}^2 \hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \nabla \hat{\mathbf{b}} + \mu \nabla B_0 \right) / (m B_0 \Omega),$$

- The fields are represented by

$$\chi = J_0(\gamma) \left( \Phi - \frac{v_{\parallel}}{c} A_{\parallel} \right) + \frac{J_1(\gamma)}{\gamma} \frac{m v_{\perp}^2}{q} \frac{\delta B_{\parallel}}{B}.$$

Here,  $\gamma = k_{\perp} v_{\perp} / \Omega$ .

# Gyrokinetic Maxwell Equations

---

- Fields determined by Maxwell equations, neglecting displacement current.
- Poisson's equation:

$$\nabla_{\perp}^2 \Phi = 4\pi \sum_s \int d^3v q \left[ q\Phi \frac{\partial F_0}{\partial \epsilon} + h \exp(iL) \right],$$

where  $L = (\mathbf{v} \times \hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \mathbf{k}_{\perp})/\Omega$  accounts for the gyrophase dependence.

- Preferred velocity space coordinates are  $(\epsilon, \mu, \xi)$ , so that

$$\int d^3v = \frac{B}{m^2} \int \frac{d\epsilon d\mu d\xi}{|v_{\parallel}|} \equiv \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^2v d\xi$$

- Integrate over the gyrophase to find

$$\nabla_{\perp}^2 \Phi = 4\pi \sum_s \int d^2v q \left[ q\Phi \frac{\partial F_0}{\partial \epsilon} + J_0(\gamma)h \right]$$

- Similarly, Ampere's equation provides the two components of the perturbed magnetic field:

$$\nabla_{\perp}^2 A_{\parallel} = -\frac{4\pi}{c} \sum_s \int d^2v q v_{\parallel} J_0(\gamma)h$$

$$\frac{\delta B_{\parallel}}{B} = -\frac{4\pi}{B^2} \sum_s \int d^2v m v_{\perp}^2 \frac{J_1(\gamma)}{\gamma} h$$



# Summary of Gyrokinetic Ordering

---

- As stated before:

$$\frac{\omega}{\Omega} \sim \frac{k_{\parallel}}{k_{\perp}} \sim \frac{\delta f}{f} \sim \frac{e\delta\Phi}{T} \sim \frac{\delta B}{B} \sim \frac{\rho}{L} \ll 1$$

- Also,  $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$  velocity must remain small

$$\frac{v_E}{v_t} \sim \frac{\rho}{L} \ll 1$$

- And equilibrium quantities may evolve only very slowly:

$$\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}|_{eq}}{\omega} \sim \left(\frac{\rho}{L}\right)^2$$

- No specific assumptions about size of any of:

$$\beta, \quad k_{\perp}\rho, \quad \frac{\omega}{k_{\parallel}v_t}, \quad \frac{\omega}{\omega_d}, \quad \frac{\omega}{\omega_b}, \quad \frac{\omega}{\nu}, \quad \frac{\omega}{\omega_{NL}}$$

# Higher-Order Effects

---

- “Parallel nonlinearity”:

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \nabla \delta\Phi \times \left( \frac{\partial \delta f}{\partial v_{\parallel}} \right)$$

- Formally small because gradients in velocity space are ordered  $1/v_t$ .

- Nonlinearities without gradients, *e.g.*, terms like the last one in:

$$\delta(n\Phi) \sim n_0 \delta\Phi + \delta n \Phi_0 + \delta n \delta\Phi$$

which are sometimes kept in PIC implementations.

- Evolution of equilibrium – *i.e.*, evolution of longest perpendicular wavelengths of global simulation

# Numerical Issues

---

- Coordinate choices: flux coordinates universal, but
  - Details differ. *E.g.*, how to define  $k_\theta$  in general geometry, whether to let simulation domain become severely distorted, *etc.*
  - Parallel extent of simulation domain
- Integration schemes
  - Eulerian *vs.* Lagrangian
  - Implicit *vs.* explicit
  - Pseudo-spectral *vs.* finite difference
- Sources of error/inaccuracy
  - Particle noise
  - Velocity-space filamentation
- Consistency
  - Flux tube large enough?
  - Resolution adequate?
  - Orderings satisfied?

# Integration Scheme: GS2

---

- Convenient to advance

$$f = h + q \frac{\partial F_0}{\partial \epsilon} \left[ J_0(\gamma) \Phi + \frac{J_1(\gamma)}{\gamma} \frac{mv_{\perp}^2}{q} \frac{\delta B_{\parallel}}{B} \right]$$

- GKE becomes

$$\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L} \right) f = C(f) + S \left( \Phi, A_{\parallel}, \frac{\delta B_{\parallel}}{B} \right) - [\chi, h]$$

- Method of fractional steps used:
  - $\mathcal{L}$  and source term  $S$  treated implicitly with finite differencing along the field line.
  - Momentum-conserving Lorentz collision operator  $C(f)$  treated implicitly in pitch-angle space.
  - Nonlinear term evaluated explicitly with dealiased pseudo-spectral algorithm. Time-stepping scheme is second-order Adams-Bashforth.
- Time step adjusted dynamically to satisfy Courant condition for nonlinear term. Limiting velocity is  $\mathbf{v}_{\chi} \propto \hat{\mathbf{b}} \times \nabla \chi$ .
- Maxwell's equations solved with “implicit supercell” technique since boundary condition couples different  $k_{\rho}$ 's along the field line.

# Implicit Algorithm Automatically Recovers Low Mass Approximation

---

- Consider relevant terms:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + v_{\parallel} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta} = \mathcal{S}$$

- Centered, implicit time and space differences:

$$\frac{f_{j+1/2}^{n+1} - f_{j+1/2}^n}{\Delta t} + v_{\parallel j+1/2} \left( \frac{f_{j+1}^{n+1/2} - f_j^{n+1/2}}{\Delta \theta} \right) = \mathcal{S}_{j+1/2}^{n+1/2}$$

where  $f_{j+1/2}^{n+1} \equiv \frac{1}{2} (f_{j+1}^{n+1} + f_j^{n+1})$  and  $f_{j+1}^{n+1/2} \equiv \frac{1}{2} (f_{j+1}^{n+1} + f_{j+1}^n)$ .

- Leads to an upper diagonal system, easily inverted.
- Trapped particles and parallelism made easy by homogeneous, inhomogeneous sweeps in spatial coordinate  $j$ .
- For large  $\Delta t$  and simple source

$$\mathcal{S} = v_{\parallel j+1/2} \left( \frac{\Phi_{j+1}^{n+1/2} - \Phi_j^{n+1/2}}{\Delta \theta} \right) F_m$$

the solution is easy:

$$f_j^{n+1} = \Phi_j^{n+1} F_m$$

# Implicit Algorithm Automatically Recovers Low Mass Approximation

---

- Electromagnetic source give  $\frac{\partial A_{\parallel}}{\partial t}$  contribution.
- In general, one finds

$$f^{n+1}(z) = \int^z \frac{dz'}{v_{\parallel}} \left( \frac{\mathcal{S}^{n+1} + \mathcal{S}^n}{2} \right)$$

so that this scheme has recovered the bounce (or orbit) average when  $\Delta t > t_{\text{bounce}}$ .

- As the amplitudes get large enough to limit the time step, the correct non-bounce-averaged response is recovered.  
*No subsidiary ordering of the nonlinear terms is required.*

# Implicit Integration of Collision Operator

---

- Lorentz collision operator:

$$C(f) = \frac{\nu(E)}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} (1 - \xi^2) \frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi}$$

with optional momentum-conserving terms allowed.

- For example, for electron-ion collisions:

$$\nu(E) = \frac{\nu_{ei}}{(v/v_{te})^3} \left[ Z_{\text{eff}} + \frac{v_{te}}{v\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\left(\frac{v}{v_{te}}\right)^2} + \left(1 - \frac{v_{te}}{2v^2}\right) \text{erf}\left(\frac{v}{v_{te}}\right) \right]$$

where

$$\nu_{ei} = \frac{4\pi n e^4 \ln \Lambda}{(2T_e)^{3/2} m_e^{1/2}}$$

and

$$\xi = \frac{v_{\parallel}}{v} = \sqrt{1 - \lambda B}$$

- Implicit, tridiagonal solve
- Second derivative in velocity space implies realistic collision level is enough to keep  $f$  smooth. **Removes filamentation problem** for typically resolved distribution function.

# Pseudo-Spectral Evaluation of Nonlinear Terms

---

- Simple bracket form of nonlinear term valid in general geometry

$$[\chi, h] = \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial \rho} \frac{\partial h}{\partial \alpha} - \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial \alpha} \frac{\partial h}{\partial \rho}$$

can be evaluated with standard pseudo-spectral algorithm.

- Derivatives evaluated in transform space, multiplication carried out in real space.
- Time-integration is second-order Adams-Bashforth, which requires only one evaluation of nonlinear term per timestep.
- Issues: de-aliasing, spectral blocking
- Advantages: Fast, highly accurate (no numerical dissipation such as occurs with finite-differencing schemes)



# Why Pseudo-Spectral?

---

## 1. “Exponentially convergent” derivatives.

- Compare with finite difference:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \sim \frac{f(x+h) - f(x-h)}{2h} + \mathcal{O}(h^2)$$

or

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \sim \frac{-f(x+2h) + 8f(x+h) - 8f(x-h) + f(x-2h)}{12h} + \mathcal{O}(h^4)$$

- Pseudo-spectral is much better: error in  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \sim \mathcal{O}(h^N)$  at fixed  $h$  but

$$\text{error} \sim \mathcal{O} \left( \left( \frac{1}{N} \right)^N \right)$$

since  $h$  decreases as  $N$  increases.

## 2. At fixed accuracy, pseudo-spectral is memory minimizing.

- To resolve a function with 1% accuracy, spectral requires  $N/2$  (compared to non-spectral scheme with  $N$  points)
- GS2 is spectral in  $\rho$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $E$ ,  $\lambda$ , implying  $\sim$  factor of 16 savings.
- Advantages greater at higher resolution – but probably not important for turbulence.

# Why Pseudo-Spectral?

---

## 3. Integrals more accurate

- Simple rules like

$$\int_a^b f(x) dx = \sum_{i=1}^N f(x_i) w_i$$

integrate polynomial of degree  $N + 1$  accurately over finite domain with equally spaced grid points.

- But, use freedom to choose  $x_i$  to minimize error; increases degree of polynomials that are exactly integrated to  $2N + 1$ .
- No free lunch:  $x_i, w_i$  must be precomputed.

# Summary of Numerical Issues

---

- GS2 uses spectral decomposition in the two directions perpendicular to the field line and for energy and pitch angle for good accuracy with minimal memory & CPU usage.
- Implicit integration of fast motion along field lines reduces time step restrictions and automatically recovers appropriate orbit averages, without any subsidiary ordering of nonlinear terms.
- Velocity-space filamentation not a problem for realistic collision frequencies with Lorentz collision operator.
- Electrostatic and electromagnetic perturbations treated on equal footing.
- Pseudo-spectral evaluation of nonlinear terms is fast, without introducing numerical dissipation.
- Flux-tube simulation domain is maximally consistent with GK ordering.