#### **Time Resolved T<sub>e</sub> from X-ray Streak Camera Measurements at the NIF**

National ICF Diagnostics Working Group Meeting - October 6 - 8, 2015

Shahab Khan Prav Patel, Niko Izumi, Tammy Ma, Charlie Jarrott



LLNL-PRES-677825 This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under contract DE-AC52-07NA27344. Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC



#### Outline

- X-ray Streak Cameras on NIF: SPIDER & DISC
  This talk will show T<sub>e</sub> using SPIDER; DISC will need to be adapted for T<sub>e</sub>
- Method of inferring T<sub>e</sub> using a hot spot model & filters
- T<sub>e</sub> results using SPIDER from recent DT shots on NIF
- Opacity of fuel, ablator & plasma and uncertainty in filter thickness causes problems in calculating T<sub>e</sub>
- Continuum Method of inferring T<sub>e</sub>
- Future plan: Using DISC for inferring T<sub>e</sub> using the Continuum



#### The two X-ray Streak Cameras on the NIF, SPIDER<sup>1</sup> & DISC<sup>2</sup>, are utilized differently



SPIDER is a fixed diagnostic that primarily measures bang time and burn widths from implosions, DISC is a DIM instrument used for 1D Radiography experiments and spectroscopy with NXS<sup>3</sup>



### SPIDER is mostly a fixed diagnostic, whereas DISC can vary its recording parameters

- Both SPIDER and DISC use an identical streak tube design
- Calibrated sweep windows: 3, 5, 10, 20 ns
- SPIDER temporal slit: 150  $\mu$ m  $\rightarrow$  13 ps temporal resolution
- SPIDER photocathode: 1 μm CsI
- DISC temporal slit: 100 μm 500 μm
- DISC photocathodes: 0.15, 0.2, 1 μm CsI & 30 nm Au

SPIDER uses a fixed slit, photocathode and standoff distance while DISC can change these as well as affix a snout for 1D imaging, spectroscopy, etc.; However, it must occupy a DIM



# SPIDER uses sets of four filters as Ross pairs & to infer $\rm T_e$









# $\rm T_e$ is inferred by comparing the measured signal to simulated signals using a model

#### **Generalized Hot Spot Emission Model**

Hot spot model using fits to DCA\* 100 Gbar tables (Patel):

 $f \downarrow H = 2.8 / A \downarrow v \uparrow 2 Z \downarrow H \uparrow 2 \times 5.04E22 e \uparrow -hv/kTe 1/(hv) \uparrow 0.39 1/(kTe) \uparrow 0.15$ 

Bound-Free Absorption (Atzeni, Patel):

Absorption ~  $e^{-(Emfp/hv)}$ 3

 $Emfp \sim (\rho L) \uparrow 1/3$  is equivalent to the photon energy corresponding to a single mean free path through the shell



\*Detailed Configuration Accounting, Opacity model in HYDRA

Absorption becomes insignificant above 20keV





# $T_e$ and Absorption are simultaneously solved by minimizing the $\chi$ 12 difference from measured signal

- Integrate the simulated signal over all energy for each filter
- Scan over a range of T<sub>e</sub> and E<sub>mfp</sub> until the squared difference between measured and simulated signal is minimized
- This analysis often results in no absorption



Least squares fit of T<sub>e</sub> and E<sub>mfp</sub> comparing measured signal to model is found for each time step



### In this example, calculated $\rm T_e$ is close to $\rm T_{ion}$ measurement from N-TOF's of 5.3 keV



Calculated zero optical depth; Gaussian fit of signal produces smooth T<sub>e</sub> evolution



### This HDC DT shot produced two x-ray peaks, the 1<sup>st</sup> from the core and the 2<sup>nd</sup> from the shell



It is expected that the 2<sup>nd</sup> hump have a much lower temperature, since the carbon emission occurs in the colder shell region



#### However, the analysis returns a low T<sub>e</sub> throughout the emission and a jump in the optical depth





# Fixing optical depth at 0, the calculated $\rm T_e$ is within range of $\rm T_{ion}$ and evolves as expected



Systematic issue: (1) Opacity model may not capture HDC/NVH well, (2) filter transmission not as assumed



### **Opacity of fuel, ablator & plasma and uncertainty in filter thickness causes problems**



Using thick filters that would sample the continuum region of the hot spot model would eliminate the reliance in opacity models and drastically reduce uncertainty in filter thickness



#### **Continuum model requires two thick filters to** solve for T<sub>e</sub>; add'l filters for Opacity or Ross pairs



Titanium filters, 400 & 600 µm thickness are one choice that would focus on Continuum slope



### Simulating the SPIDER signal through thick Ti gives low signal



SPIDER Signal through thick filters would be close to detector noise: unreliable T<sub>e</sub> calculations



### DISC would be better for inferring T<sub>e</sub> using the continuum slope method

- DISC on a DIM can get ~7X closer to TCC for up to 50X more solid angle than SPIDER
- In order to optimize dynamic range of the streak camera with the other thinner filters, 1% Open Area ratio Gold Mesh (20 micron thick) would be used to reduce signal on thinner filters
- Currently, DISC can't operate in high neutron flux not only due to CCD, but also because the instrument contains components with EEPROM\* and micro-controllers

\*Electrically Erasable Programmable Read-Only Memory

NIF may build a DISC usable in a high neutron flux similar to the HGXD's



### Simulated DISC signal through thick filters would give exceptional S/N



This signal level would theoretically result in good T<sub>e</sub> calculations; Possible to use even thicker Ti



#### Summary

- T<sub>e</sub> can be inferred by performing a least squares fit of x-ray signal through certain filters to signal derived from a generalized hot spot model
- The T<sub>e</sub> results using data from SPIDER show reasonable time evolution and good agreement with T<sub>ion</sub> but unrealistic absorption
- There is uncertainty in the opacity model & filter thicknesses
- The continuum slope method may be better for inferring T<sub>e</sub>
- DISC would be ideal to record hard x-rays since it can be placed much closer to TCC and detect optimal signal levels using thick filters

#### NIF may build a DISC usable in a high neutron flux similar to the HGXD's







### Calculated $T_e$ using simulated signal gives similar values to thinner filter results



#### $T_e$ decreases through emission





# Fixing optical depth at 0, the calculated $\rm T_e$ is within range of $\rm T_{ion}$ and evolves as expected





#### Ge transmission source shows negative Ross pair results even though model shows positive







LLNL-PRES-677825



#### Analyzed data on another DT symcap shot

DT shot using a 3-shock high foot pulse



Performance: DT T<sub>ion</sub> ≈ 5.1 keV DT Yield ≈ 6.2e15



High Foot DT, 1.78MJ, 390TW, DU nominal hohl, 1.6mg/cc He fill, 1xSi, T-1 shell, 0.8K quench, P1 asymmetry imposed ice layer





### Calculated peak $\rm T_e$ is close to time-integrated $\rm T_{ion}$ measurement of 5.1 keV



T<sub>e</sub> increases then decreases through x-ray emission





### Calculated evolution of $\rm T_e$ is very smooth if using a Gaussian fit of the signal



T<sub>e</sub> increases then decreases smoothly



