Diagnosing Polar-Direct-Drive Energy Coupling with Solid Spheres at the National Ignition Facility





Summary

Solid-sphere radiography is used to diagnose energy coupling at the National Ignition Facility (NIF) in polar-direct-drive experiments

- Experimental shock- and ablation-front trajectories are inferred from time-resolved radiographic images and compared to 2-D DRACO radiation-hydrodynamic simulations
- A preliminary comparison between experiment and simulation reveals multiple discrepancies
 - Shock trajectories are overestimated at low intensities
 - Outer surface trajectories are systematically overestimated, but within preliminary error bars



Collaborators

W. Theobald, M. J. Rosenberg, P. B. Radha, S. P. Regan, C. Stoeckl, R. Betti, K. S. Anderson, J. A. Marozas, V. N. Goncharov, and E. M. Campbell Laboratory for Laser Energetics University of Rochester

> C. M. Shuldberg, R. W. Luo, W. Sweet, L. Aghaiain, and D. N. Kaczala General Atomics

> > B. Bachmann, T. Döppner, and M. Hohenberger Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

> > > K. Glize and R. H. H. Scott Rutherford Appelton Laboratory

A. Colaïtis Centre Lasers Intenses et Applications University of Bordeaux



Previous NIF polar-direct-drive shell-trajectory measurements





Motivation

Previous NIF polar-direct-drive shell-trajectory measurements were limited by hydrodynamic instabilities*





Solid, spherical, plastic targets are now used to drastically reduce the growth of hydrodynamic instabilities*





Radial optical depth profiles are extracted from raw radiographs by fitting entire strips simultaneously and azimuthally averaging the transmission images*



E29888J1



Optical depth profiles are roughly Abel transformations of the radial attenuation coefficient (density times opacity)





Attenuation profiles are reconstructed by Abel inverting the optical depth profiles



Attenuation profiles converge to $\rho_0 \mu_0$ in the unshocked region as expected



The same analysis applied to post-processed* *DRACO*** simulations shows significant differences in ablation trajectory and overall attenuation



The width of the shocked region is underpredicted by simulations and cannot be due to hydrodynamic instabilities

* J. J. MacFarlane *et al.*, High Energy Density Phys. <u>3</u>, 181 (2007). ** P. B. Radha et al., Physics of Plasmas <u>12</u>, 032702 (2005).



Tracking the 50% rise and fall surfaces of the attenuation profiles shows significant discrepancies, particularly at lower intensities



Shock velocities are overestimated at low intensities by ~11%

* Scattered light analysis: S. Kostick CO04.00009



Solid-sphere radiography is used to diagnose energy coupling on the National Ignition Facility (NIF) in polar-direct-drive experiments

- Experimental shock- and ablation-front trajectories are inferred from time-resolved radiographic images and compared to 2-D DRACO radiation-hydrodynamic simulations
- A preliminary comparison between experiment and simulation reveals multiple discrepancies
 - Shock trajectories are overestimated at low intensities
 - Outer surface trajectories are systematically overestimated, but within preliminary error bars

Upcoming experiments with new pulse shapes will help to distinguish between cross-beam energy transfer, preheat, and heat transport discrepancies





Backup Slides



Without noise, this reconstruction method has less than 0.06 g/cm³ RMSE when applied to DRACO simulations



RMSE: Root-mean-square error $\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - Y_i)^2 / n\right]^{1/2}$





The same analysis applied to post-processed *DRACO* simulations shows significant differences in ablation trajectory and overall attenuation



The width of the shocked region is underpredicted by simulations and cannot be due to hydrodynamic instabilities



The same analysis applied to post-processed *DRACO* simulations shows significant differences in ablation trajectory and overall attenuation



The width of the shocked region is underpredicted by simulations and cannot be due to hydrodynamic instabilities



Profile shapes become more discrepant between experiment and simulations at lower intensities



Ionization in shocked region lowers opacity in experiment, but shape discrepancies are still under investigation*

* Backscatter analysis: S. Kostick CO04.00009



The same analysis applied to post-processed *DRACO* simulations shows significant differences, particularly at lower intensities



Plot the 50% rise and fall surfaces



The same analysis applied to post-processed *DRACO* simulations shows significant differences in ablation trajectory and overall attenuation



The width of the shocked region is underpredicted by simulations and cannot be due to hydrodynamic instabilities



Shock trajectories were previously calculated by tracking the maximum optical depth in each line out*, showing good agreement with 2D DRACO simulations**



The simulations were post-processed with *Spect3D*⁺ and take the instrument response function into account

* Trajectory analysis performed by Wolfgang Theobald

** P. B. Radha et al., Physics of Plasmas 12, 032702 (2005).

[†] J. J. MacFarlane et al., High Energy Density Phys. <u>3</u>, 181 (2007).



The radius of minimum transmission, corresponding roughly to the shock front position, is in good agreement between the experiment and simulations



Using this method, the shock velocity is inferred to be approximately $4 \pm 3\%$ lower in experiment, requiring additional accuracy in future measurements.



The arrival time of the shock in the center of the sphere was measured at 4 \times 10¹⁴ W/cm² from the x-ray flash created by the shock collapse



The x-ray flash time from both diagnostics is in agreement, providing an average value of 13.61 ± 0.05 ns, which will be compared to radiation-hydrodynamic simulations.



Backlighter profiles are inferred from fits and used to produce transmission profiles in each strip



Backlighter

Two elliptical, rotatable super-Gaussians

Transmission
Forward Abel transform of:
Unshocked sphere $(\rho_0 \mu_0)$
Linear Rise
Shocked shell $(ho_{ m h}\mu_{ m h})$
Linear Fall

 $ho_0 = 1.07 \text{ g/cm}^3$ $\mu_0 = 3.2 \text{ cm}^2/\text{g}$

