Extreme Atomic Physics in Plasma Mixtures at Gbar Pressure



S. X. Hu University of Rochester Laboratory for Laser Energetics 64th Annual Meeting of the American Physical Society Division of Plasma Physics Spokane, WA 17–21 October 2022





D. Bishel, D. A. Chin, P. M. Nilson, V. V. Karasiev, D. I. Mihaylov, N. R. Shaffer, S. Zhang Laboratory for Laser Energetics University of Rochester

> I. E. Golovkin, M. Gu, and T. Walton Prism Computational Sciences

S. B. Hansen Sandia National Laboratories



A reliable atomic physics model is essential to interpret x-ray spectroscopy signals for diagnosing dense plasmas



TC15963J1



LLE

Convergent-geometry on OMEGA can provide a platform to do x-ray spectroscopy at ultra-high pressure for testing our understanding of atomic physics in dense plasmas





Radiation-hydrodynamic simulations with DRACO indicate ~Gbar pressure in the stagnating shell (CHCu-mixture)



The hot-spot radiation serves as "*backlighter*" for x-ray spectroscopy measurements of the stagnating plasma



Both time-integrated and time-resolved x-ray spectroscopic measurements were conducted through implosions on OMEGA





To understand experimental measurements, we have developed a DFT-based multi-band kinetic model (VERITAS)



VERITAS: DFT-based multi-band kinetic modeling

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dn_i}{dt} = -n_i \sum_{j \neq i}^{N} W_{ij}(I, \nu) + \sum_{j \neq i}^{N} n_j W_{ji}(I, \nu) = 0, \text{ for band } i \\ \mu \frac{\partial I(r, \nu)}{\partial r} + \frac{(1 - \mu^2)}{r} \frac{\partial I(r, \nu)}{\partial \mu} = \eta(r, \nu) - \chi(r, \nu) I(r, \nu) \end{cases}$$

- The above coupled kinetic & rad-transfer equations can be solved for the *self-consistent* radiation field and band populations
- Instead of using a traditional atomic-physics model to calculate the Einstein coefficients (rates W_{ij}) for bound-bound and bound-free transitions, we extract them (oscillator strength) from DFT simulations!

The measured time-integrated X-ray spectra* can differentiate VERITAS from traditional CRE models



*S. X. Hu et al., "Probing atomic physics at ultra-high pressure". Nature Communications (under review).

The self-consistent DFT treatment of dense plasma environment is key to understand the observed time-resolved X-ray spectra*





Spherically-convergent geometry can provide an efficient platform for precision x-ray spectroscopy of dense plasmas at ultra-high pressure



- Traditional collision-radiative-equilibrium (*CRE*) models are sensitive to which *ad hoc* continuum lowering model to use for reproducing experimental observations
- A DFT-based multi-band kinetic modeling code (*VERITAS**), which self-consistent accounts for the ionization balance in such warm/hot dense plasma mixtures, can reproduce most of x-ray spectroscopy features observed in experiments

These results indicate the necessity and viability of modeling dense plasmas with *self-consistent* methods like DFT



UR 🔬

^{*}S. X. Hu et al., "Probing atomic physics at ultra-high pressure". Nature Communications (under review).







Integrated measurements give us some confidence on hydropredicted plasma conditions in such high-adiabat implosions

Table 2 Comparisons of implosion performance between experiments and DRACO simulations.							
Shot# 97628	Experiment	DRACO Simulation					
D-D Neutron Yield	$(7.3 \pm 0.4) \times 10^9$	6.2×10^{9}					
<t<sub>i>_n (keV)</t<sub>	2.2 ± 0.5	2.6					
<pr>n (mg cm⁻²)</pr>	67 <u>+</u> 7	66.5					
Neutron bang time (ns)	2.04 ± 0.05	2.08					



The hot-spot radiation serves as "*backlighter*" for X-ray spectroscopy measurements for the stagnating plasma





The 1s-2p absorption signature is caused by the heat-wave induced depletion of Cu's 2p-band

b Experiment Inner interface - - Outer interface 8400 20 ρ (g cm⁻³) 15 8300 10 5 8200 0 hv (eV) 600 T_e (eV) 8100 400 200 8000 0 7900 f_{2p} of Cu 800830 5 7800 з 1.8 1.9 2.0 2.1 2.2 2.3 1.8 2.0 2.2 Time (ns) Time (ns)



The ionization balance from traditional CRE models show differences from the DFT treatment of dense plasmas

		kT = 200 eV			kT = 300 eV		
cm ⁻³	Models	n _e (cm ⁻³)	Z*	f_{2p}	n _e (cm ⁻³)	Z*	f_{2p}
$\rho = 20 \text{ g}$	ATBASE + Stewart-Pyatt (<i>Spect3D</i>)	5.1×10^{24}	13.76	6.00	5.5×10^{24}	15.78	5.93
%] at	SCRAM + ion-sphere	5.1×10^{24}	14.39	5.84	5.5×10^{24}	16.37	5.25
CHCu[2	DFT + QMD (<i>VERITAS</i>)	$5.0 imes 10^{24}$	12.88	5.87	$5.3 imes 10^{24}$	14.96	5.27
	DFT + AA (Muze)	5.0×10^{24}	12.52	5.87	5.5×10^{24}	14.43	5.24
Y of	FAC + AA (<i>FAC</i>)	4.2×10^{24}	12.86	5.87	4.9×10^{24}	15.19	5.19



UR 🔌 LLE²