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Abstract—Two key properties that are often used to define a plasma operating scenario in nuclear fusion tokamak devices are the current and electron temperature \( T_e \) profiles due to their intimate relationship to plasma performance and stability. In the tokamak community, the current profile is typically specified in terms of the safety factor \( q \) profile or its inverse, the rotational transform \( t = 1/q \) profile. The plasma poloidal magnetic flux \( \Psi \) and \( T_e \) dynamics are governed by an infinite-dimensional, nonlinear, coupled, physics-based model that is described by the magnetic diffusion equation and the electron heat transport equation. In this work, an integrated feedback controller is designed to track target \( t \) (proportional to the spatial gradient of \( \Psi \)) and \( T_e \) profiles by embedding these partial differential equation models into the control design process. The electron thermal conductivity profile is modeled as an uncertainty, and the controller is designed to be robust to an expected uncertainty range. The performance of the integrated \( t + T_e \) profile controller in the TCV tokamak is demonstrated through simulations with the simulation code RAPTOR by first tracking a nominal target, and then modulating the \( T_e \) profile between equilibrium points while maintaining the \( t \) profile in a stationary condition.

I. INTRODUCTION

Nuclear fusion is the process by which two light nuclei combine together. Energy generated from these reactions can be used to produce electrical power through a conventional Rankine cycle. However, many technological challenges still need to be solved in order to develop a commercial fusion power plant. Due to the Coulombic repulsion force that exists between the positively charged nuclei, they must be heated to very high temperatures so that the nuclei possess enough kinetic energy to get close enough to fuse. At these temperatures, the fusion reactants are in the plasma state. The tokamak [1] machine employs a helical magnetic field structure to confine the plasma in a fixed toroidal volume and create the conditions necessary for fusion to occur by exploiting the plasma’s ability to conduct electrical current.

In order to meet the objectives of the ITER tokamak project [2] (next phase of tokamak development), extensive research has been conducted to find plasma operating scenarios characterized by a high fusion gain and magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) stability where a dominant fraction of the current flowing in the plasma is generated by noninductive means [3]. Two key properties that are often used to define a plasma operating scenario are the current and electron temperature \( T_e \) profiles due to the intimate relationship these quantities have to plasma performance [4] and stability [5]. Therefore, the development of plasma profile control algorithms has the potential to improve the performance and reproducibility of tokamak operating scenarios. In the tokamak community, the current profile is typically specified in terms of the safety factor \( q \) profile. Advances towards developing first-principles-driven (FPD), physics-model-based algorithms for \( q \) profile control in various tokamaks are discussed in [6]–[17]. Additionally, algorithms for simultaneous control of the \( q \) profile and the volume-averaged plasma energy have been developed following both data-driven [18] and FPD [19], [20] approaches. Finally, an algorithm for \( q \) and \( T_e \) profile control based on real-time estimation of linearized static plasma profile response models is discussed in [21]. In this work, we synthesize a feedback algorithm for simultaneous \( q \) and \( T_e \) profile control in the TCV tokamak following a FPD, physics-based approach.

The plasma poloidal magnetic flux \( \Psi \) and electron temperature dynamics are governed by an infinite dimensional, nonlinear, coupled physics model that is described by the magnetic diffusion equation [22] and the electron heat transport equation [23]. The rotational transform \( t \) profile, defined as \( t = 1/q \), is proportional to the spatial gradient of \( \Psi \), and therefore represents a natural plasma property conducive for feedback control. In this work, an integrated feedback controller is designed to track target \( t \) and \( T_e \) profiles by embedding the partial differential equation (PDE) models into the design process. We model the electron thermal conductivity profile as an uncertainty and design the controller to be robust to an expected uncertainty range. The actuators used for \( t \) and \( T_e \) profile control are the total plasma current and the auxiliary heating/current-drive (H&CD) system. The RAPTOR code [24], which is a simplified physics-based code that simulates the plasma \( \Psi \) and \( T_e \) profile dynamics, is used to test the capabilities of the controller in TCV. The integrated \( t + T_e \) profile controller performance is demonstrated by first tracking a nominal target, and then modulating the \( T_e \) profile between equilibrium points while maintaining the \( t \) profile in a stationary condition.

II. PLASMA PROFILE DYNAMIC MODELS

The helical magnetic field \( \vec{B} \) in a tokamak plasma is composed of a toroidal component \( \vec{B}_\phi \) and a poloidal component \( \vec{B}_\theta \) as shown in Fig. 1. The poloidal magnetic
Fig. 1. Toroidal magnetic flux surfaces in a tokamak plasma. The limiting flux surface at the plasma core is called the magnetic axis and \( R_0 \) is a constant poloidal magnetic flux, which is defined as a disk of radius \( R \) that is perpendicular to a unit vector in the \( Z \) direction. In a well-confined plasma MHD equilibrium \([1]\), nested toroidal surfaces, which are defined by a constant poloidal magnetic flux, are obtained as shown in Fig. 1. Any quantity that is constant on these magnetic flux surfaces can be used to index them. In this work, the spatial coordinate \( \hat{\rho} = \rho / \rho_b \) is used to index the magnetic flux surfaces, where \( \rho \) is a mean effective minor radius of a magnetic flux surface, i.e., \( \Phi(\rho) = \pi B_0 \rho^2 \). \( \Phi \) is the toroidal magnetic flux, \( B_0 \) is the vacuum toroidal magnetic field at the geometric major radius \( R_0 \) of the tokamak, and \( \rho_b \) is the mean effective minor radius of the last closed magnetic flux surface.

The rotational transform is related to the spatial gradient of the poloidal magnetic flux and is defined as

\[
t(\hat{\rho}, t) = \frac{1}{q(\hat{\rho}, t)} = -d\Psi/d\Phi = -[\partial \Psi / \partial \hat{\rho}] / [B_0 \Phi(\hat{\rho})],
\]

where \( t \) is the time and \( \Psi(\hat{\rho}, t) \) is the poloidal stream function, which is closely related to \( \Psi(\rho, t) \), i.e., \( \Psi = 2\pi \psi \).

The poloidal magnetic flux dynamics in a tokamak plasma are given by the magnetic diffusion equation \([22]\)

\[
\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\mu_0 \rho_b^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{\rho}} \left( \hat{\rho} \frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial \hat{\rho}} \right) + R_0 \hat{H} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \hat{\rho}} + \alpha \left[ \frac{1}{2 \lambda_3} T_e(\hat{\rho}, t) \frac{\partial n_e}{\partial \hat{\rho}}(\hat{\rho}, t) \right],
\]

with boundary conditions \( \partial \psi / \partial \hat{\rho}(0, t) = 0 \) and \( \partial \psi / \partial \hat{\rho}(1, t) = -k_b \rho_0 \), where \( \eta(\hat{\rho}, t) \) is the plasma resistivity, \( T_e(\hat{\rho}, t) \) is the electron temperature, \( \mu_0 \) is the vacuum magnetic permeability, \( n_0(\hat{\rho}) \) is the electron density, \( \rho_0(\hat{\rho}) \) is the electron density, \( T_e(\hat{\rho}, t) \) is the electron thermal conductivity, \( Q_e(\hat{\rho}, t) \) is the total electron heating power density, and \( T_e(\hat{\rho}, t) \) is the electron temperature at the plasma boundary, which is assumed constant.

III. PHYSICS-BASED PLASMA PARAMETER MODELING

The plasma resistivity scales inversely with the electron temperature and is modeled by a simplified Spitzer model as

\[
\eta(\hat{\rho}, t) = k_{\text{Sp}}(\hat{\rho}) Z_{\text{eff}} / [T_e(\hat{\rho}, t)]^{3/2},
\]

where \( k_{\text{Sp}} \) is a spatial profile and \( Z_{\text{eff}} \) is the effective average charge of the ions, which is assumed constant in space and time. The total noninductive current density is generated by the auxiliary sources and the bootstrap current \([25]\), i.e.,

\[
J_{\text{in}}(\hat{\rho}, t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{aux}}} J_{\text{aux},i}(\hat{\rho}, t) + J_{\text{bs}}(\hat{\rho}, t),
\]

where \( j_{\text{aux},i} \) is the current density driven by the individual auxiliary sources, \( j_{\text{bs}} \) is the current density driven by the bootstrap current, and \( n_{\text{aux}} \) is the number of auxiliary sources. The individual auxiliary current-drives are modeled as

\[
J_{\text{aux},i}(\hat{\rho}, t) = J_{\text{ref}}^{\text{aux},i}(\hat{\rho}) \left[ T_e(\hat{\rho}, t) / n_e(\hat{\rho}, t) \right] P_{\text{aux},i}(t),
\]

where \( J_{\text{ref}}^{\text{aux},i} \) is a normalized reference current density deposition profile for the \( i \)-th auxiliary source, \( T_e/n_e \) represents the current-drive efficiency (for electron cyclotron current-drive \([26]\)), and \( P_{\text{aux},i} \) is the \( i \)-th auxiliary power. The bootstrap current is a self-generated current in the plasma which arises from the radial pressure gradient that is produced by the magnetic confinement \([25]\), and is modeled as \([27], [28]\)

\[
J_{\text{bs}}(\hat{\rho}, t) = k_{\text{brem}} R_0 \left( \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \hat{\rho}} \right)^{-1} \left[ 2 \lambda_3 T_e(\hat{\rho}, t) \frac{\partial n_e}{\partial \hat{\rho}}(\hat{\rho}, t) \right] + \left( 2 \lambda_3 + \lambda_3 + \alpha \lambda_3 \right) n_e(\hat{\rho}, t) \frac{\partial T_e}{\partial \hat{\rho}}(\hat{\rho}, t),
\]

where \( \lambda_3(\hat{\rho}) \), \( \lambda_3(\hat{\rho}) \), \( \lambda_3(\hat{\rho}) \), and \( \alpha(\hat{\rho}) \) depend on the magnetic configuration of a particular plasma equilibrium, \( k_{\text{brem}} = 1.602 \times 10^{-16} \text{ J/keV} \), and we have assumed equal electron and ion densities and temperatures, respectively.

The total electron heating power density is expressed as

\[
Q_e(\hat{\rho}, t) = \frac{1}{k_{\text{brem}} \text{eV}} \left[ Q_{\text{e,ohm}}(\hat{\rho}, t) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{aux}}} Q_{\text{e,aux},i}(\hat{\rho}, t) - Q_{\text{e,rad}}(\hat{\rho}, t) \right],
\]

where \( Q_{\text{e,ohm}}(\hat{\rho}, t) \) is the ohmic power density, \( Q_{\text{e,aux},i}(\hat{\rho}, t) \) is the individual auxiliary power densities, and \( Q_{\text{e,rad}}(\hat{\rho}, t) \) is the radiated power density. The ohmic power density is modeled as

\[
Q_{\text{e,ohm}}(\hat{\rho}, t) = j_{\text{tov}}(\hat{\rho}, t)^2 \eta(\hat{\rho}, t),
\]

where the total toroidal current density is expressed as

\[
j_{\text{tov}}(\hat{\rho}, t) = -\frac{1}{\mu_0 \rho_b^2 R_0 \hat{H}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{\rho}} \left( \hat{\rho} \hat{G} \hat{H} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \hat{\rho}} \right) \left[ 2 \lambda_3 T_e(\hat{\rho}, t) \frac{\partial n_e}{\partial \hat{\rho}}(\hat{\rho}, t) \right],
\]

and the individual auxiliary power densities are modeled as

\[
Q_{\text{e,aux},i}(\hat{\rho}, t) = Q_{\text{ref}}^{\text{aux},i}(\hat{\rho}) P_{\text{aux},i}(t),
\]

where \( Q_{\text{ref}}^{\text{aux},i}(\hat{\rho}) \) is a normalized reference power density deposition profile for the \( i \)-th auxiliary source. The radiated power density (for Bremsstrahlung radiation) is modeled as \([1]\)

\[
Q_{\text{e,rad}}(\hat{\rho}, t) = k_{\text{brem}} Z_{\text{eff}} n_e(\hat{\rho}, t)^2 \sqrt{T_e(\hat{\rho}, t)},
\]

where \( k_{\text{brem}} = 5.5 \times 10^{-37} \text{ Wm}^3/\text{keV} \) is the Bremsstrahlung radiation coefficient.
IV. FEEDBACK CONTROL DESIGN

The auxiliary H&CD actuators on TCV considered in this work are 4 electron cyclotron (gyrotron) launchers that are grouped into 2 clusters (denoted as a and b). The current-drive and power density deposition profiles for each source are shown in Fig. 3. The gyrotrons in cluster a are: 1 on-axis heating and co-current-injection source ($f_{ec\text{a}}$ and $Q_{ec\text{a}}$) in Fig. 3 and 1 off-axis heating and counter-current-injection source ($f_{ec\text{b}}$ and $Q_{ec\text{b}}$ in Fig. 3), and the gyrotrons in cluster b are: 1 on-axis heating and counter-current-injection source ($f_{ec\text{b}}$ and $Q_{ec\text{b}}$ in Fig. 3) and 1 off-axis heating and co-current-injection source ($f_{ec\text{a}}$ and $Q_{ec\text{a}}$ in Fig. 3). The electron density could be used for control, but in this work the electron density profile is assumed regulated around a constant profile.

By combining the magnetic diffusion equation (2) with the resistivity (4) and noninductive current-drive (5)-(7) models, and defining the quantities $f_1(\rho) = k_JZ_{eff}/[\mu_0\rho_0^2\bar{E}_z^2]$, $D_{\Psi}(\rho) = \bar{G}\bar{H}$, $g_{ec\text{a}}(\rho) = R_0\bar{H}Z_{eff}f_{ec\text{a}}/n_{el}$, $f_{ec\text{b}}(\rho) = k_{JkeV}R_0k_{B}Z_{eff}\gamma_{ec\text{b}}/\bar{F}$, $f_{bs\text{a}}(\rho) = 2Z_{3b}[\mu_0\rho_0^2/\bar{D}_{\rho}^2]$, $f_{bs\text{b}}(\rho) = \{2Z_{3a} + \alpha Z_{3a}\} n_{el}$, for $i \in [1,2,1a,2b,2b]$, we obtain

$$\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} &= f_1 \frac{1}{T_e^{3/2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \left( \rho D_{\Psi} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \rho} \right) \\
&+ \frac{1}{T_e^{3/2}} \left( [g_{ec\text{a1}} + g_{ec\text{a2}}] P_{ec\text{a}}(t) + [g_{ec\text{b1}} + g_{ec\text{b2}}] P_{ec\text{b}}(t) \right) \\
&+ f_{bs\text{a}} \left( \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \rho} \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{T_e^{3/2}} \left( f_{bs\text{a}} T_e + f_{bs\text{b}} \frac{\partial T_e}{\partial \rho} \right). \tag{14}
\end{align*}$$

By combining the electron heat transport equation (3) with the electron heat source (8)-(11) and $\chi_e$ (12) models, and defining the quantities $f_{r}(\rho) = [2/3]/[1/\rho_0^2 n_{el}]$, $D_{\bar{t}}(\rho) = \bar{G}\bar{H}n_{el}/\bar{F}$, $f_{bs\text{a}}(\rho) = [2/3]k_{JkeV}Z_{eff}f_{ec\text{b}}/n_{el}$, $f_{bs\text{b}}(\rho) = [2/3]k_{B}\bar{H}Z_{eff}f_{ec\text{a}}/n_{el}$, $m_{ec\text{a}}(\rho) = [2/3]Q_{ec\text{a}}/\gamma_{JkeV}n_{el}$, for $i \in [1,2,1a,2b,2b]$, we get

$$\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial T_e}{\partial t} &= f_r \frac{1}{T_e^{3/2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \left[ \rho D_{\bar{t}} \left( \sum_{a=1}^{n_a} \Lambda_a (\gamma_{\alpha a}^{\text{nom}} + \gamma_{\alpha a}^{\text{unc}}) \right) \frac{\partial T_e}{\partial \rho} \right] \\
&+ f_{bs\text{a}} \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \left( \rho D_{\bar{t}} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \rho} \right) \right)^2 \frac{1}{T_e^{3/2}} - \frac{\partial T_e}{\partial \bar{t}}. \tag{15}
\end{align*}$$

From (1), we see that the rotational transform is related to the poloidal flux spatial gradient, which we define as $\theta(\rho,t) \equiv [\partial \rho/\partial \rho(\rho,t)]$. Inserting this definition into (14)-(15) and after application of the chain rule, we obtain PDE models of the $\theta$ and $T_e$ profile dynamics. Spatially discretizing these models by employing a finite difference method results in ordinary differential equation models defined by

$$\dot{\theta} = F_{\theta}(\hat{\theta},\hat{T}_e,u) \quad \hat{T}_e = F_{T_e}(\hat{\theta},\hat{T}_e,u,\delta) \quad u_i = \frac{1}{B_{\theta,0}\rho_0^2}\theta_i,$$
The feedback control problem is formulated as shown in Fig. 4, where $\dot{\theta} = [\theta_2, \ldots, \theta_{m-1}] \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\hat{T}_c = [T_{c_2}, \ldots, T_{c_{m-1}}] \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\theta$, $T_c$, $\xi$, and $\hat{\theta}$ are the values of $\theta$, $T_c$, $\xi$, and $\hat{\theta}$ at the discrete nodes, for $i = [2, \ldots, m-1]$, $u = [\theta_{P_{eq}}, P_{eq}, I_p] \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the control input vector, $\delta = [\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n] \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the uncertain parameter vector, $F_{\theta} = \partial F_{\theta,\hat{T}_c}/\partial \hat{T}_c \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n \times n}$ is the control input Jacobian, $\partial R_{\xi,\hat{\theta}}/\partial \hat{\theta} = \partial R_{\xi,\hat{\theta}}/\partial \hat{\theta}$ is the uncertain parameter Jacobian, and $\Sigma$ is a diagonal matrix of singular values, and $U \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 3}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ are matrices that possess the following properties $V^T V = VV^T = I, U^T U = I$. We have introduced the positive definite matrices $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ to weight the relative tracking performance and control effort.

The singular vectors of the basis for the subspace of obtainable output values ($\hat{y} = Q^{-1/2}U^s \Sigma^s y^s$) and the corresponding input singular vectors ($\hat{u} = R^{-1/2} V \Sigma^s y^s$) are shown in Fig. 5, where $\hat{y}^s$ and $\hat{u}^s$ are the decoupled output and input, i.e., $\hat{y}^s = \hat{y}^s_{fb}$. In this work, the frequency to evaluate the relevant channels at is chosen as $\omega_{dc} = 250$ rad/s. By examining Fig. 5, we see that this choice allows us to use the gyrotrods ($P_{eqa}$ and $P_{eqb}$ in opposite directions) to control the $T_c$ profile in the plasma core through auxiliary current-drive, the total plasma current to control the $T_c$ profile near the plasma boundary, and the gyrotrods ($P_{eqa}$ and $P_{eqb}$ in the same direction) to control the $T_c$ profile.

The feedback control problem is formulated as shown in Fig. 4, where $r$ is the reference value, $e = r - y$ is the tracking error ($e^* \triangleq \Sigma^{-1} U^T Q^{1/2} e \triangleq r^* - y^*$), and $K$ is the feedback controller. The closed-loop system outputs are $Z_1$ and $Z_2$, and the frequency dependent weight functions $W_p$ and $W_d$ are used to optimize the feedback performance. The feedback control objectives are to maintain a small tracking error for
any reference, reject the effects of the external disturbance, use as little feedback control effort as possible, and robustly stabilize the system. The control problem is formulated as

$$\min_K \left| T_{zw} \right|_\infty, \forall \omega \quad T_{zw} = \begin{bmatrix} W_p S_{DC_0} & -W_p S_{DC_0} \\ W_a K_{DC_0} & -W_a K_{DC_0} \end{bmatrix},$$

which represents the closed-loop nominal performance (NP) condition. The function $T_{zw}$ is the closed-loop transfer function from the inputs ($r^*, d^*$) to the outputs ($Z_1, Z_2$), $d^* = \Sigma^{-1} U^T Q^{1/2} d$, and $S_{DC_0} = (I + \Sigma^{-1} U^T Q^{1/2} P_{22} R^{-1/2} V K)^{-1}$.

The feedback controller is obtained using the state-space form as

$$\dot{x}_{fb} = A_{fb}^* x_{fb} + B_{fb}^* e^s, \quad u_{fb}^* = C_{fb}^* x_{fb} + D_{fb}^* e^s,$$

where $x_{fb}$ is the controller state vector, and $A_{fb}^*, B_{fb}^*, C_{fb}^*, D_{fb}^*$ are the controller matrices obtained by solving (19).

To analyze the closed-loop system NP, the maximum singular value diagrams of the inverse of the performance weight functions and the achieved transfer functions $S_{DC_0}$ and $K_{DC_0}$ are shown in Fig. 6(a). As shown, the controller achieves NP. The closed-loop system robust stability (RS) with the nominal controller is analyzed by exploiting the block-diagonal structure of $\Delta$, which allows us to compute the structured singular value $\mu(N_{11}(\omega))$ [31], where $N_{11}$ is the closed-loop transfer function between the signals $y_\Delta$ and $u_\Delta$ in Fig. 4. A plot of $\mu$ versus frequency is shown in Fig. 6(b). As shown, for all possible uncertainties (dashed line in Fig. 6(b)) according to the model (12), RS is not achieved. However, by comparing the $\chi_\varepsilon$ profile that results in the largest $\mu$-value for this case (dashed line in Fig. 6(c)) to the $\chi_\varepsilon$ profiles predicted by RAPTOR in Fig. 2(b), we see that the model (12) can allow unphysical $\chi_\varepsilon$ profiles for the considered scenarios. Therefore, we restrict the uncertainties in the model (12) by requiring that the resulting $\chi_\varepsilon$ profile satisfies $\partial \chi_\varepsilon / \partial \hat{\rho} < 0$ for $\hat{\rho} \in [0, 0.35]$ and $\partial \chi_\varepsilon / \partial \hat{\rho} > 0$ for $\hat{\rho} \in [0.45, 0.85]$. We then recompute $\mu$, and as shown by the solid line in Fig. 6(b), RS is achieved for this subset of uncertainties (marginal stability is reached at 100 rad/s).

V. CONTROL ALGORITHM PERFORMANCE TESTING

We now test the closed-loop performance of the integrated $t + T_e$ profile feedback controller (20) in TCV RAPTOR [24] simulations. In order to ensure a fair test of the controller performance, the target plasma state must be physically achievable, i.e., the $t$ and $T_e$ profiles that are specified as targets in the simulations must be compatible with each other. In this work, we obtain $T_e$ profiles that are compatible with specific $t$ profiles by executing RAPTOR simulations with $t$ profile control only [16] and taking the resulting $T_e$ profile as a nominal compatible target. In this work, a $q$ profile achieved in TCV with $I_p = 190$ kA and counter-current-injection auxiliary power is chosen as the target, and the corresponding nominal $T_e$ profile has a broad profile shape.

During the simulations, the $t$ profile target is held constant, and the nominal $T_e$ profile is set as the target for $t \in [0, 1]$ s. For $t \in [1, 1.4]$ s, the nominal $T_e$ profile is scaled down by 10%, and the resulting profile is set as the target. Finally, the nominal $T_e$ profile is scaled up by 10%, and the resulting profile is set as the target for $t \in [1.4, 2]$ s. First, a $t$ and $T_e$ profile evolution is obtained by executing a feedforward-only simulation with a particular set of input trajectories. Next, the ability of the controller to track the target is determined by executing a feedforward + feedback simulation with the same feedforward input trajectories used in the first simulation.

Time traces of $q$ and $T_e$ at various spatial locations, and a comparison of the control inputs is shown in Fig. 7. Once the controller becomes active at 0.1 s, it is able to drive the $t$ and $T_e$ profiles to the target during the nominal phase of the simulation ($t \in [0, 1]$ s) by increasing the total plasma current and the cluster $b$ gyrotron power and decreasing the cluster $a$ gyrotron power. During the time interval $t \in [1, 2]$ s, the controller is able to modulate the $T_e$ profile between equilibrium points while maintaining the $q$ profile in a relatively stationary condition by rejecting the effects that the changing $T_e$ have on the magnetic profile dynamics.
VI. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

An integrated feedback algorithm for $t$ and $T_e$ profile control in tokamaks was developed following a FPD, physics-based modeling approach. The controller was designed to be robust to an expected range of uncertainty in the $\chi_e$ profile. The performance of the controller was demonstrated through RAPTOR simulations of the TCV tokamak plasma dynamics. One direction of future work is to develop a model of the $\chi_e$ that naturally predicts physically relevant profiles. Additionally, our future work includes using the closed-loop plasma state observer developed in [32] to reconstruct the $t$ and $T_e$ profiles in real-time to experimentally test the controller in TCV.
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