Abstract

Equilibrium reconstruction codes calculate the distributions of flux and toroidal current density over the plasma and surrounding vacuum region that best fit the external magnetic measurements in a least square sense, and that simultaneously satisfy the MHD equilibrium equation (Grad-Shafranov equation). Although these codes often use direct measurements of the currents in the plasma and poloidal coils, they sometimes neglect the current induced in the tokamak vessel due to the fact that they cannot be directly measured. Kalman filtering theory is employed in this work to optimally estimate the current in the tokamak vessel. The real-time version of the EFIT code is modified to accept the estimated vessel currents with the goal of improving the equilibrium reconstruction for the DIII-D tokamak.
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1. Introduction

The efficient and safe operation of fusion devices relies on accurate knowledge of many of the discharge parameters. The values of several discharge parameters which are not directly measurable, such as plasma shape and current density distribution, can be reconstructed from magnetic field and flux measurements.
all unknown. Thus, in addition to the plasma toroidal current, the currents in the poloidal field (PF) coils can be free parameters and, potentially, the induced currents in the vacuum vessel and support structures can be treated this way as well. There are direct measurements of the PF coil currents, but these measurements have uncertainties which can be properly accounted for in the least squares fitting procedure by solving for the external currents using the measurements as constraints. A similar procedure could be followed for the vessel currents if they were measurable. Unfortunately, this is not usually the case.

Kalman filtering theory is used in this work to optimally estimate the current in the tokamak vessel. With the ultimate goal of improving the equilibrium reconstruction for the DIII-D tokamak, the real-time version of the EFIT algorithm [3] is modified to accept the estimation for the DIII-D tokamak, the real-time version the ultimate goal of improving the equilibrium reconstruction algorithm provides a new approach for improving control, (2) obtain reliable (consistent both with known physics and with available measurements) estimates of internal parameters, such as the current profile.

Assuming an axisymmetric plasma in a cylindrical coordinate system \( \{r, \phi, z\} \), the equilibrium MHD equations (fluid mechanics equations + Maxwell’s equations) reduce to the Grad-Shafranov equation:

\[
\Delta^* \psi_p = -\mu_0 r J_\phi
\]

which describes the force balance of the tokamak equilibrium. The elliptic operator \( \Delta^* \) is given by

\[
\Delta^*\psi = \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial z^2} + r \frac{\partial}{\partial r}((1/r)(\partial \psi/\partial r)),
\]

\( J_\phi \) is the toroidal component of the current density, and \( \psi = \psi_p + \psi_{ext} \) is the total poloidal flux per radian, i.e., \( \psi = \psi_{pol}/2\pi \), where \( \psi_p \) is the poloidal flux resulting from the plasma current and \( \psi_{ext} \) is the poloidal flux generated by current in the sources external to the plasma, like coil and induced current.

The task of the equilibrium reconstruction is to calculate the distributions in the \( r, z \) plane of the poloidal flux \( \psi \), and the toroidal current density \( J_\phi \), that provide a least squares best fit to the diagnostic data and which simultaneously satisfy the Grad-Shafranov Eq. (1). The solution to the equilibrium reconstruction problem is obtained through an iterative algorithm that estimates the magnetic measurement \( C_{m+1} \) using the flux \( \psi^m \) in the plasma domain \( \Omega^m \) calculated in the previous step \( m \). The magnetic measurements usually have two contributions, one due to the external conductor currents \( I_e \), and the other due to the plasma current \( J_\phi \). The magnetic measurement \( C \) at a generic point \( Z_i \) is obtained from the current sources placed at locations \( Z_i \)’s by means of Green’s functions \( G \):

\[
C_{Z_j}^{m+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_c} G(Z_j, Z_i) I_{c_i}
\]

\[
+ \int \int_{\Omega^m} G(Z_j, Z) J_\phi(Z, \psi^m) \, dZ
\]

Finally, conclusions and identified future work are presented in Section 6.

2. Equilibrium reconstruction basis

The primary objective of equilibrium reconstruction is twofold: (1) substantially improve the accuracy with which the plasma boundary is estimated, thereby improving control, (2) obtain reliable (consistent both with known physics and with available measurements) estimates of internal parameters, such as the current profile.
The estimated magnetic measurements \( C \)'s generated by EFIT, at certain locations where magnetic sensors are placed, are compared with data from those magnetic sensors, to obtain the plasma current \( J_\psi^{m+1}(\psi^m) \) that minimizes the quadratic error:
\[
\chi^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{meas}}} \left( \frac{M_k - C_k}{\sigma_k} \right)^2
\]
(3)
where \( M_k, C_k, \) and \( \sigma_k \) are the measured values, the computed values, and the error associated with the \( k \) measurement. The flux function is finally updated solving the Grad-Shafranov Eq. (1):
\[
\Delta^* \psi^{m+1} = -\mu_0 r J_\phi^{m+1}(\psi^m)
\]
(4)

The real-time version of EFIT [3] uses a two-loop scheme. A fast loop performs the least squares fit (3) using new measured values from the magnetic sensors in each iteration but using the last equilibrium flux provided by the solution of (4). The plasma current \( J_\phi \) in each iteration is used to compute, through Green's functions, the magnetic flux values at a predefined set of control points (geometrical points at which the poloidal magnetic flux is regulated by the shape controller). A slow loop, approximately 25 times slower than the fast loop, solves the equilibrium problem (4) to update the magnetic flux \( \psi \).

In real-time EFIT [3], the diagnostic data presently consist of measurements of magnetic flux and field outside the plasma, plasma plus vessel current from a Rogowski loop, field internal to the plasma from a motional stark effect diagnostic, and current in the poloidal field and ohmic heating coils. One of the main contributions of this work is the incorporation of estimated induced vessel currents into the diagnostic data set (Section 4).

3. Vessel current estimation

The system composed of plasma, shaping coils, and passive structure can be described using circuit equations derived from Faraday's law, and radial and vertical force balance relations for a particular plasma equilibrium. In addition, rigid radial and vertical displacement of the equilibrium current distribution is assumed, and a resistive plasma circuit equation is specified. The result is a circuit equation describing the linearized response, around a particular plasma equilibrium, of the conductor–plasma system to voltages applied to active conductors. The model equations for poloidal field (PF) coil current, vessel (passive conductor) currents, and plasma current are respectively:
\[
M_{cc}^* I_c + R_c I_c + M_{cv}^* I_v + M_{cp}^* I_p = V_c
\]
\[
M_{vv}^* I_v + R_v I_v + M_{vc}^* I_c + M_{vp}^* I_p = 0
\]
\[
M_{pp}^* I_p + R_p I_p + M_{pc}^* I_c + M_{pp}^* I_v = V_{no}
\]
(5)
where \( I_c, I_v, \) and \( I_p \) represent currents in PF coils, vessel, and plasma, respectively. \( V_c \) the vector of voltages applied to the PF coils, and \( V_{no} \) is the effective voltage applied to drive plasma current by noninductive sources. \( R_c, \) for \( a \in \{c, v, p\}, \) represents the resistance matrix of each one of the circuits. \( M_{ab}^* = M_{ab} + X_{ab} \) plasma-modified mutual inductance, where \( a, b \in \{c, v, p\}. \) \( M_{ab} \) is the usual conductor-to-conductor mutual inductance, and \( X_{ab} \) describes a plasma motion-mediated inductance, linearized around the plasma equilibrium. The plasma response matrix \( X_{ab} \), representing changes in flux due to plasma motion, are functions only of the equilibrium current distribution and vacuum magnetic field \( B_{eq} \). The \( X_{ab} \) matrix is computed starting with an EFIT equilibrium [1], and added to the mutual inductance \( M_{ab} \) as part of the model construction process.

In contrast to the dynamic Eq. (5), the mapping from currents to outputs (for example, diagnostic data such as flux loops, magnetic probes, Rogowski loops) is expressed explicitly in terms of current deviations from equilibrium values [9]:
\[
\delta y = C_{I_s} \delta I_c + C_{I_v} \delta I_v + C_{I_p} \delta I_p
\]
(6)
where \( \delta T = T - T_{eq} \), for \( T \in \{I_c, I_v, I_p\} \). The subscript “eq” denotes values at the equilibrium from which the models (5) and (6) are derived. In the rest of the paper, \( \delta \) will be omitted for simplicity, but it will be implicitly assumed that the output equation is written in terms of deviation variables. The matrices \( C_{I_s} \), for \( I_s \in \{I_c, I_v, I_p\} \), are defined as
\[
C_{I_s} = \frac{\partial y}{\partial I_s} + \frac{\partial y}{\partial r_c} \frac{\partial r_c}{\partial I_s} + \frac{\partial y}{\partial z_c} \frac{\partial z_c}{\partial I_s}
\]
(7)
where the first term on the right hand side is the “direct” response, e.g., given by Green’s function calculations in the case of magnetic probes or flux loops. The remaining terms are responses due to motion of the
plasma; \( r_c \) and \( z_c \) denote the radial and vertical positions of the plasma current centroid, i.e., “center of mass” of the current. It is common to include disturbance terms describing the response to variations in kinetic and current profile quantities such as poloidal beta (\( \beta_p \)), and normalized internal inductance (\( \ell_i \)) [10]. However, disturbance terms are neglected in the present study.

If the estimation of the vessel current is the only objective, a simplified model for the dynamics of the vessel current can be extracted from (5). The second equation in (5), combined with (6), can be rewritten in state space form as

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_v &= A_v x_v + B_v u_v + G_v w_1 \\
y &= C_v x_v + D_v u_v + w_2
\end{align*}
\]

where \( x_v = I_v \), \( u_v = [I_c^T I_p^T I_c^T I_p^T]^T \). The new system matrices are \( A_v = -M_v^{-1} R_v \), \( B_v = -M_v^{-1} \{ 0 0 M_v^* M_v^p \} \), \( G_v = B_v \), \( C_v = C_b \), \( D_v = [C_L C I_p 0 0] \). The output \( y \) may include flux loops, magnetic probes, and Rogowskii loops. Process noise or disturbance \( w_1 \), and measurement noise \( w_2 \) has been added to the model (8). The noise covariance matrices are given by \( \Sigma \{ w_1 w_1^T \} = Q_n \), \( \Sigma \{ w_2 w_2^T \} = R_n \). To optimally estimate the vessel current \( I_v \), we implement a Kalman filter [11]:

\[
\dot{\hat{x}}_v = A_v \hat{x}_v + B_v u_v + K(y - C_v \hat{x}_v - D_v u_v) \tag{9}
\]

where \( \hat{x}_v \) is the estimation for \( x_v \). Solving the Riccati equation for \( Y \):

\[
0 = A_v Y + Y A_v^T + G_v Q_n G_v^T - Y C_v^T R_n^{-1} C v Y
\]

we can obtain the Kalman gain matrix \( K = Y C_v^T R_n^{-1} \). Carefully tuning \( Q_n \) and \( R_n \), based on the knowledge of the system, an optimal estimation of the vessel current can be obtained.

4. Reconstruction with vessel currents

The equilibrium solution consists of values of \( \psi \) and \( J_\phi \) on a rectangular grid which covers the entire area of the vacuum vessel. The current is modeled as being distributed among a set of rectangular elements, one centered at each grid point, with the total number of grid points typically 1000 or more. The large number of grid points allows the solution to provide a realistic distribution of the current density, including provision for finite current density at the discharge edge. In the Grad-Shafranov Eq. (1), the toroidal current density \( J_\phi \) is written as

\[
J_\phi = r \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial \psi} + \frac{\mu_0 F}{4\pi^2 r^2} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \psi} \right)
\tag{10}
\]

where \( P \) is the plasma pressure, and the auxiliary function \( F \) is proportional to the poloidal current \( I_{pol} = 2\pi F/\mu_0 \) flowing in the plasma. Although \( J_\phi \) is modeled as being distributed among a large set of rectangular elements, it is parameterized by only a small number of free parameters. Simple polynomial models are used to represent \( P' \) and \( FF' \):
where the subindex \( i \) denotes that the quantities are evaluated at the \( i \)th grid point. All terms linearly proportional to \( \delta z \) are collected into \( C_{\delta z} \). In addition to the plasma toroidal current, the currents in the external poloidal field (PF) coils, \( I_c \), have been considered so far as free parameters. The direct measurements of the external PF coil currents have uncertainties that are properly accounted for in the least squares fitting procedure by solving for the external currents using the available measurements as constraints. The DIII-D flux loops are wired so that all flux measurements are made relative to the total flux measured at a single reference position. This reference flux value (\( \psi_{\text{ref}} \)) has also been treated then as a free parameter with the measured value weighted by its uncertainty used as a constraint. In this work, we add the vessel current to the set of free parameter. With this purpose, the vessel structure has been discretized into 28 segments as it is shown in Fig. 1 (a). The 28 vessel currents, \( I_v \), are considered as free parameters in the fitting procedure.

The optimal vessel current estimations, provided by the Kalman filter implementation, are incorporated as an additional constraints after weighting them by their uncertainties. Thus, the total vector of unknowns for the fitting problem is now \( U = [I_c, I_v, \Theta, \psi_{\text{ref}}] \).

Considering the discretization of the toroidal current (13) and including the discretized vessel currents, (2) can be rewritten in matrix form as

\[
C = \zeta \times U
\]  

(15)

The diagram in Fig. 2 shows the response matrix \( \zeta \). Blocks (a) and (b) in the matrix contain the precalculated Green’s function coefficients that specify the contribution to the magnetic measurement \( C \) by each of the external coil currents and induced vessel currents. Block (c) represents the contribution to the magnetic measurement \( C \) by the plasma current at each grid element. When the magnetic measurements are calculated at positions where magnetic diagnostics are placed,
we are interested in finding the vector $U$ that makes these measurements equal to the values measured by the sensors, i.e., the diagnostic data $D$. Therefore, (15) is rewritten as

$$D = \zeta \times U \quad (16)$$

Because the number of diagnostic measurements is usually much larger than the number of fitting parameters, (16) is not an exact relation. This leads to the requirement that $U$ be obtained in a least squares sense. After multiplying both sides of (16) by a weight vector $W$, that has one element for each diagnostic signal equal to the inverse of the measurement uncertainty (or estimation uncertainty, in the case of the vessel currents). The solution that minimizes (3) is obtained by using the pseudo-inverse of the weighted response matrix, i.e.,

$$U = (W \cdot \zeta)^{-1} \times (W \cdot D) \quad (17)$$

where the operator “$\cdot$” indicates multiplication of each column of the matrix by the vector, and the operator “$\times$” indicates matrix multiplication. The vector of all the axisymmetric current sources, $I_{\text{axi}} = [I_c, I_v, I_\phi]$, is assembled from the solution for $U$. The flux is updated by solving (4), which ensures the fulfillment of the Grad-Shafranov equation.

5. Results

We use a data set from experimental discharges at DIII-D to study the effectiveness of the Kalman filter (9) in estimating the induced vessel currents. In all the cases presented in this section, we consider that the output vector of the system (8) is composed only of magnetic flux loops and Rogowskii loops.

We estimate the vessel current in the interval 1.5–4.0 s. for DIII-D experimental discharge (shot)
118572, which corresponds to an approximate flattop stage of the plasma current evolution. By carefully tuning \( Q_n \) and \( R_n \), the output of the Kalman filter matches the diagnostic data. Fig 3 shows the results for some of the output variables; “PCRL03” is one of the Rogowskii loops, and “PCPSI89NB”, “PCPSI89FB” and “PCPSI7B” are three of the magnetic flux loops. The figure compares measured (blue) and Kalman-filter-estimated (green) values. Due to the good matching it is difficult to distinguish both signals from the figure.

Present models used by the equilibrium reconstruction algorithm and the Kalman filter are not totally consistent, in particular for the inner vessel segments (segments 1, 2, 3, 13, 14, 15 in Fig. 1 (a)). For this reason, we set weights (matrix \( W \) in (17)) for these vessel segments that are 1000 times smaller than those for the other vessel segments.

We compare now reconstruction results for the time interval 2.0–3.0 s, with and without using the vessel current estimates. The reconstruction results obtained using the estimates of the vessel currents are stored in the virtual shot 900014, while those obtained without using the vessel currents estimates are simply labeled 121858. Table 1 compares the resulting \( \chi^2 \) at \( t = 2400 \) ms for both shots. The PF coil \( \chi^2 \) contains vessel current errors as well as coil current errors for 900014. We can appreciate that \( \chi^2 \) is indeed reduced by incorporating the currents of the vessel segments as free parameters. The similarities between the vessel currents estimated by the Kalman filter and the real-time EFIT, shown in Fig. 4, suggest that the fitting error is minimized at a physical solution. Thus, the equilibrium reconstruction has been improved. The flux surfaces and plasma boundary for both shots are compared in Fig. 1 (b). We expect this similarity for equilibria in plasma current flattop, since vessel currents are relatively small at those times. The goal is to validate the method with these comparisons, then apply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shot</th>
<th>PF-coil</th>
<th>B-probe</th>
<th>Flux loops</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121858</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>33.23</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>40.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900014</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>17.42</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>25.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 4. Kalman-filter-estimated $I_v$ (green dashed) and real-time EFIT computed $I_v$ (blue solid) (time (horizontal axis) [ms], currents [A]). (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of the article.)

the method to situations where large and changing vessel currents are expected, such as in plasma current rampup or rampdown.

6. Conclusions

The proposed Kalman filter solution improves on the physics model used for the fit by adding free parameters representing currents flowing in the vessel conductors. This approach also provides additional physics, defined by the dynamics of the current evolution, that constrain the currents that flow in these conductors. Further work is needed to correctly incorporate estimation uncertainty (analogous to measurement uncertainty) to balance the effect of free parameters and constraints. The advantages of the Kalman filter estimated currents are that they provide current estimates to the reconstruction with substantially reduced noise levels and at the same time are able to track fast changes in vessel currents.

For the inner vessel segments, the currents estimated by the Kalman filter and the real-time EFIT show considerable disagreements. Using the vessel currents estimated by EFIT as the output of the dynamic model (8), a system identification approach can be followed to better estimate the uncertain parameters in the dynamic model such as the resistances of the vessel segments. Kalman filter theory arises as a powerful tool for model reconciliation, which is a very common, and at the same time difficult, problem in plasma physics.

Future work includes the development of a scheduling rule to update the linearized plasma model used by the Kalman filter as the equilibrium evolves.
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