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Stony Brook University
U.S.-China collaboration makes excellent start in optimizing lithium to control fusion plasmas. Plasma that fuels fusion must stay stable and hot. Lithium can be effective for both, researchers find.
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Guiding principles:

If Edison had a needle to find in a haystack, he would proceed at once with the diligence of the bee to examine straw after straw until he found the object of his search... I was a sorry witness of such doings, knowing that a little theory and calculation would have saved him 90% of his labor.
–Nikola Tesla, New York Times, October 19, 1931

“You do not really understand something unless you can explain it to your grandmother.” Albert Einstein

The traditional trial-and-error approach to PMI for future fusion devices by successively refitting the walls of toroidal plasma devices with different materials and component designs is becoming prohibitively slow and costly.

Need bottom-up approach arising from the fundamental atomistic and nano science with the primary goal to understand the phenomenology of PMI for fusion.
LAYOUT (Why, How, What?):

• Why to study PMI for nuclear fusion?

• Methods of simulation; preparation of a target
  CMD: REAXFF
  QCMD: SCC-DFTB

• Results: Main Accomplishments
  LICO:D, BCO:D, LiBCO:D, LiO:D systems
  retention, sputtering
WHY are we DOING IT?
Challenges at the Plasma-Material INTERFACE

This is not the material science!
Science of the interface has many fundamental processes & synergies

Schematic magnetic fusion reactor

Plasma heating (rf, microwave, ...)

Drivers: Plasma
Multi -T, -n, -species, plasma irradiation, neutrons
sheath acceleration

Give rise to synergistic effects

Damage Effects:
Vacancies, bubbles, blisters, dislocations, voids, neutrons?
Re-deposition Co-deposition
Erosion Ablation Melting (metals)

First few nanometers play decisive role

trapping/detrapping retention
diffusion, permeation
re-emission & sputtering & chemistry
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Application of SCC-DFTB: Lithium wall conditioning improves confinement!

Why?

• From in-situ experiments labs, and more than 7 different tokamak machines (TFTR, CDX-U, FTU, DIII-D, TJ-II, EAST, and NSTX): Graphite with thin lithium coatings have a "significant" effect on plasma behavior: Reduced hydrogen recycling, erosion and ELMs, improved energy confinement time.

Noticeable is the ratio of the dimensions of the plasma and Li layer!!

“Nano-control of macro device”

• Initially the experimentalists conjecture was that there was some "functionality" that governed the behavior of the Li-C-O-H system observed indirectly by analyzing the O(1s) and C(1s) peaks.

Working assumption was that the main generator was Li-H chemistry.
Lithium dynamics: Difficult to study theoretically by usual classical MD because of Li polarizing features when interacting with other elements.

Electronegativity is a chemical property of an element defining its tendency to attract electrons. Li has it exceptionally low in comparison to H, C, O, Mo, W.

Consequence: Bonding between Li and other atoms covalent and polar; Long-range nonbonding: Coulomb: $1/R$; Lennard-Jones: $1/R^6$, $1/R^{12}$

Quantum-Classical MD based on Self-Consistent-Charge Density-Functional Tight-Binding (SCC-DFTB) method (developed by Bremen Center for Computational Mat. Science, Germany) a possible answer for qualitative phenomenology is our choice.

Li-C-O-H parameterization came from K. Morokuma and S. Maeda, Kyoto U.
“State of the Art” Plasma Simulation Codes Use Rudimentary PMI Models

- SOLPS = B2 (2-D fluid plasma transport) + EIRENE (3-D kinetic neutral transport) used to simulate JET, design ITER, etc.

- UEDGE (2-D fluid plasma transport) & XGC (kinetic plasma turbulence & transport) use specified recycling coefficients,
  - Can be coupled to DEGAS 2 kinetic neutral transport to use TRIM reflection data.

- PMI do not evolve in response to plasma ⇒ no consistent solution to plasma-material system.

- Replace with dynamic, first principles, atomistic, multi-scale model:
  - Consistent treatment of D retention & recycling,
  - Surface morphology evolution through erosion & redeposition,
  - Kinetic characterization of impurity sources,
  - Etc.

Long-term goal: Integrated modeling of plasma and PFC’s
How does PMI see a flux of $10^{25}$ particles/m²s mean (ITER)?

The flux is 0.01 particle/nm²ns, i.e. 1 particle each 10 ns at 10 nm²

A typical evolution of deuterium impact at 100 eV even with chemical sputtering in carbon takes no more than 50 ps, and penetration no more than 2 nm; in tungsten events even faster

Each particle will functionalize the material, change the surface for the subsequent impact!

Processes essentially discrete

Happening at nanoscale in both time and space, scales determined by impact plasma particle energy

Interface is dynamic, changing on nanoscale!!!

The traditional trial-and-error approach to PMI for future fusion devices by successively refitting the walls of toroidal plasma devices with different materials and component designs is becoming prohibitively slow and costly

Need bottom-up approach arising from the fundamental atomistic and nano science
Building from bottom-up

How uncertainty propagates through scales?

As these computational codes have limits, so do the experimental and metrology tools. The key is to fill the gaps in knowledge from both approaches and recognize regions of validation in combination with the data uncertainty and more importantly **identify appropriate and strategic problems to solve**
HOW WE BUILD PMI THEORY?
Uncertainty Quantification
Quantifying uncertainty in computer simulations
Sensitivity Analysis (which parameters are most important?)
Variability Analysis (intrinsic variation associated with physical system)
Uncertainty Analysis (degree of confidence in data and models)

Uncertainty quantification in computer simulations is an active & recent research area: A key for credible predictions

Currently applied in: Meteorology, Geology, Engineering (FEM-codes)
Military Research (Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative (ASCI (2000))).

Recent international workshop at Stony Brook U. brought together physicists in plasma, materials and atomic physics and UQ mathematicians to help developing UQ in fusion related sciences: Adequate algorithms exist, need to be adapted by joined effort,
http://www.iacs.stonybrook.edu/uq/pages/workshop
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METHODS: Use all tools available and reasonable

Classical Molecular Dynamics (CMD) with REAXFF method and potentials

*What is CMD?*

In generic sense method which solves Newton equations of motion of all atoms in a sample. Atoms mutually interact with forces which are determined by gradient of the potential, which is given in advance. Classical potential for a given mixture of atoms is a fit of many parameters, fit functions define various potentials (BOP, EAM,....) +parameters calculated by QM (usually DFT)+ Empirical (exp.) parameters. **CMD is as good as the potential used is good.**

*Why do we chose REAXFF potential?* It is BOP, i.e. simulate chemistry within accuracy, has showed good in other applications.

LAMMPS with REAXFF is capable to re-calculate charges at the atoms after each step or number of steps, using EEM, EEM: semi-empirical, semi-quantum method. **CMD cannot calculate anything with electron cloud.**

*Why do we need EEM?* Our atoms have different electronegativities. Thus, Li has 0.94, B has ~2, C and H have ~2.5, O has 3.4. This means atoms could mutually charge and long range Coulomb forces will influence dynamics.

Quantum Classical Molecular Dynamics (QCMD) with SCC-DFTB quantum component

*What is QCMD?*

Each time step (fraction of fs) freeze all atoms and solve QM problem for all electrons. From this it follows QM potential and its gradient gives forces, to move atoms between the steps by CMD with QM “frozen”. **Why we chose SCC-DFTB?** It is a good approximation to DFT, the QM method, which is about 1000 times faster than DFT. QCMD is still 1000 slower than CMD, but about 100 times slower than REAXFF-CMD (because of EEM). QM component of QCMD calculates all charges and forces dynamically, **no need for potential defined in advance**, or EEM to treat charging.

Because QCMD is here 100 slower than CMD, we do CMD but verify the results occasionally by QCMD.
Classical MD is only as good as the interatomic potential model used

Most advanced: hydro-carbon potential developed for chemistry
- Brenner, 1990, 2002: REBO, short range, 0.2nm
- more sophisticated AIREBO (Stuart, 2000, 2004, 1.1 nm)
- > 400 semi-empirical parameters, “bond order”, chemistry

Adaptive Intermolecular Reactive Bond Order (AIREBO) potential: torsion, dispersion, Van der Waals,

EX: MD calc. of reflection coeff.
- Significant sensitivity to changes in potential model for some processes
- Experimental validation essential to establish credible MD simulation.
- Interatomic potentials for W, Be, C exist (talk of Nordlund)
- Experimental validation?

Improvements to CH potentials done (Kent et al, 2010)
New Li-C-H-O potentials being developed (Dadras et al, ...)
Examples of verification of CMD/REAXFF vs. QCMD

Configuration with Li, C, O bombarded by D

Filled symbols is CMD/REAXFF

How efficient are various constituents of a surface in bonding D?

In BCOD with 20% O and 20% of B, bonding of D to O suppressed by B?

Both methods give this effects qualitatively, numbers somewhat different

IAEA CRP: Atomic Data for Vapor Shielding in Fusion Devices, RCM#1, Vienna
More examples of validation with experiment

Experiment: MAPP in NSTX-U

Boronization B(CD3)3

Calculation (--> done for 20% of B and O and 60% of C following exp (above)

XPS at days of
Approx. conc. as left
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(Krstic et al, Nucl. Fusion 57 086050, 2017)

IAEA CRP: Atomic Data for Vapor Shielding in Fusion Devices,
RCM#1, Vienna
Preparation of a target surface: learned from experiment

1) **Populate amorphous carbon cell** with desired % of Li, B, O atoms randomly distributed. Size of the cell depends on the desired impact energy.

2) **Heat, anneal it** until all atoms sit “comfortably” in their potential chairs.

3) **Thermalize** the sample to desired T (usually 300K-most of the experiments).

4) If study hydrogenated sample at a given impact energy, **bombard the sample with H (D)** and register the implanted % (after each impact stabilizes thermalize the sample, relax).

5) The 2D **periodicity in the** surface direction is applied in all steps: Surface boundary.

---

**BCO cell bombarded by 5 eV D (yellow)**

**IAEA CRP: Atomic Data for Vapor Shielding in Fusion Devices, RCM#1, Vienna**

**Implanted D (in Li-C-O)**
Method of calculation for any variable

1) Take the **target cell, prepared** for a particular energy, temperature,..., with a desired % of accumulated D

2) **Vary** a position of the **impact particle randomly** over the surface, defining impact trajectories

3) **Repeat the impact** of each of these trajectories and do full computation (**typically 5,000 trajectories**)

4) Calculate the desired results for each trajectory, and do **statistics** over all trajectories (ME, SD, SE,...).

- **Repeat** the procedure of **preparation** and MC bombardment **for each set of input parameters** (impact energy and angle, T, surface mixture,...)

  **Do not apply thermostat during the collision cascade!!!**

- Verify and validate, present results (ME +SE)
Examples of the successes of the atomistic approaches to PMI processes

Remarkable agreement of theory & beam exp’t when simulation prepare the sample at the level of nanoscale (fluence) to mimic exp’t. No fitting parameters!

Chemical sputtering of carbon

LITHIUM
Presence of Li requires QM approach on nm scale, resulted in answer:
If there is a SIGNIFICANT amount of oxygen on surface with lithium present in the graphite matrix, OXYGEN becomes the main player in retention-erosion chemistry; NOT LITHIUM!!!

Main challenges and opportunities in the new phenomenologies lay by far in the lithium based divertor!!!
RESULTS

1) D retention in Li-C-O (2013, 2017)

2) Chemical sputtering by D impacts of Li-C-O (2018)
Dominguez et al, J. of Nucl. Mat. 492, 56 (2017)

3) D retention in Li and oxidized Li as function of T (90-650K) (2018)

4) D retention and reflection, sputtering of solid Li by D and D\textsubscript{2} (5-200eV) (2019)
Review: Krstic et al, Matter and Radiation at Extremes 3, 165 (2018), and references therein (on all Li and boron processes)
Bedoya et al, Scientific Reports (Nature) 9, 2435 (2019), and references therein (on boron processes)
D retention in Li-C-O (2013, 2017)

Oxygen role!!!
Experiments from Purdue and NSTX (PPPL) indicate higher retention and lower erosion rate with D whenever Li present in C, however XPS diagnostics show dominating D-O-C chemistry. Why – was the question?

From experiments: There was correlation between hydrogen irradiation and the behavior change of the O(1s) and C(1s) peaks ONLY IN THE PRESENCE OF LITHIUM.

The Li(1s) peak was always invariant???

But theory says:

D has only a slight preference for interacting with Li rather than with C.

Krstic et al., FED (2012)

Challenge!
Simulations: How much is uptake of D correlated to O and Li contents?

If there is a significant amount of oxygen on surface with lithium present in the graphite matrix, oxygen becomes the main player in retention-erosion chemistry; not lithium!!!

Prediction from simulation:

If there is a significant amount of oxygen on surface with lithium present in the graphite matrix, oxygen becomes the main player in retention-erosion chemistry; not lithium!!!

How did we do this?

SCC--DFTB method, QCMD + REAXFF, QMD
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Simulation of deuterium impact to lithiated and oxidized carbon surface (quantum-classical approach, DFTB)

- Cell of \textbf{a few hunredis atoms} of lithiated and oxidated amorphous carbon
- (~20\% of Li, \textbf{and/or} ~20\% of O), at \textbf{300K}

How?
- By random seed of Li and O in \textbf{amorphous carbon} and \textbf{energy minimization}, followed by thermalization
- bombarded by \textbf{5 eV D} atoms, up to 500fs for the full evolution
- \textbf{Perpendicularly} to the shell interface

- \textbf{5004 random trajectories} (embarrassingly parallel runs at Jaguar, Kraken); Time step \textbf{1 fs}; 30,000-50,000 CPU hours per run, number of runs > 10.
Analysis

Partial charge method

Integrated
distribution

Normalized
counts (a.u.)

Matrix composition:
A
B
C
D
E

-0.3 0.0 0.3
-0.3 0.0 0.3
-0.3 0.0 0.3
-0.3 0.0 0.3

Partial Charge (e)

Nearest neighbors method

Matrix composition:
A
B
C
D
E

100%
80%
60%
52%
80%

Li
Li
O
C

Counts (a.u.)

Nearest Neighbor Distance (Å)

Normalized
distribution

Quantitative results

Retention
Reflection

Total
Carbon

Probability per D (%)

Stimulating yield (%)

Surface configuration

Surface configuration

A = Carbon
B = Li-C (20%-80%)
C = Li-C-O (20%-60%-20%)
D = Li-C-O-D (16%-52%-16%-16%)
E = C-O (80%-20%)

IAEA CRP: Atomic Data for Vapor Shielding in Fusion Devices, RCM#1, Vienna

13-15 March, 2019
Sanity check!

How to get high concentrations of Oxygen in the surface? How could we study 100’s of eV and keV impacts with 5 eV D?

D interactions with lithiated graphite

- (left) The surface chemistry is found independent of the incident energy
- (right) With lithium on graphite, surface concentration of Oxygen increased upon bombardment by D

At most 5% oxygen content on the surface of NON-LITHIATED graphite... AS EXPECTED.

With lithium one gets 10% of Oxygen

IMPORTANT: with LOW-ENERGY IRRADIATION one gets 20-40% oxygen on the surface.

..... B/C LITHIUM BRINGS IT THERE WHEN LITHIATED GRAPHITE IS IRRADIATED.
It is not Lithium that suppresses erosion of C, and increases retention of H

**OXYGEN** plays the key role in the binding of hydrogen.

**Lithium is the oxygen getter:** Lithiation of C brings **A LOT OF Oxygen inside C and this the main role of Li.**

If there is a **SIGNIFICANT amount of oxygen** on surface with lithium present in the graphite matrix, **OXYGEN becomes the main player; NOT LITHIUM!!!** Oxygen and Oxygen-Carbon bond D strongly: suppressing erosion & increasing D retention.

... consistent with the XPS data!!

Chemical sputtering by D impacts of Li-C-O (2018)
Sputtering of lithium configurations

Total sputtering of the Components Li, C, O

Li suppresses C sputtering (except at lowest energies)
Oxygen further suppresses carbon and total sputtering

Hydrocarbons sputtering large, oxygen suppresses

LiD decreases with energy for LiC:D, and is much smaller for LiCO:D
With O the dominant molecular products LiO, OD, OC

IAEA CRP: Atomic Data for Vapor Shielding in Fusion Devices, RCM#1, Vienna
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Sputtering as would be seen by mass spectrograph

LiC:D  Li dominant product  LiCO:D

Atomic C and O also the main sputtering products
C2D2, CO and LiO at all energies
Sputtered translational energy and angular spectra

**Gray line average over energies**

**Solid angle distribution of ejected carbon atoms and CDx molecules from the LiCO:D surface**

Shaded areas: sput distributions at various impact energies

Symbols: average, solid curves are best fits \((\cos \theta)^a\)

Confidence level >0.99
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D retention in Li and oxidized Li as function of T (90-650K)
Computation: MD with REAXFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature (K)</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>305</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Li₂O</td>
<td>Li atoms</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>1329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O atoms</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Atomic content for Li and Li₂O target surfaces; Langevin thermostat

O-D and Li-D NNs similarly represented!!

Indicates similar efficiency of H or D retention in Li and Li₂O surfaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T (K)</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>305</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Li-D (%)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-D (%)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Atomic content for Li-D and O-D bonds at various T
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Results and comparison with experiment  

Temperature programmed desorption (TPD)  
Bruce Koel group, PU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature (K)</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>560</th>
<th>600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>D_{ret} %</td>
<td>D_{ret} %</td>
<td>D_{ret} %</td>
<td>D_{ret} %</td>
<td>D_{ret} %</td>
<td>D_{ret} %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li$_2$O</td>
<td>4632</td>
<td>91.90</td>
<td>3807</td>
<td>75.53</td>
<td>3472</td>
<td>68.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H$_{ret}$</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>H$_{ret}$ %</td>
<td>H$_{ret}$ %</td>
<td>H$_{ret}$ %</td>
<td>H$_{ret}$ %</td>
<td>H$_{ret}$ %</td>
<td>H$_{ret}$ %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>4471</td>
<td>88.701</td>
<td>3630</td>
<td>72.027</td>
<td>3117</td>
<td>61.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13-15 March, 2019  
IAEA CRP: Atomic Data for Vapor Shielding in Fusion Devices, RCM#1, Vienna
D retention and reflection, sputtering of Li by D and \( \text{D}_2 \) (5-200eV)

(In preparation for publication)
CONCLUDING REMARKS and LOOK at FUTURE PLANS

• We have shown published results for retention, sputtering and surface chemistry of Li-C-O:D amorphous mixtures at 300K at chosen impact energies of D, as well as retention of D in Li and Li-O in a range of temperatures (90-650K).
• We have also shown new results for sputtering, reflection and retention of amorphous Li surface by impact of D and D₂, in range 5-200 eV at room T. Validation with available experiments or computations has been done.

Remarks: The PMI theory has a strong need for exascale (and quantum “if”) computing for:
• Integration of the plasma simulation codes and first principles PMI codes at mesoscale (should be doable in next 10 years)
  Example: SOL and turbulence transport (XGC1)+neutral particle transport (DEGAS 2) with surface damage & erosion (SPARKS) + particle transport, dust, redeposition (PALABOS)
• Uncertainty Quantification for plasma and PMI modeling
  Relevant to tokamak plasmas: Data interpretation/analysis, validation of theory, prediction to support “decision making” UQ in tokamak models necessary to support validation (uncertainty in inputs); need for research into the UQ due to model inadequacy; advanced algorithms can help; Should be doable now, but changes in culture of theorists needed.

This year plans:
• Sputtering, reflection and retention of D, D2 (or adequate single charged ions) of fully deuterated amorphous Li at 300K (amorphous), range of impact energies 5-200 eV.
• Simulation of evolution of the layers chemistry and morphology upon evaporative deposition techniques of Li and Li₂O Layers on Mo
• Deciphering evolution of the oxidation of Li layers; chemistry and temperature dependence.
Thank you!