Spectroscopic investigations on energy, angular and atomic level distribution functions of sputtered tungsten

S. Ertmer, O. Marchuk, S. Dickheuer, S. Brezinsek, A. Kreter

Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH - Institut für Energie- und Klimaforschung - Plasmaphysik, Partner of the Trilateral Euregio Cluster (TEC), 52425 Jülich, Germany

Joint IAEA-FZJ Technical Meeting on Collisional-Radiative Properties of W and Hydrogen in Edge Plasma of Fusion Devices – 31 March 2021





This work has been carried out within the framework of the EUROfusion Consortium and has received funding from the Euratom research and training programme 2014-2018 and 2019-2020 under grant agreement No 633053. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the European Commission.



MOTIVATION

- Tungsten (W) proposed as PFM in divertor (ITER, DEMO) and main chamber (DEMO)
- Lifetime of PFM determined by sputtering
- Erosion of W leads to cooling of plasma and needs to be monitored
- Spectroscopy as tool to monitor W gross erosion

 \rightarrow Understanding of the atomic data and the ongoing processes is essential





MOTIVATION

Physical sputtering

- Occurs at solid surfaces at plasma boundary
- Depends on impact energy and incident angle of incoming particles
- Sputtering at high impact energies well understood
- In fusion research impact energy in the range of 100 eV
- Energy and angular distribution of sputtered atoms remains open question
- Sputtering in ground and/or excited level





[2] R. Behrisch and W. Eckstein "Sputtering by Particle Bombardment", Springer-Verlag (2007)

3

MOTIVATION

Experimental facility PSI-2



conditions	argon plasma		
Τ _e	≈3 eV		
n _e	≈ 1 ·10 ¹² cm ⁻³		
E _{imp}	Up to 150 eV		
В	92 mT		
T _{surf}	300 K		





OUTLINE

- I. Line shape of sputtered atoms
- II. Atomic level population of sputtered tungsten





Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft

Motivation

- Knowledge of absolute intensity I_{tot} is essential to determine the gross erosion
- Light reflection impacts the measured intensity values and line shape
- Light reflection in a carbon machine was investigated in [4], research on reflection of metallic walls (W) is needed



7

[4] N.H. Brooks et al. 2005 J. Nucl. Mater. 227–231[5] refractiveindex.info for W: Werner et al. 2009 DFT calculations; for C : Larruquert et al. 2013



31 March 2021



Motivation: Energy and angular distribution of sputtered atoms

High ion impact energy [6]:

Thompson energy distribution F(E) [7]:

$$F(E) = \frac{E}{(E+E_{\rm b})^{n+1}} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{E}{E_{\rm max}}}\right)$$

E = Energy of sputtered atoms,

 $E_{\rm b} = {\rm surface \ binding \ energy},$





[6] R. Behrisch and W. Eckstein "Sputtering by Particle Bombardment", Springer-Verlag, 2007 [7] M W Thompson 1968 Phil. Mag. 18 377-414

Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft

Cosine angular distribution $G(\Theta)$:

$$G(\Theta) \propto \cos^b(\Theta)$$

 $\Theta = \text{polar angle},$ b = 1 (scaling parameter).

Low ion impact energy:

Deviations from Thompson energy (n>2) and cosine angular (heart shape) distribution are reported





Method



Doppler shift:

$$\lambda = \lambda_0 \sqrt{\frac{c-v}{c+v}}$$

 $\lambda = \text{detected wavelength},$ $\lambda_0 = \text{emitted wavelength},$ c = speed of light,v = particle velocity.

Effect has been observed for fast H atoms in PSI-2 [8]





Experimental results

• Stronger line shape deformation for AI than for W (proof of principle)

 $\frac{\Delta\lambda}{\lambda} \propto \sqrt{\frac{2E_{kin}}{m}}$

- Only explanation is light reflection
- Erosion of surface leads to decrease in reflection





Al-target before and after exposure

Al-target in argon plasma E_{impact} ≈ 110 eV





31 March 2021

Model

Doppler-shifted emission model based on [9]:

- Point source approximation
- Cosine angular distribution $G(\Theta) \propto \cos^b(\Theta)$
- Light reflection at the surface

Adapted:

• Energy distribution = Thompson energy distribution

Expanded:

- Zeeman-effect
- Instrumental broadening





4982.4 4982.45 4982.5 4982.55 4982.6 4982.65 4982.7 4982.75 4982.8

Wavelength [Å]



[9] S. Dickheuer et. al Physics of Plasmas 26, 073513 (2019)

31 March 2021

Page 11

Intensity [arb. unit]



Results

Impact energy	70 eV	90 eV	110 eV	130 eV	150 eV
n	2.17	2.12	2.04	2.00	1.99
Reflection [%]	54	53	54	55	55

- Good agreement using Thompson energy and cosine angular distribution
- \rightarrow Same as for high impact energies
- Good agreement for literature values of reflection ≈ 53% [5]

W-target in argon plasma: Variation of impact energy



[5] W. S. M. Werner et al. J. Phys Chem Ref. Data 38, (2009) 1013-1092

intensity [arb. unit]

Results



SDTrimSP simulations [10] for Ar ions at $E_{\rm imp} = 150 \, {\rm eV}$

Angular distribution



Energy distribution of SDTrimSP: good agreement only for over-cosine (b>1) in angular distribution

Especially for high energetic part of the spectrum

[10] A. Mutzke et al. IPP-Report 2019-02, (2019)

14





Summary

- Proof of light reflection in the line shape of sputtered atoms
- In-situ light reflection measurements by modeling
- Energy distribution modeled from line shape
- Good agreement for Thompson energy and cosine angular distribution
- SDTrimSP energy distribution only good agreement for over-cosine

Outlook

- Expand model to 2D source for angular and energy distribution modeling
- Benchmark angular distribution with spatial intensity development
- Investigation of impact of surface morphology on angular and energy distribution





Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft

Motivation

- Initial atomic energy level population distribution of sputtered W is unknown
 - important for analysis of spectroscopic data
 - not well understood
 - TEXTOR experiments: population according to effective temperature T_w led to unphysical electron temperature T_e (1 eV) [12]
 - Ion beam experiments using different materials: population in the ground level (>95 %) [13]

Grotrian diagram of W





[11] nist.gov (visited on 24.11.2020)[12] I. Beigman et al. Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion (2007) 49 1833

[13] A. P. Yalin et. al. Applied optics (2005) Vol. 44 6496

Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft

17

Method





Method

$$\frac{dN_i}{dt} = -\sum_{j < i} N_i A_{ij} + n_e N_0 \langle v_e \sigma_X \rangle$$

• Position of maximum line intensity is proportional to velocity and reciprocal Einstein coefficient:

$$d = v \cdot \tau = \frac{v}{\sum A_{ij}}$$

• Angular distribution of sputtered particles leads to:

$$d \approx \frac{v}{2\sum A_{ij}}$$

 Ionisation and geometrical losses lead to decreasing intensity



Results



electron configuration [11]

Wavelength (Å)	Lower level	Einstein coefficient (s ⁻¹)	Einstein coefficient upper level (s ⁻¹) [11]	Relative proportion
4982.593	⁵ D ₀	4.17E+5	5.31E+5	0.79
4008.751	⁷ S ₃	1.63E+7	1.65E+7	0.99



[11] nist.gov (visited on 24.11.2020) Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft

Results

- Experimental data: maximum of both lines at the same position
- $d \approx \frac{v}{2\sum A_{ij}}$
- According to Thompson energy distribution [7]: $v \approx 2100 \,\mathrm{m\,s^{-1}}$
- Agreement only for ground term ⁵D₀



21



Wavelength (Å)	Lower level	Einstein coefficient (s ⁻¹)	Einstein coefficient upper level (s ⁻¹) [11]	Relative proportion
4982.593	⁵ D ₀	4.17E+5	5.31E+5	0.79
4008.751	⁷ S ₃	1.63E+7	1.65E+7	0.99

[7] M W Thompson 1968 Phil. Mag. 18 377–414

[12] A. Goehlich et. al. J. Nucl. Mater. 1999 Vol.266-269 501-506

[11] nist.gov (visited on 24.11.2020)



Results



Wavelength (Å)	Lower level	Position maximum (mm)	Einstein coefficient upper level (s ⁻¹) [11]	Calculated velocity (m/s)	Relative proportion
4982.593	⁵ D ₀	2.34	5.31E+5	1952	0.79
4294.605	⁷ S ₃	2.21	1.32E+7	58212	0.94

[11] nist.gov (visited on 24.11.2020)

Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft

31 March 2021



Results



Wavelength (Å)	Lower level	Position maximum (mm)	Einstein coefficient upper level (s ⁻¹) [11]	Calculated velocity (m/s)	Relative proportion
4982.593	⁵ D ₀	2.34	5.31E+5	1952	0.79
4843.810	⁵ D ₂	1.80	3.37E+6	12132	0.56

[11] nist.gov (visited on 24.11.2020)

Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft

31 March 2021



Results



Wavelength (Å)	Lower level	Position maximum (mm)	Einstein coefficient upper level (s ⁻¹) [11]	Calculated velocity (m/s)	Relative proportion
4982.593	⁵ D ₀	2.34	5.31E+5	1952	0.79
4244.367	⁵ D ₄	4.05	1.44E+6	11664	0.96

[11] nist.gov (visited on 24.11.2020)

Mitglied der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft

CH

Forschungszentrum

Summary

- High spatial resolution spectroscopy measurements
- For a cold target (T_{surf}= 300 K) and mono-energetic incident ions in the order of 100 eV, W atoms are sputtered in the ground state ⁵D₀
- Exited levels 7S_3 and ${}^5D_{x>0}$ are not populated during sputtering

Outlook

- Further investigation with different lines, target temperatures, gases and plasma parameters
- Laser absorption measurements and Laser induced fluorescence (LIF) measurements in front of the target (direct measurements of population)

