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Magneto-Inertial Fusion Technology Inc. has been working on a Z-pinch concept where a high atomic number liner is compressing a fusion fuel (deuterium-deuterium, or deuterium-tritium) target. The viability of this so called Staged Z-pinch (SZP) concept as a potential high-gain fusion energy source has been questioned in a recent publication by Lindemuth et al. The authors attempted to reproduce previously published MACH2 simulation results for Z-machine parameters using three different MHD codes: Hydra, Raven and MHRDR. Their conclusion was that “there is no conceivable modification of the parameters that would lead to high-gain fusion conditions using these other codes”. Although they used well-established MHD codes to check the SZP concept, and correct input current profiles, we show that their Lagrangian formalism was likely not treating the vacuum/liner boundary properly. Proper modeling using Lagrangian, Eulerian or Adaptive Lagrangian-Eulerian (ALE) formalism indeed confirms that fusion energy production > 1 MJ can be expected without alpha heating, and significantly higher if alpha heating is included. It is shown that magnetosonic shocks play an important role in preheating the target plasma and in piling liner mass at the liner/target interface, which substantially increases the ram pressure just before the pinch stagnation time.

I. INTRODUCTION

Z-pinch are one of the first thermonuclear fusion energy ideas explored. The earliest observations of deuterium-deuterium fusion neutrons from Z-pinch were reported in 1950s, but the classical magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) and magnetio Rayleigh-Taylor (MRT) instabilities limited the fusion yield. In the late 1970s, Amnon Fisher and collaborators at the University of California, Irvine (UCI), created the first gas puff Z-pinch using a 200-kA pulsed power generator. Use of gas mixtures enhanced the pinch stability and increased its radiation efficiency. Preionization with electron beams improved the uniformity of the initial-breakdown in a gas puff Z-pinch and increased the magnetic flux compression, allowing amplification of the axial magnetic field and stabilization of the Z-pinch. Later on gas puff Z-pinch experiments were undertaken on several multi megamperes pulse power generators with a goal of increasing either the X-ray and stabilization of the Z-pinch radiation efficiency to I. R. Lindemuth et al.

Our recent experiments at the 1 MA Nevada Terawatt Facility (University of Nevada, Reno) investigated the compression of a deuterium target by argon (Z=18) and krypton (Z=36) liners. The pinch implosion dynamics was studied with the radiation-MHD code MACH2 using initial conditions approximating the experiments. MACH2 simulations confirmed the diffusion of the azimuthal magnetic field through the liner, indicating that the associated magnetic field pressure contributed to the target acceleration. Shock waves then develop in the target plasma, preheating it to several hundred eV. Finally, the target is adiabatically compressed to stagnation, reaching volume-averaged ion temperatures, for the krypton liner case, of 4 keV. Neutron yields of up to
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Magnetized Liner Inertial Fusion (MagLIF) experiments are carried on this machine, where a beryllium liner is used to compress laser preheated deuterium target plasma. This preheating scheme introduces additional complexities (for example, the uniformity of the laser energy deposition and the propagation of the burn wave) which are under active investigation.

The Z Pulsed Power Facility at the Sandia National Laboratory is the most powerful Z-pinch machine in the world. It has 20 MJ stored energy in large capacitor banks and can deliver up to a 26 MA load current pulse with a 100 ns rise time. Megajoules of X-ray energy over a few nanosecond period were radiated in plasmas created from wire array loads. Such plasmas are of great scientific and technical interest, for example in studies related to fusion, atomic physics and laboratory astrophysics. More recently, extensive Magnetized Liner Inertial Fusion (MagLIF) experiments are carried on this machine, where a beryllium liner is used to compress laser preheated deuterium target plasma. This preheating scheme introduces additional complexities (for example, the uniformity of the laser energy deposition and the propagation of the burn wave) which are under active investigation.

Our recent experiments at the 1 MA Nevada Terawatt Facility (University of Nevada, Reno) investigated the compression of a deuterium target by argon (Z=18) and krypton (Z=36) liners. The pinch implosion dynamics was studied with the radiation-MHD code MACH2 using initial conditions approximating the experiments. MACH2 simulations confirmed the diffusion of the azimuthal magnetic field through the liner, indicating that the associated magnetic field pressure contributed to the target acceleration. Shock waves then develop in the target plasma, preheating it to several hundred eV. Finally, the target is adiabatically compressed to stagnation, reaching volume-averaged ion temperatures, for the krypton liner case, of 4 keV. Neutron yields of up to
$2 \times 10^9$ were measured in argon, and up to $2.5 \times 10^{19}$ in krypton liner experiments, and they were in reasonable agreement with the MACH2 predictions.

The shock aided preheating in the Staged Z-pinch has inherent simplicity, and the preheating strength is largely determined by the implosion velocity and the atomic composition of the liner. In a recent paper by Lindemuth et al., the viability of the SZP concept as a potential high gain fusion energy source was questioned. The authors attempted to reproduce our published MACH2 results for the Z-machine by using three different MHD codes (Hydra, Raven and MHRDR) running in 1-D Lagrangian mode, and they concluded that "there is no conceivable modification of the parameters that would lead to high gain fusion conditions using these or any other codes". They also recommended that SZP should not be considered as a potential high-gain fusion energy source.

Our papers were identified as SZP1, SZP2, and SZP3; they all modeled compression of a 50-50 % deuterium-tritium target. For the sake of clarity and brevity, in this paper we discuss only the SZP2 case. We tested the other two cases, SZP1 and SZP3, and confirmed that they produce high fusion gain as well.

In section II we reproduce the SZP2 results of Lindemuth et al. by running the MACH2 code in 1-D Lagrangian mode and by using their computational grid: one liner block and one target block, with 64 grid points in each block. This verifies the code as a SZP modeling tool. We further show that this set-up is not appropriate as it leads to too few computational cells in the outermost liner region, and an incorrect calculation of the azimuthal magnetic field $B_\theta$. When a dedicated, third vacuum block is added to the simulation, the problems with the $B_\theta$ profile calculation are alleviated and the plasma current calculated from Ampere’s law at the liner/vacuum boundary is identical to the current calculated from circuit equations. We want to point out that in most of our simulations the current is derived from circuit equations, with dynamically calculated pinch inductance and resistance at each time step. This current in essence drives the simulation, which next calculates the $B_\theta$ magnetic field, the induced current in the plasma, the associated ohmic heating, and so on. The three block Lagrangian simulation predicts much higher fusion energy yield, especially when $\alpha$-particle heating is included. We confirmed these results by running 1-D pure Eulerian and ALE simulations.

In section III we discuss the important role of shocks in plasma preheating, and in concentrating mass at the liner/target boundary which enables significant final adiabatic target heating. Improperly calculated azimuthal magnetic field $B_\theta$ results in weaker shocks, less mass concentration and weaker ram pressure in the last nanosecond of the target compression which limits its temperature growth to 1 keV.

More realistic, two dimensional simulation results based on high resolution pure Eulerian and ALE models are presented in section IV. The role of $\alpha$-particle heating and plasma radiation are discussed at length in section V.

II. STAGED Z-PINCH 1-D LAGRANGIAN MACH2 SIMULATIONS: CODE VERIFICATION

Any code attempting to simulate a real physical system has to undergo verification and validation. Code verification confirms that the computer model describing the system is correctly implemented, while code validation compares the simulation results with measurements and gives credence to the code usefulness for analyzing the physical system.

The Multi-block Arbitrary Coordinate Hydromagnetic (MACH2) code is a multi-material, single fluid, three temperature resistive MHD code, developed by the Center for Plasma Theory and Computation at the Air Force Research Laboratory, Phillips Research Site. It solves for the following set of equations: mass continuity, single fluid momentum, electron and ion specific internal energy, radiation energy and the Faraday’s law for the magnetic field. The radiative losses are calculated with a single-group, flux limited, non-equilibrium radiation model. Plasma equations of state and transport variables (radiation opacities, thermal and electrical conductivities, etc.) are obtained from the LANL SESAME tables.

This 2 1/2 dimensional code has an adaptive mesh generator which can adjust the computational grid according to user specified criteria. Its Arbitrary Lagrangian-Eulerian (ALE) implementation allows simulations to be run in pure Lagrangian, pure Eulerian, pure Eulerian axially and Lagrangian radially, or any other combination. The adaptive algorithm can adjust the grid spacing, depending on the magnetic field or plasma pressure gradients (or both), providing increased computational accuracy in regions with large spatial changes of these quantities while, in principle, conserving computational time. The fixed Eulerian method, where the computational grid is constant for all time steps in the simulation, is the most straightforward to conceptualize and analyze. However, to properly resolve important phenomena driving the system dynamics, it may require subdividing the simulation domain into numerous blocks with a sufficiently high number of cells in each block.

MACH2 has been successfully used for studies of plasma opening switches, explosive magnetic generators, inertial-confinement fusion and alternate fusion concepts, compact toroid schemes, and Z-pinches with solid liners. Therefore, the code itself has been extensively verified and validated. A possible question remains whether it was correctly used in our SZP simulations; in particular, whether adequate boundary conditions and spatial resolution were provided.

Limited computational resources at our disposal years ago led us to use the ALE method for our previous papers. For this paper all three major methods were used: pure Lagrangian, pure Eulerian and ALE with feedback on magnetic field and plasma pressure gradients. Both R-space (1-D) and RZ-space (2-D) calculations were done.

MACH2 has a self consistent circuit modeling capability, and it has been modified to accurately model the refurbished Z pulsed power machine at Sandia National Laboratory. The simplified R-L circuit has the follow-
Lindemuth et al. correctly state that "Although various test problems can be used for partial verification, at some point, only code comparisons such as reported in this paper will provide confidence that the simulations can accurately guide an experimental program". Therefore, our first attempt was to verify the MACH2 model of the Staged Z-pinch by using exactly the same parameters as those used in the Hydra, Raven and MHRDR models; computational grid with only one liner and one target block, with 64 grid points in each of them; initial target density of $9.8 \times 10^{-3}$ gm/cm$^3$ from 0 to 2 mm; initial silver liner density of 0.6 gm/cm$^3$ with uniform distribution from 2 mm to 3 mm; and initial temperature of 2.0 eV applied to both regions. The silver liner opacities are not publicly available, so we and Lindemuth et al. use opacities for dysprosium (SESMAE material 212).

Figure 1 illustrates the three distinct SZP regions (target, radiative liner and vacuum), the plasma current flowing predominantly at the inner liner/vacuum boundary, the azimuthal magnetic field created, and the Lorentz force $\mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B}$ which compresses the pinch.

We studied two 1-D pure Lagrangian models driven by current calculated from the circuit equation, and compared their results with the Raven code: one with two blocks, each of them with 64 cells, and another, which is extension of the first, where a third cell vacuum block extending from 3.0mm to 3.1mm was added. Vacuum in the three block model is defined as a very low density plasma region, with high resistivity, so that the magnetic flux can rapidly diffuse through it. In figures 2, 3, 4 and 5 we refer to these models as $\text{Lag}_{2\text{blk}}$ and $\text{Lag}_{3\text{blk}}$, and use the alpha suffix if $\alpha$-particle heating was calculated.

We also run a third model driven by current from the Lindemuth et al. paper. Note that we digitized the current from that publication, which in turn must have been digitized from our publication. The model has three blocks: a 225 cell liner block, a 100 cell target block, and a 30 cell vacuum block, where the outer vacuum boundary is fixed at 3.1cm. In pure Lagrangian simulations the computational grid moves with the plasma fluid which preserves high resolution in each block as the plasma profiles steepen. If the outer vacuum boundary is fixed, the pinch compression leaves wider and wider vacuum regions behind; having a fixed number of grid points, the spatial resolution in this region becomes coarse, resulting in a crude calculation of the magnetic field. We refer to this simulation as $\text{Lag}_{3\text{blk}}_{\text{hydra}}$, because that was apparently the model used in the 1-D Hydra code simulation.

Currents from this Lagrangian study are compared in Fig.2. The two and three block pure Lagrangian currents are essentially indistinguishable until the stagnation time (125.87 ns for $\text{Lag}_{2\text{blk}}$ and 127.01 ns for $\text{Lag}_{3\text{blk}}$). Subsequently, they start deviating and a particularly steep rise is seen in the $\text{Lag}_{3\text{blk}}_{\text{alpha}}$ case. The post-stagnation current evolution in the two block models (with and without alpha heating) is indistinguishable.

In Fig.3 the time evolution of: (a) interface radii, (b) interface velocities, and (c) mass averaged fuel temperatures are compared with the corresponding waveforms from the Raven code. We chose the Raven code curves because they were easier to distinguish in the Lindemuth et al. paper; the curves for the other two codes were similar but were often obscured with identification letters and thus more difficult to digitize.

The radial position and velocity of the liner/target interface is quite similar for both models and codes. For the two block Lagrangian model, the mass averaged fuel temperature peaks at 1 keV which is the same value as in the Raven case; addition of $\alpha$-particle heating in the model does not change the maximum temperature. For the three block Lagrangian model, the temperature continues rising to 2.8 keV and dramatically increases.
to 60 keV when α-particle heating is included, as highlighted in 3(d). The mass averaged fuel temperature the Lag\_3blk\_hydra model also peaks at 1 keV (not shown).

The pinch compression dynamics is illustrated in Fig. 4. The two block Lagrangian model has very similar compression trajectory to the Raven case, with peak compression ratio \( CR_{\text{max}} \sim 64 \). The three block Lagrangian models exhibit significant shock preheating from 30 eV to 160 eV over just 2.7 ns (119.6-122.3 ns) when the corresponding compression ratio increases from 4 to 6.7; their peak mass averaged temperatures are 2.8 keV and 60 keV, depending whether α-particle heating is included or not.

What is the reason for such significant difference between the two and three block pure Lagrangian simulations? Ampere’s law states that at all times the current driving the pinch should be:

\[ I(t) = 5.0 \times R(t) \times B_\theta(t), \]

where \( B_\theta \) is the azimuthal magnetic field in Gauss, calculated at the outer liner radius R, which is in cm. This current should be identical to the current driving the simulation, regardless of whether it is calculated from circuit equations or provided as direct input. Figure 5 shows that this is the case with the three block, but not with the two block pure Lagrangian simulation, where the peak current calculated from Ampere’s law is 8.2% lower. At first glance, it is perplexing why such marginally lower current leads to clamping the mass averaged target temperature to 1 keV (Fig.3d). This question will be explored in the next section where we discuss how the underlying differences in the calculated azimuthal magnetic field lead to quite different adiabatic compression strength near the stagnation time when the compression stops and the pinch starts to expand.

There is larger difference between the current driving the Lag\_3blk\_hydra model and the current derived from Amperes law; their peak values differ by 20.6%. In order to match the pinch implosion time in the SZP2 paper, Lindemuth et al. had to lower the liner mass density by 30% as compared to the one used in SZP2. The apparent problem with the magnetic field calculation is the likely explanation why they had taken this course.

In summary, by reproducing the Lindemuth et al. results (Figs.3,4) with the two block pure Lagrangian model, we verified the MACH2 code.

III. STAGED Z-PINCH 1-D MACH2 SIMULATIONS: FUSION YIELD, AND THE ROLE OF SHOCKS AND RAM PRESSURE

In addition to the Lagrangian models discussed in the previous section, we studied ALE and Eulerian models with various grid resolutions. The 2-D ALE and Eulerian models will be discussed in the next section; here we compare the corresponding 1-D models with the Lagrangian models.

The Eulerian models were defined over five radial blocks: three for fuel plasma (128 cells for 0.0-0.2 mm, \( \Delta R = 1.6 \mu m \); 128 cells for 0.2-1.0 mm, \( \Delta R = 6.25 \mu m \); 64 cells for 1.0-2.0 mm, \( \Delta R = 15.6 \mu m \), one for liner plasma (64 cells for 2.0-3.0 mm, \( \Delta R = 15.6 \mu m \), and one

FIG. 3. Comparison of two and three block 1-D MACH2 pure Lagrangian simulations, with and without alpha heating, with results from the Raven code: (a) radius and (b) implosion velocity, both calculated at the liner/target interface, and (c) mass-averaged fuel temperature. The crucial temperature difference among these simulations is highlighted in (d).
FIG. 4. Comparison of the mass-averaged fuel temperature vs. compression ratio for two and three block 1-D MACH2 pure Lagrangian simulations, with and without alpha heating, with results from the Raven code. The curve sections that raise faster than the CR$^{4/3}$ line indicate shock heating.

FIG. 5. Comparison of the current profile (black) obtained from the circuit equation, with current profiles calculated from Ampere’s Law, for 1-D MACH2 Lagrangian simulations with for 3 blocks (red dots), 2 blocks (blue), and three blocks with fixed vacuum boundary and input current profile from the Lindemuth et al. publication.

for low density vacuum region (16 cells for 3.0-3.1 mm, $\Delta R = 6.25\mu m$).

The ALE models were also defined over five radial blocks: three for fuel plasma (64 cells for 0.0-0.5 mm, $\Delta R = 7.8\mu m$; 64 cells for 0.5-1.0 mm, $\Delta R = 7.8\mu m$; 64 cells for 1.0-2.0 mm, $\Delta R = 15.6\mu m$), one for liner plasma (64 cells for 2.0-3.0 mm, $\Delta R = 15.6\mu m$), and one for low density vacuum region (8 cells for 3.0-3.1 mm, $\Delta R = 12.5\mu m$). They used an adaptive mesh generator, with feedback on both the magnetic field and the plasma pressure spatial gradients, which enabled proper MHD calculations when these quantities rapidly change in a radial grid that was 2-3 times coarser than the Eulerian grid. This leads to a similar spread in the inflection times of the fusion energy curves when they reach >90% of their final values.

The pinch stagnation times and the total fusion energy produced by the various 1-D models are summarized in Table I. Three models with no $\alpha$-heating ($Lag_{3blk}$, ALE_1D and EUL_1D) consistently calculate about 4 MJ; their prediction is about 40-50 times higher when $\alpha$-heating is included. Remarkably, the $Lag_{2blk}$ and $Lag_{3blk}$_hydra models calculate only 30 kJ and 90 kJ; $\alpha$-heating can not change these numbers. Visual representation of these results is shown in Fig.6, which also illustrates how the 1.5ns spread in stagnation times.

A closer look at Fig.3(d) reveals that from 122 ns to 126 ns the $Lag_{3blk}$ mass averaged fuel temperature grows slower than the corresponding temperatures in the Raven and $Lag_{2blk}$ cases. It reached 1 keV at $t=125$ ns, and then in the next 1 ns it peaked at 2.8 keV. This leads to substantially higher thermal pressure close to the stagnation time $T_s$, as illustrated in Fig.7 where $P_{tot} = P_i + P_e$ contour plots are centered around $T_s$ for each individual simulation. The EUL_1D and $Lag_{3blk}$ contour plots look quite similar, with a white central region of high pressure $P_{tot} > 40GBar$; the ALE_1D contour plot (not shown) also looks like these two.

The triangular white spaces outside of the liner/vacuum boundary in the two and three block Lagrangian simulations are due to the shrinkage of the computational domain as the plasma compresses. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$T_{stag}$ (ns)</th>
<th>$E_{fusion}$ (MJ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EUL_1D</td>
<td>125.88</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALE_1D</td>
<td>125.53</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lag_2blk</td>
<td>125.87</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lag_3blk</td>
<td>127.01</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lag_3blk_hydra</td>
<td>125.52</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUL_1D_alpha</td>
<td>125.79</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALE_1D_alpha</td>
<td>125.47</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lag_2blk_alpha</td>
<td>125.87</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lag_3blk_alpha</td>
<td>126.98</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 6. Fusion energy from 1-D MACH2 simulations, with and without alpha heating. The Lagrangian simulation with a hydra suffix is using three blocks, fixed vacuum boundary and input current profile from the Lindemuth et al. publication.
density several times higher than the downstream values. A more in-depth discussion on this topic involving Hugoniot equations is beyond the scope of this paper.

Plasma mass density $\rho$ contour plots for the same set of four 1-D MACH2 simulations from Fig.7 are shown on the left side of Fig.8. Liner mass accumulation is clearly visible starting ~2 ns before the stagnation time, and it is stronger by a factor of 2-3 for the EUL_1D and Lag_3blk models (and the ALE_1D model, which is not shown) compared to the Lag_blk and Lag_blk_hydra models. The liner mass density around $T_s$ is up to two orders of magnitude higher than the solid silver density $\rho_{Ag} = 10.5 \text{ gm/cm}^3$.

The corresponding ram pressure $P_{Ram} = \rho v^2$ contour plots are shown on the right side of Fig.8. They confirm the several times higher ram pressure for the EUL_1D and Lag_3blk models just before stagnation. The higher pressure, through the adiabatic work done on the fuel column, results in a higher fuel thermal energy which can explain why these two models have 2-3 times higher mass averaged fuel ion temperature, compared to the Lag_blk and Lag_blk_hydra models.

If magneto-sonic waves are responsible for piling liner mass at the interface then there must be a variation in the $B_\theta$ magnetic field strength between the models with high and low fusion yield. In Fig.9 $B_\theta$ profiles are shown at stagnation time $T_s$ and at four previous nearby times for the same set of four 1-D MACH2 models shown in Fig.7 and Fig. 8. The magnetic field at the liner/target interface is indeed about 2 times stronger for the EUL_1D and Lag_3blk models.

The profiles for the Lag_3blk_hydra model are particularly instructive. One can visualize the three profiles at $T_s - 2$, $T_s - 1.5$, $T_s - 1$ ns being similar to the corresponding profiles for the EUL_1D model, except that their tops are clipped. The clipping is more pronounced for the last two profiles, at $T_s - 0.5$ and $T_s$, and their shape is quite different from the shape of the corresponding profiles for the EUL_1D model. A check of the computational grid for the Lag_3blk_hydra model shows that the clipping of the $B_\theta$ field maxima is due to loss of resolution; there is only one single cell covering the region where $B_\theta$ peaks, resulting in a flat line.

The ion temperature profiles for four representative times, the last being the instant when the shock reaches the axis, for the MACH2 models from Fig.9 are shown in Fig.10. They reveal another problem with the Lag_2blk and Lag_3blk_hydra models: There are sharp peaks at the liner/vacuum boundary and the liner/target interface. Again, this problem can be traced to single cells covering regions of rapid variable change. For example, the Lag_3blk model has 16 dedicated vacuum cells, and the magnetic field diffusing from the outermost liner region inside can be more properly calculated. However, proper calculation requires taking into account the $1/R$ dependance of $B_\theta$ in the vacuum region and can be done only with the EUL_1D or ALE_1D models. Improperly calculated $B_\theta$ profile leads to artificially induced very high $J_z$ current over a few adjacent grid cells, which then ohmically heats the plasma and produces those $T_i$ profile spikes. In the next computational step, when the diffusion of the $B_\theta$ field is calculated from the plasma
FIG. 8. Left column: plasma mass density $\rho$ contour plots for four different 1-D MACH2 SZP models without $\alpha$-heating. Notice that the EUL_1D and Lag_3blk models, about 0.5ns before and after the stagnation time, have significantly larger mass concentration at the liner/target interface. Right column: corresponding ram pressure $P_{\text{RAM}} = \rho v^2$. The stronger ram pressure at the liner/target interface during the last 1.5 ns of the adiabatic compression is responsible for the much higher fusion energy production in the EUL_1D and Lag_3blk models. The time axis is centered around the stagnation time for each model.

At the end of this section we briefly touch upon shocks in plasmas, about which there is vast literature that can not be reviewed here. In general, large amplitude waves can propagate at speeds larger than the speed of sound $C_s$. These waves steepen during propagation and the steepening process can be balanced by dispersion and diffusion. If the steepening is balanced by dispersion then this class of waves are called solitary waves which propagate as an isolated finite-amplitude disturbance in plasmas. On the other hand, if steepening is balanced by diffusion it can form a thin layer called shock which then propagates through the system. During propagation, shocks separate regions of different density and temperature, and the shock front exhibits steep gradient in plasma pressure. Computer simulations must carefully address these gradients, otherwise the shocks role might be lost or underestimated. Shock waves are continuously produced during the SZP implosion, as long as the liner plasma remains cold and the sound speed $C_s$ is lower than the implosion speed $V_r$. Profiles of the radial compression $V_r$, sound $C_s$, and Alfvein velocity $V_A$ (Fig.15) confirm that the liner implodes super-Alfvenically, and the target implodes supersonically.

IV. 2-D SIMULATIONS OF THE STAGED Z-PINCH

Plasma instabilities are present in any Z-pinch, therefore the computational grid should cover two dimensions (R-Z) for a more realistic representation of the SZP dynamics. For our Eulerian and ALE 2-D models the corresponding 1-D grids were extended axially with 64 vertical cells ($\Delta Z = 234\,\mu m$). A 3-D MHD code would bring further refinement to the simulation results, but we do not have access to such a code.

The 2-D simulations were driven by currents from a circuit model in analogous way, like the Lagrangian simulations presented in Section 2. These currents are compared with the current from Lindemuth et al in Fig.11. The time evolution of the (a) interface radius, (b) interface radial velocity, and (c) mass-averaged fuel temperature are presented in Fig.12. The comparison is very much like the comparison shown in Fig.3. As expected, the peak values of the mass averaged temperatures are somewhat lower: 2.7 keV and 40 keV, depending whether conditions in the previous time step, its profile will be affected by the slower magnetic field diffusion through the hot plasma regions; ultimately leading to different $B_0$ profiles and different magnetosonic shock dynamics compared to those in the EUL_1D or ALE_1D models.

At the end of this section we briefly touch upon shocks in plasmas, about which there is vast literature that can not be reviewed here. In general, large amplitude waves can propagate at speeds larger than the speed of sound $C_s$. These waves steepen during propagation and the steepening process can be balanced by dispersion and diffusion. If the steepening is balanced by dispersion then this class of waves are called solitary waves which propagate as an isolated finite-amplitude disturbance in plasmas. On the other hand, if steepening is balanced by diffusion it can form a thin layer called shock which then propagates through the system. During propagation, shocks separate regions of different density and temperature, and the shock front exhibits steep gradient in plasma pressure. Computer simulations must carefully address these gradients, otherwise the shocks role might be lost or underestimated. Shock waves are continuously produced during the SZP implosion, as long as the liner plasma remains cold and the sound speed $C_s$ is lower than the implosion speed $V_r$. Profiles of the radial compression $V_r$, sound $C_s$, and Alfvein velocity $V_A$ (Fig.15) confirm that the liner implodes super-Alfvenically, and the target implodes supersonically.
FIG. 9. Radial $B_\theta$ profiles from 1-D MACH2 calculations using Eulerian, two block pure Lagrangian, three blocks Lagrangian with fixed vacuum boundary and three block pure Lagrangian formalism. The color coded dotted lines indicated the location of the liner/target interface at a particular time. 

$\alpha$-particle heating is included or not. The effectiveness of shock heating in raising the target adiabat can be seen by plotting the average target temperature versus target convergence ratio (CR). For a lossless, cylindrical adiabatic compression of a monatomic ideal gas, the temperature increases as $CR^{4/3}$. Shock heating or ohmic heating can cause the target to heat super-adiabatically, whereas radiative and conductive losses can lead to sub-adiabatic heating. A typical trajectory of the mass averaged target ion temperature vs. CR is shown in Figure 13. Most of the shock heating occurs during the initial acceleration of the target and concludes when the shock front reaches the axis, at CR~5.

The fusion energy production is shown in Fig.14. It is slightly lower than for the corresponding 1-D models without $\alpha$-heating: 3.2 vs. 4.6 MJ (EUL), and 3.5 vs. 3.6 MJ (ALE). Similarly, the Eulerian 2-D model with $\alpha$-heating predicts lower total fusion energy: 170 vs. 196 MJ. However, the prediction for the ALE 2-D model with $\alpha$-heating is higher: 165 vs. 142 MJ, close to the 2-D Eulerian prediction, which highlights the importance of proper grid size selection and the somewhat arbitrary grid readjustments in each MACH2 computational block.

FIG. 10. Radial $T_i$ profiles from 1-D MACH2 calculations using Eulerian, two block pure Lagrangian, three blocks Lagrangian with fixed vacuum boundary and three block pure Lagrangian formalism. The color coded dotted lines indicated the location of the liner/target interface at a particular time.
FIG. 11. Current profiles from circuit equations driving 2-D Eulerian and ALE SZP simulations, with and without alpha particle heating. The dot-dash green current profile is from the Lindemuth et al. publication.

and time instant, when the ALE method is used.

The Staged Z-pinch shocks are examined in more detail in Fig.15, where total plasma pressure \( P_{\text{tot}} = P_i + P_e \) contour plots at 9 different times within \( \sim 25 \) ns of the pinch stagnation are presented. Profiles of the radial plasma implosion velocity \( V_r \), the Alfven velocity \( V_A \), and the sound velocity \( C_s \) are shown as well. These velocity profiles confirm that the liner implodes super-Alfvenically, and the target implodes supersonically. The SZP compression progression is clearly visible in each set of three contour plots (notice the radial scale change in each set), and it picks up pace as the pinch is closer to stagnation. After stagnation (not shown), the pinch radial momentum reverses sign and the plasma expands rapidly.

The top three panels of Fig.15 show \( P_{\text{tot}} \) contour plots at 100, 105, and 115 ns. At 100 ns, the shock, which is generated in the liner, has still not reached the interface. At 105 ns, it just crossed the interface, and at 115 ns it propagates to \( R=0.5 \) cm, which is well into the target region. Both liner and target plasma keep imploding and accelerating. The three middle panels show the contours at 118, 119, and 121 ns. At 118 ns, the shock front begins to exhibit Richtmyer-Meshkov type instability, and by 119 ns, the unstable shock front reaches the axis (note the skewed aspect ratio of the plots: The vertical dimension is compressed up to 30 times with respect to the radial dimension).

We run MACH2 on a modern Linux workstation built around the Intel Xeon E5 2690 v4 processor (2.6GHz, 14 cores and 28 threads). However, MACH2 is a single thread code and it takes about 100 hours to complete the 2-D ALE and EUL models with \( \alpha \)-particle heating. The unexpectedly high wall time expended on the ALE,2D model, in spite of the 2-3 coarser grid than the EUL,2D model, was perhaps due to the readjustments of the computational grid at each time step of the calculation.

FIG. 12. Comparison of 2-D Eulerian and ALE simulations, with and without alpha heating, with results from the Raven code: (a) radius, (b) implosion velocity and (c) mass-averaged fuel temperature, all calculated at the liner/target interface. The large temperature increase when \( \alpha \)-particle heating is included is highlighted in (d).
V. ALPHA PARTICLE HEATING AND PINCH RADIATION CONSIDERATIONS

Now we focus on the crucial role of α-particle heating by closely examining our 2-D Eulerian simulations. The MACH2 α-heating implementation assumes 100% α-particle energy deposition into the D-T fuel plasma; this assumption will be revisited shortly.

Figure 16 illustrates the dramatic effect of α-heating by comparing the fusion energy calculated in 2-D Eulerian models with and without such heating; it takes only 0.3 ns to increase the fusion energy from 1.4 MJ to 118 MJ! The plasma current does not change until 126.24 ns (when 150 MJ are already produced, i.e. 88% of the total 170 MJ), and then it starts growing much faster than the current in the model without α-heating.

Figure 17 clarifies the internal plasma dynamics during the α-heating phase by showing contour plots of the ion density $N_i$ and ion temperature $T_i$ at four times: 125.9, 125.94, 126.07 and 126.24 ns, when the fusion energy is 5.5, 10, 100 and 150 MJ, respectively. The azimuthal magnetic field $B_\theta$ is shown as well, in appropriate colors.
to provide contrast with the contour plots; outside of the liner region i.e. in the vacuum region $B_\theta$ decreases as $1/R$. The radial $B_r$ and axial $B_z$ components of the magnetic field are zero everywhere.

The fuel ion density is roughly between $10^{24}$ and $10^{25}$ cm$^{-3}$ for the first three selected times. For the last, the target radius had approximately doubled (notice the radial scale change) and the fuel density deceased several times, as $1/R^2$. The ion temperature at 125.9 ns is about 5 keV for most of the fuel plasma, with a single narrow region reaching 20-25 keV. After 0.17 ns, by which time 100 MJ of fusion energy is produced, most of the fuel volume has temperatures of about 100 keV. In the next 0.17 ns, while the plasma column keeps expanding, additional 50 MJ of energy are produced, in a slightly colder plasma, with several times lower density.

The $B_\theta$ magnetic field profile has very high value at the liner/target interface: approximately between $10^4$ and $3 \times 10^4$ T. This field has been continuously growing by diffusing through the liner, and by liner compression (Fig.9), until the stagnation time. After stagnation, $\alpha$-heating builds enormous pressure which can not instantaneously reverse the radial motion of the large liner mass. This pressure rapidly compresses the magnetic field at the interface to levels above $10^4$ T, and that is the essence of the magneto-inertial confinement mechanism in the Staged Z-pinch: The extremely strong $B_\theta$ field helps with the $\alpha$-particle confinement and reduces the thermal energy exchange between the very hot fuel and cold liner plasma.

There are two questions to be answered regarding $\alpha$-heating: Are the $\alpha$-particles confined and do they have enough time to deposit their energy to the background plasma? The second question is easily answered by comparing the $\alpha$-particle energy slowing down time $\tau_{\alpha/e,slw}$ on electrons, $\tau_{\alpha/e,slw}$, within the $\alpha$-heating time window $\Delta t \approx 0.35$ ns. At 125.9 ns, $N_e \approx 10^{25}$ cm$^{-3}$, $T_e \approx 5$ keV and $\tau_{\alpha/e,slw} \approx 10^{-3}$ ns, and since $\tau_{\alpha/e,slw} \sim T_e^{3/2}/N_e$, this slowing down will not change dramatically. It takes $t = 3 \times \tau_{\alpha/e,slw}$ to deposit 95% of the 3.5 MeV $\alpha$-particles energy, therefore alphas have plenty of time to transfer their energy to the fuel plasma.

The 3.5 MeV $\alpha$-particle larmor radius in a $B_\theta = 10^4$ T magnetic field is $\rho_L = 27 \mu$m, which is comparable to the radius of the target region during the $\alpha$-heating period. Its velocity is $v_\alpha = 1.3 \times 10^7$ m/s, so it covers a 0.44 mm path length in $\Delta t = 0.34$ ns. Taking into account the very fast slowing down on electrons, this path length will quickly shorten, and thus only a small fraction of alphas may be lost by reaching the vertical boundaries of the simulation domain (Z=0 and Z=15 mm).

FIG. 16. Alpha particle heating illustration: in just 0.3 ns (shaded region) the fusion energy production increases from 1.4 MJ to 118 MJ. The pinch stagnation time for the model with alpha heating is 125.82 ns, and 125.84 ns if the alpha heating is turned off.

FIG. 17. Ion density and temperature contour plots for four $\alpha$-heating time instances which demonstrate the dramatic rise in fusion energy production from 5.5 MJ to 150 MJ, in just 0.34 ns. The superimposed $B_\theta$ magnetic field profiles are sharply peaked near the liner/target interface where $B_\theta > 10^4$ T provides good $\alpha$-particle confinement. Data is from the Eulerian 2-D simulation.
Finally, let’s consider the effects of possible fuel depletion due to the high fusion rate during the $\alpha$-heating phase. The central fuel volume is $V = 2.83 \text{ cm}^3$ and contains $6.6 \times 10^{21}$ of deuterium, and the same number of tritium nuclei; their fusion produces a total of $6.1 \times 10^{19}$ 14 MeV neutrons and same number of 3.5 MeV alphas, i.e. 170 MJ. Therefore, only about 1% of the fuel is consumed ("burn-up" fraction), which can be ignored, since MACH2 does not have a burn-up calculation which depletes the fuel density as the high fusion rate proceeds in the target.

Simple estimates of radiation and thermal conduction losses and $PdV$ heating rates can be used as another check of a MHD code simulation results. Estimates in Lindemuth’s 2017 paper Table III show that radiation losses are greater than the $PdV$ heating, but they assume radiation temperature $T_r = 0$. In reality, the radiation temperature inside the target is nonzero because the liner is optically thick. In SZP2 it is assumed that $T_r$ equilibrates with the electron temperature $T_e$ instantaneously, i.e. that the radiation losses are zero. The radiation loss estimates by Lindemuth for SZP2 therefore cannot be used to invalidate the SZP2 results.

Because $T_r = T_e$ is a strong assumption, the results presented in this paper use a radiation diffusion model that allows $T_r$ to evolve dynamically. As shown in our Table II, $T_r = T_e$ is in closer agreement with the conditions near stagnation than $T_r = 0$. Estimates of the bremsstrahlung radiation should therefore be reduced by the factor $(T_e^4 - T_r^4)/T_r^4$, which brings the estimated radiation loss rates below the $PdV$ heating rates until stagnation. These results clearly indicate the possibility of ignition, which occurs when the $\alpha$-particle heating exceeds the plasma energy losses.

In Table III we compare the $\alpha$-particle heating rates with the heating and loss estimates for the EUL_1D_alpha simulation. Again, the $PdV$ heating is larger than the corrected bremsstrahlung estimates, and at peak compression the $\alpha$-particle heating exceeds even the $T_r = 0$ radiation loss estimate, confirming the ignition predicted by MACH2.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We used the MACH2 code in various Lagrangian, Eulerian and arbitrary Lagrangian Eulerian (ALE) modes to simulate the Staged Z-pinch dynamics where a thin silver liner implodes onto D-T fuel in the Sandia Laboratories Z-machine. By using a two block Lagrangian model, and a three block Lagrangian model with a fixed boundary, we reproduced the results of Lindemuth et al.7 and thus verified the code. We then pointed out that the likely problem with the Hydra, Raven and MHRDR results is the incorrect treatment of the liner/vacuum boundary. Insufficient computational grid resolution in this critical region leads to calculating incorrect $B_\theta$ profiles, and they affect the strength of the magneto-sonic shocks which are responsible for piling mass at the liner/target interface. With proper liner/vacuum boundary treatment, MACH2 indicates that there is extra liner mass accumulated at the interface, which increases the ram pressure in the final implosion stages; the associated $PdV$ work adiabatically transfers the liner kinetic energy into fuel thermal energy, raises its mass-averaged temperature from 1 kV to $\sim 2.5$ keV, and sets the stage for successful $\alpha$-particle heating.

We believe that, in spite of the limitations of the MACH2 code, these results merit careful review with codes and material tables not available in the public domain. If confirmed, only experiments on the Z-machine can validate them and hopefully surpass break-even fusion energy production.
TABLE II. Radiation loss and \(P_dV\) heating estimates for the 1-D Lagrangian 2-block simulation using the same methods as in Lindemuth’s 2017 paper\(^4\). Modification of the radiation loss estimates to account for nonzero \(T_T\) is shown to lower loss estimates below \(P_dV\) heating except near stagnation, for \(t = 125.8\) ns. Note that \(n_0 = 2.36 \times 10^{25}\) \(\text{cm}^{-3}\) and \(r_0 = 3\) mm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (ns)</th>
<th>122</th>
<th>123</th>
<th>124</th>
<th>125</th>
<th>125.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(r_{\text{target}}) (m)</td>
<td>3.18 \times 10^{-4}</td>
<td>2.29 \times 10^{-4}</td>
<td>1.21 \times 10^{-4}</td>
<td>4.73 \times 10^{-5}</td>
<td>3.08 \times 10^{-5}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v_{\text{target}}) (cm/(\mu)s)</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\langle \tau_{\text{target}} \rangle) (cm(^{-3}))</td>
<td>9.31 \times 10^{22}</td>
<td>1.81 \times 10^{23}</td>
<td>6.48 \times 10^{23}</td>
<td>4.22 \times 10^{24}</td>
<td>9.93 \times 10^{24}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\langle T_e \rangle) (eV)</td>
<td>70.94</td>
<td>118.74</td>
<td>266.53</td>
<td>767.21</td>
<td>978.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\langle T_v \rangle) (eV)</td>
<td>70.88</td>
<td>118.52</td>
<td>263.21</td>
<td>753.34</td>
<td>974.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P_{\text{brems}}(W/m^3))</td>
<td>1.23 \times 10^{21}</td>
<td>6.01 \times 10^{21}</td>
<td>1.16 \times 10^{23}</td>
<td>8.32 \times 10^{24}</td>
<td>5.20 \times 10^{25}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\langle T_e^4 \rangle - \langle T_v^4 \rangle / \langle T_e \rangle^4 )</td>
<td>3.38 \times 10^{-3}</td>
<td>7.39 \times 10^{-3}</td>
<td>4.89 \times 10^{-2}</td>
<td>7.04 \times 10^{-2}</td>
<td>1.65 \times 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P_{\text{brems corrected}}(W/m^3))</td>
<td>4.34 \times 10^{18}</td>
<td>4.42 \times 10^{19}</td>
<td>5.67 \times 10^{21}</td>
<td>5.86 \times 10^{23}</td>
<td>8.46 \times 10^{24}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P_{P_dV}(W/m^3))</td>
<td>5.89 \times 10^{20}</td>
<td>6.29 \times 10^{21}</td>
<td>9.82 \times 10^{22}</td>
<td>2.41 \times 10^{24}</td>
<td>3.02 \times 10^{24}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III. Radiation loss and \(P_dV\) heating estimates for the 1-D Eulerian simulation with \(\alpha\)-particle heating, using the same methods as in Lindemuth’s 2017 paper\(^4\). Modification of the radiation loss estimates to account for nonzero \(T_T\) is shown to lower loss estimates below \(P_dV\) heating. Note that \(n_0 = 2.36 \times 10^{25}\) \(\text{cm}^{-3}\) and \(r_0 = 3\) mm. The calculated \(\alpha\)-particle heating is also included, and shown to exceed radiation losses near peak compression, indicating ignition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (ns)</th>
<th>122</th>
<th>123</th>
<th>124</th>
<th>125</th>
<th>125.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(r_{\text{target}}) (m)</td>
<td>2.23 \times 10^{-4}</td>
<td>1.70 \times 10^{-4}</td>
<td>1.07 \times 10^{-4}</td>
<td>5.55 \times 10^{-5}</td>
<td>2.89 \times 10^{-5}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v_{\text{target}}) (cm/(\mu)s)</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\langle \tau_{\text{target}} \rangle) (cm(^{-3}))</td>
<td>1.90 \times 10^{23}</td>
<td>3.28 \times 10^{23}</td>
<td>8.17 \times 10^{23}</td>
<td>3.06 \times 10^{24}</td>
<td>1.13 \times 10^{25}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\langle T_e \rangle) (eV)</td>
<td>118.72</td>
<td>174.04</td>
<td>328.32</td>
<td>868.14</td>
<td>3991.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\langle T_v \rangle) (eV)</td>
<td>116.18</td>
<td>173.51</td>
<td>327.90</td>
<td>865.06</td>
<td>3787.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P_{\text{brems}}(W/m^3))</td>
<td>6.66 \times 10^{21}</td>
<td>2.40 \times 10^{22}</td>
<td>2.04 \times 10^{23}</td>
<td>4.67 \times 10^{24}</td>
<td>1.36 \times 10^{26}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\langle T_e^4 \rangle - \langle T_v^4 \rangle / \langle T_e \rangle^4 )</td>
<td>8.29 \times 10^{-2}</td>
<td>1.21 \times 10^{-2}</td>
<td>5.11 \times 10^{-3}</td>
<td>1.41 \times 10^{-2}</td>
<td>1.89 \times 10^{-1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P_{\text{brems corrected}}(W/m^3))</td>
<td>5.53 \times 10^{20}</td>
<td>2.87 \times 10^{20}</td>
<td>1.05 \times 10^{21}</td>
<td>6.59 \times 10^{22}</td>
<td>2.57 \times 10^{25}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P_{P_dV}(W/m^3))</td>
<td>4.08 \times 10^{21}</td>
<td>1.35 \times 10^{22}</td>
<td>1.03 \times 10^{23}</td>
<td>9.89 \times 10^{23}</td>
<td>2.96 \times 10^{25}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P_{\alpha}(W/m^3))</td>
<td>3.22 \times 10^{11}</td>
<td>8.71 \times 10^{13}</td>
<td>2.32 \times 10^{17}</td>
<td>5.52 \times 10^{21}</td>
<td>1.81 \times 10^{26}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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