



## Overview of Liquid-Metal PFC R&D at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

D. Andruczyk, R. Rizkallah, D. O'Dea, A. Shone, S. Smith, B. Kamiyama, R. Maingi, C. E. Kessel, S. Smolentsev, T. W. Morgan & F. Romano

To cite this article: D. Andruczyk, R. Rizkallah, D. O'Dea, A. Shone, S. Smith, B. Kamiyama, R. Maingi, C. E. Kessel, S. Smolentsev, T. W. Morgan & F. Romano (2023): Overview of Liquid-Metal PFC R&D at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Fusion Science and Technology, DOI: [10.1080/15361055.2023.2171259](https://doi.org/10.1080/15361055.2023.2171259)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15361055.2023.2171259>



Published online: 11 Apr 2023.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 41



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



# Overview of Liquid-Metal PFC R&D at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

D. Andruczyk,<sup>1</sup> R. Rizkallah,<sup>a</sup> D. O’Dea,<sup>a</sup> A. Shone,<sup>a</sup> S. Smith,<sup>a</sup> B. Kamiyama,<sup>a</sup> R. Maingi,<sup>b</sup> C. E. Kessel,<sup>c</sup> S. Smolentsev,<sup>c,d</sup> T. W. Morgan,<sup>c</sup> and F. Romano<sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup>University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois

<sup>b</sup>Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Princeton, New Jersey

<sup>c</sup>Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee

<sup>d</sup>University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California

<sup>e</sup>Dutch Institute for Fundamental Energy Research, Eindhoven, The Netherlands

Received August 15, 2022

Accepted for Publication January 11, 2023

**Abstract** — *The design and implementation of future flowing liquid-lithium plasma-facing components (LLPFCs) will be dependent on several factors. Of course, one of the most important is the need to be able to deal with high heat fluxes incident on the surface of the LLPFCs, but there are also several other important liquid-metal behaviors that have been identified for their critical impact on the feasibility of a LLPFC. One of these is the ability to constantly wet 100% of the plasma-facing component area and the best way to achieve that. Another key point is knowing and understanding the erosion and corrosion of the surfaces subject to a flowing liquid-lithium system and the ability for hydrogen and helium uptake by the system.*

*The Center for Plasma Material Interactions (CPMI) has been tasked with looking at these various issues. The Mock-up Entry module for EAST device was used to investigate wetting and erosion effects and to design a suitable distribution and collection system with a liquid-lithium loop. The vapor shielding effects of lithium on the surface were also modeled and studied. A model coupling CRANE, an open-source global reaction network solver, and Zapdos, a plasma transport solver, is being developed to better understand the dynamics of the vapor cloud. Experiments on the Magnum-PSI at the Dutch Institute for Fundamental Energy Research have been carried out to study the vapor shielding effect and obtain experimental benchmarks to verify the model. Also, initial experiments using the Hybrid Illinois Device for Research and Applications have been performed to understand the pumping effects of lithium on helium.*

*Experiments with a drop of liquid lithium (~100 mg) into a helium plasma have shown the ability of lithium to take out the cold recycling helium gas as well as hydrogen and oxygen impurity gases. The improvement in plasma performance was significant, and further understanding of this effect will have impacts on how future LLPFCs will be designed. Further investigation into the exact mechanism for helium pumping by lithium needs to be performed in the future. This paper presents a summary of the results obtained at the CPMI.*

**Keywords** — *Lithium, liquid metal, plasma, fusion, vapor shielding.*

**Note** — *Some figures may be in color only in the electronic version.*

---

\*E-mail: [andruczy@illinois.edu](mailto:andruczy@illinois.edu)

## I. BACKGROUND

The ability of plasma-facing components (PFCs) to survive the harsh environments of an operating fusion reactor over a long time is one of the main detriments to an operating commercial device. This makes the development of PFCs of the utmost importance. Currently, solid materials such as tungsten are the leading candidates, but they have several issues, such as tritium retention,<sup>1,2</sup> surface degradation,<sup>3</sup> and fuzz and bubble formation.<sup>4,5</sup> Flowing liquid metals (LMs), such as lithium, offer at least a solution to protecting the surface of the underlying substrate.<sup>6</sup> Thus, the Fusion Nuclear Science Facility (FNSF) has been proposed as an intermediate step to finally figure out the material issues for a fusion reactor.<sup>7</sup> LMs pose a potential solution, in particular lithium. However, lithium has its own engineering issues that need to be addressed. A study of LMs for the FNSF was done by Kessel et al.<sup>1,7</sup> that identified several challenges that implementation of a liquid-metal plasma-facing component (LMPFC) system would have.<sup>8</sup> However, the many benefits that come with using lithium as a LMPFC potentially outweigh any detraction.<sup>9–13</sup>

To this end, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) has implemented a domestic LMPFC development program with the direct aim of eventually designing a flowing LM divertor for the FNSF or a compact pilot plant<sup>14</sup> (CPP). The aim of the program is to evaluate LM PFC concepts through engineering design calculations, modeling, and experiments.<sup>14</sup> Lithium was selected as the LM of choice since it is the most well studied of the PFC candidates. Three institutions were chosen to lead the program: the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC).

The goals of the UIUC part of the LMPFC program consist of performing single-effect experiments that will further the engineering understanding of liquid-lithium systems and identifying potential issues and developing solutions. Three main tasks have been identified:

1. *Liquid-lithium loop and wetting of surfaces:* This is to develop a full flowing liquid-lithium loop system with an integrated loading system, LM pumps, and flow velocity measurements. An important aspect of this is the need to have an effective distributor design that will ensure an even distribution of lithium down a surface, as well as ensure full wetting of a surface when flowing lithium. The full wetting of surfaces has been problematic in past experiments<sup>15</sup> and will need to be resolved for future devices.

2. *Lithium vapor shielding (LVS):* The effect of LVS is a phenomenon that has been observed and identified recently.<sup>16,17</sup> The effect of impurities, such as helium and neon, in the plasma is an unknown with regard to the effect they will have on the ability of the LVS to dissipate incoming heat flux from the plasma. Helium is a natural impurity derived from the  $D + T \rightarrow He + n$  reaction, and neon is currently one of the candidate neutral seeding gases for plasma detachment in the divertor region. We aim to develop a better understanding of the effect through experiments on the Magnum-PSI and through modeling using plasma transport model and plasma chemistry codes, such as Zapdos-CRANE (Ref. 18).

3. *Hydrogen and helium retention by lithium:* One of the main arguments against lithium is that it will react with and retain tritium, but also will not be able to retain and pump helium. Helium pumping is an issue in fusion as turbo pumps take a long time to pump helium effectively and cryogenic pumps do not pump helium. It is important to know and understand the rate at which hydrogenic species will be captured by lithium, the rate at which they can be removed,<sup>8</sup> and whether lithium is able to pump, retain, and remove helium from the plasma.<sup>19</sup>

This paper summarizes some of the results from the initial single-effect experiments that have been undertaken at UIUC as part of the domestic LMPFC program.

## II. DISTRIBUTION AND WETTING

Operation of a flowing liquid-lithium system will require several engineering technologies to come together effectively. The first is a flowing liquid-lithium loop, a closed system that would enable lithium circulation with flow control. The second is an effective means to ensure distribution of the lithium over a surface to achieve full coverage. This is tightly connected to surface wetting and is known to change for different metals and different temperatures.<sup>20</sup> Last is an effective way to load lithium into the loop without air leakage, which can contaminate the lithium.

Previously an international collaboration between several U.S. institutions and the EAST team<sup>15</sup> performed experiments on EAST designed to tackle some of the questions connected to flowing lithium technologies; the experiments had several positive outcomes. The experiments successfully flowed liquid lithium over surfaces with different geometries and demonstrated improved plasma performance. However, surface wetting was not total, and there is still a long way to go before having a fully integrated and flowing system. The tested flowing

liquid lithium (Refs. 15 and 21 through 23) and lithium/metal infused trenched (LiMIT) (Refs. 24 and 25) plates were connected to an internal reservoir and electromagnetic (EM) pump system, moving the lithium through a distributor, down the plate surface, and around, but not out of the machine. From this previous program, the Mock-up Entry module for EAST (MEME) was designed and built for UIUC to further research and develop such LM systems. It is based on the Material and Plasma Evaluation System,<sup>26,27</sup> which allows LM systems to enter the EAST vessel without breaking vacuum.

## II.A. Description of the MEME

The motivation for obtaining the MEME was to have a system where LM systems could be developed with an interface with EAST. The system is a cube box with dimensions of  $1.0 \times 1.0 \times 1.0$  m with a total volume of  $V_{\text{MEME}} = 1.0 \text{ m}^3$ . This is in fact much larger than the lithium plasma evaluation system (LiPES) installed on EAST, which is  $0.65 \times 0.65 \times 0.65$  m with a total volume of  $V_{\text{LiPES}} = 0.275 \text{ m}^3$ . There is a 1-m stroke length transfer arm that LM systems can be mounted on. The transfer arm allows access for power, cooling, and thermocouples (TCs) to any LM system. A turbomolecular pump with a 1000 L/s rate evacuates the MEME down to a base pressures of  $P_o \sim 1.2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ Pa}$  ( $9 \times 10^{-8} \text{ Torr}$ ). A Pfeiffer full-range gauge measures the pressure. The MEME has 25 ports of varying sizes, which gives a vast choice for choosing viewing ports and mounting diagnostics.

In addition to the previously mentioned full-range gauge and residual gas analyzer (RGA), color and infrared

cameras are installed to monitor ongoing experiments. There is an internal attachment on the transfer arm that allows for some rotation of any mounted LM surface, enabling the study of flowing systems under different angles. Figure 1 shows a photo of the MEME in its current setup with an image of the rotation mechanism superimposed on a computer-aided design (CAD) of the MEME.

Though the MEME was designed with EAST in mind, it serves as a perfect tool for the domestic LMPFC program and the testing and development of LM loops as well as surface wetting experiments. Its large volume facilitates experiment design and mounting of the various necessary systems, such as the ones needed to develop a fully operational lithium loop system connected to a PFC plate of a desired geometry.

As part of the LMPFC program, flowing LM development was divided into three milestones, the first of which is the development of a flowing lithium loop along with LM pumps and flow sensors. The second is the development of a lithium loading method in such a way that the lithium is not tarnished due to undesired exposure to air. The last milestone is to achieve full-surface wetting with the lithium to evenly coat the surface.

## II.B. Flowing Lithium Loop Experiments

Figure 2 shows the flowing liquid-lithium loop installed in the MEME. The aim of this loop is to deliver lithium to the distributor and surface. The internal reservoir (red) is filled with lithium from an external loading system. The lithium is heated to  $270^\circ\text{C}$ . At the moment, this seems to be the limit of the heating system. Because of this, the pipes in the loop may




Fig. 1. The MEME system used on EAST is designed to develop plug-and-play LM systems for EAST. Currently, it is being used to develop LM loops and wetting experiments for the LMPFC program.




Fig. 2. (a) CAD drawing of the internal flowing liquid-lithium loop that is installed and being tested in the MEME for the program. The internal reservoir (red) has lithium loaded into it via an external loading system. Once the lithium melts and the system reaches 270°C, the lithium flows into the first EM LM pump (purple), which pumps the lithium up to the second EM LM pump (pink) and to the distributor and PFC plate (gray) system for wetting studies. The lithium is then collected and flows back to the internal reservoir, completing the whole loop. The system has been continuously run for several 10s of minutes at a time. (b) Actual photo of the internal loop inside the MEME.

not be wetting completely, since the wetting temperature for stainless steel is 320°C (Ref. 20). The lithium melts and flows into the pipe connected to the first LM pump (purple). The LM pump is a standard EM pump with a current passing through the lithium and a perpendicular magnetic field. The resulting  $\mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B}$  force moves the liquid lithium up a vertical section and into a second LM pump (pink). This is also an EM pump that helps to flow the lithium to the distributor. The current required for EM pump 1 is  $I_1 = 129$  A, and for EM pump 2 it is  $I_2 = 100$  A.

The distributor is based on the design of the LiMIT posts<sup>28</sup> to try and help distribute the lithium evenly across the surface of the attached plate. As the lithium flows down the plate surface, it is collected in a collector and then flows back into the loop reservoir. This completes the loop, which can continuously flow the lithium around. The whole system is mounted on the transfer arm and can be tilted to about 13 deg under the current setup. This is only a restriction of the current design; the future redesign of the system will allow for larger angles to be explored. There are seven TCs attached to the loop and a further six TCs on the plate itself to monitor the temperature of the different sections of the system. A total amount of 300 g of lithium is loaded into the loop reservoir before the experimental runs. Figure 2a shows a CAD of the loop system, and Fig. 2b is a photo of the loop inside the MEME chamber.

The lithium is loaded into the loop via a lithium loading system. A CAD of this is shown in Fig. 3a, and a photo of it as mounted on the top of the MEME is shown in Fig. 3b. A suitcase (green) is loaded with lithium inside an argon-filled glove box. Argon, which also fills the suitcase, is an inert gas and minimizes the amount of tarnishing of the lithium. The suitcase is a con-flat flange with one end sealed and the other connected to a gate valve. Once loading is complete, it is then mounted onto the loading station (blue) and pumped out. The lithium is then dropped into a melting chamber (orange) where it is melted. Once sufficiently hot, the lithium flows down into the internal reservoir of the loop. A CAD of how the loading system and lithium loop link together is shown in Fig. 3c.

### II.C. Initial Distributor Tests and Flow Velocity

For the initial lithium distribution tests, a color camera was used to observe the flowing lithium over the studied plate. The distributor, which has a dedicated cover plate, initially had its posts exposed, as seen in Fig. 4a. However, only droplets of lithium were formed as the lithium came out of the loop and unto the distributor. Such droplets can also be seen in Fig. 4a. These droplets most often would skip the distributor post surface and flat plate altogether and go straight down to the




Fig. 3. (a) CAD drawing of the lithium loading system that is used to load lithium into the lithium loop on the MEME. A suitcase (green) has the lithium loaded in a glove box filled with argon. This then attaches to an evacuation system (blue) where the argon is pumped out and the lithium is pumped to low pressures to minimize the amount of tarnishing of the lithium. This is then dropped into a premelting reservoir (orange) where the lithium is melted and then flows through a pipe into the internal reservoir of the loop. (b) Photo of the lithium loading system on the MEME. (c) CAD drawing showing the lithium loading system connected to the lithium loop system.

collector. Nonetheless, when a droplet would hit the stainless steel plate at 320°C, it did seem to wet the plate surface. It was clear that a distributor cover plate needed to be installed to force the lithium through the distributor posts and improve distribution before reaching the plate. This should also improve lithium wetting at the plate level.

With the distributor cover installed, a stream of lithium formed and flowed down the plate. The lithium flow was still only a stream and did not fully spread unto the plate, but it did clearly wet the region along that stream. A 2-mm gap between the distributor cover plate and the top of the posts could be at least partially to blame for the suboptimal lithium distribution, as the lithium was able to flow down the distributor cover and then onto the plate. Design modifications along different distributor geometries are being investigated to improve on these results. The loop operation in these initial distribution experiments was over 30 min, and this has been

repeated consistently multiple times. The flow of the lithium in the loop was confirmed via the multiple installed TCs as the lithium went past temperature changes.

In Fig. 4b, the distributor is mounted with its cover plate and two lithium streams can be seen. When first switched on (for the runs with the distributor cover), the lithium started flowing down the left side, which is highlighted in the yellow rectangle. This was most probably due to a blockage that was there from some previous runs. As the current in the second EM pump was increased, the blockage was cleared and the lithium stream moved to the plate center region, highlighted in the red rectangle.

The flow characteristics of the lithium stream change as the current of the second EM pump changes. In Fig. 5a, there are several frames showing how the flow evolved with varying pump currents, going up to 100 A. The flow starts with a single drop of lithium and then




Fig. 4. (a) Initial loop and distributor tests in the MEME showing that when lithium gets on the stainless steel plate there is wetting. The distributor posts are clearly seen. (b) The cover plate is now installed, and a clear stream of flowing liquid lithium is flowing down the plate.

forms into a continuous flow, but presents some oscillations and instabilities. Eventually, as the maximum current in the pump is reached, a laminar type of flow is reached and the flow becomes even down the plate. The plate area around the lithium stream is wetted by the lithium, which follows the wetted path. Flowmeters to measure the flow velocity are still being developed; however, an estimate of the flow can be obtained from tracking the features present in the flow down the plate. Figure 5b shows more frames where a feature, a bulge in the flow, moves down the plate. The estimates of this are about  $v_{flow} = 1$  m/s.

### III. LITHIUM VAPOR SHIELDING

A phenomenon that has been observed with lithium in recent years is that of LVS. When subject to an incident heat flux, the lithium evaporates and creates a lithium vapor cloud above the surface. This cloud is suspected to radiate a portion of the upstream heat fluxes away from the lithium surface, extending its operational window. The first published characterization of the effect

was performed by van Eden et al.<sup>16</sup> in tin and Rindt et al. in lithium<sup>17</sup> on the Magnum-PSI (Ref. 29). When the vapor shielding regime is achieved, a locking temperature of the liquid surface is attained. That is, the liquid surface maintains this temperature even with increasing heat fluxes. This is a strong suggestion that the formed vapor cloud in between the liquid surface and upstream plasma radiates a considerable amount of power away from the surface, allowing it to maintain this locking temperature. This typically is seen to be between 750°C to 800°C for lithium. A minimum heat flux is required to reach the conditions where the LVS is observed, as too low of a heat flux does not allow for a dense enough lithium cloud to form.

Experiments carried out on the Magnum-PSI suggest that LVS starts to be significant around  $q = 6$  MW·m<sup>-2</sup>, with heat fluxes up to  $q = 20$  MW·m<sup>-2</sup> observed to be handled by LVS, as seen in Fig. 6. The surface used to perform these Magnum-PSI experiments was a capillary pore structure<sup>30,31</sup> that was three-dimensional-printed in tungsten. Figure 6 shows the temperature evolution of both the lithium targets and solid molybdenum reference targets with plasma powers of 15 and 20 MW·m<sup>-2</sup>. The




Fig. 5. (a) Changes in the flow of the lithium with increasing EM pump current, going from drops to an unstable flow to a stable laminar flow. (b) The flow velocity is estimated by looking at a bulge feature that travels down the flow and is measured to be 1 m/s.





Fig. 6. Example of the LVS: 15 to 20 MW·m<sup>-2</sup> heat flux discharges without lithium (red) and with lithium (black) where the locking temperature is clearly observed.

red lines correspond to the solid reference target, while the black lines are the lithium ones. The locking temperature appears to be around 750°C. By the time these shots were made, the transmission of the windows was very low, and determining its exact value along with the exact surface emissivity of lithium was not possible. Still, the locking temperature phenomenon is clearly seen, sitting within its expected range.

These measurements were done using hydrogen as the fueling gas; however it is critical to know how the LVS effect will behave with certain impurities present. Helium will be generated via the fusion reaction



and will need to be removed. This will be done via the divertor, and if a flowing liquid lithium system with LVS is operating, the helium could have an effect on operation. The other impurity of interest is that of neon, which is a potential candidate gas for plasma detachment. Thus, a campaign of LVS with helium and neon impurity seeding in the Magnum-PSI was undertaken as part of the LMPFC program. Since a divertor is to be designed, understanding how LVS will behave with these impurities is crucial.

Furthermore, a model is being developed to predict and provide some of the input numbers for the LVS effect to combine this into the SOLPS-ITER calculations being developed as part of the LMPFC program. The goal here is to do calculations to see the plasma response, via the SOLPS-ITER, with injected neon and lithium with a three-plate FNSF geometry.<sup>32</sup>



### III.A. Dutch Institute for Fundamental Energy Research Experiments

Figure 7 shows an image of the probe head on the Magnum-PSI. The heat flux is measured using steady-




Fig. 7. Image showing where the MAGNUM-PSI probe head is with plasma surface interactions and where the lithium vapor cloud occurs. The plasma is coming in from left to right.

state calorimetry. In Fig. 8, colorimetry data show the vapor shielding effect on the Magnum-PSI targets under three different power settings. Each of these power settings (4, 6, and 8  $\text{MW}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ ) were used with both a lithium and molybdenum reference target, with a pure hydrogen plasma, and with the addition of helium and neon species. The control shot using a nonlithiated molybdenum reference target under a pure hydrogen plasma is in blue. This measured the absolute heat flux generated by the plasma and hitting the surface. Next, a pure hydrogen plasma with the same source current and magnetic field setting was generated against a lithium surface, shown in orange. Third, the lithium target was subjected to the hydrogen plasma with neon seeding, shown in green. This is about 1% of the density of neon. Finally, the lithium target was subjected to a hydrogen plasma with helium seeding, shown in red.

For the 4  $\text{MW}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$  shots, there is not much difference between the different plasmas being used and between the lithium and reference targets in the calorimetry data. As seen in Fig. 8, at this power setting, all four curves lay around the same level. However, at the two higher heat fluxes (6 and 8  $\text{MW}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ ), the measured heat flux to the surface locks around 4.5 to 5  $\text{MW}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$  for the lithium targets, whereas it increases for the solid reference target. The cloud is therefore dissipating about 1.5  $\text{MW}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$  at the intermediate power setting and about 3  $\text{MW}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$  at the highest power setting.




Fig. 8. Heat flux measurements of plasmas on the surface of the MAGNUM-PSI. Four separate experiments were done for each value of heat flux. The first (blue) is a nonlithium plasma, the second (orange) is lithium with just hydrogen, the third (green) is lithium with neon, and finally, the fourth (red) is lithium with helium: (a) 3.99  $\text{MW}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ , (b) 6.88  $\text{MW}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ , and (c) 9.73  $\text{MW}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ . It is clear to see that below a threshold of heat flux there is no effect, but above some value of heat flux what is seen by the surface is reduced and limited to about 5.5  $\text{MW}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ .

Figure 8 also shows that below a certain incident heat flux level, the vapor shielding effect is not observed. It is clear that there needs to be a minimum heat flux to the surface to start to evaporate lithium sufficiently for the vapor cloud to properly form and be dense enough to effectively radiate power away. Figure 8 also shows no effect of adding helium or neon to the system. At the low temperatures of the Magnum-PSI, the ionization fraction of these species is so low that they do not affect the system much. Investigating neutral vapor shielding in a neutrally seeded environment would require a different device with higher operational temperatures. The bump at the end of the Li target with He in Fig. 8c is due to the lithium supply running out at the surface.

### III.B. Zapdos-CRANE Modeling

To understand how LVS influences the design of a working LM divertor, knowledge of the conditions that create the vapor shielding is needed. Designing and modeling the behavior of lithium in a future plant, like the FNSF, will need to be done using tools like SOLPS-ITER, and these need input parameters for how lithium will behave under plasma interactions. The contributing factors to LVS are that as the plasma heat flux interacts with the surface, the surface temperature will increase and lithium will start to evaporate. At some point, the heat flux will reduce until it saturates at some equilibrium, thus locking into the observed temperature and heat flux. There are two factors that contribute to the heat dissipation. The first is the lithium evaporative heat flux and heat lost to lithium sputtering. The second is the lithium vapor cloud itself radiating power away from the target via plasma chemistry.

These parameters are determined by a one-dimensional model that uses a plasma chemistry code (CRANE) and is coupled to a plasma transport solver (Zapdos). The evaporative lithium particle flux  $J_{Li}$  can be modeled from past data and existing empirical relations<sup>33–35</sup> as

$$J_{Li}(T_{surf}) = e^{-T_{surf}} + A \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{1 + e^{\left(\frac{T_{surf}-c}{s}\right)}} \right], \quad (2)$$

where  $T_{surf}$  is the lithium surface temperature, and  $A$ ,  $c$ , and  $s$  are fitting parameters. The evaporative heat flux  $Q_{Li}^{vap}$  is obtained from  $J_{Li}$ , the lithium heat of vaporization  $h_{Li}$ , and Avogadro's number  $N_A$  as

$$Q_{Li}^{vap} = \frac{h_{Li} \times J_{Li}}{N_A}. \quad (3)$$

To determine the total heat dissipation, also accounting for the plasma chemistry, a heat diffusion model is solved correcting for the heat flux  $\Delta Q$ , such that an observed locking temperature is observed. This gives

$$\Delta Q(T_{surf}) = BT_{surf} + C \left[ 1 + \text{erf} \left( \frac{T_{surf} - \mu}{\sigma_m} \right) \right] + D, \quad (4)$$

where  $B$ ,  $C$ ,  $D$ ,  $\mu$ , and  $\sigma_m$  are fitting parameters. Using as a reference one of the intermediate-power shots from the Magnum-PSI campaign where the heat flux is  $6 \text{ MW}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$  on the solid target and  $4.5 \text{ MW}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$  on the lithium target, some numerical values can be obtained. The dissipated heat by lithium for this shot is  $1.5 \text{ MW}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$  or 265 W, knowing the area of the used targets. The lithium surface temperature at this power setting was measured via an infrared camera to be  $650^\circ\text{C}$ . This gives a maximum evaporative heat flux of  $Q_{Li}^{vap} = 45 \text{ W}$ , assuming no redeposition. We can assume that at the temperatures of the Magnum-PSI, losses via sputtering are low and lithium evaporation and sputtering will combine to dissipate the 45 W computed with the zero redeposition assumption. This leaves a total of  $Q_{Li}^{chem} = 220 \text{ W}$ , at least, to be dissipated via plasma chemistry.

Hence, the excitation and ionization of lithium atoms are probably the most likely mechanisms for the energy dissipation. These are driven by electron collisions. The rate coefficients can be obtained by integrating the reaction cross sections over a Maxwellian distribution

$$k = \int_E \sigma(E) \sqrt{\frac{2E}{\mu_m}} y(E) dE, \quad (5)$$

where  $\sigma$  is the cross section,  $\mu_m$  is the reduced mass, and  $y(E)$  the Maxwellian distribution. The measured electron temperatures during the Magnum-PSI shots of interest, here using Thomson scattering, were about 1.2 eV. The power loss per lithium atom can then be found for a particular reaction as

$$P_{loss} = kn_e \Delta E. \quad (6)$$

This leads to the values shown in Table I for a few excitation ionization reactions. The power losses per lithium atom displayed in Table I suggest that the power dissipation is achieved mainly through the excitation of the ground-state lithium atoms and the ionization of excited lithium atoms. However, the deexcitation reaction rates are

TABLE I  
Excitation and Ionization Power Losses for Different Li Species

Excitation Power Loss		Ionization Power Loss	
Reaction	$P_{loss}$ (MeV/s)	Reaction	$P_{loss}$ (MeV/s)
$e + \text{Li}(2s) \rightarrow e + \text{Li}(2p)$	73.6914	$e + \text{Li}(2s) \rightarrow \text{Li}^+ + 2e$	0.7229
$e + \text{Li}(2s) \rightarrow e + \text{Li}(3s)$	4.4306	$e + \text{Li}(2p) \rightarrow \text{Li}^+ + 2e$	7.8615
$e + \text{Li}(2s) \rightarrow e + \text{Li}(3p)$	2.1462	$e + \text{Li}(3s) \rightarrow \text{Li}^+ + 2e$	56.4405
$e + \text{Li}(2s) \rightarrow e + \text{Li}(3d)$	2.9590	$e + \text{Li}(3p) \rightarrow \text{Li}^+ + 2e$	111.1002
		$e + \text{Li}(2d) \rightarrow \text{Li}^+ + 2e$	118.9097

much higher than the excitation rates for the experimental plasma parameters proper to the studied shots, as shown in Fig. 9. Hence, only excitation of the ground-state lithium atoms is significant at power radiation inside the vapor cloud. As soon as a lithium atom gets excited, it is much more likely to deexcite instantly than to ionize.

A more thorough analysis could be carried out via the use of Zapdos-CRANE. CRANE allows for a very rich reaction network to be implemented with no limit on the number of reactions that can be traced, while Zapdos can track the transport of the different species and give back spatial profiles for the species concentrations or plasma parameters. An initial model implementation in Zapdos-CRANE gave back the species density profiles shown in Fig. 10. Experimental benchmarks from the Magnum-PSI experimental campaigns have been obtained and are being implemented into the Zapdos-CRANE model to properly capture the formation of the vapor cloud and determine the different power dissipation mechanisms.

#### IV. NOTE ON HELIUM RETENTION

The third goal of the program was to start looking at hydrogen and helium retention. Experiments with helium plasmas using lithium were performed on the Hybrid Illinois Device for Research and Applications<sup>36,37</sup> (HIDRA). These experiments were not directly associated with the LMPFC program, but have direct consequences for the program. Liquid lithium was introduced into the plasma using the material analysis test stand<sup>38</sup> and a lithium injector.<sup>39</sup> The aim of the experiments was to test porous tungsten samples in helium plasma without and with lithium. The effect of the lithium on the performance of the plasma and reduction in recycling inside the HIDRA showed that there is a more interesting phenomenon to be explored. The results are described in Andruczyk et al.<sup>40</sup> The fact that lithium pumped helium is of utmost importance and is one of the main goals set out for the LMPFC program. The HIDRA is considered to have impurities mainly through water vapor and hydrogen,




Fig. 9. (a) Excitation and (b) deexcitation rates for lithium species. This shows that the deexcitation reaction rates are much higher than the excitation ones.




Fig. 10. Density profiles for different species within the vapor cloud. This not only includes the lithium species, but also incoming plasma.

and oxygen is seen spectroscopically as well as on the RGAs. However, when lithium is present, the levels of these also drop significantly. Thus, this suggests that hydrogen and helium can indeed be pumped by lithium. This is an extremely important result for future LMPFC designs for future devices.

## V. FUTURE EXPERIMENTS

Though much headway has been made in the understanding of lithium in a vacuum system and its operation with a loop, the ability to wet a surface fully still needs to be achieved and under different conditions, such as the angle of the surface and flow velocity. The material that the PFC surface will be made from is also important. Not only does it need to operate with lithium, but it also needs to be able to hold up to the corrosiveness of lithium. Future experiments will have a lithium loop where different samples can be inserted into the loop. The loop is shown in Fig. 11. The exposure will need to be done for hundreds of hours, and the mass reduction in the samples will determine the corrosion rate. Using surface analysis, the facilities at UIUC will also be able to determine the surface changes that occur.

Lithium vapor shielding needs to be demonstrated in a toroidal environment. The steady-state operation of the HIDRA provides a platform for this to happen. Surfaces mounted in the HIDRA-MAT can be exposed to plasmas for up to 5400 s. The surface temperature is monitored, and thus, if a locking temperature is observed, will be an indication of the LVS being established.

Understanding the exact mechanism for why lithium pumps helium will be important as well. It is clear that helium is pumped by lithium, but the actual mechanism is




Fig. 11. Proposed corrosion loop to test different materials under flowing lithium conditions. This will be done in an argon atmosphere for simplicity.

not yet understood and if that will translate to a flowing system. Past experiments on the FLiER device<sup>41-43</sup> suggest that helium can be pumped by a flowing lithium system. Helium ions were fired into a differentially separated system. The lithium formed the seal between the two chambers and RGAs were used to measure the helium. When the helium was fired into the lithium, it appeared in the second chamber. When switched off, the helium signal disappeared. This, with the HIDRA results, suggests that helium pumping should be possible. Hydrogen pumping is also important, and the ability for lithium to remove hydrogen and then be able to remove it is crucial. Fuel like tritium and deuterium, which are not used in the fusion experiment and are removed with the lithium, will need to be extracted and reused. The rate that this happens needs to be equal to or greater than what is absorbed. This will be part of future experiments to determine the absorption rate and the extraction rate.<sup>44,45</sup>

## VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The domestic LMPFC program is charged with developing a flowing liquid-lithium divertor for a future FNSF or CPP design. UIUC is tasked with developing the loop and surface technology. A flowing liquid-lithium loop is now in operation with 1 m/s flow velocities. Marginal wetting of a full-plate surface has been achieved and needs to be further developed. One way to do this is to improve the distribution system. Material compatibility will also be important, and a future flowing loop for

corrosion studies will be built. An understanding of the lithium vapor cloud is being developed. LVS is potentially an important effect that needs to be understood, as it could be a way to dissipate incoming heat flux to the divertor surface. This is being modeled with Zapdos-CRANE and has been observed in a series of Magnum-PSI experimental campaigns. Future experiments will see LVS experiments in the HIDRA under actual toroidal conditions. This will determine the parameters needed to be input into SOLPS-ITER to help with the modeling and design of the divertor. Furthermore, future experiments looking at helium and hydrogen retention and recovery will be undertaken.

## Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the support of the Magnum-PSI Facility Team at the Dutch Institute for Fundamental Energy Research (DIFFER). The Magnum-PSI facility at DIFFER has been funded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research and EURATOM. This work has been carried out within the framework of the EUROfusion Consortium, funded by the European Union via the Euratom Research and Training Program (grant agreement no. 101052200 EUROfusion). The views and opinions expressed are those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be held responsible for them.

## Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## Funding

This work is supported in part by the DOE under contracts DE SC0020642, DE-AC02-09CH11466, and DE-AC05-00OR22725. The University of California Los Angeles appreciates the support from the subcontract with ORNL (no. 4000171188).

## ORCID

D. Andruczyk  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6613-3509>

## References

1. C. E. KESSEL et al., “Critical Exploration of Liquid Metal Plasma-Facing Components in a Fusion Nuclear Science

Facility,” *Fusion Sci. Technol.*, **75**, 886 (2019); <https://doi.org/10.1080/15361055.2019.1610685>.

2. G. F. MATTHEWS et al., “Current Status of the JET ITER-Like Wall Project,” *Phys. Scr.*, **T138**, 014001 (2009); <https://doi.org/10.1088/0031-8949/2009/T138/014030>.
3. H. ZOHN et al., “On the Physics Guidelines for a Tokamak DEMO,” *Nucl. Fusion*, **53**, 073019 (2013); <https://doi.org/10.1088/0029-5515/53/7/073019>.
4. M. J. BALDWIN et al., “Helium Induced Nanoscopic Morphology on Tungsten Under Fusion Relevant Plasma Conditions,” *Nucl. Fusion*, **48**, 035001 (2008); <https://doi.org/10.1088/0029-5515/48/3/035001>.
5. M. J. BALDWIN et al., “The Effects of High Fluence Mixed-Species (Deuterium, Helium, Beryllium) Plasma Interactions with Tungsten,” *J. Nucl. Mater.*, **390–391**, 886 (2009); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2009.01.247>.
6. M. ONO et al., “Active Radiative Liquid Lithium Divertor Concept,” *Fusion Eng. Des.*, **89**, 2838 (2014); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fusengdes.2014.05.008>.
7. C. E. KESSEL et al., “Overview of the Fusion Nuclear Science Facility, a Credible Break-In Step on the Path to Fusion Energy,” *Fusion Eng. Design.*, **135**, 236 (2018); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fusengdes.2017.05.081>.
8. A. de CASTRO et al., “Lithium, a Path to Make Fusion Energy Affordable,” *Phys. Plasmas*, **28**, 050901 (2021); <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0042437>.
9. D. MANSFIELD et al., “Enhancement of Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor Performance by Lithium Conditioning,” *Physics of Plasmas*, **3**, 1892 (1996); <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.871984>.
10. H. W. KUGEL et al., “The Effect of Lithium Surface Coatings on Plasma Performance in the National Spherical Torus Experiment,” *Phys. Plasmas*, **15**, 056118 (2008); <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2906260>.
11. G. Z. ZUO et al., “Primary Results of Lithium Coating for the Improvement of Plasma Performance in EAST,” *Plasma Sci. Technol.*, **12**, 646 (2010); <https://doi.org/10.1088/1009-0630/12/6/02>.
12. R. MAJESKI et al., “Enhanced Energy Confinement and Performance in a Low-Recycling Tokamak,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **97**, 075002 (2006); <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.075002>.
13. A. MAAN et al., “Plasma Facing Component Characterization and Correlation with Plasma Conditions in Lithium Tokamak Experiment-β,” *IEEE Trans. Plasma Sci.*, **48**, 1463 (2020); <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPS.2020.2969115>.
14. D. ANDRUCZYK et al., “A Domestic Program for Liquid Metal PFC Research in Fusion,” *J. Fusion Energy*, **39**, 441 (2020); <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10894-020-00259-0>.

15. D. ANDRUCZYK et al., “Overview of Lithium Injection and Flowing Liquid Lithium Results from the US-China Collaboration on EAST,” *Phys. Scr.*, **T171**, 014067 (2020); <https://doi.org/10.1088/1402-4896/ab6ce1>.
16. G. G. van EDEN et al., “Self-Regulated Plasma Heat Flux Mitigation due to Liquid Sn Vapor Shielding,” *Phys. Rev. Letter.*, **116**, 135002 (2016); <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.135002>.
17. P. RINDT et al., “Power Handling and Vapor Shielding of Pre-filled Lithium Divertor Targets in Magnum-PSI,” *Nucl. Fusion*, **59**, 056003 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-4326/ab0560>.
18. S. KENILEY et al., “Multiphase Modeling of the DC Plasma-Water Interface: Applications to Hydrogen Peroxide Generation with Experimental Evaluation,” *Plasma Source. Sci. Technol.*, **24**, 075001 (2022).
19. M. NIETO et al., “Helium Retention and Diffusivity in Flowing Liquid Lithium,” *J. Nucl. Mater.*, **313–316**, 646 (2003); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-3115\(02\)01372-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-3115(02)01372-7).
20. P. FIFLIS et al., “Wetting Properties of Liquid Lithium on Select Fusion Relevant Surfaces,” *Fusion Eng. Des.*, **89**, 2827 (2014); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fusengdes.2014.03.060>.
21. J. S. HU et al., “Experiments of Continuously and Stably Flowing Lithium Limiter in EAST Towards a Solution for the Power Exhaust of Future Fusion Devices,” *Nucl. Mater. Energy*, **18**, 99 (2019); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nme.2018.12.017>.
22. G. Z. ZUO et al., “Results from a New Flowing Liquid Li Limiter with TZM Substrate During High Confinement Plasmas in the EAST Device,” *Phys. Plasmas*, **27**, 052506 (2020); <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5143179>.
23. G. Z. ZUO et al., “Improvement on the Plasma Performances via Application of Flowing Lithium Limiters in EAST Tokamak,” *Phys. Scr.*, **T171**, 014008 (2020); <https://doi.org/10.1088/1402-4896/ab3bed>.
24. C. L. LI et al., “Evidence of Vapor Shielding Effect on Heat Flux Loaded on Flowing Liquid Lithium Limiter in EAST,” *Plasma Sci. Technol.*, **24**, 095104 (2022).
25. D. O’DEA et al., *Nucl. Fusion*. (submitted for publication).
26. G. Z. ZUO et al., “Upgraded Flowing Liquid Lithium Limiter for Improving Li Coverage Uniformity and Erosion Resistance in EAST Device,” *Rev. Sci. Instrum.*, **88**, 123506 (2017); <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4997806>.
27. X. C. MENG et al., “Real-Time Gas Cooling of Flowing Liquid Lithium Limiter for the EAST,” *Fusion Eng. Des.*, **154**, 111537 (2020); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fusengdes.2020.111537>.
28. M. SZOTT, “Advances Geometries for Dryout Mitigation in TEMHD-Driven Liquid Lithium Systems,” PhD Thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (2020).
29. G. de TEMMERMAN et al., “High Heat Flux Capabilities of the Magnum-PSI Linear Plasma Device,” *Fusion Eng. Des.*, **88**, 483 (2013); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fusengdes.2013.05.047>.
30. S. MIRNOV et al., “Experiments with Lithium Limiter on T-11M Tokamak and Applications of the Lithium Capillary-Pore System in Future Fusion Reactor Devices,” *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion*, **48**, 821 (2006); <https://doi.org/10.1088/0741-3335/48/6/009>.
31. P. RINDT et al., “Using 3D-Printed Tungsten to Optimize Liquid Metal Divertor Targets for Flow and Thermal Stresses,” *Nuclear Fusion*, **59**, 5, 054001 (2019); <https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-4326/ab0a76>.
32. J. LORE et al., “Simulation of Liquid Lithium Divertor Geometry Using SOLPS-ITER,” *IEEE Trans. Plasma Sci.*, **50**, 11, 4199 (2022); <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPS.2022.3166402>.
33. R. F. MATTAS et al., “ALPS—Advanced Limiter-Divertor Plasma-Facing Systems,” *Fus. Eng. Des.*, **49–50**, 127 (2000); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-3796\(00\)00385-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-3796(00)00385-9).
34. A. KHODAK et al., “Parametric Study of a Divertor Cooling System for a Liquid-Metal Plasma-Facing Component,” *IEEE Trans. Plasma Sci.*, **42**, 8, 2161 (2014); <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPS.2014.2330292>.
35. A. KHODAK et al., “Modeling of Liquid Lithium Flow in Porous Plasma Facing Material,” *Nucl. Mater. Energy*, **26**, 100935 (2021); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nme.2021.100935>.
36. D. ANDRUCZYK et al., “HIDRA: Hybrid Illinois Device for Research and Applications,” *Fusion Sci. Technol.*, **68**, 497 (2015); <https://doi.org/10.13182/FST14-989>.
37. R. RIZKALLAH et al., “Latest Results From the Hybrid Illinois Device for Research and Applications (HIDRA),” *IEEE Trans. Plasma Sci.*, **46**, 2685 (2018).
38. A. SHONE et al., “An Overview of the Hybrid Illinois Device for Research and Applications Material Analysis Test-stand (HIDRA-MAT),” *J. Fusion Energy*, **39**, 438 (2020); <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10894-020-00260-7>.
39. A. SHONE et al., “HIDRA-MAT Liquid Metal Droplet Injector for Liquid Metal Applications in HIDRA,” *Fusion Eng. Des.*, **180**, 113193 (2022); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fusengdes.2022.113193>.
40. D. ANDRUCZYK et al., “First Lithium Experiments in HIDRA and Evidence of Helium Retention During Quasi-Steady-State Stellarator Plasma Operations,” *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion*, **64**, 085011 (2022); <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6587/ac7973>.
41. J. P. ALLAIN et al., “FLIRE—Flowing Liquid Surface Retention Experiment, Design and Testing,” *Fusion Eng. Des.*, **61–62**, 245 (2002); [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-3796\(02\)00118-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-3796(02)00118-7).

42. M. NIETO et al., “Measurement of Implanted Helium Particle Transport by a Flowing Liquid Lithium Film,” *J. Nucl. Mater.*, **350**, 101 (2006); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2005.09.028>.
43. R. STUBBERS et al., “Measurement of Hydrogen Absorption in Flowing Liquid Lithium in the Flowing Lithium Retention Experiment (FLIRE),” *J. Nucl. Mater.*, **337–339**, 1033 (2005); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2004.09.045>.
44. M. CHRISTENSON et al., “A Distillation Column for Hydrogen Isotope Removal from Liquid Lithium,” *Fusion Eng. Des.*, **135**, 81 (2018); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fusengdes.2018.07.009>.
45. M. CHRISTENSON et al., “A Study on Hydrogen Absorption and Dissolution in Liquid Lithium,” *Nucl. Fusion*, **59**, 026011 (2019); <https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-4326/aaf587>.