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Shock waves become radiative when ...

- radiative energy flux would exceed incoming material energy flux

\[ \sigma T_s^4 \propto u_s^8 \quad \rho_0 u_s^{3/2} \]

where post-shock temperature is proportional to \( u_s^2 \).

- Setting these fluxes equal gives a threshold velocity of 60 km/s for our system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>xenon gas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>6.5 mg/cc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial shock velocity</td>
<td>200 km/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial ion temperature</td>
<td>2 keV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typ. radiation temp.</td>
<td>50 eV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I will show you

- Where we are, and
- How we got here, and
- Point toward ongoing work on a few issues discussed later today
CRASH is completing the primary project goals

- CRASH has completed the year 5 (elliptical tube) experiment and analysis of the data

- The CRASH code has run effectively since late 2011 in support of run sets for assessment of predictive capability
  - Also has proven effective in support of other experiments

- CRASH has completed an initial assessment of predictive capability by comparing predictions based on run sets and circular-tube data to elliptical-tube data
  - For shock location the predictions differ from observations by about 10%
    - This is of order the experimental variability and achieves our stated goal
  - Work with other metrics is ongoing
  - Difference perhaps attributable to combined effects of diffusion rad tran model and 3D geometry
We started with a few pieces

- A base experiment
- A space weather code
- A (black box) laser energy deposition code
- A primitive version of PDT for linear Boltzmann
We extended the code to high energy density

- **CRASH 3.2**
  - Hydro equations with relevant source terms
  - Dynamic AMR
  - Level set interfaces
  - EOS
    - Self-consistent EOS and opacities for 5 materials
    - STA Xe opacities
  - Multigroup-diffusion radiation transport
  - Electron physics and flux-limited electron heat conduction

- This involved implementation of many verification tests

- Eventually we added a laser package

3D Nozzle to Ellipse @ 13 ns
A key point in code development was simulations of the year-5 experiment.

Elliptical simulations (H2D initiated):

Van der Holst et al, HEDP 2012

13 ns multigroup
Doing all this gave reasonable fidelity for the base experiment

- By the middle of year 4
The experiments addressed the needs of UQ

- The year 1 and 5 experiments assessed experimental variability for the circular and elliptical cases
- The year 2 through 4 experiments were mainly in service of code fidelity

Early time radiographs

Shock breakout

Omega laser beams

ASBO probe beam
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ASBO and SOP

600 µm tube
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Circular nozzle
Our radiographic studies provided foundational data for code assessment

- Bayesian analysis of tilt gives compression ~ 22
  - Doss HEDP, A&SS 2010

- Shock-shock interactions give local Mach number
  - Doss PoP 2009

- Shape of entrained flow reveals wave-wave dynamics
  - Doss PoP 2011

- Thin layer instability; scaling to supernova remnants
  - Doss thesis & to be pub.

Credit: Carolyn Kuranz

This research was supported by the DOE NNSA/ASC under the Predictive Science Academic Alliance Program by grant number DEFC52-08NA28616.
We used the work of our early years to develop and demonstrate techniques for prediction

- Sensitivity studies
- Approaches to metrics
- Predictive studies using 1D simulations

\[ y_m = \eta(x, \theta) + \delta(x) + \epsilon \]
\[ y_c = \eta(x, \theta_c) \]
As our codes evolved, we did many run sets to support UQ

- A substantial fraction of our activity
  - Defining
  - Initiating via a formal process
  - Running (as platforms change)
  - Processing
  - Analyzing
  - Reacting

- Many people & interactions

- RS 4: 104 2D on base expt
- RS 5: 512 1D on numerics
- RS 6: 128 2D on numerics
- RS 7: 128 99 for nozzles
  - The final H2D runset (ugh!)
- RS 8: 27 2D Nozzle properties
- RS 9: 10 3D Ellipticity and shape
- RS 10: 128 2D base CRASH
  - With laser package
- RS 11: 128 2D base CRASH
  - Updated laser physics and parameter ranges from RS10
- RS 12-14 discussed later

H2D could not get the job done
From early work, we developed a new statistical model for combining outputs from multi-fidelity simulators

- Used simulations from 1-D and 2-D models
- 2-D models runs come at a higher computational cost
- Used all simulations, and experiments, to make predictions
- **1-D CRASH Simulations**
  - 1024 simulations
  - Experiment variables: Be thickness, Laser energy, Xe fill pressure, Observation time
  - Calibration parameters: Electron flux limiter, Laser energy scale factor
- **2-D CRASH Simulations**
  - 104 simulations
  - Experiment variables: Be thickness, Laser energy, Xe fill pressure, Observation time
  - Calibration parameters: Electron flux limiter, Wall opacity, Be gamma
Our joint model using two simulation codes

\[ \text{BOT}_1 = \eta_{\text{BOT}}(x, t_1, t_c) \]

\[ \text{BOT}_2 = \eta_{\text{BOT}}(x, \theta_1, t_c) + \delta_{1 \rightarrow 2}(x, t_2, t_c) \]

\[ \text{BOT}_m = \eta_{\text{BOT}}(x, \theta_1, \theta) + \delta_{1 \rightarrow 2}(x, \theta_2, \theta) \]

\[ + \delta(x) + \epsilon \]

- Theta values put in model M1 only
- Common theta values put in M1 & M2
- M1-theta tuned to model M2
- Theta values in M2 only
- Tuned values of theta
We used 1D & 2D run sets to predict shock breakout time.

\[
\eta_{\text{BOT}} + \delta_{1 \rightarrow 2}
\]
The year 4 and 5 experiments were new

- We met the necessary challenges in fabrication
  - The circular to elliptical transition was not trivial
We used CRASH 3.2 to do run sets in support of predictions for the year 5 experiment

- RS12:
  - 128 2D base CRASH runs
  - Laser package with fully 3D ray tracing
  - Revised parameter ranges to adequately provide coverage of reasonable values

- RS13:
  - 80 3D base CRASH runs with gray radiation
  - Laser deposition phase carried out in 2D CRASH with conditions mapped to the 3D mesh after the laser pulse ends
  - Full year-5 experimental geometry

- RS 14:
  - Same as RS13 with multigroup radiation
  - Still running, slowly
It is far from trivial to get adequate run sets

- Challenges include
  - Spanning what turns out to be the data
  - Identifying need for changes in the runs when the experiment evolves
  - One improves with practice

![Shock Location vs Time from Cylindrical Runs](image-url)
We are (just) now able to use the junction of the primary shock and wall-shock interface as metrics

- Results from RS12 and cylindrical tube data
  - Each black dot is from one run at one time
  - Green X’s are experimental data

Mike Grosskopf will explain the details
We applied our predictive methodology to the year 5 experiment

- You will hear much more about this next from Derek Bingham
- Median prediction = 3401.3
- All but one observation is within 10% of median prediction
- Largest value is differs from median by 10.92%
The difference between predictions and observations may reflect the detailed interplay of radtran and hydro

- The wall shock in the nozzle helps choke off some downstream flow
  - Our diffusive radtran model should get the wall heating wrong
  - <20% difference in net forward momentum would match the data

- We are at the level of differences of order the experimental variability: this was our stated goal
Throughout we made progress in code development

- **CRASH 3.2**
  - Flux limited electron heat xport
  - EOS source adaptivity
  - Laser package
  - Improved multigroup preconditioner
  - Better use of level sets
  - Improved scaling with HYPRE
  - Non-LTE

- **PDT**
  - Implemented thermal radiation
  - Improved single-core performance
  - Optimal sweeps \( \rightarrow \) parallel scaling
  - Developed STAPL; ported PDT

- **After CRASH 3.2**

- **Improved physics**
  - Non-LTE
  - Field-aligned heat conduction
  - Magnetic field effects in \( \text{rz-} \) geometry

- **Improved algorithms**
  - Support for higher-order schemes
  - Semi-implicit resistivity terms

- **Improved code**
  - Generalized initialization routines, including using 2D output to initialize 3D run
  - Finalized integration with the improved adaptive-mesh library, BATL
Years 1 through 4 involved many elements of progress in UQ

- **Predictive studies**
  - Predictive study involving calibration
  - Predictive study with calibration from H2D run set
  - Predictive method involving joint models
  - Predictive study with joint models and calibration/tuning

- **UQ**
  - Deep analysis of experimental sources of uncertainty
  - Radiograph interpreters for integrated metrics
  - Hydro validation studies
  - Extensive studies of output sensitivities
    - Experimental parameters
    - Physical parameters
    - Solver details
    - H2D parameters and use
    - Fidelity with AMR

- **Continued solid code engineering practices**
  - Many code verification tests
  - Our code comparison project proved useful to LANL
We did a fair bit of physics along the way too

- We published or are preparing papers on
  - Wall shock and related flows
  - Relevant radtran & radhydro theory
  - The specific physics of our shocks
  - X-ray driven walls theory
  - SN/FLD comparison

- We also did substantial work on
  - Obtaining STA opacities
  - Non-LTE effects
  - SN/FLD comparison
We now use CRASH in support of all our HED experiments

Diverging Rayleigh-Taylor

Ablative flows

Kelvin Helmholtz experiments

Data

CRASH

Rayleigh-Taylor growth in the presence of a radiative shock

Plasma jets

High Drive: 310 eV Tr source

Low Drive 207 eV Tr source
With PDT and CRASH-opacity we studied opacity UQ

- Treated inputs to CRASH-opacity code (not opacities themselves) as the uncertain inputs.
- Used 1D axial and radial problems to screen parameters
  - Involved 32k runsets – sets of 32k opacity tables with 32k PDT runs
- Used thousands of 2D runs (each with unique opacity table) to explore variations in Absorption Rate Densities in plastic wall.
With PDT we studied energy deposition in the wall

- We varied spatial, energy, and directional resolution
- We examined Abs. Rate. Density (ARD) as a function of time and position in the plastic
- Gray is terrible. 10-group not grossly different from 50-group, which is close to 99-group.
- S6 (24 directions in 2D) and S8 (40) show differences relative to S16 (144).
We have also addressed several issues of past concern:

- Diffusion vs transport (Myra and TAMU Talk)
- Non-LTE effects (Sokolov talk)
  - Evidence indicates no important effects for metrics
- Solution verification (Fryxell talk)
  - We have convergence on simple tests that extrapolates to small errors
  - Other tests and the full problem do not match well the assumptions underlying standard simple solution verification models
- Also figured out how to extract better metrics for the wall shock, finally (Grosskopf talk)
Grad student summary

- 5 continuing students whose graduate student support has been > 40% from CRASH Sponsor funds.
  - All have made lab visits

- 9 continuing students doing CRASH-related research having had < 40% CRASH sponsor fund support.
  - 3 have made lab visits

- 19 graduated Ph.D.s (projected through summer 2018) who received direct or indirect CRASH support.
  - 12 of them made 18 lab visits.
  - 4 of them are now working at NNSA labs and several others are working at other DOE labs

- 5 students who have left CRASH orbit or dropped.

- 38 students total whose research has been directly or indirectly supported by CRASH
CRASH is completing the primary project goals

- CRASH has completed the year 5 (elliptical tube) experiment and analysis of the data

- The CRASH code has run effectively since late 2011 in support of run sets for assessment of predictive capability
  - Also has proven effective in support of other experiments

- CRASH has completed an initial assessment of predictive capability by comparing predictions based on run sets and circular-tube data to elliptical-tube data
  - For shock location the predictions differ from observations by about 10%
    - This is of order the experimental variability and achieves our stated goal
  - Work with other metrics is ongoing
  - Difference perhaps attributable to combined effects of diffusion rad tran model and 3D geometry
Supplemental material follows
### CRASH Faculty

**Paul Drake, Director**

#### Predictive Capability beyond traditional V&V
- **James Holloway**, Co-PI, lead: UM Prof. Nuclear  
- **Bruce Fryxell**, chief scientist: UM AESS Res. Sci.  
- **Natasha Andronova**: UM AESS Res. Sci.  
- **Krzysztof Fidkowski**: UM Prof. Aero  
- **Bani Mallick**: TAMU Prof. Stats  
- **Vijayan Nair**: UM Prof. Stats & IOE  
- **Derek Bingham**: SFU Prof. Stats

#### Scientific Computing
- **Quentin Stout**, Co-PI, lead: UM Prof. CSE  
- **Nancy Amato**: TAMU Prof. CompSci  
- **Lawrence Rauchwerger**: TAMU Prof. CompSci

#### Code Development and Traditional V&V
- **Ken Powell**, Co-PI, lead: UM Prof. Aero  
- **Gabor Toth**, Software Archit.: UM AESS Res. Sci.  
- **Igor Sokolov**: UM AESS Res. Sci.  
- **Bart van der Holst**: UM AESS Res. Sci.  
- **Eric Myra**: UM AESS Res. Sci.  
- **Ben Torralva**: UM MSE Res. Sci.

#### Modeling and Theory
- **Marv Adams**, Co-PI: TAMU Prof. Nuclear  
- **Tamas Gombosi**: UM Prof. AESS  
- **Ed Larsen**: UM Prof. Nuclear  
- **Eric Johnsen**: UM Prof. Mechanical  
- **Smadar Karni**: UM Prof. Math  
- **Bill Martin**: UM Prof. Nuclear  
- **Ryan McClarren**: TAMU Prof. Nuclear  
- **Jim Morel**: TAMU Prof. Nuclear  
- **Phil Roe**: UM Prof. Aero  
- **Katsuyo Thornton**: UM Prof. MSE  
- **Bram van Leer**: UM Prof. Aero  
- **Marcel Klapisch**: ARTEP  
- **Michel Busquet**: ARTEP

#### Experiments
- **Paul Keiter**: UM AESS Res. Sci.  
- **Carolyn Kuranz**: UM AESS Res. Sci.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grad Students</th>
<th>Advisor</th>
<th>UO/APC</th>
<th>Scient. Comp. &amp; Theory</th>
<th>Experiments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker, Eric</td>
<td>Larsen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbu, Anthony</td>
<td>Adams and Morel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheatham, Jesse (graduated)</td>
<td>Holloway and Martin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou, Jason</td>
<td>Fryxell and Drake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahm, Johann</td>
<td>Fidkowsky</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson, Greg (graduated)</td>
<td>Larsen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di Stefano, Carlos</td>
<td>Kuranz and Drake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doss, Forrest (graduated)</td>
<td>Drake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards, Jarrod</td>
<td>Morel and Adams</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fein, Jeff</td>
<td>Holloway and Drake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Frahan, Marc</td>
<td>Johnsen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamboa, Eliseo</td>
<td>Drake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goh, Joslin</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetzler, Adam</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington, Channing</td>
<td>Drake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krauland, Christine</td>
<td>Drake and Kuranz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magino, Peter</td>
<td>Morel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald, Michael</td>
<td>Drake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moran, Tiberus</td>
<td>Holloway</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movahed, Pooyah</td>
<td>Johnsen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandya, Tara</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson, Nick</td>
<td>Thornton and Drake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poon, Patrick</td>
<td>Stout</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Tim</td>
<td>Rauchwerger</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starinshak, Dave</td>
<td>Karni and Powell</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stripling, Hayes</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Till, Andrew</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visco, Tony</td>
<td>Drake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wan, Wesley</td>
<td>Drake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Rachel</td>
<td>Kuranz and Drake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaide, Daniel</td>
<td>Powell and Roe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang, Zhanyang</td>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Technical Staff | | | |
|-----------------|---------|--------|------------------------|-------------|
| Mike Grosskopf  | UM Sr. Res. Eng. | X | X | X |
| Donna Marion    | UM Technician/Target Fab | X |                  |             |
| Erica Rutter    | UM Technician/ Codes | X |                  |             |
| Mauro Bianco    | TAMU Post doc | X |                        |             |
| Guy Malamud     | TAMU Post doc | X |                        |             |
| Avishek Chakraborty | TAMU Post doc | X |                  |             |
| W. Daryl Hawkins | TAMU Softw Architect | X |                  |             |
| Sergey Manolov  | TAMU Staff programmer | X |                  |             |
| Michael Adams   | TAMU Staff programmer | X |                  |             |

| Administrative | | | |
|----------------|---------|--------|------------------------|-------------|
| Kathy Norris   | UM CRASH Admin | | | |
| Jan Beltran    | UM Sr. Admin. Asst. | | | |
We’ve invested real effort in scaling

- CRASH hydro on BG/L

- PDT transport on Sequoia (60% efficiency on 393k cores with STAPL-beta version)