

Bayesian inference of inaccuracies in radiation transport physics from inertial confinement fusion experiments

J.A. Gaffney^{a,*}, D. Clark^a, V. Sonnad^a, S.B. Libby^a

^aLawrence Livermore National Laboratory, 7000 East Ave, Livermore, CA 94550

Abstract

First principles microphysics models are essential to the design and analysis of high energy density physics experiments. Using experimental data to investigate the underlying physics is also essential, particularly when simulations and experiments are not consistent with each other. This is a difficult task, due to the large number of physical models that play a role, and due to the complex (and as a result, noisy) nature of the experiments. This results in a large number of parameters that make any inference a daunting task; it is also very important to consistently treat both experimental and prior understanding of the problem. In this paper we present a Bayesian method that includes both these effects, and allows the inference of a set of modifiers which have been constructed to give information about microphysics models from experimental data. We pay particular attention to radiation transport models. The inference takes into account a large set of experimental parameters and an estimate of the prior knowledge through a modified χ^2 function, which is minimised using an efficient genetic algorithm. Both factors play an essential role in our analysis. We find that although there is evidence of inaccuracies in off-line calculations of X ray drive intensity and Ge *L* shell absorption, modifications to radiation transport are unable to reconcile differences between 1D HYDRA simulations and the experiment.

Keywords: inertial confinement fusion, radiation hydrodynamic simulation, Bayesian inference, plasma opacity, uncertainty analysis, convergent ablator, national ignition facility, radiation transport

1. Introduction

In recent inertial confinement fusion (ICF) experiments performed at the national ignition facility (NIF) [1], significant differences between radiation-hydrodynamic simulations and experimental data have been observed [2]. It is not clear whether these simulations are inaccurate, or that they neglect some important physical effect. It is quite challenging to investigate which aspects of physics models are causing discrepancies and should be improved, largely due to the complex, nonlinear dependence of ICF capsule evolution on a large number of underlying models.

The complex nature of the experimental designs is an important source of the difficulties. There are a large number of experimental parameters that are only known with limited accuracy; variations in these parameters represent a noise source in the experimental data that can reduce the significance of the experimental result. Since the physical models we aim to investigate are fairly well constrained by a large amount of previous work, it is im-

portant to take into account the relative significance of the experiment and of any previous work. The interplay between experimental and previous information is an essential ingredient in a reliable analysis, and is often neglected. Its inclusion requires a consistent treatment of all physical and experimental parameters; together there are far too many of these to treat directly, however they are too important to neglect completely.

In this paper we present an analysis of experimental data taken from a single NIF shot, N110625. The aim is to develop a method of investigating microphysics models taking into account many of the noise sources in the experiment, and prior work. We use an inference model that has been developed specifically to allow the large number of parameters to be dealt with in a consistent manner [3]. In this work we focus on inferring information about radiation transport in the ablator of an ICF capsule from time resolved data taken from radiography [4]. Radiation transport relies on several physics models which must be approximated to make a full capsule simulation tractable, and as a result are often considered to be potential sources of model inaccuracy. In this work existing microphysics tables are modified in physically motivated ways; these modifiers are interpreted as measures of the inaccuracies in the physics models, and their inferred values give in-

^{*}This work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344. LLNL-JRNL-617033

^{*}Corresponding author

Email address: gaffney3@llnl.gov (J.A. Gaffney)

45 formation about the source of difficulties in describing
46 experimental observations.

47 **2. Microphysics in Inertial Confinement Fusion** 48 **ablators**

49 In a typical indirect drive ICF design a spherical plastic
50 shell, filled with deuterium-tritium (DT) fuel, is bathed
51 in X rays created by the interaction of laser light with
52 a high Z hohlraum. The resulting ablation of the outer
53 plastic produces a rocket action that implodes the shell,
54 compressing the fuel until it undergoes thermonuclear fu-
55 sion. The propagation and absorption of X ray energy
56 in the plastic and fuel is an essential piece of describing
57 the implosion that requires detailed models of microscopic
58 physics. These physics issues are described by a suit of
59 computer simulations which provide, for example, tables
60 of radiative opacities which are taken as input by subse-
61 quent radiation-hydrodynamic simulations [5].

62 Achieving ignition is a challenge and so the design of
63 successful targets requires careful tuning of a large set of
64 design parameters, based on the results of simulations [6].
65 This means that the fine details of microphysics models
66 can be very significant; nevertheless, the important as-
67 pects can be understood with relatively simple one dimen-
68 sional models [7]. We will discuss the important aspects
69 of microphysics models in these terms.

70 At its peak, the X ray drive on the outer surface of the
71 capsule has a brightness temperature of around 300eV.
72 The majority of the energy of this field is in photon en-
73 ergies that coincide with the K shell absorption edge in
74 carbon (which accounts for $\sim 50\%$ by number of the plastic
75 ablator) and so the model of this absorption feature plays
76 an important role in determining energy deposition in the
77 ablator. Higher photon energies are able to propagate all
78 the way through the carbon, depositing their energy in
79 the DT fuel. Heating of the fuel by these hard X rays
80 has a detrimental effect on the implosion since, for the
81 efficient adiabatic implosions driven by the NIF, the final
82 density is in part determined by the initial temperature
83 of the DT. Preheat by X rays reduces fuel compressibility
84 and ultimately reduces the final convergence that can be
85 achieved. An important player in this preheat is emis-
86 sion from the M shell of the gold hohlraum wall, which
87 produces an enhancement over the thermal spectrum of
88 photon energies $> 1.8\text{KeV}$; in order to block these from
89 reaching the fuel a dopant layer is buried in the ablator.
90 In this work we consider germanium doped ablators, in
91 which case absorption by the Ge L shell aligns with the
92 Au M shell emission and prevents preheat of the fuel.
93 In reality, the growth of 2 and 3 dimensional instabili-
94 ties also plays a very important role in determining the
95 implosion efficiency. In severe cases these can be much
96 more important than the 1D considerations that we have
97 described.

98 These two aspects of radiation transport, namely ab-
99 sorption of the drive field and preheat of the fuel, clearly
100 depend on models of the generation of the drive spectrum
101 and of the absorption in carbon and germanium at a large
102 range of conditions (10-200 eV, 1-10 g/cc). They also have
103 direct consequences for the dynamics of the implosion. A
104 simple rocket model for the inwards acceleration of the
105 ablator [7] shows that the velocity and remaining ablator
106 mass are directly related to velocity of the ablated mate-
107 rial, and therefore the absorption of drive radiation. The
108 density of the fuel at a given time is related to the preheat.
109 Measurements of these three quantities, as described in
110 section 4, can therefore provide information about under-
111 lying radiation transport physics models. The complexity
112 of ICF experiments and radiation-hydrodynamic simula-
113 tions means that extracting this information is a chal-
114 lenging data analysis problem; we describe a method of
115 performing this analysis in the next section.

116 **3. Bayesian analysis of ICF experiments**

117 The relationship between physical models, which them-
118 selves are very complex, and the data is approximated by
119 radiation-hydrodynamic simulations which may not be
120 well behaved enough to allow the use of computational
121 inversion techniques [8] or fitting techniques [9, 10]; the
122 large number of physical models that control the evolution
123 of an ICF target also presents a problem for these meth-
124 ods. The complex nature of the experiments also means
125 that there are a large number of experimental parameters;
126 although these are often constrained by target metrology
127 and design tolerances, their large number makes them
128 a significant source of noise in simulations [11]. Dealing
129 with the very large space of physical and experimental pa-
130 rameters is an important challenge to a consistent analysis
131 of ICF data. The usual methods of reducing the number
132 of parameters, for example by Monte-Carlo sampling (see,
133 for example, [12]), are prohibitively expensive, and simply
134 neglecting parameters will lead to misleading results.

135 In [3] we have developed an inference method that al-
136 lows these problems to be addressed. The approach is to
137 separate out those parameters that are known to affect
138 radiation-hydrodynamic simulations but are not of direct
139 interest to the investigation of microphysics models; these
140 are defined as ‘nuisance parameters’. Typically these pa-
141 rameters refer to experimental variables which have a
142 known probability distribution, for example a target di-
143 mension that has been measured with some error bar.
144 The probability distributions of all nuisance parameters
145 are mapped onto the output of radiation-hydrodynamic
146 simulations; as a result the simulation output can be con-
147 sidered as being probabilistic. In our model we assume a
148 linear response to nuisance parameters, resulting in an an-
149 alytic expression for the probability distribution of simu-
150 lation outputs (the *likelihood*). Parameters that are phys-
151 ically interesting (and therefore will be inferred from ex-

152 perimental data), such as microphysics models, are kept
 153 separate from the nuisance parameters allowing their re-
 154 lationship with experimental data to be described using
 155 the full complexity of the simulation code.

156 The inference model we have outlined is based on the
 157 maximum *a posteriori* (MAP) estimate; that is, the most
 158 probable values of all parameters of interest when the
 159 experimental data and prior have been taken into account.
 160 In our analysis these values are found by minimising the
 161 function [3]

$$\begin{aligned}
 I(\theta|d_{exp}) = & \sum_i \frac{(d_{exp,i} - d_m(\theta)_i)^2}{\sigma_{exp,i}^2} \\
 & - (d_{exp} - d_m(\theta))^T \beta^T \beta (d_{exp} - d_m(\theta)) \\
 & + \frac{1}{2} \ln (|\Lambda_\eta| |\alpha^T \alpha|) - \ln P(\theta)
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

with respect to the vector of interesting parameters θ .
 In the above expression, $d_m(\theta)$ is the vector of simu-
 lation outputs for given interesting parameters and nomi-
 nal values of the nuisance parameters, d_{exp} is the vector
 of experimental data, $P(\theta)$ is the prior distribution of in-
 teresting parameters (discussed below) and the matrices
 α and β satisfy the equations

$$\begin{aligned}
 \alpha^T \alpha &= A^T \Lambda_{exp}^{-1} A + \Lambda_\eta^{-1} \\
 \beta^T \alpha &= \Lambda_{exp}^{-1} A.
 \end{aligned}$$

162 These matrices summarise the effect of nuisance param-
 163 eters on our analysis; Λ_{exp} and Λ_η are the covariance
 164 matrices of the experimental measurement and nuisance
 165 parameters, respectively, and A is the linear response of
 166 the simulation to nuisance parameters η : $A_{ij} = \frac{\partial d_m(\theta)_i}{\partial \eta_j}$.

167 Equation (1) takes the form of a modified χ^2 function.
 168 The first term on the right hand side is the usual χ^2 anal-
 169 ysis, and the second can be interpreted as a loss of infor-
 170 mation from the experiment due to nuisance parameters.
 171 The third is a normalisation factor. The final term ex-
 172 presses the contribution from prior work on the values of
 173 the interesting parameters. In our application we inter-
 174 pret this term as an estimated error bar on the physical
 175 models we aim to investigate, reflecting previous work to
 176 validate them. The inclusion of this prior information
 177 provides context for the experimental result, allowing in-
 178 ferences to be obtained from a single observation. In [3]
 179 this was shown to play a very important role in the anal-
 180 ysis of NIF data.

181 The summary of nuisance parameters in the matrix
 182 $\beta^T \beta$ has reduced the number of variables we must con-
 183 sider to only the ones of direct interest. The resulting
 184 smoothing of the simulation output also means that the
 185 minimisation of equation (1) can be approached using
 186 standard numerical methods. In this work we use a ge-
 187 netic algorithm (GA) to efficiently perform the minimi-
 188 sation. The details of the genetic algorithm have been

189 optimised to allow an efficient exploration of a large pa-
 190 rameter space; the sacrifice is that the algorithm is more
 191 likely to find local minima. In the case of the ICF data
 192 we will consider here, this is not expected to be an issue
 193 since the interplay between likelihood and prior tends to
 194 produce a single minimum. In more complex cases this
 195 can be tested by using several random initialisations, or
 196 avoided by using a more robust algorithm.

197 4. Application to NIF experimental data

198 We aim to demonstrate the application of our Bayesian
 199 inference method to the investigation of microphysics
 200 models using NIF data. We use 1D simulations of a cap-
 201 sule implosion performed using the HYDRA radiation-
 202 hydrodynamics code [13]. Our investigation proceeds by
 203 defining a set of modifiers to the inputs of these simula-
 204 tions, and inferring the values of these modifiers. We are
 205 concentrating on physics issues in radiation transport and
 206 so our modifiers are to the X ray drive spectrum imping-
 207 ing on the capsule's outer surface (found from separate
 208 models of the hohlraum), and to relevant opacity models
 209 of the ablator material (taken from the TABOP opacity
 210 model). The use of modifiers, placed on the results of
 211 existing calculations, allows our inference results to be
 212 interpreted as implied inaccuracies in microphysics mod-
 213 els. We give details of our modifiers in table 1. In the case
 214 of the drive timing modifier, the prior error bar reflects
 215 the error bar on the DANTE instrument [14], which gives
 216 a time-resolved measurement of the drive radiation tem-
 217 perature. This instrument has played an important role
 218 in the development of the separate hohlraum simulations
 219 which produce drive profiles for our capsule simulations.
 220 For all other modifiers, prior errors are estimated in order
 221 to reflect the expected accuracy of the underlying physi-
 222 cal models. All modifiers, with the exception of the drive
 223 timing, are dimensionless multipliers on existing models
 224 and so their 'nominal' (and therefore prior) values are 1;
 225 the drive timing has a nominal shift of 0 ns.

226 Experimental data are taken from a single NIF 'con-
 227 vergent ablator' shot, N110625. This experiment utilised
 228 a germanium doped capsule which was radiographed as
 229 it imploded giving a time- and space- resolved measure-
 230 ment of plasma density [4, 15]. This then gives time-
 231 resolved data for the implosion velocity, mass of the ab-
 232 lator, and the ρR product of the imploding fuel shell.
 233 We consider these three data points, taken at three times
 234 during rocket-like phase of the implosion, in our analysis.
 235 The use of implosion velocity and ablator mass, which
 236 diagnose the drive, along with the ρR which is sensitive
 237 to preheat of the fuel, should allow the degeneracy of our
 238 modifier set (for example the drive intensity and C K
 239 shell) to be lifted. This is important since such degen-
 240 eracy results in a set of multiplier values that minimise
 241 equation (1); the inclusion of the ρR data should select a

Modifier Name	Description	Expected Effect	Prior Error
Drive Intensity	Multiplies intensity of 4 th rise in X ray drive	Increased drive results in increased velocity and decreased ablator remaining at given time	± 0.1
Drive Timing	Shifts the timing of the 4 th rise of the X ray drive	Earlier rise increases drive at given time	± 0.1
Au <i>M</i> Shell	Multiplies the intensity of the gold <i>M</i> shell component of X ray drive spectrum	Increased <i>M</i> shell results in increased preheat and reduced ρR at given time	± 0.2
C <i>K</i> Edge	Multiplies the opacity of the <i>K</i> shell absorption edge in carbon	Increased absorption increases effective drive	± 0.1
Ge <i>L</i> Edge	Multiplies the opacity of the <i>L</i> shell absorption edge in germanium	Increased absorption reduces preheat	± 0.1

Table 1: Description of the modifiers placed on input physics models. The values of these modifiers are inferred from experimental data using the method described in the text, and are intended to give information about the accuracy of radiation transport models for NIF ablaters.

Modifier	No Prior	Including Prior
Drive intensity	0.57	0.90
Drive timing	-0.45 ns	0.01 ns
Au <i>M</i> shell	1.84	0.97
C <i>K</i> edge	0.92	1.0
Ge <i>L</i> shell	1.15	1.16

Table 2: Positions of the best fit to experimental data for NIF shot N110625. In both cases 29 nuisance parameters are included; comparison of the two sets of data measures the significance of the experimental data when compared to prior knowledge.

single one of these values since it more fully reflects the physics of the problem.


For the multipliers and experimental data described, our genetic algorithm is randomly initialised and proceeds by automatically calling HYDRA. The nuisance parameter modification $\beta^T \beta$ is calculated for the 29 physical dimensions, densities and material composition parameters of the capsule [6], which are assumed to be known with an error of 1%. We ran the GA for 25 generations with 92 members per generation, requiring up to 2300 HYDRA simulations (the actual number is lower due to the optimisations made to the GA), equivalent to < 200 CPU hours. In table 2 we give the position of the results for two cases; including and neglecting the prior, respectively. Since the position of the minimum of equation (1) is determined by the relative importance of the prior and experimental results, comparison of these two cases provides information about the significance of the experiment in measuring radiation transport physics.

In table 2 the fit given in the ‘No Prior’ column corresponds to a maximum likelihood (ML) analysis, in which the experimental data are the only source of information about the values of the modifiers. In this case, the results


demonstrate that in order to fit the data all modifiers should be significantly different from their nominal values; this implies that microphysics models are in considerable error. Given the extensive work that has been undertaken on these models in the past, it is unlikely that this is truly the case. The previous work is taken into account in the ‘Including Prior’ column, and the large difference in results demonstrates the importance of including prior knowledge. In that case (corresponding to the MAP result) all modifiers are much closer to their nominal values. The noise in the experiment makes the observed data insensitive to the details of radiation transport; only the overall drive and Ge absorption are significantly modified from their prior values. Our results suggest that the calculated drive intensity is too high, consistent with previous work on ICF data, and that the calculated absorption by the germanium dopant layer is too low.

Comparison of the best fits to experiment, found using the two inference methods (neglecting and including the prior), allows us to measure the ability of inaccuracies in radiation transport to explain problems with modelling of the experiment. The quality of the inferred fits to experimentally inferred implosion velocity, ablator fraction, and line density are shown in figure 1(a),(b) and (c) respectively. In these figures, experimental data as a function of time are shown in blue, and simulation results using modifier values from table 2 are plotted in red (no prior) and black (prior included). The ML analysis, neglecting the prior, gives a reasonable qualitative fit to the data, but does not match within all error bars. The MAP result is much closer to an unmodified simulation and gives a poorer agreement with experiment. The inability of either approach to give a good match to the data suggests that discrepancies between simulations and experiments are not solely due to issues with radiation transport.


5. Discussion and Conclusions



(a) *Implosion velocity*



(b) *Fraction of ablator remaining*



(c) *Fuel ρR*

Figure 1: Best fits to experimental data, corresponding to HYDRA simulations using modifiers given in table 2. Experimental data are shown in blue, and inference results neglecting and including prior knowledge are shown in red and black, respectively.

301 The work presented in this paper demonstrates a
 302 method for inferring information about first principles
 303 physics models from ICF data. The inference model we
 304 use allows the inclusion of a large number of nuisance
 305 parameters; these play an important role in determin-
 306 ing the information in the experimental result. This is
 307 essential when comparing experimental results with the
 308 results of previous work, which is often the case in high
 309 energy density physics. Although we focus here on ra-
 310 diation transport in ICF ablaters, the issues we discuss
 311 are important in many of the experiments performed in
 312 high energy density physics, and the inference method we
 313 describe is easily applicable to any of these.

314 The main result of this work is that prior knowledge
 315 about microphysics plays a very important role. Includ-
 316 ing this in a consistent manner allows meaningful informa-
 317 tion to be extracted from data, so that when data imply
 318 a modification to physics models the result truly reflects
 319 the state of the art. We have also shown that the complex
 320 nature of ICF experiments means that the neglect of nui-
 321 sance parameters and/or prior information in a simple χ^2
 322 or maximum likelihood analysis will give misleading re-
 323 sults. In this work 29 parameters have been varied by 1%
 324 in order to produce the information loss due to nuisance
 325 parameters; for the well characterised targets used at the
 326 NIF certain capsule dimensions are known to a much bet-
 327 ter level than this, however prior knowledge will play an
 328 essential role regardless.

329 Once these factors are accounted for, there is evidence
 330 that both the overall X ray drive and the absorption of the
 331 germanium L shell are inaccurate. This could serve to fo-
 332 cus subsequent investigation of the underlying models (for
 333 example further inferences of inaccuracies in charge state
 334 balance), however the poor agreement between the cur-
 335 rent best fit and the experimental data shows that issues
 336 with radiation transport cannot explain discrepancies be-
 337 tween the details of ICF implosions and simulations. It is
 338 important to note that inferences based on an incomplete
 339 set of modifiers, which appears to be the case here, may
 340 never give a good fit to data. Until a good fit is found the
 341 physical meaning of multipliers is limited, and inferred
 342 values should be treated accordingly.

343 The method used here has been specifically designed
 344 so that an analysis with a large enough set of modifiers is
 345 feasible. Cases with 1-2 orders of magnitude more eval-
 346 uations of χ^2 are possible with a fairly modest computa-
 347 tional requirement, and the number of nuisance param-
 348 eters can be increased in our linear model with almost no
 349 numerical overhead.

350 Genetic algorithms have been previously used for
 351 HEDP applications, with good results [16–18]. In par-
 352 ticular, there is interest in using multi-objective genetic
 353 algorithms to consider several data sets simultaneously
 354 (typically 3 or 4). For the 9 data points we consider here,

and the even larger sets we aim to use, such multiobjective approaches would be difficult. Our single objective modified χ^2 approach is in effect a linear scalarisation of the multiobjective problem and allows much larger datasets to be considered. The trade off is that a single solution is found where multiobjective methods give several candidates; our careful treatment of the error bars on each data point serves to justify our choice of scalarisation.

It has been previously noted that the linear model we employ is not justified for ICF targets, since they have been highly tuned to operate at peak performance. The advantages of the analytic expression (1) are great, and so the authors aim to develop an analytic model that is more suited to ICF data. The linear model does, however, capture the essence of the problem; that complex experiments produce less significant results when compared to existing knowledge.

The Bayesian nature of our method allows the consistent analysis of all available data, either by evolving the prior knowledge as more data becomes available or by including all data in a single analysis; the different sets of data do not need to be from the same experiment, or even ones of the same design. These extensions will form a important part of our further work. Finally, the computational methods we have presented are suitable for both experimental design and discovery purposes, and we aim to develop this application.

References

[1] EL Moses. The national ignition facility and the national ignition campaign. *IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science*, 38(4):684–689, 2010.

[2] O L Landen, R Benedetti, D Bleuel, *Et al.* Progress in the indirect-drive national ignition campaign. *Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion*, 54(12):124026, 2012.

[3] JA Gaffney, D Clark, V Sonnad, and SB Libby. Development of a Bayesian method for the analysis of ICF experiments on the NIF. Submitted to Nuclear Fusion.

[4] D. G. Hicks, N. B. Meezan, E. L. Dewald, *Et al.* Implosion dynamics measurements at the national ignition facility. *Physics of Plasmas*, 19(12):122702, 2012.

[5] J Castor. *Radiation Hydrodynamics*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[6] SW Haan, JD Lindl, DA Callahan, *Et al.* Point design targets, specifications, and requirements for the 2010 ignition campaign on the national ignition facility. *Physics of Plasmas*, 18:051001, 2011.

[7] S Atzeni and J Meyer-ter Vehn. *The Physics of Inertial Fusion*, volume 125 of *International Series of Monographs on Physics*. Oxford Science, 2004.

[8] KM Hanson and GS Cunningham. Posterior sampling with improved efficiency. *Proceedings of the SPIE*, 3338:371–382, 1998.

[9] J Sacks, WJ Welch, TJ Mitchell, and HP Wynn. Design and analysis of computer experiments. *Statistical Science*, 4(4):409–435, 1989.

[10] Marc C. Kennedy and Anthony O’Hagan. Bayesian calibration of computer models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 63(3):425–464, 2001.

[11] D. Clark. Capsule modeling of ConAbl N101220. Presented at NIC Workshop, April 18 2011.

[12] Byron P. Roe. Statistical errors in monte carlo estimates of systematic errors. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment*, 570(1):159 – 164, 2007.

[13] M. M. Marinak, G. D. Kerbel, N. A. Gentile, *Et al.* Three-dimensional HYDRA simulations of national ignition facility targets. *Physics of Plasmas*, 8(5):2275–2280, 2001.

[14] J. L. Kline, K. Widmann, A. Warrick, *Et al.* The first measurements of soft x-ray flux from ignition scale hohlraums at the national ignition facility using dante. *Review of Scientific Instruments*, 81(10):10E321, 2010.

[15] D. G. Hicks, B. K. Spears, D. G. Braun, *Et al.* Convergent ablator performance measurements. *Physics of Plasmas*, 17(10):102703, 2010.

[16] I Golovkin, R. Mancini, S Louis, *Et al.* Analysis of X-ray spectral data with genetic algorithms. *Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer*, 75:625–636, 2002.

[17] T Nagayama, R. Mancini, R Florido, *Et al.* Processing of spectrally resolved x-ray images of inertial confinement fusion implosion cores recorded with multimono-chromatix x-ray imagers. *Journal of Applied Physics*, 109:093303, 2011.

[18] T Nagayama, J. Bailey, G. Rochau, *Et al.* Investigation of iron opacity experiment plasma gradients with synthetic data analyses. *Review of Scientific Instruments*, 83:10E128, 2012.