

Numerical validation of a volume heated mixed fuel concept

Hartmut Ruhl and Georg Korn

Marvel Fusion, Theresienhöhe 12, 80339 Munich, Germany

Abstract

While the underlying physics of the ICF approach to nuclear fusion is well understood and a technological implementation of the indirect drive variant of the ICF paradigm has recently been given at NIF commercially viable ICF concepts for energy production and beyond are still under investigation. In the present paper we propose core elements of a novel fast direct drive mixed fuel ICF concept that might be commercially viable. It makes use of ultra-short, ultra-intense laser pulses interacting with nano-structured accelerators embedded into the mixed fuel context. The embedded accelerator technology promises to be highly efficient and capable of fast fuel heating without fuel pre-compression but is not the focus of the paper. It is the predominant purpose of the mixed fuel concept to avoid cryogenic fuels since specific chemical compounds exist that are capable of chemically binding DT. To which extent mixed fuel concepts can work is investigated in the paper. Under the assumption that the proposed direct drive fast heating concept is capable of rapidly heating the fuel uniformly to sufficiently high temperatures it is found with the help of MULTI, an ICF community code, that a pBDT mixed fuel design can reach a target yield $Q_T > 1$ with MJ level external isochoric heating. The simulations are used to validate a theoretical scaling model of the mixed fuel reactive hydro flows. The paper does not present a reactor point design.

Keywords: MULTI simulations, nuclear fusion, fast preheating, embedded nano-structured accelerators, high intensity laser arrays.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Mixed fuel scaling model	2
3	MULTI simulations	4
4	Conclusions	5
5	Acknowledgements	6

1. Introduction

The indirect drive ICF approach to nuclear fusion has recently achieved a milestone at LLNL [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9] demonstrating the principal viability of inertial confinement fusion for energy production.

The implementation of the ICF concept at LLNL is an indirect drive variant of the latter and is not considered for commercial energy production in the community [10] raising the question if there are alternative approaches to nuclear fusion, that might be commercially viable.

For commercial energy production direct drive concepts are discussed in the ICF community. Marvel Fusion investigates two different direct drive ICF concepts. The first one limited to DT is the mainstream approach and relies on cryogenic fuels, fuel pre-compression and subsequent hotspot generation. It is the well-documented classic. The problem with the approach

is a lack of efficiency, a range of parasitic instabilities, and the need of expensive cryogenic fuel technology. The second is novel and the focus of Marvel Fusion at present. It makes use of mixed fuels without pre-compression, does not require cryogenic fuels, and promises to be efficient due to a proposed novel fast direct drive fuel heating technology embedded into the fuel context consisting of nano-structured accelerators interacting with ultra-short, ultra-intense laser pulses. The embedded accelerators are assumed to be capable of suppressing parasitic parametric instabilities. They comprise both the ion beam [11] and the electron beam [12] based fast fuel heating concepts. The absence of fuel pre-compression is important since it is the prerequisite for fast energy deposition in the fuel. The fuel is assumed to be immobile in configuration space during energy deposition while it almost instantaneously rearranges its momentum space.

For a sketch of the embedded accelerator concept see Fig. 1. The metallic structures in the figure are the nanorods embedded into the fuel. They are assumed to consist of pB. The fuel is represented by the green patches between the nanorods. The nanorods are irradiated by multiple ultra-short, ultra-intense laser pulses from the top and the bottom. The nanorods Coulomb explode with high efficiency when interacting with the laser pulses, see [13]. The fast ions and electrons emitted by the exploding nanorods are assumed to heat the green fuel patches with high efficiency on a time scale much shorter than the confinement time of the fuel.

A main advantage of an efficient heating technology is the




Figure 1: Top view of a section of the reactor layout for the MULTI simulations. We assume an appropriate pBDT fuel composite represented by the green patches in the figure. The fuel is interlaced with embedded accelerators illustrated by the metallic structures consisting of pB in the figure. The structures are irradiated by ultra-short, ultra-intense laser pulses from the top and the bottom. The fuel is enclosed by a gold layer and heated uniformly to $kT_i = kT_e = 5 - 30$ keV with the help of the laser-irradiated embedded nanostructures. We assume that $R = L = 1.0 - 2.0$ mm hold, where R is the fuel radius and L its length. The fuel densities are $0.6 n_p = 0.6 n_D = 0.6 n_T = n_B$ with $\rho_{DT} \approx 500 \text{ kgm}^{-3}$ and $\rho_{pB} \approx 800 \text{ kgm}^{-3}$. The thickness of the gold enclosure ranges between $0 - 1$ mm. The reactor sketch given here is not a point design.

possibility of reactor designs that can potentially operate at low Q_T . Low Q_T requirements promise to improve the commercial viability of a reactor concept, in case $Q_T \gg 1$ at reduced heating requirements could be achieved. Combining fuel pre-heating with in-situ fuel compression while there is no fuel pre-compression might allow an attractive range of novel performant reactor designs. However, they are not the focus of the present paper. Essentially, it is suggested that the embedded accelerators represent a novel direct drive fast fuel heating technology.

With the help of simulations an effective rod model can be derived. The embedded accelerators are assumed to be composed of effective rods. The effective rods are capable of predicting the amount of laser energy absorbed per unit length of laser propagation along the effective rod. In addition, the effective rod model is capable of predicting the relative shares of the laser energy converted into ions and electrons. Assuming that there is fast deposition of the energy of the electrons and ions obtained from the effective rods in the fuel surrounding the latter the number of rods in the embedded accelerators required for a desired fusion yield Q_T can be predicted. Preliminary properties of the effective rod model have been discussed in [13].

In section 2 an analytical scaling model describing the reactive hydrodynamical aspects of a mixed fuel reactor filled with pBDT is given. The proposed mixed fuel concept is new and it is a priori not clear to which extent such fuel mixes can work. The analytical model is intended to explain the hydrodynamical properties of the underlying mixed fuel. Boron based chemical compounds are capable of chemically binding DT, while the boron in the present paper is involved only marginally in fusion reactions. The predominant purpose of the boron is to avoid

cryogenic DT. We explicitly do not discuss the challenging physics of the direct drive fast heating approach in the present paper. In section 3 the reactive hydro aspects of the mixed fuel reactor concept are validated with the help of MULTI simulations of a pBDT filled cylindrical reactor layout. MULTI is a validated ICF community code. We assume that the mixed fuel reactor is heated almost instantaneously over the entire volume to high kT_e and kT_i , while there is no initial fluid flow. This initial reactor setup is unusual but has interesting consequences. The simulated reactor is enclosed by gold. However, instantaneous fuel heating without substantial fluid motion is a technological challenge. We assume that an instantaneous heating profile is possible with the help of the proposed direct drive fast embedded accelerator technology, the details of which, however, are not the focus of the present paper. In section 4 a short summary of results is given.

2. Mixed fuel scaling model

Since mixed fuel concepts are new it is a priori not clear to which extent they might work. Hence, we discuss an analytical scaling model for mixed fuels with in-situ fusion energy feedback and effective inertial confinement in the present paper, see also [14] and references therein. The analytical scaling model is intended to support the analysis of the MULTI simulations presented in section 3. It identifies the dominant fusion relevant parameters and their impact on fusion yield in the mixed fuel context. To some extent the model is a generalization of an earlier one by Atzeni et al. [15], but has also important novel features. Since Marvel Fusion is a commercial entity our goal are commercially viable variants of the established ICF concept.

We recall that any variant of the ICF concept is inevitably thermal due to the large discrepancies between collisional and reactive probabilities in plasma. This leads to lower temperature thresholds for electrons and ions for an ICF reactor. In addition, any variant of the ICF concept requires inertial confinement, which can be engineered with the help of fuel mixes and fuel enclosures, where the enclosures can be reactive or non-reactive. For high fusion yield in-situ fusion energy feedback for the underlying fuel concept is required, which again depends on the fuel mix and the selected enclosure materials. Under certain conditions in-situ fusion energy feedback can lead to rising reactor temperatures, which is synonymous with ignition.

We assume that the proposed direct drive fast fuel heating concept is capable of heating the fuel of the reactor to the temperatures kT_e and kT_i on a time scale much shorter than the effective confinement time of the reactor. We assume that the reactor can be heated such that in-situ fuel compression is avoided. Under these assumptions we find for the lower threshold of the density - range product of for a pBDT fuel mix

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho R & (1) \\ & \geq \frac{(H_1 + H_2) Q_F - (A_1 H_2 + A_2 H_1)}{2 (A_1 + A_2 - Q_F)} \\ & + \sqrt{\frac{H_1 H_2 Q_F}{A_1 + A_2 - Q_F} + \left(\frac{(H_1 + H_2) Q_F - (A_1 H_2 + A_2 H_1)}{2 (A_1 + A_2 - Q_F)} \right)^2} \end{aligned}$$

with

$$Q_F = \frac{A_1 \rho R}{H_1 + \rho R} + \frac{A_2 \rho R}{H_2 + \rho R} \leq A_1 + A_2, \quad (2)$$

where

$$A_1 = \frac{2 \epsilon_f^{DT} n_D}{3 k T_i (n_p + n_D + n_T + n_B)}, \quad (3)$$

$$A_2 = \frac{2 \epsilon_f^{pB} n_p}{3 k T_i (n_p + n_D + n_T + n_B)} \quad (4)$$

and

$$H_1 \approx \frac{4 m_p u^s}{\sigma_{R0}^{DT} u_{DT}}, \quad H_2 \approx \frac{4 m_p u^s}{\sigma_{R0}^{pB} u_{pB}}, \quad (5)$$

$$u^s \approx \sqrt{\frac{3 k T_i}{m_Z}}. \quad (6)$$

Assuming cylindrical symmetry we have

$$E_i > \frac{3 \pi k T_i L}{m_p \rho_p} (\rho R)^2, \quad (7)$$

$$\Delta \tau > \frac{1}{4 u^s \rho_p} \rho R. \quad (8)$$

It holds $Q_F = E_f/E_i$, where E_f is the final energy in the reactor and E_i the deposited initial one. The parameter $\Delta \tau$ is the effective confinement time. The parameter Q_F is the fuel yield. If the proposed direct drive fast fuel heating technology is efficient $\eta \rightarrow 1$ is implied, where η is the fuel coupling efficiency. We then have for the fusion target yield $Q_T = \eta Q_F \approx Q_F$, see [14]. The parameter ρ_p is the proton mass density used for normalization, u^s is an effective flow velocity modeling the combined effective inertial behavior of all fluid flows including the reactive or non-reactive enclosure, the ϵ_f are the elementary fusion energies of all fuels involved without neutrons, the σ_{R0} are the fusion cross sections of the fuel mix, R is the reactor radius, L is its length, ρR is the density - range product normalized to ρ_p , $k T_i$ is the initial ion temperature of the fuel mix, and $k T_e$ the initial electron temperature. The equilibrium electron temperature $k T_e$ is a function of $k T_i$, where $k T_e < k T_i$ holds. The parameters n_B , n_p , n_D , and n_T are the number densities of the fuels involved. As noted earlier the fuel ions in the model (1) - (8) are mobile while the dynamics of hydro observables is restricted to fluid rarefaction [15] and m_Z is the effective inertial mass accounting for the effective inertia all the fuel and enclosure materials. The assumption made simplify the analytical scaling model substantially and prove to be good enough.

According to (1) - (8) the temperatures $k T_e$ and $k T_i$ are required. The temperatures $k T_e$ and $k T_i$, at which sufficient in-situ fusion energy feedback sets in can be estimated by comparing leading density normalized power gain and loss terms. Assuming that they are P_f/ρ_p^2 , P_{ie}/ρ_p^2 , and P_r/ρ_p^2 and by equating

$$\frac{P_f}{\rho_p^2} = \frac{P_{ie}}{\rho_p^2} = \frac{P_r}{\rho_p^2}, \quad (9)$$

where P_f is the fusion power deposited in the fuel without neutrons, P_{ie} is the power transfer from all ions to electrons, and

P_r is the radiation power from all electrons, lower equilibrium temperature thresholds for $k T_e$ and $k T_i$ with $k T_e < k T_i$ are obtained. For explicit definitions of P_f , P_{ie} , and P_r see [14]. For the densities $0.6 n_p = 0.6 n_D = 0.6 n_T = n_B$ and the assumption that the total fusion α -particle energies are deposited in the fuel an intersection at $k T_i \approx 20$ keV with $k T_e < k T_i$ is obtained.

As outlined in [14] the temperature $k T_i$ can rise in case a lower temperature threshold exists, at which $P_f > P_{ie}$ and $P_f > P_r$ hold, and the time ordering

$$\Delta \tau \gg t_{ij}^{eq} \quad (10)$$

is valid, where i and j denote all charged particle species and the t_{ij}^{eq} are the Spitzer equilibration times [16] between particles i and j given by

$$t_{ij}^{eq} \approx \frac{4 \pi \epsilon_0^2 m_i m_j}{Z_i^2 Z_j^2 q_j^4 n_j \ln \Lambda (n_i, n_j)} \left(\frac{k T_i}{m_i} + \frac{k T_j}{m_j} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (11)$$

We introduce the temperature $k T_\alpha$ to distinguish the temperature of the α -particles from the general background. Making the simplifying assumption $k T_e = k T_i = k T$ we obtain for the power transfer ratios between α -particles and ions and α -particles and electrons, see [14]

$$\frac{P_{\alpha i}}{P_{\alpha e}} = \frac{n_e m_e}{n_i m_i} \left(\frac{1 + \frac{m_\alpha k T}{m_e k T_\alpha}}{1 + \frac{m_\alpha k T}{m_i k T_\alpha}} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (12)$$

There are a few cases that can be discriminated easily

$$\frac{m_i}{m_\alpha} < \frac{k T}{k T_\alpha} \rightarrow \frac{P_{\alpha i}}{P_{\alpha e}} \approx \frac{n_e}{n_i} \sqrt{\frac{m_i}{m_e}} \gg 1, \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{m_i}{m_\alpha} > \frac{k T}{k T_\alpha} > \frac{m_e}{m_\alpha} \rightarrow \frac{P_{\alpha i}}{P_{\alpha e}} \approx \frac{n_e m_\alpha^{\frac{3}{2}}}{n_i m_i \sqrt{m_e}} \left(\frac{k T}{k T_\alpha} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{m_e}{m_\alpha} > \frac{k T}{k T_\alpha} \rightarrow \frac{P_{\alpha i}}{P_{\alpha e}} \approx \frac{n_e m_e}{n_i m_i} \ll 1. \quad (15)$$

For $k T \gg k T_\alpha$, see (15), the power transfer from α -particles into ions is much larger than the power transfer from α -particles into electrons. For $k T \ll k T_\alpha$ predominantly the electrons are heated by the α -particles. The question is, of course, what a good estimate for $k T_\alpha$ is. The worst case is equating $k T_\alpha$ to the fusion α -particle energies.

To be capable of depositing their total energy in the fuel volume the ranges of the fast ions generated by the presumed embedded accelerators and the fusion related α -particles should preferentially be shorter than the extension of the fuel. Else, not the total absorbed external laser and in-situ fusion energies are available for fuel heating. A brief discussion of α -particle stopping power models for DT is found in [17]. The ranges and velocities of various ions and fusion α -particles with initial energies $\epsilon_i = 3.5$ MeV in the pBDT mixed fuel background at $k T_e = 20$ keV based on the electronic stopping power exerted on the ions according to [18] are discussed in [19].

How useful the analysis (9) - (15) really is can be debated. The embedded accelerators are capable of generating high currents accompanied by strong electromagnetic fields. Strong

electromagnetic fields alter relaxation times. Also, there is little reason to believe that distribution functions are Maxwellians as is assumed when deriving (11) or that the assumption of cold monoenergetic fusion related α -particles underlying [17] is valid. While (9) - (15) are helpful to get an idea how in-situ fuel heating might work the details of binary encounters between all particles have to be simulated with the help of a detailed relativistic kinetic model comprising binary correlations for more accurate predictions, see for example the MD model discussed in [13].

Typical confinement times $\Delta\tau$ are in the ns range, see MULTI simulations in section 3. The model (1) - (15) highlights the influence of fusion relevant parameters on the fusion gain Q_T of the fuel. It is plausible that $Q_T > 1$ can be obtained by quickly preheating the fuel to high temperatures $kT_e > kT_i$, by confining the fuel, and by enabling sufficiently large in-situ fusion energy feedback.

Since there is a long history of code development for radiating reactive flows within the ICF community, e.g. see [20] and references therein, it does not really make a lot of sense to engage in better analytical scaling models. The focus should be on advanced numerical modeling. Hence, we rather simulate the pBDT mixed fuel reactor for more accurate predictions. However, it must be pointed out that most reactive hydro codes in existence fall short when it comes to multiple interacting resistive high velocity flows as they are generated by the embedded accelerators in Fig. 1. Early elements for a more appropriate numerical MD model have been outlined in [13].

In section 3 we focus on MULTI (a multi-physics, fully Lagrangian radiation hydrodynamics code) simulations, see [20], for reactor setups without in-situ fuel compression and with uniform fuel preheating. With the help of the simulations we try to consolidate our analytical scaling model for pBDT.

3. MULTI simulations

The intent of the numerical analysis based on MULTI is the consolidation of the mixed fuel reactor concept heated by exawatt and MJ level multi beam laser drives. The laser pulses are assumed to be ultra-short and to have high contrast. They are assumed to interact with small nanorods consisting of pB as illustrated by the metallic structures in Fig. 1. As discussed in [13] a single small diameter nanorod made of pB is capable of absorbing about $0.1 \text{ mJ}/\mu\text{m}$ corresponding to an absorption power capability of approximately 30 GW and an absorption energy capability of about 0.1 J for the single nanorod. The integrated absorption power of many embedded accelerator units consisting of many effective rods can be in the multi exawatt range. Further details of the effective rod model are beyond the scope of the present paper.

We make use of the established community code MULTI to predict the fusion yield Q_T of uniformly preheated pBDT reactor layouts. We assume that the preheating takes place on time scales much shorter than the confinement time $\Delta\tau$. We assume that there is no fuel pre-compression and that the reactor is enclosed by gold layers of variable thickness. As we will see there is mild in-situ compression due to the implosion of the

gold layers, since fusion α -particles are capable of penetrating and of heating the gold enclosure.

The nanorods explode as the laser pulses propagate along them into the reactor. When the nanorods explode they generate fast electrons and ions with very high efficiency. The fast electrons and ions exiting the nanorods are assumed to be completely absorbed in the nuclear fuel surrounding the nanorods leading to efficient fast heating of the green fuel patches in Fig. 1 without triggering parasitic instabilities.

Since cylindrical geometry is assumed in the analytical scaling model for the pBDT fuel mix we make use of cylindrical geometry in the MULTI simulations. We assume that the initial fuel densities in the MULTI simulations are close to the natural densities of the constituents in the assumed fuel composite consisting of pBDT. In the MULTI code we interlace DT shells with pB shells with high resolution. Since MULTI is a fully Lagrangian code, the shells cannot pass each other implying specifically that DT shells cannot penetrate pB ones. We expect that this restriction underestimates fusion yield in the mixed fuel context. However, energy and momentum can be exchanged between the DT and pB shells. MULTI is capable of simulating hydro motion, correct α -particle stopping, heat conduction, radiation transport, and fuel heating. MULTI comprises more realistic equations of state (for further details see [20]). The geometry and the composition of the reactor simulated with MULTI is illustrated in Fig. 1. The embedded accelerators in the figure are emulated by appropriate pB fuel shells. Further parameters are stated in the figure captions. It is assumed that the fuel mix acquires uniform temperatures $kT_e = kT_i$ within a fraction of the confinement times corresponding to the respective simulated reactor layouts.

A graphical illustration of the fusion gains obtained with the help of MULTI simulations is shown in Fig. 2. The elevated inertia of the fuel due to the gold enclosure has a significant effect as is expected by the scaling relations (1) - (11). A thicker gold layer implies increasing the effective m_Z in (6) for the fuel leading enhanced confinement times $\Delta\tau$ and hence higher Q_T . As predicted by the analytical scaling relations fusion gain also strongly depends on the initial temperatures $kT_e = kT_i$. Higher initial temperatures lead to higher Q_T . Since the reactor explodes the initial temperatures cannot be too high.

In Fig. 3 the fusion gains Q_F as functions of reactor radius and gold layer thickness are shown for a range of spatially uniform initial temperatures $kT_e = kT_i$. As the plots in Figs. 2 and 3 indicate the scaling of Q_F obtained with MULTI can be approximated by a function of the form

$$Q_F = \frac{A \rho R}{H + \rho R} \quad (16)$$

during the early stages of the reactors, where A and H are effective parameters comprising an effective initial temperature, an effective initial fluid density, and an initial effective fuel mass. The shape of (16) is obtained from (2). The free parameters in (16) can be obtained from the results of the simulations shown in Fig. 3.

Since the MULTI simulations predict E_i in the range of $1 \text{ MJ} \leq E_i \leq 45 \text{ MJ}$ for gains of $0 \leq Q_F \leq 4$ for the pBDT




Figure 2: MULTI simulations of fusion gains Q_T . Plot to the left: Fusion gain vs fuel radius for the gold layer thicknesses 0.15 mm and 0.75 mm and a range of uniform initial temperatures between $0 \leq kT_e = kT_i \leq 30$ keV. Plot to the right: Fusion gain vs gold layer thickness for the reactor radii $R = 1.5$ mm and $R = 2.0$ mm. The heating energies are between $1 \text{ MJ} < E_i < 45 \text{ MJ}$ depending on R and the temperatures $kT_e = kT_i$. The fuel densities are $0.6 n_p = 0.6 n_D = 0.6 n_T = n_B$ with $\rho_{DT} \approx 500 \text{ kgm}^{-3}$ and $\rho_{PB} \approx 800 \text{ kgm}^{-3}$.

fuel mix without fuel pre-compression, while the parametric function in (2) neglecting energy feedback and enhanced fuel confinement predicts $E_i > 1 \text{ GJ}$ for $Q_F \approx 1$ the discrepancy to the MULTI simulations can only be explained by some degree of in-situ energy feedback, the increase of the effective fuel confinement in the reactor due to the gold enclosure, and mild in-situ compression triggered by the partial implosion of the gold layer heated by fuel ions.

Figures 4 and 5 show snapshots of the fuel and enclosure densities, the fuel and enclosure temperatures, the fuel and enclosure energies, the fuel and enclosure pressures, and the fuel and enclosure reaction rates vs reactor radius at $t = 0$ and at $t = 1$ ns. Since according to the Lee and Petrasso stopping power model, see [17], the fusion α -particles lose only between 30% – 70% of their energy and hence are capable of heating the gold leading to fuel temperatures dropping below the initial ones, while $kT_e < kT_i$ holds as is expected. The heated gold partially implodes driving mild shocks in the fuel. Towards the end of the simulation the reactor explodes. At this instant a large share of the energy of the system is in the gold. The comparison of the reaction rates in Figs 4 and 5 shows that they are higher within the fluid shock. Another shock propagates radially out through the gold enclosure.

In section 4 we draw a few conclusions.

4. Conclusions

Marvel Fusion pursues two direct drive ICF variants. The first one is the mainstream approach consisting of direct drive fuel pre-compression and subsequent ion based hotspot generation. The concept requires ns low coherence laser drivers and ps laser pulses for subsequent ion beam generation. However, direct drive fuel pre-compression is known to suffer from parasitic parametric instabilities. Hotspot creation via laser accelerated particle beams, see [11], suffers from suppressed laser energy conversion efficiency into fast ions and potential beam transport instabilities, see [21], that have to be overcome.




Figure 3: MULTI simulations of fusion gain Q_T vs the reactor radii $1 \text{ mm} \leq R \leq 2 \text{ mm}$ and gold layer thicknesses ranging between 0 – 1 mm. The number densities are $0.6 n_p = 0.6 n_D = 0.6 n_T = n_B$, where $\rho_{DT} \approx 500 \text{ kgm}^{-3}$ and $\rho_{PB} = 800 \text{ kgm}^{-3}$. The MULTI simulations predict $Q_F \approx 0 - 4$ for $E_i \approx 1 - 45 \text{ MJ}$.

In contrast to the mainstream direct drive approach the fast direct drive concept proposed by Marvel Fusion does not rely on pre-compressed fuel, is capable of tailored fuel preheating, and potentially in-situ fuel compression without cryogenic fuels. The embedded accelerators, which are an integral part of the direct drive fast heating scheme, are capable of accelerating both ions and electrons simultaneously at extremely high efficiency, see [13], both of which have been proposed as independent fast ignition concepts earlier in the realm of ICF, see [11, 12]. However, the details of the proposed embedded accelerator based direct drive fast heating scheme are beyond the scope of the present paper. The focus of the present paper is on the viability of mixed fuel reactor designs assuming the feasibility of specific fast fuel preheating profiles in the fuel.

The analytical scaling model outlined in [14] is capable of predicting the correct orders of magnitude for E_i , E_f , and Q_T for a mixed fuel reactor setup consisting of a pBDT chemical compound. According to MULTI a fuel mix consisting of pBDT at solid density can reach $Q_F \approx 2$ at $E_i \approx 4 \text{ MJ}$ with the help of uniform fuel preheating and without fuel pre-compression. In the present paper only a specific fuel preheat-




Figure 4: Initial conditions of the fuel and the gold enclosure as a function of reactor radius for a fuel radius of $R = 1.1$ mm with a gold layer of thickness of 0.3 mm. The initial temperatures are $kT_e = kT_i = 20$ keV. The number densities are $0.6 n_p = 0.6 n_D = 0.6 n_T = n_B$, where $\rho_{DT} \approx 500 \text{ kgm}^{-3}$ and $\rho_{pB} = 800 \text{ kgm}^{-3}$. The quantity f is the fraction of the burnt fuel.

ing profile leading to uniform initial temperatures for kT_e and kT_i has been assumed.

The MULTI simulations show that mixed fuel fusion reactor layouts with $Q_T > 1$ based on a pBDT fuel mix are conceivable if the proposed embedded accelerator based direct drive heating technology is available. We believe that an advanced mixed fuel fusion reactor concept for efficient energy production without fuel pre-compression is viable. A prerequisite, however, is a novel laser facility consisting of many beamlines of advanced highly efficient lasers, that can operate with ns to fs pulse lengths at high rep-rate and high wall-plug efficiency yielding multiple petawatt to multiple exawatt level laser power with MJ laser pulse energy. A laser platform providing the required technology is available.

5. Acknowledgements

The present work has been motivated and funded by Marvel Fusion GmbH. We would like to thank the authors of the MULTI code for providing it to the community. Special thanks go out to Ondrej Pego Jaura for doing the numerical modeling.

References

[1] M. Banks, Significant step towards break-even target, *Physics World* 34 (10) (2021) 11ii.




Figure 5: A snapshot of a MULTI simulation at $t = 1$ ns. The initial radius is $R = 1.1$ mm and the initial gold layer thickness is 0.3 mm. The initial temperatures are $kT_e = kT_i = 20$ keV. The initial number densities are $0.6 n_p = 0.6 n_D = 0.6 n_T = n_B$, where $\rho_{DT} = 500 \text{ kgm}^{-3}$ and $\rho_{pB} = 800 \text{ kgm}^{-3}$ is assumed. The quantity f is the fraction of burnt fuel. The simulations predict $Q_F \approx 2$ at $E_i \approx 3.8$ MJ.

[2] A. B. Zylstra, et al., [Burning plasma achieved in inertial fusion](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-04281-w), *Nature* 601 (2022) 542–548. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-04281-w. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-04281-w>

[3] H. Abu-Shawareb, et al., [Lawson criterion for ignition exceeded in an inertial fusion experiment](https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.129.075001), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 129 (2022) 075001. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.129.075001. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.129.075001>

[4] A. L. Kritcher, et al., [Design of an inertial fusion experiment exceeding the lawson criterion for ignition](https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.106.025201), *Phys. Rev. E* 106 (2022) 025201. doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.106.025201. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.106.025201>

[5] A. B. Zylstra, et al., [Experimental achievement and signatures of ignition at the national ignition facility](https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.106.025202), *Phys. Rev. E* 106 (2022) 025202. doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.106.025202. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.106.025202>

[6] U. D. of Energy, [Doe national laboratory makes history by achieving fusion ignition](https://www.llnl.gov/news/national-ignition-facility-achieves-fusion-ignition), retrieved on Dec. 14, 2022 (Dec 2022).

[7] B. Bishop, [National ignition facility achieves fusion ignition](https://www.llnl.gov/news/national-ignition-facility-achieves-fusion-ignition), retrieved Dec. 14, 2022 (Dec 2022). URL <https://www.llnl.gov/news/national-ignition-facility-achieves-fusion-ignition>

[8] K. Chang, [Scientists achieve nuclear fusion breakthrough with blast of 192 lasers](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/12/13/science/nuclear-fusion-energy-breakthrough.html), retrieved Dec. 14, 2022 (Dec 2022). URL <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/12/13/science/nuclear-fusion-energy-breakthrough.html>

[9] D. Clercy, [With historic explosion, a long sought fusion breakthrough](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/12/13/science/nuclear-fusion-energy-breakthrough.html), retrieved Dec. 14, 2022 (Dec 2022).

- URL <https://www.science.org/content/article/historic-explosion-long-sought-fusion-breakthrough>
- [10] O. Hurricane, D. Callahan, A. Kritcher, A. Zylstra, *Optimism is not a strategy: A white paper of how to give ife a fighting chance to be real* (2022).
URL <https://lasers.llnl.gov/content/assets/docs/nif-workshops/ife-workshop-2021/white-papers/hurricane-LLNL-IFE-workshop-2022.pdf>
- [11] M. Roth, T. Cowan, M. Key, S. Hatchett, C. Brown, W. Fountain, J. Johnson, D. Pennington, R. Snively, S. Wilks, et al., Fast ignition by intense laser-accelerated proton beams, *Physical review letters* 86 (3) (2001) 436.
- [12] M. Tabak, J. Hammer, M. E. Glinsky, W. L. Kruer, S. C. Wilks, J. Woodworth, E. M. Campbell, M. D. Perry, R. J. Mason, Ignition and high gain with ultrapowerful lasers, *Physics of Plasmas* 1 (5) (1994) 1626–1634.
- [13] H. Ruhl, G. Korn, High current ionic flows via ultra-fast lasers for fusion applications (Dec. 2022). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2212.12941.
- [14] H. Ruhl, G. Korn, Uniform volume heating of mixed fuels within the ICF paradigm (Feb. 2023). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2302.06562.
- [15] S. Atzeni, J. Meyer-ter Vehn, *The physics of inertial fusion: beam plasma interaction, hydrodynamics, hot dense matter*, Vol. 125, OUP Oxford and citations therein, 2004.
- [16] L. Spitzer, *Physics of fully ionized gases*, Courier Corporation, 2006.
- [17] N. Xu, *Effects of alpha particle stopping-power models on inertial confinement fusion implosions* (2014).
- [18] M. Basko, *Stopping of fast ions in dense plasmas*, Tech. rep., Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics (1983).
- [19] H. Ruhl, G. Korn, Numerical validation of a volume heated mixed fuel reactor concept (Feb. 2023). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2306.03731.
- [20] R. Ramis, J. Meyer-ter Vehn, Multi-ife—a one-dimensional computer code for inertial fusion energy (ife) target simulations, *Computer Physics Communications* 203 (2016) 226–237.
- [21] H. Ruhl, T. Cowan, J. Dahlburg, P. Parks, R. Stephens, Super-intense quasi-neutral proton beams interacting with plasma: a numerical investigation, *Nuclear fusion* 44 (3) (2004) 438.