



Overview of the ASDEX Upgrade results

Downloaded from: <https://research.chalmers.se>, 2026-05-29 21:53 UTC

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Pütterich, T., Albrecht, F., Alessi, E. et al (2026). Overview of the ASDEX Upgrade results. Nuclear Fusion, 66(11). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1741-4326/ae61c8>

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

Overview of the ASDEX Upgrade results

To cite this article: T. Pütterich *et al* 2026 *Nucl. Fusion* **66** 116002

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

You may also like

- [Non-boronized compared with boronized operation of ASDEX Upgrade with full-tungsten plasma facing components](#)
A. Kallenbach, R. Dux, M. Mayer et al.
- [Radiative boundary discharges with impurity injection and the H - L transition in ASDEX Upgrade](#)
A. Kallenbach, R. Dux, H-S Bosch et al.
- [Ten years of W programme in ASDEX Upgrade—challenges and conclusions](#)
R. Neu, V. Bobkov, R. Dux et al.

Overview of the ASDEX Upgrade results

T. Pütterich^{1,*} , F. Albrecht^{1,7}, E. Alessi¹² , S. An¹, C. Angioni¹ , F. Antlitz¹, N. Arden¹, V. Artigues¹ , M. Astrain¹ , M. Balden¹ , A. Banon Navarro¹ , A. Bergmann¹, M. Bergmann¹ , M. Bernert¹, A. Biancalani⁴² , R. Bielajew⁴¹ , M. Biasizzo¹, R. Bilato¹ , G. Birkenmeier^{1,7}, T. Blanken⁵, V. Bobkov¹ , A. Bock¹, T. Bolzonella⁸, A. Bortolon³², B. Böswirth¹, A. Bottino¹, H. van den Brand⁵, M. Brenzke¹⁰, S. Brezinsek¹⁰, D. Brida¹, D. Brioschi¹, F. Brochard¹¹, J. Buchanan⁶, A. Buhler¹, A. Burckhart¹, Y. Camenen⁵¹, B. Cannas³⁸, P. Cano Megías²⁰, J.A. Capitan Garcia¹, M. Carr⁶, C. Castaldo⁵⁰, A. Castillo Castillo¹, A. Cathey¹, M. Cavedon⁴⁴, C. Cazzaniga⁸, C. Challis⁶, A. Chankin¹, A. Chomiczewska¹⁶, C. Cianfarani⁵⁰, F. Clairet⁹, S. Coda¹³, J.W. Coenen¹⁰, G. Conway¹, S. Costea¹⁴, D. Coster¹, T. Cote⁴⁶, D. Cretu¹, G. Croci¹², D.J. Cruz Zabala²⁰, G. Cseh¹⁵, I. Cziegler³⁰, O. D'Arcangelo³⁴, A. Dal Molin⁴⁴, P. David¹, C. Drobny¹, M. de Baar⁵, P. de Marné¹, R. Delogu⁸, P. Denner¹⁰, A. Di Siena¹, J.J. Dominguez Palacios Durán²⁰, D. Dunai¹⁵, M. Dreval⁵², M. Dunne¹, B.P. Duval¹³, R. Dux¹, T. Eich⁵⁵, S. Elgeti¹, A. Encheva⁴³, B. Esposito⁵⁰, E. Fable¹, M. Faitsch¹, D. Fajardo Jimenez¹, U. Fantz¹, M. Farnik⁴⁵, H. Faugel¹, F. Felici¹³, O. Ficker⁴⁵, R. Fischer¹, O. Ford², L. Frassinetti¹⁸, M. Fröschele¹, G. Fuchert², J.C. Fuchs¹, M. Fulici¹, H. Fünfgelder¹, S. Futatani³³, K. Galazka¹⁶, J. Galdon-Quiroga²⁰, D. Gallart Escolá³³, Y. Gao¹⁰, S. Garavaglia¹², J. Garcia-Dominguez²⁰, M. Garcia Muñoz²⁰, M. Gehring¹, B. Geiger⁴⁶, L. Giannone¹, S. Gibson⁴⁹, L. Gil³, E. Giovannozzi⁵⁰, O. Girka¹, T. Gleiter¹, M. Gobbin⁸, I. Gomez Ortiz¹, J.C. Gonzalez¹, J. Gonzalez Martin²⁰, T. Goodman¹³, G. Gorini⁴⁴, T. Görler¹, D. Gradic², G. Granucci¹², A. Gräter¹, G. Grenfell¹, H. Greuner¹, M. Griener¹, M. Groth⁴, O. Grover¹, A. Gude¹, S. Günter¹, D. Hachmeister³, A.H. Hakola²¹, C. Ham⁶, T. Happel¹, N. den Harder¹, G. Harrer²⁹, J. Harrison⁶, V. Hartmann¹, T. Hayward-Schneider¹, B. Heinemann¹, P. Heinrich¹, T. Hellsten¹⁹, S. Henderson⁶, P. Hennequin²³, C. Herkommer¹, A. Herrmann¹, M. Herschel^{1,7}, S. Heurax¹¹, E. Heyn⁵³, J. Hidalgo-Salaverri²⁰, F. Hindenlang¹, J. Hobirk¹, I. Hofer-Maksymiw¹, K. Höfler¹, L. Hollendonner¹, J.H. Holm²⁵, M. Hölzl¹, C. Hopf¹, S. Hörmann^{1,7}, L. Horvath³⁰, T. Höschen¹, A. Houben¹⁰, A. Hubbard⁴¹, A. Huber¹⁰, K. Hunger¹, V. Igochine¹, M. Iliasova⁴⁰, J. Illerhaus¹, K. Insulander Björk⁴⁷, C. Ionita-Schrittwieser¹⁴, S. Irmer¹, I. Ivanova-Stanik¹⁶, S. Jachmich⁴³, W. Jacob¹, A. Jansen van Vuuren²⁰, F. Jaulmes⁴⁵, F. Jenko¹, T. Jensen²⁵, M. Jimenez-Comez²⁰, A. Kallenbach¹, J. Kalis¹, M. Kantor⁵, A. Kappatou¹, J. Karhunen⁴, C.-P. Käsemann¹, S. Kasilov^{53,54}, Y. Kazakov²⁸, A. Kendl¹⁴, R. Kermenov¹, W. Kernbichler²⁹, E. Khilkevitch⁴⁰, M. Kircher¹, A. Kirk⁶, S. Kjer Hansen¹, F. Klossek¹, G. Kocsis¹⁵, M. Komm⁴⁵, M. Kong¹³, A. Krämer-Flecken¹⁰, M. Krause¹, A. Kreuzeder¹, K. Krieger¹, O. Kudlacek¹, D. Kulla², B. Kurzan¹, B. Labit¹³, F. Laggner³², A. Lahtinen⁴, P. Lainer²⁹, P.T. Lang¹, P. Lauber¹, M. Lehnen⁴³, E. Lerche²⁸, N. Leuthold⁵⁴, L. Li¹⁰, Y.-C. Liang^{1,7}, J. Likonen²¹, H. Lindl¹, B. Lipschultz³⁰, Y. Liu¹⁹, G. Lo-Cascio¹, Z. Lu¹, T. Luda di Cortemiglia¹, N.C. Luhmann³¹, T. Lunt¹, A. Lysoivan²⁸, J. Madsen²⁵, H. Maier¹, M. Maierbeck¹, J. Mailloux⁶, R. Maingi³²,

* Author to whom any correspondence should be addressed.



Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 licence](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI.

S. Makarov¹, E. Maljaars⁵, V. Maquet²⁸, A. Mancini¹, A. Manhard¹, P. Mantica¹², M. Mantsinen^{17,33}, P. Manz¹⁷, M. Maraschek¹, C. Marchetto³⁷, M. Markl²⁹, L. Marrelli⁸, P. Martin⁸, M. Mayer¹, M.-L. Mayoral⁶, P.J. McCarthy³⁵, R. McDermott¹, K. McKay²⁰, R. Merkel¹, A. Merle¹³, H. Meyer⁶, D. Milanese³⁷, V. Mitterauer¹, A. Moreau¹, V. Naulin²⁵, R. Nazikian³², R.D. Nem²⁵, R. Neu^{1,36}, A. Nischler¹, A.H. Nielsen²⁵, S.K. Nielsen²⁵, M. Nocente⁴⁴, R. Nocentini¹, R. Novak¹, S. Nowak¹², R. Ochoukov¹, J. Olsen²⁵, P. Oyola²⁰, A. Orduna Martinez¹, O. Pan¹, G. Papp¹, I. Paradelo Perez⁴, A. Patel¹, A. Pau¹³, G. Pautasso¹, C. Paz-Soldan⁵⁴, M. Peglau¹, E. Peluso²⁶, J. Perez Gonzalez²⁰, P. Petersson¹⁸, J. Pfennig¹, C. Piron⁸, L. Piron⁸, B. Plaum²⁴, B. Plöckl¹, G. Pokol^{15,22}, E. Poli¹, L. Porte¹³, J. Puchmayr¹, T. Pütterich¹, L. Radovanovic²⁹, M. Ramisch²⁴, J. Rasmussen²⁵, G. Ratta⁴⁸, S. Ratynskaia¹⁸, G. Raupp¹, A. Redl¹, D. Réfy¹⁵, M. Reich¹, D. Reiser¹⁰, M. Reisner¹, D. Reiter¹⁰, D. Ricci¹², R. Riedl¹, J. Riesch¹, J.F. Rivero Rodriguez²⁰, G. Rocchi⁵⁰, P. Rodriguez-Fernandez⁴¹, V. Rohde¹, G. Ronchi⁵, M. Rott¹, M. Rubel¹⁸, D.A. Ryan⁶, F. Ryter¹, S. Saarelma⁶, M. Salerno¹, M. Salewski²⁵, A. Salmi⁴, O. Samoylov¹, L. Sanchis Sanchez²⁰, J. Santos³, S. Sasidharan¹, O. Sauter¹³, G. Schall¹, J. Schellpfeffer⁴¹, A. Schlüter¹, J. Scholte⁵, K. Schmid¹, O. Schmitz⁴⁶, P.A. Schneider¹, R. Schramm¹, R. Schrittwieser¹⁴, M. Schubert¹, T. Schwarz-Selinger¹, J. Schweinzer¹, O. Seibold-Benjak¹, A. Shalpegin¹³, S. Sharapov⁶, F. Sheffield¹, U. Sheikh¹³, A. Shevelev⁴⁰, G. Sias³⁸, B. Sieben¹, M. Siccinio¹, B. Sieglin¹, A. Sigalov¹, A. Silva³, C. Silva³, D. Silvagni¹, J. Simpson⁶, S. Sipilä⁴, A. Snicker⁴, E. Solano⁴⁸, F. Solfronk¹, C. Sommariva¹³, C. Sozzi¹², M. Spacek¹, G. Spizzo⁸, M. Spolaore⁸, R. Stadler¹, F. Stefanelli¹, B. Stefanoska¹, A. Stegmeir¹, M. Stejner²⁵, D. Stieglitz¹, J. Stobbs¹, J. Stober¹, U. Stroth^{1,7}, E. Strumberger¹, R. Stucchi¹, G. Suarez Lopez⁴³, A. Sulimro¹, W. Suttrop¹, T. Szepesi¹⁵, M. Szücs¹, T. Tala²¹, W. Tang¹, G. Tardini¹, M. Tardocchi¹², D. Terranova⁸, M. Teschke¹, E. Thorén¹⁸, R. Takacs¹, D. Told¹, W. Treutterer¹, G. Trevisan⁸, M. Tripský²⁸, P. Ulbl¹, M. Usoltseva¹, M. Valisa⁸, M. Valovic⁶, M. Van Zeeland¹⁹, S. Van Mulders⁴³, F. Vannini¹, B. Vanovac⁴¹, T. Verdier²⁵, G. Verdoolaege^{27,28}, N. Vianello⁸, J. Vicente³, T. Vierle¹, E. Viezzer²⁰, I. Voitsekhoitch⁶, J.-C. Volz¹, U. von Toussaint¹, D. Wagner¹, X. Wang¹, M. Weiland¹, D. Wendler^{1,7}, A.E. White⁴¹, M. Willensdorfer¹, B. Wiringer¹, M. Wischmeier¹, R. Wolf², E. Wolfrum¹, Q. Yang³⁹, C. Yoo⁴¹, Q. Yu¹, R. Zagórski¹⁶, F. Zahn¹, I. Zammuto¹, T. Zehetbauer¹, H. Zhang¹, W. Zhang³⁹, W. Zholobenko¹, M. Zilker¹, C.F.B. Zimmermann¹, A. Zito¹, H. Zohm¹ and S. Zoletnik¹⁵

¹ Max-Planck-Institut für Plasmaphysik, Garching, Germany² Max-Planck-Institut für Plasmaphysik, Greifswald, Germany³ Instituto de Plasmas e Fusão Nuclear, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal⁴ Department of Applied Physics, Aalto University, Espoo, Finland⁵ Eindhoven, University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands⁶ CCFE, Culham Science Centre, Abingdon, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland⁷ Physics Department, Technical University of Munich, TUM School of Natural Sciences, 85748

Garching, Germany

⁸ Consorzio RFX, Padova, Italy⁹ CEA/IRFM, Saint Paul Lez Durance, France¹⁰ Forschungszentrum Jülich, Germany¹¹ Institut Jean Lamour, Université de Lorraine, Nancy, France¹² ENEA, IFP-CNR, Milan, Italy¹³ Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Swiss Plasma Center (SPC), Lausanne, Switzerland¹⁴ ÖAW, IAP, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria¹⁵ Centre for Energy Research, Budapest, Hungary¹⁶ Institute of Plasma Physics and Laser Microfusion, Warsaw, Poland¹⁷ Universität Greifswald, Germany¹⁸ KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden¹⁹ General Atomics, San Diego, CA, United States of America²⁰ Universidad de Sevilla, Spain²¹ VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland, VTT, Espoo, Finland

- ²² Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Budapest, Hungary
²³ Laboratoire de Physique des Plasmas, Ecole Polytechnique, Palaiseau, France
²⁴ IGVP Universität Stuttgart, Germany
²⁵ Department of Physics, Technical University of Denmark, Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark
²⁶ Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Rome, Italy
²⁷ Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium
²⁸ ERM/KMS, Brussels, Belgium
²⁹ ÖAW, IAP, Vienna University of Technology, Austria
³⁰ York Plasma Institute, University of York, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
³¹ Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of California, Davis, CA, United States of America
³² Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Princeton, NJ, United States of America
³³ Barcelona Supercomputing Center, Barcelona, Spain
³⁴ ENEA Consorzio CREATE, Naples, Italy
³⁵ School of Physics, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland
³⁶ Department of Materials Engineering, Technical University of Munich, TUM School of Engineering and Design, 85748 Garching, Germany
³⁷ ISC-CNR, Politecnico di Torino, Italy
³⁸ Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, University of Cagliari, Italy
³⁹ Chinese Academy of Sciences, Hefei, China
⁴⁰ Ioffe Institute, St. Petersburg, Russian Federation
⁴¹ MIT Plasma Science and Fusion Center, Cambridge, MA, United States of America
⁴² De Vinci Higher Education, De Vinci Research Center, 92 916 Paris, France
⁴³ ITER Organization, Saint-Paul-lez-Durance, France
⁴⁴ ENEA, University of Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy
⁴⁵ Institute of Plasma Physics of the CAS, Praha, Czech Republic
⁴⁶ University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, United States of America
⁴⁷ Department of Physics, Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden
⁴⁸ Laboratorio Nacional de Fusión, CIEMAT, Madrid, Spain
⁴⁹ Department of Physics, Durham University, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
⁵⁰ ENEA, Centro Ricerche Frascati, Italy
⁵¹ Aix-Marseille University, CNRS, Marseille, France
⁵² Institute of Plasma Physics, National Science Center Kharkov Institute of Physics and Technology, Krakov, Ukraine
⁵³ ÖAW, Graz University of Technology, Graz, Austria
⁵⁴ Columbia University, New York City, NY, United States of America
⁵⁵ CFS, Fort Devens, MA, United States of America

E-mail: thomas.puetterich@ipp.mpg.de

Received 8 January 2026, revised 11 March 2026

Accepted for publication 20 April 2026

Published 14 May 2026



Abstract

After a 26-month vent ASDEX Upgrade (AUG) went back in operation with a newly designed upper W-divertor suitable for alternative divertor configurations (featuring in-vessel coils and cryo-pump). Parameter scans and an extensive set of measurements were obtained and their interpretation is ongoing. Prompted by the ITER wall change, dedicated experiments on non-boronized plasma startup were contrasted to that employing asymmetric and more symmetric boronizations. The asymmetric boronization proved to be as beneficial as the more symmetric one, which is in contrast to previous model calculations assuming perfect sticking of boron (measurements suggest sticking ≈ 0.3). In the startup phase also the impurity influxes at the outboard limiters were investigated contrasting the unboronized case featuring cold edges (low-Z radiation) to the boronized case, in which the lifetime of the boron layers could be estimated. Pedestal stability investigations revealed that the quasi-continuous exhaust (QCE) regime is obtained when ballooning modes are active in the vicinity of the separatrix and the global peeling-ballooning stability is high enough. Thus, at high enough shaping and high gas flux both can be achieved and QCE is a consequence. The closely related enhanced D-alpha (EDA) mode is not clearly distinguishable from QCE, e.g. the quasi-coherent mode characteristic for EDA also shows up in QCE. In QCE the impurity transport is behaving benign

as could be measured for Ne with a novel analysis method making use of a comprehensive set of CXRS measurements. For high radiative fractions the regime of the X-point radiator (XPR) is accessible at AUG and the understanding of its access conditions and behaviour is further developed. Due to the localized radiative cooling at the X-point the XPR can be well diagnosed and thus controlled. For negative triangularity shapes, further experiments at increased shaping resulted in strongly heated L-mode plasmas avoiding ELMs. Two integrated modelling approaches towards ITER suggested that core W-accumulation will be no issue for ITER and that the fusion yield in ITER may be $Q = 12$ (i.e. ITPA20-IL scaling is too pessimistic). Further, investigations of the ITER ramp-down in AUG provide insights into maintaining position control. Various aspects of shattered pellet injection were investigated in AUG and one of the results show that with increasing Ne fraction the radiation during the current quench increases and the current decay becomes faster.

Keywords: ASDEX Upgrade, FEC overview, alternative divertor configuration

(Some figures may appear in colour only in the online journal)

1. Introduction

The ASDEX Upgrade (AUG) programme is dedicated to addressing key physics challenges for ITER operation and to developing plasma scenarios for future fusion devices. The AUG plasma ($R_0 = 1.65$ m, $a = 0.5$ m, $I_p \leq 1.4$ MA, $B_t \leq 3.5$ T) can be heated with up to 20 MW of neutral beam injection (NBI), 6 MW of electron cyclotron resonance heating (ECRH), and 5 MW of ion cyclotron resonance heating (ICRH), enabling a broad spectrum of plasma scenarios. Since 2007, the AUG first wall has been fully clad with tungsten (W), and the operational experience accumulated since then is proving highly valuable for supporting the ITER re-baselining including the full-W wall. An extensive set of diagnostics provides detailed measurements, while plasma control is managed through the Discharge Control System (DCS), which is continuously advanced to expand the scope of real-time plasma control. The latter is also important for testing operational strategies of ITER already in AUG.

During the long vent spanning from August 2022 to October 2024, a major upgrade of the upper divertor [1] has been performed, during which in-vessel coils [1–3], an additional cryo-pump [4] with charcoal and a reshaping of the first wall was performed providing access to a considerable variety of alternative divertor configurations (ADCs) [5] (see to figure 1). Hence, a major part of the programme was dedicated to exploiting these new capabilities and to perform a lay of the land concerning the accessibility and performance of the new configurations. Additional focus was put on the effect of uniformity of boronizations, W-erosion during limiter phases, transport and confinement of core and edge plasmas with a particular focus on ELM-free or small ELM scenarios. Further topic of interests are disruptions and their temporal tailoring employing the shattered pellet injection (SPI) system designed and installed in the course of an ITER collaboration.

2. Startup with no, asymmetric and more symmetric boronization

After the long vent AUG underwent the standard procedure of baking and leak searches [6] and the first discharges were attempted without boronization [7]. Unlike the unboronized restart in 2008 [8, 9], NBI was not yet available for restart, while ECRH was available. However, due to the less developed ECRH interlock procedures less power was used during the restart, which led to a slower conditioning progress. Consequently, the burn-through at the plasma ramp-up was deteriorated leading to long phases with increased loop voltages and the creation of run-away beams [10, 11]. This is documented in figure 2, in which the upper row shows the plasma before the first boronization using ECRH during current ramp-up, but then failing the maintenance of the current due to excessive radiation from low-Z elements. The lower row in figure 2 corresponds to the first plasma discharge after boronization, in which ECRH was not necessary. After the occurrence of large runaway electron contributions to the plasma current the decision to boronize before fully establishing plasma operation was made, while EC or IC wall conditioning were not attempted. This first boronization was performed via a glow discharge using only two (sector 3 and 8) out of four anodes (sectors 3, 8, 14 and 16), however, the subsequent plasma startup worked with the first attempt documenting the strong benefit even from an asymmetric boronization.

Subsequent boronizations were then used to quantitatively compare more symmetric (section 3, 8, 14 and 16) to asymmetric boronizations (without 8) and as can be seen in figure 3(a), a considerable amount of boron is deposited in sector 8 even though the anode was not active [10]. Note, that the percentages quoted in figure 3(a) are the relative thickness of the layer compared to an expected thickness derived from the boron inlet being homogeneously distributed on the wall surface of approximately 50 m². In [10] it was found that practically all




Figure 1. In-vessel photographs during vent: (a) cryo-pump; (b) in-vessel coils after in-vessel bending and mounting; (c) view after mounting of all PFCs.




Figure 2. (a) and (b) Trajectories of plasma current, ECRH, Ohmic heating and radiated power at the end of the unboronized restart. (c) and (d) Same for the first discharge after boronization. Adapted from [10]. CC BY 4.0.




Figure 3. (a) Overview of important actuators and measurements for performing and characterizing each boronization (Adapted from [10]. CC BY 4.0). Bars indicate the deposited boron amount using the various quartz micro balance (QMB) locations normalized to the expected boron layer thickness, if all boron was homogeneously distributed over the wall surface of $\approx 50 \text{ m}^2$. Light green give the percentage for more symmetric boronizations using (anodes in sectors 3, 8, 14 and 16) and turquoise corresponds to one asymmetric boronization (3, 14, 16). The red ellipses indicate the area near those anodes. (b) Measurements and simulation of a cavity probe depositions (bottom and ceiling deposition in cavity vs distance to the hole at position 0 mm) for evaluating the sticking coefficient of boron molecules [12]. Beta is the surface loss probability showing very small sticking for neutrals and ions. (Adapted from [12]. CC BY 4.0). The combined sticking is in the range of 0.3 %.

the boron injected is deposited in the vessel. The measured amounts in sector 8 are much larger than the ones expected from modelling (model cf to [13]) and this is probably related to the boron molecule sticking coefficient being assumed 1

in the model, while in experiment cavity probes (analysis in figure 3(b)) revealed it to be in the range of ≈ 0.3 , which is a weighted mix of ion and neutral sticking. The latter analysis relies on fitting the sticking parameters in the simulation in




Figure 4. (a) Plasma equilibrium and lines of sight (LOS) of the limiter erosion measurement (b) Photon fluxes of B^{1+} on the LOS depicted in (a) from #41876, higher fluxes are measured by lower LOSs. Note, same colours correspond to same LOS. Direct B and W comparison not intended as photon fluxes would require translation to particle fluxes. (c) Photon flux of W^0 from #41876. (d) Same as a (b) but from #41877. (e) Same as (c) but from #41877. Adapted from [10]. CC BY 4.0.

order to model the deposition measurements in the floor and ceiling of the cavity probe (data points). This suggests that the boronization result is more symmetric than originally believed even if fewer anodes are available, which could give more freedom in the anode positioning in ITER.

3. W-erosion during the limiter phase

Due to the re-baselining of ITER [14], the erosion of W and the underlying mechanisms have moved into focus (e.g. [15]). One of the important aspects in ITER is the behaviour of boron layers and W erosion during the limiter phase and its impact on the core plasma and correlated effects on the current ramp-up [16]. In order to address these topics, experiments in AUG were performed studying limiter discharges before and after the first boronization. Before the first boronization strong radiation from low-Z elements cooled down the plasma edge of limited discharges such that W erosion was not detectable. For the first discharges #41876 and #41877 after boronization, a rapid erosion of boron is observed. This becomes visible, when examining figure 4. In the first phase ($t < 2.4$ s) of #41876 B is strongly eroded (figure 4(b)) and no W-influx (figure 4(c)) is observed. After $t = 2.4$ s W-erosion is observed. As the heating power is also increased at 2.4 s from 0.6 MW to 1.3 MW, it is instructive to compare to the subsequent discharge (figures 4(d) and (e)) with the same heating sequence. W-erosion is observed from the beginning at a stable level, demonstrating that the erosion areas of the limiters are already free of protecting B. These and further measurements allow for benchmarking the models which may then be used to investigate the limiter phases in ITER.

4. Advanced divertor configurations

After the major upgrade of the upper divertor the alignment quality from tile to tile was checked by comparing L-mode discharges with flipped B-field directions. A good symmetry between both cases and from tile to tile was observed and

throughout the campaign this good alignment did not deteriorate. Subsequently, the ADCs were created and studied in AUG [17]. In figure 5 six prominent configurations are depicted including the non-ADC single null configuration (SN). The X-divertor (XD) features an increased flux expansion at the strike-point (SP), while the super compact radiative divertor (sCRD) is characterized by an increased flux expansion at the X-point and a closeness of the X-point to the first wall. The various snowflake configurations feature a second X-point either on the high-field side scrape-off layer (HFS SF-), low-field side scrape-off layer (LFS SF-) or in the private flux region (SF+) of the primary X-point. The power foot print, as measured by an infrared (IR) camera, for all cases clearly shows that the alternative configurations are not only seen in the reconstructed equilibria, but are also altering the power footprints at the strike lines.

In figure 6, the power footprints, for SN, XD and LFS SF- configurations are depicted in more detail. It is peculiar, that for the LFS SF- configuration, a pronounced second power peak at the target is appearing close to the secondary SP. This peak is of high interest as its magnitude is comparable to that of the primary SP. Important parameters for detachment might influence the power to the primary SP first, while the power splitting between both SP is closely related to the upstream power fall off length. It should be noted that the IR measurements are ELM averaged and more work is needed to ultimately compare the result to modelling.

In order to collect a comprehensive set of data for restraining models a large diagnostic suite was implemented in parallel with the upgrade of the upper divertor. In figure 7, the geometry of several main diagnostics is depicted. The SP are diagnosed with high resolution and the divertor volume is monitored with Thomson scattering and many LOS from bolometry and spectroscopy. Note, the spectroscopy LOS exhibit a strong toroidal angle such that the LOS have a tangency radius in the divertor volume. Each of the three visible LOSs consists of a fan of LOSs with different tangency radii, allowing for deconvolving the emissions in the divertor volume. The magnetic probes restrain the equilibrium reconstruction.




Figure 5. ADC configurations as reconstructed from an equilibrium reconstruction together with infrared ($3.5\text{--}5\ \mu\text{m}$) measurements overlaid onto the CAD visualized interior of AUG. The created configurations are single null (SN) for reference, X-divertor (XD), super compact radiative divertor (sCRD), LFS snowflake minus (LFS SF-), HFS snowflake minus (HFS SF-) and snowflake plus (LFS SF-). Reproduced from [17]. © 2026 The Author(s). Published by IOP Publishing Ltd on behalf of the IAEA. [CC BY 4.0](#).




Figure 6. (a) Separatrix geometry for three divertor configurations, also indicated are the inner, middle and outer tile of the outer target (OTi, OTm and OTo). (b) Power footprint derived from an IR camera and Langmuir probes for the SN configuration. Shaded areas indicate tile locations of outer target tiles. (c) Same for XD (d) same for the LFS SF-.

In figure 8, example measurements of additional spectroscopy LOS are depicted. The LOS are visible in the left top panel of figure 8, and on the right a full sequence of the line-integrated, reconstructed parameters of the spectroscopic measurements is depicted. The marked time points 2.8 s 3.5 s and 3.9 s correspond to the reconstructed equilibria on the left. Even though the intensity of D_{ϵ} ($n = 7 \rightarrow n = 2$), the electron density and the intensity of a N^{+1} line are LOS integrated a clear movement of the emission and density fronts is visible. Deconvolving this data in the next step and combining it with the measurements from other diagnostics will give good guidance to restraining model runs such as from SOLPS.

Generally, large parameter scans in heating (up to 20 MW), fuelling and seeding (N, Ne, Ar and Kr) were performed, while the inner strike point was always detached. The scans were

performed in all accessible ADCs (i.e. LFS SF-, HFS SF-, SF+, XD and sCRD). There were clear signs that the divertor compression suffers from the open divertor geometry and thus better performance is expected for a future implementation of divertor baffles. As a next step the performance of the ADCs will be compared and the best performing configuration will be the basis for planning the baffles. The latter will hinder the comprehensive diagnostics and thus will be implemented only after 2028.

5. Calming the plasma edge

Avoiding large type-I ELMs is an obligatory goal for future fusion devices and thus, investigations at AUG are pursued




Figure 7. Geometry of some main diagnostics in the upper divertor implemented for a comprehensive evaluation of the divertor performance and for restraining model calculations such as SOLPS. The equilibrium reconstruction corresponds to a LFS SF-configuration, where the X-points are indicated with blue circles. The arrows (magnetic probes) correspond to the measured magnetic field components.

also in this direction. A major goal is achieving ELM-free or small ELM-phases instead, but at the same time impurity exhaust is also mandatory.

5.1. Quasi-continuous exhaust/enhanced D-alpha (QCE/EDA)

A very promising regime for obtaining tolerable heat and particle exhaust via small ELMs is the QCE regime (recent AUG work [18]) which is often difficult to distinguish from the EDA regime (recent work [19]), as features that are attributed to each regime are observed sometimes in coexistence. An example for this is the quasi-coherent mode [20, 21]. As the QCE regime features also beneficial power fall-off length [22–24] it is considered an interesting reactor regime. As a first step it was also ported and investigated at JET, also in JET DT [25]. A major breakthrough was obtained by analysing the stability of the pedestal in various radial regions [26, 27]. The global pressure of the pedestal is one player responsible for the large type-I ELM crash (peeling-ballooning instability), the local pressure at the foot of the pedestal may give rise to small scale ballooning instabilities, which are believed to be characteristic for the QCE regime. Here, pressure is the total pressure of electrons and ions, ‘global’ means integrated over the radial region where the respective instability exists and ‘local’ means at a specific normalized radius. In figure 9(a), the normalized pressure gradient α from the equilibrium reconstruction (green), which is at the peeling-ballooning limit, is compared to the infinite- n ballooning limit (purple). At the plasma edge, this limit is almost achieved and an increase in the plasma shaping increases the limit for finite- n peeling-ballooning (here $\alpha_{\max, \text{crit}}$ is used as a proxy) more pronounced than the infinite- n ballooning limit $\alpha_{\text{edge, crit}}$, which then leads to the pressure profile being limited by the infinite- n ballooning limit close to the separatrix. This latter state is suggested to apply for the QCE regime [28]. In figure 9(b), the dependence of the two critical

α values is visualized for several cases with different shaping, demonstrating that the elongation κ and triangularity δ play a crucial role, which can be approximately summarized by S . At higher values of S the headroom for $\alpha_{\max, \text{crit}}$ grows and the plasma has easier access to the QCE regime. This access is typically observed at larger edge fuelling leading to an enhanced density and thus pressure in the region close to the separatrix. For shaped plasmas in JET and ITER even higher values of S are accessed, suggesting that strong fuelling will naturally open up a route to QCE. As an encouraging observation QCE is also found [29] in GRILLIX [30] simulations, which then also could be used as a tool for extrapolation to other devices.

5.2. Impurity transport

An amelioration of ELMs at good confinement always yields the question for impurity exhaust. Especially at the transport barrier at the plasma edge potentially an excessive impurities confinement is possible. In figure 10, the result of a data analysis based on Bayesian inference [31] is presented. The analysis could separate the diffusive and convective transport of Ne remarkably well, because the CXRS measurements from several Ne ions, i.e. Ne^{8+} , Ne^{9+} and Ne^{10+} are combined. The results are compared to neoclassical predictions. In the first column of figure 10 the results for L-mode show clearly that neoclassical transport is not sufficient to describe the observed Ne diffusivity across all radii and additional, i.e. turbulent transport is postulated. Thus, the v/D ratio, which is proportional to the normalized Ne-density gradient is small throughout the plasma edge. In the middle column, the analogue analysis for the inter-ELM phase of a type-I ELMy H-mode is presented. Both diffusion and convection at the pedestal region are close to neoclassical levels in agreement with earlier analyses [33]. In the recent work, also the important net effect [34] of the ELM itself was analysed and mostly an increase of diffusive transport was inferred. In the right column the QCE regime analysis is presented, and as the small transport events could not be separated the analysis is averaging over them. In this case the diffusive transport at the pedestal is almost a factor of 10 larger than pure neoclassical transport and thus reduces the impurity gradients driven by neoclassical transport to much lower levels. For the typical AUG pedestal, this relates to a smaller impurity content of the confined plasma. However, for ITER the neoclassical convection is predicted outward [35] leading to hollow impurity profiles and an increase of the diffusive part might lead to less hollow impurity profiles. The underlying effect for the outward impurity convection is called temperature screening and could be qualitatively observed in AUG in specially designed discharges with high pedestal ion temperatures. Further analysis is ongoing.

Another concern for a fusion reactor is the sufficient exhaust of He, as it will be constantly produced and the divertor compression and pumping efficiency is not known precisely. To that end the He pumping and compression have been investigated in the context of realistic conditions such as taking a wall retention into account [36]. As a further step the whole transport chain from plasma core to pump was investigated in He seeded discharges in AUG and concomitant modelling




Figure 8. Left column: The equilibrium reconstructions for XD, LFS SF- and HFS SF- are presented. In the top plot LOS from spectroscopy used in the left column are depicted. Right column: A colour map depicts the radial dependence of the LOS integrated values for the deuterium D_ϵ ($n = 7 \rightarrow n = 2$) intensity, the electron density derived from Stark broadening of D_ϵ and the intensity from the N^{+1} line at 399.5 nm.




Figure 9. (a) The α -profile (green) corresponding to a specific case in AUG is unstable to finite- n peeling-ballooning modes, and defines at its maximum $\alpha_{\max,\text{crit}}$. The mode envelope for the $n = 5$ mode is shown as the shaded region. The purple α profile corresponds to the local onset of infinite- n modes at each radius defining $\alpha_{\text{edge,crit}}$ at an chosen radius at the edge (dashed, vertical line). (b) Critical α s for global peeling ballooning modes (green) and local ballooning modes (purple) as a function of the shaping parameter S . (a) and (b) Reproduced from [28]. © 2024 The Author(s). Published by IOP Publishing Ltd on behalf of the IAEA. CC BY 4.0.

using SOLPS-ITER including drifts [37]. As important players the edge transport barrier, collisional parallel SOL-transport and the further transport to the pumps were investigated and compared to experiment. The He compression towards the divertor from the model is about a factor of 10 lower than in experiment. However, newest findings [38] indicate that the inclusion of ELM effects in the model could resolve that open question.

5.3. X-point radiator (XPR)

Impurities also play a major role for the regime of the XPR [39, 40], i.e. a localized pronounced radiation volume exists in the vicinity of the X-point or even inside the confined plasma close to the X-point. For the access of the XPR regime a model [41] has been validated. The regime is also found in GRILLIX [42]. The stable control of the regime is performed via controlling

the positioning of the radiation region with respect to the X-point. Too much nitrogen leads to a MARFE and thus requires disruption avoidance measures [43, 44], while already after the establishment of the XPR detachment is observed. For the regime in [45], the XPR regime becomes ELM-free when the XPR is 7 cm above the X-point. Controlling the XPR position was also demonstrated in other machines and on AUG and JET a system identification was performed [46] in order to document the reaction of the XPR on a change in nitrogen puffing. In accordance to the observations a model was developed for the positioning of the XPR [47].

5.4. Negative triangularity (NT)

An alternative scenario to avoid large ELMs is the employment of NT plasma shapes, which was reported to allow for L-mode plasmas at good performance [48–52]. In AUG, the NT shaping did not consistently avoid H-mode in the past




Figure 10. Left column: The diffusion coefficient D (top) as determined via Bayesian inference in colour is compared to neoclassical results for an L-mode discharge. The drift parameter v/D (bottom) is compared to the corresponding predictions for the same discharge. Middle column: Same but for the inter ELM-phase of a type-I ELMy H-mode discharge. Right column: Same but for an H-mode in the QCE regime. For QCE, the analysis is ELM averaged due to the high frequency of ELMs. Reproduced from [32]. © The Author(s). Published by IOP Publishing Ltd. [CC BY 4.0](#).




Figure 11. Comparison of #43114 with less negative triangularity to the recent discharge #43119 and an average $\delta \approx -0.275$. For the same heating power H-mode is avoided in the latter (black lines) discharges and no ELMs are visible.

[52, 53]. In the latest campaign progress in increased NT shaping ($\delta_{\text{upper}} = -0.56$) [54] led to an avoidance of the H-mode, following also quantitatively the predictions from the infinite- n ballooning calculations [55] using BALOO, which assume that L-mode can be maintained at high heating powers, if the infinite- n ballooning boundary is blocking the path to second stability. In figure 11, the experimental observation is summarized, demonstrating the avoidance of H-mode for the stronger shaped plasma. Further investigations of NT plasmas did not allow access to improved confinement at elevated heating powers including NBI, which is one of the rationals of using NT shaping. However, a NT plasma which was seeded with nitrogen exhibited improved energy confinement [54].

The exact mechanism of this improved confinement remains unclear at this stage.

6. Transport and stability

A reevaluation of the confinement scaling with size [56] towards ITER using the IMEP [57] model revealed that the newer confinement scaling ITPA20-IL [58], which takes triangularity into account and includes also new data from JET-ILW, underestimates the model based predictions and the older prediction IPB98(y,2) [59] is in better agreement. The new model-based predictions suggest a fusion yield of $Q = 12$ for the ITER baseline scenario in ITER. The underlying




Figure 12. Magnitude of neoclassical drift normalized to the turbulent diffusion. (a) The ratio is plotted versus a scaling formula not considering plasma rotation. (b) The ratio is plotted versus the full scaling formula including the enhancement of neoclassical transport by rotation effects. This effect is approximated via the inclusion of f_{rot} , in which the main ion Mach number enters. Reproduced from [62]. © The Author(s). Published by IOP Publishing Ltd. [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

confinement behaviour with higher density is consistent with the pedestal analysis in [60].

Another additional result—possibly related to the observations in JET-ILW—stems from a pedestal stability analysis including non-ideal effects such as resistivity and gyroviscosity [61]. It is unclear how this latter effect is captured by the scalings, or whether this effect is biasing the scalings in an unwanted direction.

In various phases of a plasma discharge the radiation/transport stability of the discharge is closely interconnected with the transport processes in the core of the plasma. One important aspect for this is the avoidance of W accumulation in the core of the plasma. This phenomenon is well investigated at AUG and for an extrapolation to future fusion devices it is crucial to understand the magnitude of the neoclassical transport coefficients, which are causing the accumulation with respect to the turbulent transport which typically relaxes steep impurity coefficients. This investigation uses FACIT [63] in combination with TGLF. The modelling chain was first benchmarked to describe the core impurity transport in AUG [64, 65].

Further, the different kinds of ITER plasmas were investigated and a scaling was developed to describe the importance of the neoclassical drift relative to the turbulent diffusion coefficient. In figure 12, the relative size of the neoclassical and turbulent transport is depicted. For the ITER cases the neoclassical drift is generally less important than for the AUG cases, which also include cases with strong central electron heating. All data follows considerably well the scaling formula developed in [62] only if the plasma rotation is taken into account, as can be inferred via the comparison of figures 12(a) and (b).

In order to better predict the rotation, its intrinsic torque sources need to be better understood, especially since the externally applied torque sources for ITER are comparably small. Investigations in this respect have been conducted. First, the disentanglement of external and internal torque sources was achieved via beam modulation experiments [66] in D and H plasmas [67]. Second, the results were compared to gyrokinetic predictions [68] on intrinsic core torque and good

agreement was found. This provided the basis for developing a reduced model for fast predictions.

The ramp-down phase from the flattop of the ITER baseline scenario has been investigated via RAPTOR [69, 70] and similar findings could be reproduced by modelling the ITER baseline ramp-downs using the flight simulator FENIX [71, 72]. In figure 13(a) the trajectories of one discharge are presented along with the modelled curves from FENIX. The main focus of this work was to find strategies to keep the internal inductance (here $\ell_i(3)$) as small as possible as this relates to controllability, i.e. vertical stability, of the plasma position. Major effects on $\ell_i(3)$ were found to be caused by the HL-transition (vertical, dashed line, diagnosed via the collapse of the edge pedestal) and the normalized current ramp rate, here represented as $\Delta I_p/I_p$. This normalization leads to a roughly linear dependence of the change in $\ell_i(3)$ on $\Delta I_p/I_p$ as can be seen in figure 13. FENIX is constantly improved and reduced models [73] are developed and validated for this purpose.

7. SPI for disruption mitigation

At AUG a SPI system [74] has been characterized and installed in order to identify the best strategies for disruption mitigation and runaway suppression in ITER. One of the recent results is depicted in figure 14. For a variety of Ne amounts in the pellet the current decays are compared [75]. For small amounts of Ne the current decay is slow and in fact was in experiment so slow, that vertical displacement events did show up before the actual decay to zero. With increasing amounts of Ne the energy was more rapidly removed from the plasma via better assimilation and radiation and the current could dissipate its energy faster suggesting a safer end of the discharge in terms of forces. Generally, the faster decay implies larger loop voltages and thus in principle there is a higher probability to obtain runaway electrons, which was not a concern for the present experiments, but suggests that a tailoring of the current decay is desirable. The recent experiments demonstrates that the Ne fraction allows for tailoring the current decay.




Figure 13. (a) Measured (black) and modelled (coloured) time traces for a ramp-down from an ITER baseline scenario in AUG. Phases with a different current ramp rate are highlighted with the shaded areas. (b) The increase in I_{i3} is a function of the normalized current ramp rate for both experiment and FENIX simulation.




Figure 14. Current trajectories for many disruptions, which were triggered via SPI with various amounts of Ne in the pellets. The current quench (CQ) systematically changes with the Ne amount. More details in [76].

8. Summary and conclusions

After a 26-month vent AUG went back in operation featuring a new upper divertor with a dedicated cryo-pump and in-vessel coils for obtaining ADCs. All envisaged configurations could be created and investigated. A large diagnostic suite led to a collection of a large data set, which is in the process of being analysed and interpreted. In ADC plasmas large scans of heating power (up to 20MW), fuelling and seeding were performed and the onset of detachment in the outer divertor could be observed, while the inner divertor was always detached. The neutral compression is consistent with an open divertor and can be improved via the planned installation of baffles. This upgrade is subsequent to the identification of the most promising ADC, which is best judged with the full set of diagnostics only available with an open divertor. The restart provided the opportunity to study the challenges of an unboronized startup and proved that the W erosion also during the limiter phase is unimportant in cases when low-Z impurities lead to large radiative losses. However, these losses also imply large loop voltages and consequently yield the danger of creating large runaway populations. The subsequent boronizations were studied in terms of breaking the symmetry on purpose by only using a subset of the glow

anodes during the glow discharge used for boronization. The resulting boron layers however, were much more symmetric than expected, hinting towards a more free choice for the locations of the glow anodes in ITER. Future fusion devices must avoid the detrimental type-I ELMs. AUG explored several strategies with that aim. The QCE/EDA regimes exhibit small-ELM or no ELMs and show promising power exhaust while maintaining confinement. Pedestal stability analyses linked QCE to the local infinite- n ballooning limit near the separatrix, with plasma shaping (elongation, triangularity) enabling access. An alternative approach for avoiding ELMs is the XPR featuring controllable detachment and ELM suppression for the correct XPR position, which was demonstrated to be consistently controllable. Another route to avoiding ELMs is utilizing NT shapes as was demonstrated in DIII-D and TCV. The underlying idea to destabilize infinite- n ballooning modes via more NT shaping succeeded now also at AUG and demonstrated H-mode avoidance at high heating powers. Impurity transport at the plasma edge was investigated using Bayesian inference on density measurements of Ne^{8+} to Ne^{10+} . As a result the diffusive and convective Ne transport was quantified, showing turbulent contributions beyond neoclassical predictions in L-mode and QCE phases, which mitigates impurity accumulation. Also advances on the analysis of He exhaust

have been achieved, elaborating several specialities of He, but also demonstrating the importance of taking the effect of ELMs into account. Updated confinement scalings using the integrated modelling approach IMEP suggests ITER may achieve $Q = 12$, clearly higher than recent ITPA20-IL predictions. Recent pedestal stability analyses including resistive and gyroviscous effects reproduce density-dependent reductions in stability. The integrated modelling of core impurity transport highlighted the lower importance of neoclassical vs. turbulent transport in ITER, with plasma rotation critically influencing predictions. The simulations (here flight-simulator FENIX) of ramp-down from the ITER baseline flattop identified normalized current ramp rate and H–L transition as key factors in controlling internal inductance. AUG investigated pellets from the shattered pellet injector to study safe discharge termination. Results showed that higher neon content in the pellets accelerated current decay, reducing mechanical forces but increasing loop voltages and risks of creating runaways. These findings inform ITER strategies for disruption control. In summary, the AUG upgrades and experiments provide essential benchmarks for ITER, advancing knowledge in start-up conditioning, tungsten erosion, divertor optimization, ELM control strategies, impurity transport, confinement scaling, and disruption mitigation. The insights significantly enhance predictive capability towards ITER's operation, especially after moving to a full-W wall.

Acknowledgment

This work has been carried out within the framework of the EUROfusion Consortium, funded by the European Union via the Euratom Research and Training Programme (Grant Agreement No. 101052200 - EUROfusion). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) 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.

ORCID iDs

T. Pütterich  0000-0002-8487-4973
 E. Alessi  0000-0002-8750-9867
 C. Angioni  0000-0003-0270-9630
 V. Artigues  0000-0002-2600-6457
 M. Astrain  0000-0003-3486-0941
 M. Balden  0000-0002-8755-9370
 A. Banon Navarro  0000-0003-0487-6395
 M. Bergmann  0009-0005-6052-6420
 A. Biancalani  0000-0002-7227-6343
 R. Bielajew  0000-0002-9578-368X
 R. Bilato  0000-0002-0578-9333
 V. Bobkov  0000-0002-2328-9308

References

- [1] Zammuto I. et al 2025 *Fusion Eng. Des.* **215** 115028
 [2] Herrmann A. et al 2019 *Fusion Eng. Des.* **146** 920–3

- [3] Teschke M., Herrmann A., Pautasso G., Vierle T. and Zammuto I. 2019 *Fusion Eng. Des.* **146** 1181–5
 [4] Schall G., Berger N., Bösser D., Herrmann A., Rohde V., Sochor M. and Weißgerber M. 2021 *Fusion Eng. Des.* **166** 112316
 [5] Lunt T., Zohm H., Herrmann A., Kallenbach A., Dunne M., Feng Y., Neu R. and Wischmeier M. 2017 *Nucl. Mater. Energy* **12** 1037–42
 [6] Kallenbach A. et al 2025 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **67** 085005
 [7] Rohde V., Balden M., Krieger K. and Neu R. 2025 *Nucl. Mater. Energy* **43** 101923
 [8] Kallenbach A. et al 2009 *Nucl. Fusion* **49** 045007
 [9] Neu R. et al 2009 *Phys. Scr.* **2009** 014038
 [10] Rohde V., Krieger K., Hohmann T.-O., Redl A., Hobirk J., An S. and Sasidharan S. 2025 *Nucl. Mater. Energy* **45** 102036
 [11] Hobirk J. et al 2025 Tungsten limiter start-up experiments in different boronization states in support of ITER 2025 IAEA Fusion Energy Conf. (Chengdu, China, 13–18 October 2025) submitted
 [12] Mayer M. et al 2025 *Nucl. Mater. Energy* **45** 102015
 [13] Wauters T., Hagelaar G.J.M. and Pitts R.A. 2025 *Nucl. Mater. Energy* **42** 101891
 [14] Loarte A. et al 2025 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **67** 065023
 [15] Schmid K. and Wauters T. 2024 *Nucl. Mater. Energy* **41** 101789
 [16] Pitts R. et al 2025 *Nucl. Mater. Energy* **42** 101854
 [17] Lunt T. et al 2025 First campaign with alternative divertor configurations in ASDEX Upgrade *This Conference, IAEA-CN-392/Postdeadline*
 [18] Faitsch M. et al 2025 *Nucl. Mater. Energy* **42** 101904
 [19] Gil L. et al 2025 *Nucl. Fusion* **65** 046002
 [20] Kalis J. et al 2023 *Nucl. Fusion* **64** 016038
 [21] Schellpfeffer J. et al 2026 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **68** 015004
 [22] Faitsch M., Eich T., Harrer G.F., Wolfrum E., Brida D., David P., Griener M. and Stroth U. 2021 *Nucl. Mater. Energy* **26** 100890
 [23] Faitsch M. et al 2023 *Nucl. Fusion* **63** 076013
 [24] Redl A. et al 2024 *Nucl. Fusion* **64** 086064
 [25] Faitsch M. et al 2025 *Nucl. Fusion* **65** 024003
 [26] Radovanovic L., Dunne M., Wolfrum E., Harrer G., Faitsch M., Fischer R. and Aumayr F. 2022 *Nucl. Fusion* **62** 086004
 [27] Radovanovic L., Wolfrum E., Dunne M.G., Harrer G.F. and Aumayr F. 2025 *Nucl. Fusion* **65** 056039
 [28] Dunne M., Faitsch M., Radovanovic L. and Wolfrum E. 2024 *Nucl. Fusion* **64** 124003
 [29] Zholobenko W. et al 2025 Validated, global edge-SOL turbulence simulations in various ELM-free regimes *This Conference, IAEA-CN-392/3241*
 [30] Zholobenko W. et al 2024 *Nucl. Fusion* **64** 106066
 [31] Gleiter T. et al 2025 *Nucl. Fusion* **65** 056010
 [32] Gleiter T. et al 2026 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **68** 045037
 [33] Pütterich T., Dux R., Janzer M.A. and McDermott R.M. 2011 *J. Nucl. Mater.* **415** S334–9
 [34] Dux R., Loarte A., Angioni C., Coster D., Fable E. and Kallenbach A. 2017 *Nucl. Mater. Energy* **12** 28–35
 [35] Dux R., Loarte A., Fable E. and Kukushkin A. 2014 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **56** 124003
 [36] Zito A. et al 2023 *Nucl. Fusion* **63** 096027
 [37] Zito A., Pan O., Wischmeier M., Kappatou A., Kallenbach A., Makarov S.O., Bernert M., Cavedon M., Reiter D. and Stroth U. 2025 *Nucl. Fusion* **65** 046022
 [38] Zito A. et al 2025 Numerical assessment of the impact of ELM flushing on impurity exhaust in ASDEX Upgrade H-modes 20th Int. Workshop on Plasma Edge Theory in Fusion Devices (PET-20) (Leuven, Belgium, 23–26 September 2025)

- [39] Lunt T., Bernert M., Brida D., David P., Faitsch M., Pan O., Stieglitz D., Stroth U. and Redl A. 2023 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130** 145102
- [40] Bernert M. et al 2025 *Nucl. Mater. Energy Fusion* **43** 101916
- [41] Stroth U. et al 2022 *Nucl. Fusion* **62** 076008
- [42] Eder K., Stegmeir A., Zholobenko W., Pfennig J., Brida D., Grenfell G. and Jenko F. 2025 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **67** 065034
- [43] Sieglin B., Maraschek M., Gude A., Klossek F., Felici F., Bernert M., Kudlacek O., Pau A. and Treutterer W. 2023 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **66** 025004
- [44] Sieglin B. et al 2025 *Fusion Eng. Des.* **215** 114961
- [45] Bernert M. et al 2020 *Nucl. Fusion* **61** 024001
- [46] Bosman T. et al 2024 *Nucl. Fusion* **65** 016057
- [47] Stroth U., Bernert M., Lunt T., Pan O. and Wolfrum E. 2025 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **67** 035001
- [48] Pochelon A. et al 1999 *Nucl. Fusion* **39** 1807
- [49] Camenen Y. et al 2007 *Nucl. Fusion* **47** 510
- [50] Austin M.E. et al 2019 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** 115001
- [51] Marinoni A., Sauter O. and Coda S. 2021 *Rev. Mod. Plasma Phys.* **5** 6
- [52] Happel T. et al 2022 *Nucl. Fusion* **63** 016002
- [53] Vanovac B. et al 2024 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **66** 115005
- [54] Vanovac B. et al 2025 Overview of negative triangularity experiments with strong shaping in ASDEX Upgrade 67th Annual Meeting of the APS Division of Plasma Physics (Long Beach, California, USA, 17–21 November 2025)
- [55] Nelson A., Paz-Soldan C. and Saarelma S. 2022 *Nucl. Fusion* **62** 096020
- [56] Luda T., Angioni C., Stefanelli F., Bourdelle C., Fajardo D., Dunne M., Fable E. and Tardini G. 2025 *Nucl. Fusion* **65** 072001
- [57] Luda T., Angioni C., Dunne M.G., Fable E., Kallenbach A., Bonanomi N., Schneider P.A., Siccinio M. and Tardini G. 2020 *Nucl. Fusion* **60** 036023
- [58] Verdoolaege G. et al 2021 *Nucl. Fusion* **61** 076006
- [59] ITER Physics Expert Group on Confinement and Transport and ITER Physics Expert Group on Confinement Modelling and Database and ITER Physics Basis ed 1999 *Nucl. Fusion* **39** 2175
- [60] Frassinetti L. et al 2025 Peeling limited pedestals in JET-ILW, MAST-U and TCV: effect of density and isotope mass in deuterium and tritium-rich plasma on pedestal structure and stability and validation of pedestal predictions for ITER Preprint 2025 IAEA Fusion Energy Conf., Chengdu (Chengdu, China, 13–18 October 2025) Accepted
- [61] Stefanelli F., Dunne M.G., Puchmayr J. and Zohm H. 2025 *Nucl. Fusion* **65** 086025
- [62] Fajardo D., Angioni C., Kim S.H., Koechl F., Fable E., Loarte A., Polevoi A. and Tardini G. 2024 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **67** 015020
- [63] Fajardo D., Angioni C., Casson F.J., Field A.R., Maget P. and Manas P. 2023 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **65** 035021
- [64] Fajardo D., Angioni C., Fable E., Tardini G., Bilato R., Luda T., McDermott R.M. and Samoylov O. 2024 *Nucl. Fusion* **64** 104001
- [65] Fajardo D., Angioni C., Dux R., Fable E., Plank U., Samoylov O. and Tardini G. 2024 *Nucl. Fusion* **64** 046021
- [66] Zimmermann C.F.B. et al 2022 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **64** 055020
- [67] Zimmermann C. et al 2023 *Nucl. Fusion* **63** 126006
- [68] Zimmermann C.F.B. et al 2024 *Phys. Plasmas* **31** 042306
- [69] Van Mulders S., Sauter O., Contré C., Felici F., Fischer R., Pütterich T., Sieglin B. and Teplukhina A.A. 2023 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **66** 025006
- [70] Van Mulders S. et al 2023 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **66** 025007
- [71] Fable E. et al 2022 *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **64** 044002
- [72] David P. et al 2025 *Open Plasma Sci.* **1** 14788
- [73] Solfronk F., Fable E., Pütterich T. and David P. 2025 *Nucl. Fusion* **65** 086020
- [74] Dibon M. et al 2023 *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **94** 043504
- [75] Heinrich P. et al 2025 *Nucl. Fusion* **65** 056036
- [76] Heinrich P. et al 2026 *Nucl. Fusion* Evolution of SPI-induced disruptions in ASDEX Upgrade submitted