

# Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

## LBL Publications

### Title

An initial magnet experiment using high-temperature superconducting STAR® wires

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4tz8f9q1>

### Journal

Superconductor Science and Technology, 35(12)

### ISSN

0953-2048

### Authors

Wang, Xiaorong  
Bogdanof, Timothy J  
Ferracin, Paolo  
[et al.](#)

### Publication Date

2022-12-01

### DOI

10.1088/1361-6668/ac9f82

Peer reviewed

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

# An initial magnet experiment using high-temperature superconducting STAR<sup>®</sup> wires

To cite this article before publication: Xiaorong Wang *et al* 2022 *Supercond. Sci. Technol.* in press <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6668/ac9f82>

## Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Accepted Manuscript is “the version of the article accepted for publication including all changes made as a result of the peer review process, and which may also include the addition to the article by IOP Publishing of a header, an article ID, a cover sheet and/or an ‘Accepted Manuscript’ watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by IOP Publishing and/or its licensors”

This Accepted Manuscript is © 2022 IOP Publishing Ltd.

During the embargo period (the 12 month period from the publication of the Version of Record of this article), the Accepted Manuscript is fully protected by copyright and cannot be reused or reposted elsewhere.

As the Version of Record of this article is going to be / has been published on a subscription basis, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 licence after the 12 month embargo period.

After the embargo period, everyone is permitted to use copy and redistribute this article for non-commercial purposes only, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the licence <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0>

Although reasonable endeavours have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on IOPscience once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions will likely be required. All third party content is fully copyright protected, unless specifically stated otherwise in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

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

# An initial magnet experiment using high-temperature superconducting STAR<sup>®</sup> wires

Xiaorong Wang<sup>1</sup>, Timothy J. Bogdanof<sup>1</sup>, Paolo Ferracin<sup>1</sup>, William B. Ghiorso<sup>1</sup>, Stephen A. Gourlay<sup>1</sup>, Hugh C. Higley<sup>1</sup>, Janakiram Kaushal Kadiyala<sup>2</sup>, Soumen Kar<sup>2</sup>, Reginald Lee<sup>1</sup>, Linqing Luo<sup>1</sup>, Maxwell A. Maruszewski<sup>1</sup>, Robert Memmo<sup>1</sup>, Cory S. Myers<sup>1</sup>, Soren O. Prestemon<sup>1</sup>, Jithin Sai Sandra<sup>2</sup>, Venkat Selvamanickam<sup>3</sup>, Reed Teyber<sup>1</sup>, Marcos Turqueti<sup>1</sup>, Yuxin Wu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

<sup>2</sup> AMPeers LLC, Houston, TX 77059, USA

<sup>3</sup> Department of Mechanical Engineering, Advanced Manufacturing Institute, Texas Center for Superconductivity, University of Houston, TX 77204, USA

E-mail: xrwang@lbl.gov

## Abstract.

A dipole magnet generating 20 T and beyond will require high-temperature superconductors such as  $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8-x}$  and  $\text{REBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-x}$  (RE = rare earth, REBCO). Symmetric tape round (STAR<sup>®</sup>) wires based on REBCO tapes are emerging as a potential conductor for such a magnet, demonstrating a whole-conductor current density of  $580 \text{ A mm}^{-2}$  at 20 T, 4.2 K, and at a bend radius of 15 mm. There are, however, few magnet developments using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires. Here we report a subscale canted  $\cos\theta$  dipole magnet as an initial experiment for two purposes: to evaluate the conductor performance in a magnet configuration and to start developing the magnet technology, leveraging the small bend radius afforded by STAR<sup>®</sup> wires. The magnet was wound with two STAR<sup>®</sup> wires, electrically in parallel and without transposition. We tested the magnet at 77 and 4.2 K. The magnet reached a peak current of 8.9 kA, 78% of the short-sample prediction at 4.2 K, and a whole-conductor current density of  $1500 \text{ A mm}^{-2}$ . The experiment demonstrated a minimum viable concept for dipole magnet applications using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires. The results also allowed us to identify further development needs for STAR<sup>®</sup> conductors and associated magnet technology to enable high-field REBCO magnets.

## 1. Introduction

Recent progress of multi-tape high-current REBa<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>O<sub>7- $\delta$</sub>  (REBCO, RE = rare earth elements) cable paves a way toward high-field accelerator magnets that can generate a dipole field beyond 16 T, the perceived limit for the state-of-art Nb<sub>3</sub>Sn magnet technology [1]. Two European programs, EuCARD and EuCARD2 [2, 3], have successfully demonstrated record dipole fields of 5.4 T at 4.2 K using a twin-tape cable [4–6] and 4.5 T using a Roebel cable [6–8]. Both cables can be characterized as a stacked-tape architecture that is ubiquitous in various REBCO-based fusion cable concepts [9, 10].

A round conductor, such as the Conductor on Round Core (CORC<sup>®</sup>) wire [11–14], represents an alternative architecture for a multi-tape REBCO cable. With highly-aspected REBCO tapes helically wrapped around a round former, the resulting conductor becomes mechanically and magnetically isotropic, a desirable feature to develop high-field accelerator magnets that require tight conductor bending. The U.S. Magnet Development Program (MDP) [15, 16], sponsored by the Office of High Energy Physics at the Department of Energy, is pursuing several magnet concepts using CORC<sup>®</sup> conductors [17–19].

The Symmetric Tape Round (STAR<sup>®</sup>) wire is another quintessential multi-tape round REBCO conductor [20–23]. Although its fundamental geometry is similar to CORC<sup>®</sup> conductors, the STAR<sup>®</sup> wire pushes the concept further with several distinctions. The thin substrate, 15 – 22  $\mu\text{m}$  thick, and Cu of asymmetric thickness at each side of the tape, position the REBCO layer near the neutral axis of the composite tape, improving the tape bending performance [21, 23, 24]. STAR<sup>®</sup> wires not only can use a Cu former as small as 0.7 mm diam-

eter but also usually contain less than 15 REBCO tapes. As a result, STAR<sup>®</sup> wires have a diameter less than 3 mm and a minimum bend radius of 15 mm. A whole-conductor current density of 580 A mm<sup>-2</sup> at 20 T, 4.2 K is also demonstrated [25].

Although the performance of STAR<sup>®</sup> wire progressed significantly in the past few years, there are few reports on using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires in magnets [24]. Here we report the fabrication and test of a subscale canted  $\cos\theta$  (CCT) dipole magnet called s0. The 50-mm aperture magnet has two layers and three turns of conductors in each layer. Each layer has two STAR<sup>®</sup> wires that are electrically in parallel and without transposition. We assembled both layers into the s0 magnet and tested it at 77 and 4.2 K. The magnet reached a peak current of 8.9 kA, 78% of the short-sample prediction, and a whole-conductor current density of 1500 A mm<sup>-2</sup>.

With this initial experiment of magnet development using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires, we intend to start addressing the following questions: How to make a high-field dipole magnet with STAR<sup>®</sup> wires? What is the magnet and conductor performance? What further developments are needed for the magnet and conductor technology to enable a dipole field of 20 T and above?

We describe the magnet design and fabrication in Section 2, followed by the details of measurement setup and protocol in Section 3. Sections 4, and 5 present the test results at 77 and 4.2 K. Section 6 presents the ramp-rate dependence of the current distribution, followed by the electrical-joint performance in Section 7. Finally, we discuss the implications of s0 magnet and further development needs for high-field dipole magnets based on STAR<sup>®</sup> wires.

Compared to the earlier work on CCT

*s0*: an initial magnet experiment using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires

magnets using CORC<sup>®</sup> conductors, this work introduced the ribbon-like conductor configuration of two STAR<sup>®</sup> wires and the associated coil fabrication details, including a semi-automated winding method and a concept of electrical termination for multiple STAR<sup>®</sup> wires. We also measured and discussed current distribution between the two electrically-parallel wires, which can be important for further development and application of high-current cables consisting of multiple compact STAR<sup>®</sup> wires in high-field magnets.

The experiment of the *s0* magnet suggested that it is possible to transfer the exemplary performance of STAR<sup>®</sup> wires from short samples to magnets. We expect the continued development to bring more conductor and technology options to enable high-field REBCO magnets for high-energy physics and fusion applications.


## 2. Design and fabrication of *s0*

### 2.1. Magnet configuration

The *s0* magnet follows a two-layer CCT dipole design. The CCT concept was introduced by Meyer and Flasck in 1970 [26]. Since then, various authors have further developed and demonstrated the concept [27–40]. The MDP is developing high-field CCT dipole magnet technology for Nb<sub>3</sub>Sn [41–43] and two high-temperature superconductors: Bi<sub>2</sub>Sr<sub>2</sub>CaCu<sub>2</sub>O<sub>8+x</sub> [44–47] and REBCO [19, 48, 49].


Figure 1 shows the magnet configuration. To leverage the small wire diameter and boost the total magnet current, each layer has two STAR<sup>®</sup> wires that are electrically in parallel. After winding, the wires essentially formed a ribbon-type cable with no wire transposition. Table 1 lists the main parameters for the

magnet.



**Figure 1.** Sketch of the *s0* coil winding. Layer 1 is the inner layer and Layer 2 is the outer layer. Each layer has two wires: Wire 1 is the inner one closer to the magnet aperture; Wire 2 is the outer one next to the mandrel surface. The current enters and leaves the magnet from the lead end. The wires from both layers meet at the return end to form the inter-layer joint. The red dots show the locations of the highest magnetic field that is transverse to the longitudinal axes of the wires in the *s0* magnet.

Figure 2 shows the Cartesian coordinate system of the *s0* magnet. It also shows the conductor groove that is normal to the cylindrical surface of the mandrel.



**Figure 2.** The Cartesian coordinate system for Layer 1 of the *s0* magnet, with only the *y* and *z* axes shown. The *z* axis is the rotational axis of the cylindrical mandrel. The *y-z* plane cuts through the pole regions of the magnet; the cross sections of the wires on the *y-z* plane are circles. The *x-z* plane is the mid-plane of the magnet.

We describe the longitudinal axis of each wire using a parametric equation for a CCT dipole [37]. The axis of Wire 1 follows

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= r_1 \cos t, \\ y_1 &= r_1 \sin t, \\ z_1 &= \frac{r_1 \sin t}{\tan \alpha_1} + p_1 t, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

*s0*: an initial magnet experiment using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires

4

**Table 1.** Main design parameters for the s0 magnet. The transfer function of the magnetic fields assumes an even current distribution between the both wires of each layer.

Design parameters	Unit	CCT layer	
		1	2
Inner diameter (ID)	mm	50.00	64.40
Outer diameter (OD)	mm	62.40	76.80
Mandrel length	mm	274	
Mandrel material	-	Al alloy 6061-T6	
Number of turns in each layer	-	3	
Length of a single wire inside each mandrel	m	1.1	1.2
Groove diameter/depth	mm	2.10/4.18	
Mandrel rib thickness at the mid-plane	mm	1.0	
Wire tilt angle at the mid-plane	degree	33	-33
Minimum bend radius of the wire center line	mm	15.4	18.2
Termination length	mm	127	
Termination OD	mm	7.94	
Aperture dipole-field transfer function	T kA <sup>-1</sup>	0.049	0.039
Peak conductor-field transfer function	T kA <sup>-1</sup>	0.406	0.369
Magnet inductance	μH	0.24	

where  $x_1, y_1, z_1$  are the coordinates of the wire axis as a function of parameter  $t$ ;  $r_1$  is the radius of the longitudinal axis of Wire 1 when projected to the  $x$ - $y$  plane;  $\alpha_1$  is the wire tilt angle between the longitudinal axis of the wire, when projected to the  $y$ - $z$  plane, and the  $z$  axis. Over a period of  $2\pi$  for the parameter  $t$ , the wire progresses along the  $z$  axis by  $2\pi p_1$ .

Suppose the groove contains a single stack of identical wires, we show that every wire follows (1) with a specific radius and tilt angle. If each wire is in contact with its neighboring wire(s), then the radius of the longitudinal axis of Wire  $n$ , when projected to the  $x$ - $y$  plane, can be given by  $r_n = r_1 + d(n - 1)$  where  $d$  is the wire diameter.

When we machine the groove in a mandrel, the end mill is normal to the cylindrical surface of the mandrel. This has two implications. First, all the wires in the

groove have identical  $z$  at any parameter  $t$ ,  $z_1(t) = z_n(t)$ . Second, all the wires have the same pitch,  $p_1 = p_n$ . Therefore, using (1), we can relate the tilt angle of Wire  $n$  to that of Wire 1 by  $\tan \alpha_n / \tan \alpha_1 = r_n / r_1$ . As  $r_n$  increases, the tilt angle  $\alpha_n$  for Wire  $n$  also increases (figure 2).

## 2.2. STAR<sup>®</sup> conductor

In March 2019, AMPeers LLC provided five STAR<sup>®</sup> wires to develop the s0 magnet. Each 2 m long wire contains eight layers of REBCO tapes wrapped around a 0.81 mm diameter Cu former. Each layer has one tape. AMPeers produced the REBCO tapes with 15 – 22 μm thick substrates. The Cu stabilizer, with a thickness ranging from 18 – 30 μm, is electroplated primarily on the REBCO side such that the REBCO layer is closer to the neutral plane of the final tape. Wider tapes are used

*s0: an initial magnet experiment using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires*

in the outer layers of the wire: the tape width increases from 1.8 mm of the inner first two layers to 2.6 mm of the outermost two layers.


The wires have a nominal outer diameter of 1.9 mm and a minimum bend radius of 15 mm. The ratio of Cu to non-Cu material is 0.51, taking into account the Cu former and Cu stabilizer in each REBCO tape. The wires do not have electrical insulation. The wires are described as Wires #2 to #6 in reference [24] that has more details on the wires.

### 2.3. Magnet fabrication

The magnet mandrels were made of aluminum alloy 6061-T6. To electrically insulate the mandrels from the STAR<sup>®</sup> wires, we anodized the mandrels with a 50  $\mu\text{m}$  thick coating and sealed with Teflon<sup>®</sup> according to the MIL-A-8625 F Type-III standard. Anodized aluminum mandrels were also used in CCT magnets wound with NbTi conductors [38, 50, 51].

Making one coil consisted of the following steps. Using a semi-automated winding table, we wound one wire into the empty groove. The wire remained at the bottom of the groove under a winding tension of 10 N. The next wire was then wound on top of the previous one, under the same winding tension. Figure 3 and the video show the winding of the second wire for Layer 2. A pair of twisted voltage-tap wires was then wound into the groove and stayed next to the STAR<sup>®</sup> wires.

We also co-wound a single-mode optic fiber into Layer 2 after the voltage-tap wires were installed, following the same procedure and tension as used in co-winding the voltage-tap wires. The polyimide-coated optical fiber has a diameter of 175  $\mu\text{m}$ , fitting in the space between the wall of the radial groove and the STAR<sup>®</sup> wire as a result of the winding



**Figure 3.** Winding the second STAR<sup>®</sup> wire in Layer 2 using a semi-automated winding table. The first STAR<sup>®</sup> wire is in the groove. The development of the winding table was inspired by a video from Glyn Kirby on an automated winding machine [52]. Here is a [youtube video](#) showing the winding process.

tension.

The coils were not impregnated. We wrapped an adhesive electric tape around the completed layer to constrain the conductors and instrumentation wires. The electrical resistance between the STAR<sup>®</sup> wires and mandrel was higher than 60 M $\Omega$  after winding.

The electrical termination was made in two steps.

We first prepared the wire end by tapering and exposing the REBCO tapes, similar to what is reported by Mulder *et al.* [53]. We wrapped around the tapes using a 0.127 mm diameter fine Cu wire to hold the tapes around the Cu former. Then we soldered the tape ends to the wire using a minimum amount of indium (figure 4).


Second, we placed the prepared wire ends into the groove machined in a Cu rod, together with the voltage-tap wires. We sealed the open end of the groove with an aluminum foil. Indium strips were then placed on top of the outer STAR<sup>®</sup> wire. A cartridge heater was used to heat the Cu rod. As indium started melting, we added more to fill the groove. Solder flux was sprayed into the groove at 100  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  and to the molten indium at about 160  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  before

*s0*: an initial magnet experiment using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires

6

turning off the heater.

The entire fabrication process, including warmup and cooldown, took about 15 minutes. The temperature of the Cu rod and STAR<sup>®</sup> wires remained between 150 and 160 °C for about five minutes. We removed the excessive indium to maintain the cylindrical shape of the rod after the indium solidified (figure 4).




**Figure 4.** Top: STAR<sup>®</sup> wires with the prepared ends. Bottom: the finished termination with both STAR<sup>®</sup> wires placed in the groove of the Cu rod.

We inserted Layer 1 into Layer 2 to assemble the *s0* magnet. Both layers were then aligned longitudinally and azimuthally via bronze rods through the alignment holes located near the mandrel ends. Three sets of Kapton shims, each 0.559 mm thick and 120° apart, were inserted into the radial clearance between the two layers to radially center both layers.

The wire terminations from both layers were joined electrically in a praying-hand configuration at the return end of the magnet. The terminations were sandwiched between two Cu blocks with indium foil covering the mating Cu surfaces. We then fastened the Cu blocks using screws to form a pressure contact between the Cu and indium foils.

Figure 5 shows the assembled *s0* magnet. The magnet and inter-layer joint were attached to a G10 strongback. The STAR<sup>®</sup> wires at the lead end were bent and attached to a pair of

vertical current leads from the test header. We determined the final positioning of the magnet and STAR<sup>®</sup> wires using a mock-up coil made of a cardboard tube and Cu refrigeration tubing.



**Figure 5.** The *s0* magnet attached to the test stand.

At the magnet lead end, the wires of each layer were separated by a maximum distance of 11 mm to accommodate the current transducers and current-imbalance sensors that will be described in Section 3.1. To reduce the impact of electromagnetic forces on the separated wires, we secured the STAR<sup>®</sup> wires using five G10 spacers distributed along the arc of the bent wires. Each wire stayed inside a slot on the G10 spacer and was secured using waxed strings. Four printed wire separators were also used to support the wires (figure 7(b)).

### 3. Experimental setup and measurements

#### 3.1. Instrumentation


The voltage across each layer of the magnet was measured using voltage taps embedded inside the electrical terminations. The voltage



*s0*: an initial magnet experiment using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires

7

tap was about 5 mm away from the magnet-facing end of the termination. Figure 6 shows the electric circuit of the magnet during the tests and the locations of the voltage taps. The current flowed from Layer 1 to Layer 2.




**Figure 6.** The circuit of *s0* test and the locations of the voltage taps. The voltage across Layer 1 is given by Taps 1A and 1B; the voltage across Layer 2 is given by Taps 2B and 2A. The voltage across the inter-layer joint is given by Taps 1B and 2B.

Two types of sensors were used to measure the current distribution in the STAR<sup>®</sup> wires.

The first type is a current transducer similar to the one described in [54]. The objective of using the current transducer is to measure the current in a STAR<sup>®</sup> wire. The transducer consisted of a Hall sensor (F.W.Bell<sup>®</sup> FH-301-020) and two half yokes surrounding the STAR<sup>®</sup> wire. The yoke was made of low-carbon 1018 steel (figure 7(a)). The current in each STAR<sup>®</sup> wire was measured by a dedicated current transducer. Two current transducers were placed in a polyether-ether-ketone (PEEK) base for each magnet layer. A G10 spacer separated the transducers by 1 mm to reduce the crosstalk between the transducers. The Hall sensors were glued to the yoke using VGE-7031 varnish. Appendix A has more details on the calibration and results.

The second type is a current-imbalance sensor that measures the magnetic field generated by the differential current between the two STAR<sup>®</sup> wires, following [55–57]. The sensor consisted of a Hall sensor (F.W.Bell<sup>®</sup>



**Figure 7.** Two types of current sensors are used for each layer of the *s0* magnet. (a) A current transducer that measures the current in each STAR<sup>®</sup> wire. (b) An imbalance sensor that measures the differential current between the two STAR<sup>®</sup> wires. The red arrows indicate where the wires deformed during the test.

FH-301-020) placed in between, and coplanar with, the two STAR<sup>®</sup> wires via a printed spacer (figure 7(b)). Appendix B has more details on how we interpret the data from the current-imbalance sensor.

The dipole field in the magnet aperture was measured using a calibrated cryogenic Hall sensor (F.W.Bell<sup>®</sup> BHA-921).

The cryogen level was continuously monitored to ensure that the STAR<sup>®</sup> current leads and magnet were submerged in the cryogen during the test. We installed two calibrated Cernox temperature sensors in the cryostat to monitor the test temperature: one at the maximum height of the STAR<sup>®</sup> wires at the magnet lead end and the other at the bottom of the cryostat.

We used two data acquisition (DAQ)

*s0: an initial magnet experiment using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires*

8

1 systems.

2  
3 The first system consisted of digital  
4 multimeters (Keithley 2010, 2182A, and 2700)  
5 and a temperature monitor (Lakeshore 218),  
6 all controlled by a laptop via a GPIB bus.  
7 In addition to the temperatures, the recorded  
8 data included the magnet current, voltages  
9 across each layer of the magnet and voltages  
10 across the current leads. The system also  
11 recorded the output from the Hall sensor  
12 measuring the dipole field and the output from  
13 the current transducers. The sampling rate  
14 was about 0.3 Hz.

15  
16 The second system was a National  
17 Instruments CompactDAQ (NI cDAQ) system  
18 including NI-9238 and NI-9239 cards. The  
19 system simultaneously digitized the magnet  
20 current, voltages across each layer, and the  
21 signals from the current transducers and  
22 current-imbalance sensors. The sampling rate  
23 was 1.6 kHz.

24  
25 The voltage across each magnet layer,  
26 filtered and amplified by Keithley 2182A  
27 multimeters, was used for quench detection.  
28 The detection system shut down the power  
29 supply once the input voltage was above  
30 certain thresholds. No external resistor was  
31 used to extract the energy stored in the  
32 magnet.

33  
34 A single-mode fiber was co-wound with  
35 the STAR<sup>®</sup> wires in Layer 2 to develop  
36 a procedure of using distributed fiber-optic  
37 sensing for future magnets. A commercial  
38 Luna ODiSI system was used to measure the  
39 spectrum shift of the optical signal during  
40 the tests at 77 and 4.2 K. The measurement  
41 frequency was 10 Hz. The spatial resolution  
42 was 0.65 mm along the fiber.

### 3.2. Measurements and data reduction

We measured the critical current and dipole field of each layer at 77 K, self-field, in April 2021. Layer 2 was measured again at 77 K in September 2021 to test the current transducers and current-imbalance sensors. We tested the assembled s0 magnet at 77 and 4.2 K in November 2021.

It took about 30 minutes to cool down each layer from room temperature to 77 K. It took about 160 minutes to cool down the assembled magnet in a vertical cryostat from room temperature to 77 K. The magnet was cooled down to 4.2 K after the 77 K test, when the thermometers inside the cryostat read around 100 K.

At 77 K, we measured the layer voltage and current when the current was held constant at various levels. We also ramped the current continuously at different rates to study the ramp-rate dependence of the magnet performance.

The magnet current was ramped continuously at a certain rate during the 4.2 K tests. The continuous current ramping caused a higher inductive voltage component in the voltage across each layer. We applied a moving average with a window size of 200 data points to the layer voltage and magnet current data acquired by the cDAQ system. The averaged data are reported here.

## 4. Magnet test results at 77 K

### 4.1. Conductor critical current at 77 K

We determined the critical current,  $I_c$ , and  $n$  value by fitting the measured  $V(I)$  data according to a power law [58]

$$V = V_o + IR_t + V_c \left( \frac{I}{I_c} \right)^n, \quad (2)$$

*s0*: an initial magnet experiment using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires

where  $V_o$  is the voltage offset,  $R_t$  is the termination resistance, and  $V_c$  is the voltage criterion. Here we define  $I_c$  and  $n$  values using a  $V_c$  of  $20 \mu\text{V}$ , corresponding to an electric-field criterion of about  $10 \mu\text{V m}^{-1}$ .


Table 2 gives the  $I_c$  and  $n$  value of the five STAR<sup>®</sup> wires measured at 77 K, self-field, based on the data reported in reference [24]. Wires A and B were paired for Layer 1 and Wires D and E were paired for Layer 2. We used Wire C to develop the termination concept and calibrate the current transducers.

**Table 2.**  $I_c$  and  $n$  value of the five STAR<sup>®</sup> wires measured by AMPEers at 77 K, self field. The voltage criterion is  $20 \mu\text{V}$ .

Wire #	$I_c$ (A)	$n$	Used in <i>s0</i> as
A	419	21.9	Layer 1 Wire 1
B	416	17.2	Layer 1 Wire 2
C	474	20.0	-
D	431	19.0	Layer 2 Wire 1
E	436	22.0	Layer 2 Wire 2

#### 4.2. Current-carrying capability of the magnet at 77 K

Figure 8 shows the  $V(I)$  transition for each layer measured at 77 K, self-field. The  $I_c$  decreased by 12% in Layer 1 and by 14% in Layer 2 after winding, compared to the theoretical  $I_c$  before winding (table 3). After the magnet was assembled, the  $I_c$  further decreased by 8% in Layer 1 and by 2% in Layer 2. We observed an early voltage rise starting from around 300 A in Layer 1 and around 200 A in Layer 2, when each layer was tested individually. The early voltage rise was less pronounced after the magnet assembly (figure 8).



**Figure 8.** Measured voltage across each layer as a function of current at 77 K. Black open symbols: each layer tested stand-alone; red closed symbols: after assembly into *s0*. The solid lines are the exponential fit of the measured  $V(I)$  data according to (2). The blue dashed lines are the calculated  $V(I)$  curves for each pair of wires, before winding, based on the data from table 2.

#### 4.3. Current distribution between the STAR<sup>®</sup> wires at 77 K

Figure 9 shows the Layer 1 voltage, the output voltage of the current-imbalance sensor and the current ratio between the two wires, measured during Ramp 4 at 77 K. The slope of the imbalance voltage changed around 520 A when the layer voltage started rising.

#### 4.4. Dipole transfer function at 77 K


Figure 10 shows the measured and calculated dipole-field transfer function at 77 K. The transfer function is defined as the ratio between the dipole field at the center of the magnet aperture and magnet current. The dipole field at the center of the coil aperture was measured during the test of each individual layer. The measurements were performed using direct current (DC). Compared to the calculation, the measured dipole transfer function is about 2% lower for Layer 1, 1% lower for the Layer 2, and 0.6% lower for the assembled *s0* magnet.

*s0*: an initial magnet experiment using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires


10

**Table 3.**  $I_c$  and  $n$  value of each layer of the *s0* magnet, determined at a voltage criterion of  $20 \mu\text{V}$  according to (2). The  $I_c$  and  $n$  value for each pair of wires before winding were determined from the calculated  $V(I)$  in figure 8. The  $I_c$  of Layer 2 at 4.2 K is extrapolated from the measurement data according to (2).

Layer	77 K		77 K		77 K		4.2 K		4.2/77 K $I_c$ ratio (-)
	Before winding $I_c$ (A)	$n$ (-)	After winding $I_c$ (A)	$n$ (-)	After assembly $I_c$ (A)	$n$ (-)	After assembly $I_c$ (A)	$n$ (-)	
1	836	19.6	739	10.3	681	16.2	8723	21.3	12.8
2	868	20.5	752	9.7	739	13.6	9258	7.4	12.5



**Figure 9.** Top: Voltage across Layer 1 as a function of current. Bottom: The output voltage of the current-imbalance sensor,  $V_{\text{imb}}$ , on the primary  $y$ -axis and the current ratio,  $\beta = I_1/I_2$ , on the secondary  $y$ -axis. The output voltage of the current-imbalance sensor was shifted along the  $y$ -axis to start from zero at zero current. Two sets of current-ratio data are shown: the blue crosses are determined by the current measured by the current transducers and the red squares are determined using the method described in Appendix B. The solid lines are the calculated  $V(I)$  and current ratio described in Appendix C.




**Figure 10.** The dipole-field transfer function of individual layers and assembled magnet at 77 K. Lines: calculation. Symbols: measurements using direct current. The calculation assumed that both wires carried identical current in each layer.

## 5. Magnet test results at 4.2 K

### 5.1. Magnet performance with respect to the short-sample prediction

Figure 11 shows the voltage across each layer during Ramp 14 when the magnet reached 8908 A, the highest current of all the ramps. The voltage across Layer 1 started rising around 6700 A. The voltage across Layer 2 started rising around 3800 A.

We determined the performance limit of



**Figure 11.** Voltage across each layer during Ramp 14 at 4.2 K. The dashed lines are exponential fit to the measurement when the current is above 8.5 kA. The ramp rate of the current was  $30 \text{ A s}^{-1}$  on average.

the *s0* magnet based on the  $I_c(B)$  data for Wire 1 of Layer 1 because it is expected to

*s0*: an initial magnet experiment using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires

11


experience the highest field among all four wires. The resulting performance limit is called the short-sample prediction (SSP).

Lacking the actual  $I_c(B)$  data for Wire 1 of Layer 1 at 4.2 K, we used the data from STAR<sup>®</sup> #1 in reference [25] as an approximation, because both wires have the same number of tapes and nominal wire diameter. The  $I_c(B)$  of STAR<sup>®</sup> #1 follows a scaling law of

$$I_c \propto B^{-0.818}, \quad (3)$$

where  $B$  is the applied magnetic flux density ranging from 18 to 31 T [25]. We used (3) to extrapolate the  $I_c(B)$  data down to 2 T.

Figure 12 shows the magnet load lines, short-sample prediction, and measured dipole field for *s0* at 4.2 K from Ramp 14.




**Figure 12.** Expected performance limit for *s0*. The blue solid line is the conductor peak field load line. The dashed line shows the  $I_c(B)$  data extrapolated from the data of STAR<sup>®</sup> #1 [25]. The solid black square point gives the expected limit: 5691 A in Layer 1 Wire 1 with a peak field of 2.31 T on the wire. Blue open circles represent the measured dipole field.

The expected short-sample prediction for *s0* is 11,382 A, assuming that both wires in each layer carry the same current. Layer 1 started transitioning at 59% of the SSP, and reached 78% of the SSP at a peak current of 8908 A. The current corresponds to a whole-conductor current density of  $1500 \text{ A m}^{-2}$ . We

measured a peak dipole field of 0.79 T at the center of *s0*'s aperture.

### 5.2. Degradation of critical current and burn-out in Layer 1

The  $V(I)$  of Layer 2 was largely reproducible among all the current ramps at 4.2 K, despite the early rise of the voltage around 3.8 kA (figure 13).



**Figure 13.** Layer 2 voltage as a function of magnet current. The ramp rate of the current was  $30 \text{ A s}^{-1}$  on average. The dashed line is the fit of the  $V(I)$  data for the current above 8.5 kA according to (2). The ramp number and corresponding data legend are given on the right side of the figure.

The critical current of Layer 1, however, degraded after Ramp 14, as evidenced by the  $V(I)$  curves shown in figure 14. Table 4 lists the  $I_c$  and  $n$  values of Layer 1 for each ramp. The  $V(I)$  curves of the earlier ramps, whose peak currents were below 7.5 kA, followed that of Ramp 11 in figure 14.

Figure 15 shows the current ratio between the two wires and voltages of Layer 1 during Ramp 14 with a minimum  $I_c$  degradation and Ramp 20 with a maximum degradation. We plotted the data for 4 kA and above to highlight the change of the current ratio and layer voltage.


The voltage across Layer 1 voltage went above 0.6 V at 8895 A during Ramp 20, followed by an open circuit in Layer 1. We

*s0: an initial magnet experiment using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires*

12

**Table 4.** Degradation of the  $I_c$  and  $n$  value of Layer 1 at 4.2 K.  $I_c$  and  $n$ -value are determined at a  $20 \mu\text{V}$  criterion according to (2). The changes in  $I_c$ ,  $\Delta I_c$ , and the changes in  $n$  values,  $\Delta n$ , are with respect to the values of Ramp 11.


Ramp	$I_{\max}$ (A)	$V_{\max}$ ( $\mu\text{V}$ )	$I_c$ (A)	$\Delta I_c$	$n$ (-)	$\Delta n$
11	8493	7.6	8764	0.0%	24.5	0%
12	8570	10.2	8764	0.0%	24.5	0%
14	8908	30.7	8723	-0.5%	21.3	-13%
15	8056	10.3	8531	-2.7%	13.0	-47%
18	8554	35.5	8219	-6.2%	16.3	-33%
19	8844	72.4	8141	-7.1%	14.9	-39%
20	8895	burn-out	8006	-8.6%	13.1	-47%



**Figure 14.** Top: Layer 1 voltage in  $\mu\text{V}$  as a function of magnet current. The dashed lines are the fit of the  $V(I)$  data according to (2). Bottom: The output voltage of the current-imbalance sensor in  $\text{mV}$ . The bottom graph also includes the data from earlier ramps with a peak current ranging from 1 to 7.5 kA. The ramp rate of the current was  $30 \text{ A s}^{-1}$  on average. We labeled Ramps, 11, 14 and 20 next to the data.

found that Layer 1 burned out locally after the magnet disassembly. Figure 16 shows that a 10 mm long section was damaged in both wires. Within the damaged section, about 3 mm long of wire was missing. The Cu instrumentation wire broke at the burned section. The outer tapes also appeared damaged in the wire of the neighboring turn, below the burned location.

The burned location was roughly  $-5 \text{ mm}$  away from the mid-plane along the  $y$  direction,




**Figure 15.** The measured voltage across Layer 1 and the current ratio between the two wires during Ramps 14 and 20 (symbols). The solid lines are the calculated results based on the method described in Appendix C.

close to the expected  $-6 \text{ mm}$  (figure 1). Along the  $z$  direction, the burned location was at about  $z = -2 \text{ mm}$ , close to the expected  $z = -2.2 \text{ mm}$ . The longitudinal center of the mandrel is located at  $z = 0 \text{ mm}$ . The center of the burned section in each wire shifted by  $1 - 2 \text{ mm}$  (figure 16(b)).

### 5.3. Conductor deformation and displacement during magnet energization

The lead wires in both layers deformed due to the electromagnetic force at multiple locations where the wires were separated to



**Figure 16.** (a): The wires burned about 5 mm above the mid-plane as represented by the horizontal waxed string. (b): The ends of both wires fused together. The scale in the pictures is in inches.


accommodate the current sensors, especially at the sections that were not supported. The red arrows in figure 7(b) point to one such example.

The optic fiber along the STAR<sup>®</sup> wires in Layer 2 also indicated that the wires in the mandrel grooves might have moved due to the electromagnetic forces. Figure 17 shows the spectral shift and the corresponding strain data from the fiber at two locations along the winding, when Layer 2 was tested stand-alone at 77 K. At Location A, the mid-plane region of the magnet, the spectral shift indicated that the fiber and likely the STAR<sup>®</sup> wire were under tension. At Location B, near the pole region, the fiber and likely the wire were in compression.

The amplitude of the spectral shift at 4.2 K was higher than at 77 K and saturated the instrument when the current was above 4 kA.

## 6. Ramp-rate dependence of the current distribution

Figure 18 shows the ratio of the current in the wires of Layer 1, as a function of




**Figure 17.** The spectral shift data from the fiber along the STAR<sup>®</sup> wire in Layer 2, 77 K. Positive shift means compression and negative shift means tension. (a) Spectral shift data along the coil at the peak current. (b) The strain data Locations A and B during the current ramp. Location A is near the mid-plane region and Location B is near the pole region.

current and its ramp rate at 77 K. The current ratio was determined using the method described in Appendix B. The current ratio increased with the ramp rate. Both wires carried a similar current when the total current approached the layer  $I_c$ .


Figure 19 shows the ramp-rate dependence of the current ratio of Layer 1 at 4.2 K. The current ratio again increased with the ramp rate, but to a lesser degree than that seen at 77 K.

*s0*: an initial magnet experiment using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires

14



**Figure 18.** The ratio of the current in the wires of Layer 1 at different ramp rates, 77 K. The data for the DC case are from figure 9.




**Figure 19.** The ratio of the current in the wires of Layer 1 at different ramp rates, 4.2 K.

## 7. Electrical resistance of the terminations

Figure 20 shows the voltage across the praying-hand joint between the two layers as a function of current at 77 and 4.2 K. The voltage was reproducible during all current ramps. The joint resistance is 138 n $\Omega$  at 77 K and 21 n $\Omega$  at 4.2 K, based on the slope of the  $V(I)$  curves in figure 20.

Table 5 gives the termination resistance of each layer, based on the measured  $V(I)$  data at low current according to (2).



**Figure 20.** Voltage across the inter-layer joint, as a function of current, at 77 and 4.2 K, self-field. Symbols: measurement data; lines: linear fit of the data.

**Table 5.** Termination resistance in n $\Omega$  at 77 and 4.2 K

Layer	77 K	4.2 K	ratio
1	66	11	6.0
2	151	23	6.6

## 8. Discussion

### 8.1. Continue developing magnets using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires toward higher dipole fields

The *s0* magnet provided an initial answer to the question of how to use STAR<sup>®</sup> wires to make dipole magnets. Leveraging the small wire diameter, we can use multiple STAR<sup>®</sup> wires to increase the magnet current. We wound two wires in each layer of *s0*. The wires, after the coil winding, formed a ribbon-type cable without transposition.

The transport performance of Layer 1 showed that the wires worked reasonably well. Layer 1, featuring the smallest bend radius and highest conductor fields, reached 78% of the short-sample prediction at 4.2 K. This can be a conservative estimate for two reasons. First, the reference wire, STAR<sup>®</sup> #1 in reference [25], can have a higher  $I_c$  at 4.2 K than that of the actual *s0* wire. The 77 K  $I_c$  of the



reference wire is 22% higher than that of Layer 1 Wire 1 before winding. The REBCO tapes in both the reference wire and the wires used in s0 were made by a similar process. The fabrication process and the resulting pinning characteristics in the REBCO tapes suggest that a higher  $I_c$  at self-field, 77 K, leads to a higher  $I_c$  in field, at 4.2 K. Second, the scaling law (3), determined at high fields, can overestimate the  $I_c$  at fields below 3 T as the conductor self-field becomes more pronounced.

The burnout at the expected peak-field location in Layer 1 provided a necessary condition that the magnet reached its intrinsic limit and the performance was not limited by potential conductor degradation at unexpected locations.

The s0 magnet also showed that we have a reasonable technique to make electrical terminations for a two-wire cable. The resistance across the praying-hand inter-layer joint at 4.2 K (figure 20) was comparable to those of CORC<sup>®</sup> wires in a recent magnet [49]. The reasonable joint resistance allowed us to probe the magnet performance, critical for further magnet development.

In addition, both wires of each layer had similar termination resistance. The measured current ratio at low current of the s0 magnet indicated that the termination resistances for the wires were within 5% in both layers, following the analysis in [59–61]. The similar and low termination resistance for each wire allowed current to redistribute between the two wires (figures 9 and 15), maximizing the current-carrying capability of the ribbon-type cable.

The s0 magnet, however, is not perfect in terms of the transport performance. The persistent and early voltage rise in Layer 2 at both 77 and 4.2 K suggested that some of the tapes may have degraded in the wires. The test

of Layer 2 at 77 K (figure 8) indicated that the degradation may have already occurred, for instance, during wire handling and coil winding. In addition, the 88%  $I_c$  retention of Layer 1 at 77 K after winding (table 3) is lower than the 95% retention of a similar CCT coil wound with a single STAR<sup>®</sup> wire [24].

Although the s0 performance had significant room for improvement, the initial experiment generated a minimum set of viable tools to further develop the magnet technology. We need to continue developing magnets to gain data and experience on using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires to generate higher dipole fields.

Given the minimum set of tools and a longer two-wire ribbon-type cable configuration, what field can we expect for a CCT dipole magnet? Table 6 lists the performance of a few CCT dipole magnets having an increasing number of layers. The radial thickness of each layer in these conceptual designs is identical to those in the s0 magnet. Each magnet has more conductor turns than s0 to generate a uniform dipole field along the magnet center region.

The conceptual CCT dipole magnet designs in table 6 promise a higher dipole transfer function and a smaller outer diameter, compared to the existing CORC<sup>®</sup> CCT magnets [48, 49]. The STAR<sup>®</sup>-based CCT dipole magnets can therefore be well suited for operation inside the limited aperture of Nb<sub>3</sub>Sn dipole magnets [42, 62].

The current-imbalance sensor reported here is one example of the magnetic quench-detection approach [63]. Our experiment, together with the earlier ones [56, 57], suggested that the technique can be highly sensitive to the current redistribution that is associated with voltage buildup, allowing prescient warning of conductor heating. Testing longer magnets is necessary to verify if the technique is equally effective for longer conductors.

**Table 6.** The expected dipole field from CCT dipole magnets in various background dipole fields at 4.2 K. The dipole transfer function (TF) is also included. Each magnet has a 50 mm clear aperture and uses two STAR<sup>®</sup> wires. The dipole field reported here is the short-sample prediction based on the measured  $I_c(B)$  data of STAR<sup>®</sup> #1 in reference [25].

Layers	TF (T kA <sup>-1</sup> )	OD (mm)	0 T (T)	8 T (T)	12 T (T)	15 T (T)
2	0.34	77	2.9	1.2	0.9	0.8
4	0.71	105	4.5	2.4	1.9	1.6
6	1.10	135	5.8	3.4	2.7	2.4

One tool that is missing for further magnet development is an impregnation technique. Although the STAR<sup>®</sup> wires can be resilient to the mechanical deformation and the resulting strain during the test (figures 7 and 17), we should avoid conductor deformation during magnet operation. Built on the significant experience that the community has gained [10, 64–72], a vacuum-pressure impregnation technique should be developed to support individual REBCO tapes in a STAR<sup>®</sup> wire.

The experiment with the optic fiber demonstrated that the fiber can operate at 4.2 K. A successful impregnation technique will benefit future tests of the optic fiber toward identifying the hot spots along REBCO cables [73] and ultimately the detection of normal transitions [74, 75].

### 8.2. Continue developing STAR<sup>®</sup> conductors based on the feedback from magnet results

The development of the s0 magnet confirmed the wire flexibility that was demonstrated on short STAR<sup>®</sup> wire samples. Wire 1 of Layer 1 has a minimum bend radius of 15.4 mm at six locations along the pole regions of the s0 magnet (figure 1). The transport performance of Layer 1 at 77 and 4.2 K suggested that the 15 mm minimum bend radius can be reproduced in a 2 m long wire at multiple

locations, consistent with the experience of an earlier STAR<sup>®</sup>-based CCT coil of a similar design [24].

It is necessary to demonstrate a uniform wire diameter and critical current over a length of the order of 10 m or longer as a next step for future magnet experiments. Reference [24] reports a 10 m long STAR<sup>®</sup> wire. The wire diameter varies within  $\pm 2\%$  of the mean diameter, likely sufficient for further magnet practice. The critical current, measured every 1 m along the wire, varies more.

The degradation of current-carrying capability is a serious issue that should be avoided for applications. The current-carrying capability of Layer 1 clearly degraded after Ramp 14 that reached a peak current of 8908 A (figure 14 and table 4), and continued degrading in the following ramps. Based on the measured  $V(I)$  transition of Layer 1 and the current ratio  $\beta$ , we conclude that both wires degraded, consistent with the observed burn-out. The critical current and  $n$  value decreased in both wires, leading to the change in  $\beta$  during various current ramps (figure 15). Appendix C has more details on the analysis.

We suspect that the conductor heating during the superconducting-to-normal transition caused the degradation in Layer 1. We assumed that a 5 – 7.5 mm long section in

both wires, consistent with the burn-out, absorbed an equal amount of heat under an adiabatic condition. The estimated peak temperature during Ramps 11 – 19 ranged from 440 to 1040 K, high enough to degrade the critical current of REBCO tapes [76, 77]. A recent CORC<sup>®</sup> dipole magnet suffered a similar critical-current degradation, possibly also due to the conductor heating [49].

Although Layer 2 consistently showed an early voltage rise, the critical current of Layer 2 remained the same among various current ramps (figure 13). We attribute the degradation-free behavior to the effective cooling from the surrounding cryogen. A similar behavior was also observed in the outermost layer in the CORC<sup>®</sup> dipole magnet [49].

We can avoid excessive heating in the first place if a sufficient current margin exists between the operating and current-sharing levels. A higher critical current in REBCO cable is necessary to enable this margin.

When a sufficient margin yields to the desire of a higher magnet efficiency, the ever higher current-carrying capability exacerbates the situation: more heating in a shorter time. Therefore, we also need sensitive schemes to detect soon enough the early temperature rise in a magnet.

Lacroix *et al.* has demonstrated a concept of current flow diverter that significantly boosts the propagation of normal zones in REBCO tapes [78]. Since a fast propagation of the normal zone can improve the sensitivity of the voltage-based quench detection, it can be useful to test the concept using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires and verify its impact on quench detection.

A larger fraction of low-resistivity Cu stabilizers in STAR<sup>®</sup> wires can also help reduce the peak conductor temperature. For instance, a 1.024 mm diameter Cu former will increase the Cu to non-Cu ratio from 0.51 to 0.80 in

the STAR<sup>®</sup> wire used in the s0 magnet. The resulting peak temperature can decrease by about 20% for the same amount of heat over a 5 mm long wire section.

We also need a higher current-carrying capability in STAR<sup>®</sup> wires to reach higher fields, in addition to a sufficient operating margin. The critical current should at least double or triple for the reference STAR<sup>®</sup> #1 in [25] at 20 T, 4.2 K in order for the four- and six-layer conceptual insert magnets to generate a dipole field of 5 T in a background field of 15 T (table 6)<sup>‡</sup>. Alternatively, we need a cable containing multiple STAR<sup>®</sup> wires to increase the magnet transport current, while maintaining a small bend radius similar to that of a single wire.

Multiple STAR<sup>®</sup> wires can be connected electrically in series or parallel to achieve the same ampere-turns in a magnet. For s0, we chose the latter for two reasons. First, it mitigates the potential risk of local  $I_c$  dropouts in the wires that can limit the magnet current if the wires are electrically in series. Second, the parallel configuration reduces the number of joints between the layers in the s0 magnet [38].

The parallel configuration, however, does not guarantee an even current distribution between the two wires (figures 18 and 19).

An uneven current distribution can affect the magnetic field quality. Using the two-layer CCT dipole magnet described in table 6 as an example, we expect the uneven current distribution to affect mainly the dipole field

<sup>‡</sup> The critical current of REBCO decreases as the applied magnetic field increases. If the increased  $I_c$  at 20 T leads to a similar gain in  $I_c$  at low fields, then the insert magnet, when tested stand-alone, will generate a dipole field ranging from 10 to 15 T, or higher (table 6). The high stand-alone dipole field, consistent with the findings in [62, 79], explains the need to achieve higher fields in REBCO dipole magnets.

*s0: an initial magnet experiment using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires*

18

1 but not the high-order geometric multipoles  
2 (Appendix D). The impact on the dipole field  
3 of individual magnets can lead to undesired  
4 random field errors for a group of magnets in  
5 a collider. To clarify these effects, we need to  
6 measure and confirm the actual impact on field  
7 quality.

8  
9  
10  
11 The ramp-rate dependence of the current  
12 distribution can be an intrinsic feature of the  
13 non-transposed multi-wire cable configuration.  
14 If further magnet experiments necessitate  
15 a uniform current distribution among the  
16 wires, we need to develop a transposed cable  
17 architecture using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires [80].

## 21 9. Conclusions

22  
23  
24 We made s0, a two-layer three-turn CCT  
25 dipole magnet, as an initial experiment  
26 on the magnet development using high-  
27 temperature superconducting STAR<sup>®</sup> wires.  
28 We developed a minimum set of tools for  
29 the magnet development. We wound in  
30 each layer two STAR<sup>®</sup> wires, one at a  
31 time, using a semi-automated winding table.  
32 The wires, electrically in parallel, formed  
33 a non-transposed ribbon-type cable. The  
34 minimum bend radius was 15.4 mm along the  
35 longitudinal axis of the STAR<sup>®</sup> wire. The  
36 electrical resistance of the terminations ranged  
37 from 11 to 23 n $\Omega$  at 4.2 K. The termination  
38 resistances for both wires were also uniform  
39 within 5%. The magnet reached a peak current  
40 of 8908 A at 4.2 K, 78% of the short-sample  
41 prediction, and a peak dipole field of 0.79 T.  
42 The peak current corresponded to a whole-  
43 conductor current density of 1500 A mm<sup>-2</sup>.

44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
The test results also highlighted several  
critical issues to be addressed: the critical-  
current degradation during current ramps; the  
necessity of a transposed multi-wire cable  
architecture for high-field dipole magnets; and

an impregnation technique for STAR<sup>®</sup> wires.

The initial experiment of the s0 mag-  
net set a stage for future development of  
STAR<sup>®</sup> magnets and conductors. The contin-  
ued development can ultimately lead to diverse  
options of REBCO technologies to enable high-  
field magnets for particle accelerators and fu-  
sion machines.

## Acknowledgments

JK, SK, JSS and VS developed the STAR<sup>®</sup> wires  
and measured their critical current at 77 K be-  
fore winding. RL and WBG designed the mag-  
net mandrels. WBG, with input from HCH,  
developed Winding Table Mark #2. HCH  
and WBG wound both layers. HCH devel-  
oped the termination concept and technique  
for STAR<sup>®</sup> wires and instrumented both lay-  
ers. HCH and TJB assembled the magnet and  
prepared for the magnet test. MAM designed  
and machined the current transducer assem-  
bly. RT developed the current-imbalance sen-  
sor and analyzed the data. LL implemented  
the optic fiber and analyzed the data. HCH,  
TJB, LL, RM, CSM, RT, MT and XRW tested  
the magnet.

We thank Makato Takayasu of the Plasma  
Science and Fusion Center, Massachusetts  
Institute of Technology for his discussion and  
guidance on the design and development of the  
current transducers. We also thank Tengming  
Shen of LBNL for providing a power supply to  
test the assembled magnet at 77 K and Lucas  
Brouwer for providing VGE varnish.

The work at AMPeers LLC and University  
of Houston was supported by SBIR award  
DE-SC0015983 from the US Department of  
Energy, Office of High Energy Physics. The  
work at LBNL was supported by the U.S.  
Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office  
of High Energy Physics, through the US

*s0: an initial magnet experiment using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires*

Magnet Development Program under Contract No. DEAC02-05CH11231. The work on the optic fiber was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Fusion Energy Sciences under Contract No. DEAC02-05CH11231.

One of the authors (VS) has financial interest in AMPeers.


## Appendix A. Calibration of current transducer

We calibrated all four current transducers using Wire C, at 77 K, in a dc condition. The current monotonically increased from zero to the maximum value in a stair-step fashion; the voltage reading of each transducer, measured using a Keithley 2010 multimeter, was recorded when the current was constant at each step. The measurement was repeated three times and the averaged voltage was used as the calibration data. The calibration data were linearly interpolated to determine the current in the STAR<sup>®</sup> wire.

One option to characterize the measurement error of the current transducer is to compare the sum of the measured current in each wire and the measured total current. Figure A1 shows that the error of the current transducer was less than 5% of the measured total current, up to 800 A, the maximum current for the calibration. The increasing error is due to the saturation of the low-carbon steel (figure 7).

## Appendix B. Estimation of the wire current using the current-imbalance sensor data

Here we describe a method to determine the ratio of the current in the wires, based on the current-imbalance sensor data. Suppose



**Figure A1.** The relative difference between the sum of the wire current in Layer 1 and the measured total current, 77 K. The current in each wire,  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ , is determined by the current transducer.  $I_{\text{total,measured}}$  is the power supply output current measured by a shunt resistor.

we have two parallel line currents,  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ , which have the same current direction and are separated by a distance of  $2r$ . The ratio of the current in the wires is  $\beta$ , and  $\beta = I_1/I_2$ . The total current carried by both wires,  $I_t$ , is then given by

$$I_t = (1 + \beta)I_2. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

The active sensing area of the Hall sensor is coplanar with both line currents and has an equal distance,  $r$ , to the line currents. The output voltage of the current-imbalance sensor is given by

$$V_{\text{imb}} = \omega(I_2 - I_1) = \omega I_t \frac{1 - \beta}{1 + \beta}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Here  $\omega$  is a constant and is given by

$$\omega = s \frac{\mu_0}{2\pi r}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where  $s$  is the sensitivity of the Hall sensor in  $\text{V T}^{-1}$  and  $\mu_0$  is the magnetic permeability in vacuum.

Equation (B.2) shows that the output voltage of the current-imbalance sensor,  $V_{\text{imb}}$ , depends on the current ratio,  $\beta$ . When both wires carry the same current,  $\beta = 1$  and  $V_{\text{imb}} = 0$ . When  $\beta$  is a non-unit constant,

*s0*: an initial magnet experiment using STAR<sup>®</sup> wires


20

$V_{\text{imb}}$  scales linearly with  $I_t$ . When the current redistributes between the two wires,  $\beta$  changes and  $V_{\text{imb}}$  deviates from the linear relationship with  $I_t$ . The sign of  $V_{\text{imb}}$  tells which of the two wires carries more current.

In the experiments reported here,  $I_t$  and  $V_{\text{imb}}$  are known. The current ratio is also known at low current from the current transducers. We can then determine  $\omega$  according to equation (B.2), and then use the known  $\omega$  to determine  $\beta$  for the current beyond the measurement range of the current transducers.

### Appendix C. Estimation of the wire performance using the current ratio and measured cable $V(I)$ data

Simple electric-circuit models are a powerful tool to explain the measured  $V(I)$  behavior of REBCO tapes and cables [59–61, 81–83]. Here we use an approximate method, based on a dc electric-circuit model (figure C1), to interpret and gain insight on the performance of both wires in Layer 1 (table 4). We used NGSPICE [84], an open-source SPICE simulator, to analyze the circuit behavior.



**Figure C1.** A dc electric-circuit model for two parallel STAR<sup>®</sup> wires in Layer 1 of the *s0* magnet.  $V_n$  represents the measured voltage across Wire  $n$ , as a function of current,  $I_n$ . The termination resistance for Wire  $n$ ,  $R_n$ , is given by  $R_n = R_{n1} + R_{n2}$ . The voltage across Nodes 0 and 1 represents the voltage measured across Layer 1 during the experiments.

Given that the wires have similarly low

termination resistances and comparable critical currents, the electrical-parallel configuration of the wires implies that, using the same voltage criterion, the layer reaches its critical current when both wires also reach theirs too. Therefore, we have

$$I_{c,\text{cable}} \approx I_{c,1} + I_{c,2}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

In addition, when the layer voltage reaches the voltage criterion, we have

$$\beta(V = V_c) = \frac{I_{c,1}}{I_{c,2}}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Using (C.1) and (C.2), we can determine the critical current of both wires.

After calculating the critical current of both wires, we estimate the  $n$  values by fitting the calculated  $V(I)$  data to the measurement results. We assume the  $n$  value of the layer is between those of both wires. One may start the search with  $n_{\text{cable}} \sim (n_1 + n_2)/2$ .

The estimated critical current and  $n$  value of each individual wire qualitatively reproduce the measured layer voltage and current ratio. Figure 9 gives an example at 77 K. Figure 15 gives two more examples at 4.2 K. Table C1 gives the measured layer performance and calculated wire performance for the cases at 77 and 4.2 K.

### Appendix D. Impact of current distribution on field quality

We consider only the dc geometric field errors due to transport current, assuming the as-designed conductor positioning [85]. Using the two-layer CCT dipole magnet described in table 6 as an example, we first define the transfer function for an individual wire. For instance, Wire 1 of Layer 1, carrying a current of  $I_1$ , has a transfer function

$$T_{n,L_1,W_1} = \frac{B_{n,L_1,W_1}}{I_1}, \quad (\text{D.1})$$

**Table C1.** The measured critical current (A) and  $n$  value for Layer 1 and calculated values for individual wires at 77 and 4.2 K.

Ramp	$I_{c,cable}$	$n_{cable}$	$\beta(20 \mu V)$	$I_{c,1}$	$n_1$	$I_{c,2}$	$n_2$
77 K, 4	680	16.5	1.01	341	16.9	339	16.0
4.2 K, 14	8764	21.3	1.09	4569	23.0	4195	16.5
18	8219	16.3	1.09	4281	23.0	3938	12.0
19	8141	14.9	1.09	4241	20.0	3900	11.5
20	8006	13.1	1.09	4174	18.0	3832	10.5

where  $B_n$  is the magnetic field component of order  $n$ , generated by the current in Wire 1. We can calculate  $B_n$  using the Biot-Savart law.  $T_n$  has a unit of  $T A^{-1}$ .

We define the transfer function of each layer as the following, again using Layer 1 as an example,


$$T_{n,L_1}(\beta) = \frac{T_{n,L_1,W_1}I_1 + T_{n,L_1,W_2}I_2}{I_1 + I_2}, \quad (D.2)$$

where the transfer function of each individual wire is given in (D.1).  $T_{n,L_1}$  depends on  $\beta$ , the current ratio between the two wires.

Figure D1 shows the impact of current distribution between the two wires on the dipole and sextupole field in the magnet aperture. When one wire carries all the current in both layers, the dipole transfer function is within 8% of the value where both wires carry the same current.

A 10% difference in the current of the two wires, as observed in the s0 magnet, leads to 0.4% of deviation from the case of an even current distribution. Therefore, the uneven current distribution cannot solely explain the observed discrepancy between the measured and calculated TF of each layer, tested stand-alone (figure 10). The positioning error of the Hall sensor can contribute to the discrepancy.

We expect the impact on high-order field errors to be negligible. Figure D1 shows the transfer function for the sextupole field,



**Figure D1.** The transfer function of the dipole component (top) and sextupole component (bottom) for each layer, as a function of current distribution between the two wires, for the two-layer magnet design given in table 6. We normalize the transfer function to the value when both wires carry the same current. The red line with circles is for Layer 1. The black line with crosses is for Layer 2. The blue dashed line corresponds to the current ratio.

the first allowed high-order field errors in the example magnet here. Although the transfer function of Layer 2 can change by 60% when one wire carries all the current, it is not expected to be an issue because the sextupole field is four orders of magnitude lower than the main dipole field when  $\beta = 1$ .

## References

- [1] Schoerling D and Zlobin A V (eds) 2019 *Nb<sub>3</sub>Sn Accelerator Magnets* (Springer Nature) <http://doi.org/10.1007/>

## REFERENCES

22

- 1  
2 978-3-030-16118-7
- 3 [2] Rossi L, Badel A, Bajko M, Ballarino  
4 A, Bottura L, Dhallé M, Durante M,  
5 Fazilleau P, Fleiter J, Goldacker W, Härö  
6 E, Kario A, Kirby G, Lorin C, van  
7 Nugteren J, de Rijk G, Salmi T, Senatore  
8 C, Stenvall A, Tixador P, Usoskin A,  
9 Volpini G, Yang Y and Zangenberg N  
10 2015 *IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **25**  
11 4001007
- 12 [3] Rossi L, Badel A, Bajas H, Bajko M,  
13 Ballarino A, Barth C, Betz U, Bottura  
14 L, Broggi F, Chiuchiolo A, Dhallé M,  
15 Durante M, Fazilleau P, Fleiter J, Gao  
16 P, Goldacker W, Kario A, Kirby G, Haro  
17 E, Himbele J, Lorin C, Murtomäki J,  
18 van Nugteren J, Petrone C, de Rijk G,  
19 Ruuskanen J, Senatore C, Statera M,  
20 Stenvall A, Tixador P, Yang Y, Usoskin  
21 A and Zangenberg N 2018 *IEEE Trans.*  
22 *Appl. Supercond.* **28** 4001810
- 23 [4] Borgnolutti F, Durante M, Debray F,  
24 Rifflet J M, Rijk G D, Tixador P and  
25 Tudela J M 2016 *IEEE Trans. Appl.*  
26 *Supercond.* **26** 4602605
- 27 [5] Durante M, Borgnolutti F, Bouziat D,  
28 Fazilleau P, Gheller J M, Molinié F and  
29 Antoni P D 2018 *IEEE Trans. Appl.*  
30 *Supercond.* **28** 4203805
- 31 [6] Rossi L and Senatore C 2021 *Instruments*  
32 **5** 8 ISSN 2410-390X, 2410-390X and  
33 references therein
- 34 [7] Kirby G, van Nugteren J, Ballarino  
35 A, Bottura L, Chouika N, Clement S,  
36 Datskov V, Fajardo L, Fleiter J, Gauthier  
37 R, Gentini L, Lambert L, Lopes M, Perez  
38 J, de Rijk G, Rijllart A, Rossi L, ten  
39 Kate H, Durante M, Fazilleau P, Lorin C,  
40 Haro E, Stenvall A, Caspi S, Marchevsky  
41 M, Goldacker W and Kario A 2015 *IEEE*  
42 *Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **25** 4000805
- 43 [8] van Nugteren J, Kirby G, Bajas H, Bajko  
44 M, Ballarino A, Bottura L, Chiuchiolo  
45 A, Contat P A, Dhallé M, Durante M,  
46 Fazilleau P, Fontalva A, Gao P, Goldacker  
47 W, ten Kate H, Kario A, Lahtinen V,  
48 Lorin C, Markelov A, Mazet J, Molodyk  
49 A, Murtomäki J, Long N, Perez J,  
50 Petrone C, Pincot F, de Rijk G, Rossi L,  
51 Russenschuck S, Ruuskanen J, Schmitz K,  
52 Stenvall A, Usoskin A, Willering G and  
53 Yang Y 2018 *Superconductor Science and*  
54 *Technology* **31** 065002
- 55 [9] Uglietti D 2019 *Superconductor Science*  
56 *and Technology* **32** 053001 ISSN 0953-  
57 2048 and references therein
- 58 [10] Hartwig Z S, Vieira R F, Sorbom B N,  
59 Badcock R A, Bajko M, Beck W K,  
60 Castaldo B, Craighill C L, Davies M,  
Estrada J, Fry V, Golfinopoulos T,  
Hubbard A E, Irby J H, Kuznetsov S,  
Lammi C J, Michael P C, Mouratidis T,  
Murray R A, Pfeiffer A T, Pierson S Z,  
Radovinsky A, Rowell M D, Salazar E E,  
Segal M, Stahle P W, Takayasu M, Toland  
T L and Zhou L 2020 *Superconductor*  
*Science and Technology* **33** 11LT01 ISSN  
0953-2048
- [11] van der Laan D C 2009 *Superconductor*  
*Science and Technology* **22** 065013
- [12] Weiss J D, Mulder T, ten Kate H J and  
van der Laan D C 2017 *Superconductor*  
*Science and Technology* **30** 014002 and  
references therein.
- [13] van der Laan D C, Weiss J D and  
McRae D M 2019 *Superconductor Science*  
*and Technology* **32** 033001 and references  
therein
- [14] Weiss J D, van der Laan D C, Hazelton  
D, Knoll A, Carota G, Abraimov D,  
Francis A, Small M A, Bradford G  
and Jaroszynski J 2020 *Superconductor*



## REFERENCES

- 1 *Science and Technology* **33** 044001 ISSN  
2 0953-2048
- 3
- 4 [15] Gourlay S A, Prestemon S O, Zlobin  
5 A V, Cooley L and Larbalestier D  
6 2016 The U.S. magnet development pro-  
7 gram plan [https://escholarship.org/  
8 uc/item/5178744r](https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5178744r)
- 9
- 10 [16] Prestemon S, Amm K, Cooley L, Gourlay  
11 S, Larbalestier D, Velev G and Zlobin A  
12 2020 The 2020 updated roadmaps for the  
13 US magnet development program [http:  
14 //arxiv.org/abs/2011.09539](http://arxiv.org/abs/2011.09539)
- 15
- 16 [17] Gupta R 2019 New approach and test  
17 facility for high field accelerator magnets  
18 R&D [https://www.bnl.gov/magnets/  
19 staff/gupta/publications/mt26/  
20 wed-af-or13-02-submit-2019-12-16.  
21 pdf](https://www.bnl.gov/magnets/staff/gupta/publications/mt26/wed-af-or13-02-submit-2019-12-16.pdf)
- 22
- 23 [18] Kashikhin V, Lombardo V and Velev G  
24 2019 Magnet design optimization for fu-  
25 ture hadron colliders (JACOW Publish-  
26 ing, Geneva, Switzerland) pp 4307–4310  
27 ISBN 9783954502080 [https://doi.org/  
28 10.18429/JACoW-IPAC2019-THPTS084](https://doi.org/10.18429/JACoW-IPAC2019-THPTS084)
- 29
- 30 [19] Wang X, Caspi S, Dietderich D R, Ghiorso  
31 W B, Gourlay S A, Higley H C, Lin  
32 A, Prestemon S O, van der Laan D and  
33 Weiss J D 2018 *Superconductor Science  
34 and Technology* **31** 045007
- 35
- 36 [20] Luo W, Kar S, Xu A, Li X, Yahia A B  
37 and Selvamanickam V 2017 *IEEE Trans.  
38 Appl. Supercond.* **27** 6602705 ISSN 1051-  
39 8223
- 40
- 41 [21] Kar S, Luo W, Ben Yahia A, Li X,  
42 Majkic G and Selvamanickam V 2018  
43 *Superconductor Science and Technology*  
44 **31** 04LT01
- 45
- 46 [22] Luo W, Kar S, Li X, Galstyan E,  
47 Kochat M, Sandra J S, Jaroszynski J,  
48 Abraimov D and Selvamanickam V 2018  
49 *Superconductor Science and Technology*  
50 **31** 12LT01
- 51
- 52 [23] Ben Yahia A, Kar S, Majkic G and  
53 Selvamanickam V 2019 *IEEE Trans.  
54 Appl. Supercond.* **29** 8401605
- 55
- 56 [24] Kar S, Sandra J S, Luo W, Yerragu-  
57 ravagari V, Galstyan E, Jaroszynski J,  
58 Abraimov D, Majkic G and Selvaman-  
59 ickam V 2020 *Superconductor Science and  
60 Technology* **33** 094001 ISSN 0953-2048
- [25] Kar S, Sandra J S, Luo W, Kochat M,  
Jaroszynski J, Abraimov D, Majkic G and  
Selvamanickam V 2019 *Superconductor  
Science and Technology* **32** 10LT01 ISSN  
0953-2048
- [26] Meyer D and Flasck R 1970 *Nuclear  
Instruments and Methods* **80** 339–341
- [27] Devred A 2003 High field accelerator  
magnets beyond LHC *Proceedings of  
Particle Accelerator Conference*
- [28] Meinke R B, Ball M J and Goodzeit  
C L 2003 Superconducting Double-Helix  
accelerator magnets *Proceedings of the  
2003 Particle Accelerator Conference* pp  
1996–1998
- [29] Goodzeit C L, Ball M J and Meinke R B  
2003 *IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **13**  
1365–1368
- [30] Gavrilin A V, Bird M D, Bole S T  
and Eyssa Y M 2002 *IEEE Trans. Appl.  
Supercond.* **12** 465–469
- [31] Akhmeteli A M, Gavrilin A V and  
Marshall W S 2005 *IEEE Trans. Appl.  
Supercond.* **15** 1439–1443
- [32] Akhmeteli A M, Gavrilin A V and Mar-  
shall W S 2006 *Superconductivity, Mag-  
netism and Magnets* (Nova Publishers)  
chap 5 and references therein.
- [33] Caspi S, Trillaud F, Godeke A, Dietderich  
D R, Ferracin P, Sabbi G, Giloux C, Perez

## REFERENCES

24

- 1 J G and Karppinen M 2009 *IEEE Trans.*  
2 *Appl. Supercond.* **19** 1195–1198
- 3 [34] Bosi F, Paoloni E, Fabbriatore P,  
4 Farinon S, Musenich R, Marabotto R  
5 and Nardelli D 2012 *IEEE Trans. Appl.*  
6 *Supercond.* **22** 4000104 ISSN 1558-2515
- 7 [35] Witte H, Yokoi T, Sheehy S L, Peach  
8 K, Pattalwar S, Jones T, Strachan J  
9 and Bliss N 2012 *IEEE Trans. Appl.*  
10 *Supercond.* **22** 4100110–4100110 ISSN  
11 1558-2515
- 12 [36] Caspi S, Borgnolutti F, Brouwer L, Cheng  
13 D, Dietderich D R, Felice H, Godeke A,  
14 Hafalia R, Martchevskii M, Prestemon S,  
15 Rochepault E, Swenson C and Wang X  
16 2014 *IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **24**  
17 4001804 and references therein.
- 18 [37] Brouwer L N 2015 *Canted-Cosine-Theta*  
19 *Superconducting Accelerator Magnets for*  
20 *High Energy Physics and Ion Beam*  
21 *Cancer Therapy* Ph.D. thesis Univer-  
22 sity of California, Berkeley [https://](https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8jp4g75g)  
23 [escholarship.org/uc/item/8jp4g75g](https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8jp4g75g)
- 24 [38] Kirby G A, Gentini L, Mazet J, Mentink  
25 M, Mangiarotti F, Van Nugteren J,  
26 Murtomäki J S, Hagen P, Pincot F O,  
27 Bourcey N, Perez J C, Rijk G D, Todesco  
28 E and Rysti J 2018 *IEEE Trans. Appl.*  
29 *Supercond.* **28** 4002205
- 30 [39] Auchmann B, Brouwer L, Caspi S, Gao  
31 J, Montenero G, Negrazus M, Rolando G  
32 and Sanfilippo S 2018 *IEEE Trans. Appl.*  
33 *Supercond.* **28** 4000705
- 34 [40] Wu W, Liang Y, Zhou L C, Mei E M,  
35 Ni D S, Zhen S J, Ou X J and Yang W J  
36 2020 *Journal of physics. Conference series*  
37 **1401** 012015 ISSN 1742-6588, 1742-6596
- 38 [41] Arbelaez D, Bogdanof T, Brouwer L,  
39 Caspi S, Dietderich D, Fernández J L R,  
40 Ferracin P, Gourlay S, Hafalia R, Krutulis  
41 M, Martchevsky M, Maruszewski M,  
42 Myers C, Prestemon S, Reynolds M, Shen  
43 T, Swanson J, Teyber R, Turqueti M,  
44 Vallone G and Wang X 2022 *IEEE Trans.*  
45 *Appl. Supercond.* **32** 4003207 ISSN 1558-  
46 2515
- 47 [42] Brouwer L, Juchno M, Arbelaez D,  
48 Ferracin P and Vallone G 2022 *IEEE*  
49 *Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **32** 4001805 ISSN  
50 1558-2515
- 51 [43] Rudeiros Fernandez J L, Arbelaez D,  
52 Brouwer L, Caspi S, Ferracin P, Hafalia R,  
53 Krutulis M, Prestemon S, Reynolds M A,  
54 Shen T, Swanson J H and Vallone G 2022  
55 *IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond.* 1–1 ISSN  
56 1558-2515
- 57 [44] Godeke A, Brouwer L N, Caspi S,  
58 Dietderich D R, Gourlay S A, Hafalia  
59 R R, Heys N I, Higley H C, Lipton T M,  
60 Reynolds M A and Swanson J H 2015  
*IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **25** 4002404
- [45] Garcia Fajardo L, Brouwer L, Caspi S,  
Hafalia A, Hernikl C, Prestemon S, Shen  
T, Bosque E and English C 2019 *IEEE*  
*Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **29** 4002005
- [46] Shen T and Garcia Fajardo L 2020  
*Instruments* **4** 17
- [47] Garcia Fajardo L, Shen T, Wang X,  
Myers C, Arbelaez D, Bosque E, Brouwer  
L, Caspi S, English L, Gourlay S,  
Hafalia A, Martchevskii M, Pong I and  
Prestemon S 2021 *Superconductor Science*  
*and Technology* **34** 024001 ISSN 0953-  
2048
- [48] Wang X, Dietderich D R, DiMarco J,  
Ghiorso W B, Gourlay S A, Higley H C,  
Lin A, Prestemon S O, van der Laan  
D and Weiss J D 2019 *Superconductor*  
*Science and Technology* **32** 075002
- [49] Wang X, Abraimov D, Arbelaez D,  
Bogdanof T J, Brouwer L, Caspi S,

## REFERENCES

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Dietderich D R, DiMarco J, Francis A, Garcia Fajardo L, Ghiorso W B, Gourlay S A, Higley H C, Marchevsky M, Maruszewski M A, Myers C S, Prestemon S O, Shen T, Taylor J, Teyber R, Turqueti M, van der Laan D and Weiss J D 2020 *Superconductor Science and Technology* **34** 015012 ISSN 0953-2048
- [50] Caspi S, Brouwer L N, Lipton T, Jr A H, Prestemon S, Dietderich D R, Felice H, Wang X, Rochepault E, Godeke A, Gourlay S and Marchevsky M 2015 *IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **25** 4002304
- [51] Brouwer L, Caspi S, Edwards K, Godeke A, Hafalia R, Hodgkinson A, Huggins A, Myers C, Myers S, Schillo M, Taylor J, Turqueti M, Wang X, Wan W and Prestemon S 2020 *Nuclear instruments & methods in physics research. Section A, Accelerators, spectrometers, detectors and associated equipment* **957** 163414 ISSN 0168-9002
- [52] Caspi S September 16, 2018 A video from Glyn Kirby on an automated winding table developed at CERN for a CCT magnet. private communication
- [53] Mulder T, Dudarev A, van der Laan D C, Mentink M G T, Dhallé M and ten Kate H H J 2015 Optimized and practical electrical joints for CORC type HTS cables *Materials Science and Engineering Conference Series (Materials Science and Engineering Conference Series vol 102)* p 012026
- [54] Takayasu M, Chiesa L, Bromberg L and Minervini J V 2012 *Superconductor Science and Technology* **25** 014011
- [55] Marchevsky M, Xie Y Y and Selvamanickam V 2010 *Superconductor Science and Technology* **23** 034016
- [56] Weiss J D, Teyber R, Marchevsky M and van der Laan D C 2020 *Superconductor Science and Technology* **33** 105011 ISSN 0953-2048
- [57] Teyber R, Marchevsky M, Prestemon S, Weiss J and van der Laan D 2020 *Superconductor Science and Technology* **33** 095009 ISSN 0953-2048
- [58] Iwasa Y 2009 *Case studies in superconducting magnets: design and operational issues* (Springer) chap 6, p 370 2nd ed
- [59] Zermeno V, Krüger P, Takayasu M and Grilli F 2014 *Superconductor Science and Technology* **27** 124013 ISSN 0953-2048
- [60] Willering G P, van der Laan D C, Weijers H W, Noyes P D, Miller G E and Viouchkov Y 2015 *Superconductor Science and Technology* **28** 035001
- [61] Takayasu M, Chiesa L, Allen N C and Minervini J V 2016 *IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **26** 6400210
- [62] Ferracin P, Ambrosio G, Arbelaez D, Brouwer L, Barzi E, Cooley L, Garcia Fajardo L, Gupta R, Juchno M, Kashikhin V, Marinozzi V, Novitski I, Rochepault E, Stern J, Zlobin A and Zucchi N 2022 *IEEE Transactions on Applied Superconductivity* **32** 4000906 ISSN 1558-2515
- [63] Marchevsky M 2021 *Instruments* **5** 27 ISSN 2410-390X, 2410-390X and references therein
- [64] Takematsu T, Hu R, Takao T, Yanagisawa Y, Nakagome H, Uglietti D, Kiyoshi T, Takahashi M and Maeda H 2010 *Physica C* **470** 674 – 677
- [65] Yanagisawa Y, Sato K, Piao R, Nakagome H, Takematsu T, Takao T, Kamibayashi H, Takahashi M and Maeda H 2012 *Physica C* **476** 19–22

## REFERENCES

26

- [66] Barth C, Bagrets N, Weiss K P, Bayer C M and Bast T 2013 *Superconductor Science and Technology* **26** 055007
- [67] Otten S, Dhallé M, Gao P, Wessel W, Kario A, Kling A and Goldacker W 2015 *Superconductor Science and Technology* **28** 065014
- [68] Talantsev E F, Badcock R A, Mataira R, Chong S V, Bouloukakakis K, Hamilton K and Long N J 2017 *Superconductor Science and Technology* **30** 045014
- [69] Kesgin I, Hasse Q, Ivanyushenkov Y and Welp U 2017 *IOP Conf. Ser.: Mater. Sci. Eng.* **279** 012009
- [70] Gao P, Wessel W A J, Dhallé M, Otten S, Kario A, Van Nugteren J, Kirby G, Bottura L and ten Kate H H J 2019 *Superconductor Science and Technology* **32** 055006
- [71] Yin S, Duranti M, Swenson C A, Li P, Ye L, Zhang X and Shen T 2020 *Journal of applied physics* **128** 173903 ISSN 0021-8979
- [72] Stern J, Swanson J, Bogdanof T, Krutulius M, Weiss J, van der Laan D, Wang X and Chiesa L 2022 *IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **32** 4800904 ISSN 1558-2515
- [73] Luo L, Ferracin P, Stern J, Van der Laan D, Wang X, Weiss J and Wu Y 2022 *IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **32** 1–1 ISSN 1558-2515
- [74] Scurti F, Ishmael S, Flanagan G and Schwartz J 2016 *Superconductor Science and Technology* **29** 03LT01
- [75] Salazar E E, Badcock R A, Bajko M, Castaldo B, Davies M, Estrada J, Fry V, Gonzales J T, Michael P C, Segal M, Vieira R F and Hartwig Z S 2021 *Superconductor Science and Technology* **34** 035027 ISSN 0953-2048
- [76] Lu J, Xin Y, Jarvis B and Bai H 2021 *Superconductor Science and Technology* **34** 075004 ISSN 0953-2048
- [77] Bonura M, Cayado P, Konstantopoulou K, Alessandrini M and Carmine S 2022 *ACS Applied Electronic Materials*
- [78] Lacroix C, Sirois F and Lupien J H F 2017 *Superconductor Science and Technology* **30** 064004 ISSN 0953-2048
- [79] Rochepault E, Ferracin P and Vallone G 2022 *IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **32** 4003505 ISSN 1558-2515
- [80] Uglietti D, Kang R, Wesche R and Grilli F 2020 *Cryogenics* **110** 103118 ISSN 0011-2275
- [81] Pothavajhala V, Graber L, Kim C H and Pamidi S 2014 *IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **24** 4800505 ISSN 1051-8223
- [82] Araujo Martínez A C, Ji Q, Prestemon S O, Wang X and Maury Cuna G H I 2020 *IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **30** 6600605 ISSN 1558-2515
- [83] Teyber R, Marchevsky M, Araujo Martinez A C, Prestemon S, Weiss J D and van der Laan D C 2022 *Superconductor Science and Technology* ISSN 0953-2048
- [84] ngspice <https://ngspice.sourceforge.io/index.html>
- [85] Sammut N, Bottura L and Micallef J 2006 *Phys. Rev. ST Accel. Beams* **9** 012402