World Journal of Engineering Research and Technology

www.wjert.org

Impact Factor: 7.029 **Coden USA: WJERA4**

ELECTRO-THERMO-MECHANICAL COUPLING AND QUENCH PROTECTION IN REBCO RACETRACK AND LAYER-WOUND NO-INSULATION MAGNETS

Zhongxiu Liu*, Ruichen Zhang, Ping Jiang, Xueming Liang

Article Received on 05/08/2026 **Article Revised on 25/08/2026** **Article Published on 03/09/2026**

***Corresponding Author**
Zhongxiu Liu

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22267177

How to cite this Article: Zhongxiu Liu*, Ruichen Zhang, Ping Jiang, Xueming Liang. (2026). Electro-Thermo-Mechanical Coupling and Quench Protection In Rebco Racetrack and Layer-Wound No-Insulation Magnets. World Journal of Engineering Research and Technology, 12(9), 118–129.

ABSTRACT

No-insulation (NI) winding technology, combined with controlled bypass architecture, has become the dominant strategy for protecting REBCO insert magnets operating above 20 T.[1] Experiments in 2025–2026 have shown that quench tolerance depends not only on stored energy but, more critically, on the electro-thermo-mechanical coupling response of the coil assembly.[4] Key parameters include the inter-turn contact resistivity ρc, screening-current-induced stress[12], and localized Joule heating caused by joint or solder defects.[2] This paper synthesizes recent advances in NI racetrack and layer-wound (LW-NI) magnets[6], drawing on the CEA IRFU RT9 single-pancake test (1025 A, 2.9 T)[5], the 15 T LW-NI insert developed for a 40 T hybrid magnet platform[23], and surface-shunt quench experiments under induced fault modes.[9] We propose a multiphysics modeling framework that couples the T–A formulation[30] with anisotropic heat conduction and strain-dependent critical-current degradation.[14] Simulations identify an optimal contact-resistivity window of 10^{-8}–10^{-7} Ω·m[3], which minimizes hotspot temperature while maintaining acceptable charging characteristics. Vertical-field-priority charging is shown to suppress screening-current stress by more than 30%[26], and surface-shunt integration reduces peak temperature rise by up to 40% relative to unprotected NI coils.[8] Together, these results establish a robust design baseline for next-generation 30 T-class all-superconducting magnets.[16]

Index Terms—REBCO, no-insulation coil, quench protection, contact resistivity, surface shunt, high-field magnet.

1. INTRODUCTION

During a quench, NI REBCO coils bypass local current through inter-turn contacts, suppressing voltage spikes while introducing charging delay and localized heating[3] e core physical picture of this self-protecting mechanism is as follows: when a local region quenches due to a disturbance, the inter-turn contact resistance provides a current-bypass channel, enabling current redistribution within the superconductor and thereby avoiding irreversible damage from local overheating.[5] However, the choice of bypass ratio α directly affects the quench-propagation speed and hotspot temperature[3]; too small an α leads to excessive charging time, while too large an α prevents timely diffusion of Joule heat.[9]

Despite these advances, quantitative design guidelines regarding the selection of ρc[2], integration of surface shunts[9], and mitigation of mechanical degradation induced by screening currents[25] remain conspicuously incomplete. In particular, under high-field (>20 T) operating conditions, the hoop stress induced by screening currents can approach the yield strength of REBCO tape[12], while strain-dependent critical-current degradation further compresses the safe operating window.[13]

This paper addresses these gaps by synergistically combining experimental benchmarks with a unified multiphysics modeling framework. Compared with existing literature[9], the incremental contributions of this work are threefold: (1) establishing a scaling law from the dimensionless bypass ratio α to the hotspot temperature Tmax; (2) proposing a coordinated protection strategy combining surface shunts with vertical-field-priority charging[26]; (3) performing dual validation of the model against two independent experimental data sets—CEA RT9 and 15 T LW-NI.[23]

1.1 Technical Roadmap Overview

"The research follows a four-step technical roadmap—model, solve, validate, and extrapolate:"

1. Modeling: Construct a fully coupled electro-thermo-mechanical multiphysics model. The electromagnetic core is the T–A (tape-axis) formulation[30], coupled with the anisotropic heat-conduction equation and strain-dependent critical-current degradation law[14], and incorporating a Lorentz-force–stress tensor to describe the mechanical response.[12]

2. Solution: Spatial discretization of the T–A equations by finite differences, combined with an explicit time-marching scheme to solve the transient quench evolution; the heat equation is treated with the alternating-direction implicit (ADI) method to ensure numerical stability.
3. Validation: Quantitative comparison of simulation results against the CEA RT9 single-pancake experiment (five current points)[4] and the 15 T LW-NI 72-hour long-duration run to quantify deviations and calibrate model parameters.
4. Extrapolation: Extrapolate the calibrated model to the 30 T all-s1uperconducting magnet design space[16] and derive reproducible safe-operating envelopes.

2. Multiphysics Model

This section presents the fully coupled governing equations, numerical discretization scheme, and material constitutive relations. All equations are written in cylindrical coordinates (r, θ, z) and are applicable to both racetrack and solenoidal geometries.

2.1 Electromagnetic Governing Equations (T–A Formulation)

The core idea of the T–A formulation is to express the axial current density Jz using a current vector potential T: J = ∇ × T, where T has only a θ component.[30] Its advantage is that it reduces a three-dimensional electromagnetic problem to two dimensions, enabling large-scale coil simulations to complete in minutes on a single workstation.[30] In recent years, multiscale homogenized models based on the T–A formulation have been successfully applied to REBCO coils with complex geometries.[30] The governing equations are:

$$\nabla \times (\rho c\ \nabla \times T) = -\,\partial B / \partial t$$

$$E = -\,\partial A / \partial t - \rho c\ (\nabla \times T)$$

where ρc is the inter-turn contact resistivity[30], B is the magnetic flux density, and A is the magnetic vector potential.

2.2 Numerical Discretization and Time Marching

Spatial discretization employs the finite-difference method, with Nr = 200 grid points in the radial r direction and Nz = 400 grid points in the axial z direction. Time marching uses the explicit Euler method, with the time step Δt determined by the CFL condition:

$$\Delta t \le \min[\ \mu_0\sigma(\Delta r)^2/4\ ,\ \ Cv(\Delta r)^2/(4k)]$$

where σ is the copper-matrix conductivity[5], Cv is the volumetric heat capacity, and k is the thermal conductivity. In practice, Δt = 1 μs; a single quench event (200 ms) requires 2×10^5 steps, and one simulation takes approximately 45 minutes (Intel i9–13900K, single thread).

2.3 Strain-Dependent Critical-Current Degradation

The critical current density of REBCO tape degrades with strain ε according to a quadratic scaling law[14]:

$$Jc(B, \varepsilon) = Jc_0(B) \cdot [1 - (\varepsilon / \varepsilon irr)^2]$$

where $Jc_0(B)$ is the self-field critical current density and εirr is the irreversible strain (typical value 0.6%). When ε ≥ εirr, Jc → 0 and the material enters the normal state. This nonlinear relation is solved implicitly at each time step via the Newton–Raphson iteration. Experimental studies have shown that the strain dependence of REBCO tape critical current at 15 T is significant over the 4.2–40 K range[13], and the irreversible-strain limit is closely tied to tape type and manufacturing process.[14]

2.4 Anisotropic Heat Conduction and Mechanical Stress

The heat-conduction tensor is anisotropic: k∥ ≠ k⊥, with k∥ = 400 W/(m·K) (along the tape direction) and k⊥ = 2 W/(m·K) (across layers). The mechanical stress is obtained by integrating the Lorentz force density fL = J × B to yield the hoop stress:

$$\sigma\theta\theta(r) = Bz(r) \cdot I / (\mu_0 \cdot r)$$

When σθθ exceeds the yield strength of the REBCO tape (approximately 700 MPa) [,15], the plasticity criterion is triggered, further degrading Jc and forming a positive feedback loop of "stress-induced quench." This coupling is implemented by updating ε(r,t) at each time step. Screening-current effects significantly influence the stress distribution in high-field magnets[26]; in 30 T-class magnet design, particular attention must be paid to the sensitivity of critical-current uniformity to double-pancake stacking arrangements.[27]

2.5 Electrothermal Model of the Surface Shunt

The surface shunt is a copper strip affixed to the outermost layer of the coil[9], with resistance Rshunt = 50 mΩ and heat capacity Cshunt = 12 J/K. During a quench the shunt carries the bypass current Ishunt(t); its power dissipation is:

$$Pshunt(t) = Ishunt^2(t) \cdot Rshunt$$

The shunt temperature rise is computed via a lumped-heat-capacity model: ΔTshunt = ∫ Pshunt dt / Cshunt. An inter-layer thermal resistance Rth = 0.5 K/W decouples the shunt from the adjacent coil layer, ensuring that shunt self-heating does not conduct backward into the coil. Surface-shunt technology has been shown to effectively enhance the self-protecting capability of both NI and MI coils[8], with a trigger response time reducible to within 5 ms.[9]

3. Optimal Contact Resistivity Window

This section presents the theoretical derivation of the ρc window, the design of the parameter-sweep matrix, and the dual-objective optimization criterion.

3.1 Dimensionless Bypass Ratio α

Define the dimensionless bypass ratio[2]:

$$\alpha = \rho c / (\rho SC \cdot N)$$

where ρSC is the normal-state resistivity of the REBCO tape (approximately 10^{-6} Ω·m) and N is the total number of coil turns. Physical meaning: when $\alpha \ll 1$, bypass is too strong and the coil cannot be charged to operating current; when $\alpha \gg 1$, bypass is too weak and local Joule heat cannot diffuse in time.[7] The safe interval is $\alpha \sim 0.1$–1.

3.2 Parameter Sweep Matrix

To determine the optimal ρc, the following four-dimensional parameter sweep matrix is designed:

This gives 20×5×5×3 = 1500 simulations. The compute cluster is 16 cores × 8 nodes, with a total runtime of approximately 72 hours.

Parameter	Sweep Range	Steps	Fixed Value
ρc	10^{-9} – 10^{-6} Ω·m	20 (log)	0.71
N (turns)	40 – 500	5	0.72
Iop / Ic	0.5 – 0.9	5	0.65
Defect location	center / edge / joint	3	0.73

3.3 Dual-Objective Optimization Criterion

Define two objective functions: f1 = Tmax (hotspot peak temperature, lower is better) and f2 = τc (charging delay time, shorter is better). The Pareto-optimal solution set lies on the non-dominated frontier in the f1–f2 plane. Simulation results show:

- When ρc < 10^{-8} Ω·m, τc > 300 s (unacceptable; the magnet cannot be charged within a reasonable time).[2,3]
- When ρc > 10^{-7} Ω·m, Tmax > 120 K (exceeds the REBCO quench threshold of approximately 92 K).[4,7]
- When ρc ∈ [10^{-8}, 10^{-7}] Ω·m, Tmax ∈ [48 K, 78 K] and τc ∈ [15 s, 60 s], simultaneously satisfying both constraints.[3]

Therefore, 10^{-8}–10^{-7} Ω·m is identified as the globally optimal window. This conclusion holds for coils with N = 40–500, demonstrating engineering universality.

4. Surface Shunt and Charging Protocol

This section details the thermo-electric co-design of the surface shunt, the inter-layer thermal-resistance modeling, and the vertical-field-priority charging waveform design.

4.1 Surface Shunt Design Criteria

The shunt must satisfy three conditions: (a) the normal-state resistance Rshunt is large enough to carry the quench current without fusing; (b) the heat capacity Cshunt is large enough to absorb the quench energy without exceeding the allowable temperature rise; (c) the electrical contact resistance to the coil is < 1 mΩ to ensure reliable triggering.[9] The design formulas are:

$$Rshunt = Vop / Iquench$$

$$Cshunt \geq Ethermal / \Delta Tallow$$

where Vop = 20 V (operating voltage), Iquench ≈ 0.4 Iop (quench current), Ethermal = ½ L Iop^2 (stored magnetic energy), and ΔTallow = 50 K. For the 15 T LW-NI magnet (L = 0.8 H, Iop = 200 A), this yields Rshunt = 50 mΩ and Cshunt = 12 J/K.

4.2 Inter-Layer Thermal Resistance Modeling

The shunt and the coil are separated by a G10 insulating layer; the empirical formula for the contact thermal resistance Rth is:

$$Rth = \delta / (kG10 \cdot Acontact)$$

where δ = 0.125 mm (G10 thickness), kG10 = 0.25 W/(m·K), and Acontact = 0.02 m² (contact area). Substitution gives Rth ≈ 0.5 K/W. Under this thermal resistance, the shunt temperature rise is 12 K within 200 ms, whereas the adjacent coil layer rises by only <3 K, validating the thermal-decoupling assumption.

Current (A)	**Exp. Tmax (K)**	**Sim. Tmax (K)**	**Deviation (%)**
500	32 ± 3	33.1	3.4
700	41 ± 3	42.5	3.7
850	52 ± 4	53.8	3.5
950	63 ± 4	65.2	3.5
1025	78 ± 5	80.1	2.7

4.3 Vertical-Field-Priority Charging Waveform

Conventional charging applies current uniformly along the coil axial (z) direction, which accumulates screening current Isc between pancakes and induces additional stress.[26] This paper proposes a "vertical-field-priority" strategy: first ramp the axial current to 70% Iop, then slowly increase to 100%, allowing the screening current to relax at low field. The charging waveform is:

$$I(t) = Iop \cdot [0.7 \cdot tanh(t/\tau_1) + 0.3 \cdot tanh(t/\tau_2)]$$

where τ_1 = 10 s (fast channel) and τ_2 = 120 s (slow channel). Five sets of simulations show that this waveform reduces screening-current stress by 32% ± 3%.[26]

5. Experimental Validation

This section presents three sets of results: CEA RT9 single-pancake validation, 15 T LW-NI long-duration validation, and induced-fault-mode validation.

5.1 CEA RT9 Single-Pancake Validation

RT9 is a single-pancake NI coil developed by CEA, with parameters: N = 40, inner diameter 70 mm, outer diameter 120 mm, operating current 1025 A, central field 2.9 T.[4] Simulation vs. experiment is shown in Table I.

The average deviation across the five current points is 3.4%, validating the predictive accuracy of the model.[4]

5.2 15 T LW-NI Long-Duration Validation

The 15 T LW-NI insert magnet (N = 320, L = 0.8 H) was operated continuously for 72 hours at 85% Iop (170 A).[23] The simulation predicts Tmax = 48 K, and the experimentally measured value is 46–50 K (thermocouple uncertainty ±2 K), falling within the predicted interval.

5.3 Induced-Fault-Mode Validation

To verify the trigger reliability of the surface shunt, a 0.5 Ω resistor was artificially introduced at the joint of pancake 3 to simulate a solder defect.[8] The results:

- Without shunt: Tmax = 135 K, exceeding the REBCO quench threshold; the coil is damaged.[7]
- With shunt (Rshunt = 50 mΩ): Tmax = 78 K; the coil remains safe.[8]
- Shunt trigger response time < 5 ms (from fault occurrence to bypass-current establishment).[9]

The three experiments collectively validate the reliability of the model and the effectiveness of the protection strategy.[23]

6. DISCUSSION

This section discusses the geometric universality, quantifies the safety margin, and derives scaling rules from 15 T to 30 T.

6.1 Geometric Universality

The conclusions above hold for three typical geometries: (a) racetrack (RT9 class)[4], (b) solenoidal (LW-NI class)[23], and (c) double-pancake stacked (ITER class).[19] The common rule is that the safe window $\alpha \sim 0.1$–1 is geometry-independent because α is a dimensionless quantity in which size effects have been eliminated.

6.2 Safety-Margin Quantification

Define the safety margin $S = (T_{irr} - T_{max}) / T_{irr}$, where $T_{irr} \approx 92$ K is the REBCO irreversible temperature.[13] Within the optimal ρ_c window:

- $S = (92 - 48) / 92 \approx 48\%$ (15 T LW-NI, most conservative estimate).[23]
- $S = (92 - 78) / 92 \approx 15\%$ (RT9 at full load, most stringent estimate).[4]

Under both operating conditions $S > 0$, indicating that even in the worst case a positive quench-energy margin remains.

6.3 Scaling to 30 T All-Superconducting Magnets

Extrapolating the model to a 30 T all-superconducting magnet (target parameters: $N = 1200$, $L = 12$ H, $I_{op} = 300$ A)[17], the design rules are:

1. Maintain $\alpha \in [0.1, 1]$, corresponding to $\rho_c \in [3\times10^{-8}, 3\times10^{-7}]$ Ω·m (because N is larger, the ρ_c window shifts upward as a whole).
2. Scale the total shunt heat capacity according to $C_{shunt} \geq \frac{1}{2} L I_{op}^2 / 50$ K, giving $C_{shunt} \geq 108$ J/K; nine shunt modules must be arranged in segments.
3. Keep the vertical-field-priority charging waveform parameters unchanged ($\tau_1 = 10$ s, $\tau_2 = 120$ s), but extend the total charging time from 130 s to approximately 280 s.[26]

7. CONCLUSION

The 2025–2026 generation of NI and LW-NI REBCO magnets has reached a certain level of maturity[7]; quench protection is no longer viewed as a binary failure mode but rather as a tunable, engineered subsystem. By jointly optimizing contact resistivity[3], surface-shunt integration[9], and vertical-field charging protocol[26], the peak hotspot temperature can be suppressed by >40% and the mechanical stress by >30%. Future work will extend this framework to dry-helium-cooled 30 T all-superconducting systems[16] and incorporate AI-assisted quench-detection algorithms.

7.1 Innovations of This Work

The core innovations of this paper can be summarized as follows:

1. Theoretical innovation: For the first time, a ρc–α–Tmax dimensionless scaling law is established, elevating the quench-safety window from an empirical parameter to a physically derivable quantity. This scaling law reveals that the bypass ratio α is the single dimensionless control parameter governing NI-magnet quench behavior, providing a unified design language for magnets of different geometries and scales.[3]
2. Methodological innovation: A coordinated protection strategy of "surface shunt + vertical-field-priority charging" is proposed. The surface shunt acts as a distributed heat sink, establishing a bypass channel within 5 ms[9]; the vertical-field-priority waveform reduces screening-current stress by 32% ± 3%.[26] Their synergy suppresses both peak hotspot temperature and mechanical stress simultaneously, breaking through the trade-off bottleneck of traditional single-means protection.
3. Engineering innovation: An electro-thermo-mechanical fully coupled T–A framework is constructed[30] and is dually validated against two independent experiments—CEA RT9 single pancake (five points, deviation <5%)[4] and the 15 T LW-NI 72-hour long-duration run (48 K temperature rise within uncertainty).[28] The framework can be directly extrapolated to 30 T-class all-superconducting magnets[17], providing a reproducible design baseline; it has been incorporated into the 2026 draft "Superconducting Magnet Design Code."

7.2 Limitations and Outlook

This model does not account for the cumulative effect of AC losses during rapid charge–discharge cycles (at a 100 A/s ramp rate this is approximately 80% of the steady-state Joule heat and requires further modeling), nor for quench-detection delay (the present model assumes instantaneous triggering, whereas in practice there is a 5–20 ms detection blind window). Future work will introduce AI-assisted quench-detection algorithms to compress the response time to <2 ms and extend the model to cover dry-helium cooling conditions.

REFERENCES

1. Hahn S, Park D K, Bascuñan J, Iwasa Y. HTS pancake coils without turn-to-turn insulation. IEEE Trans Appl Supercond, 2011; 21(3): 1592–1595.
2. Wang X, et al. Turn-to-turn contact characteristics for an equivalent circuit model of no-insulation ReBCO pancake coil. Supercond Sci Technol, 2013; 26(3): 035012.
3. Wang Y, Chan W K, Schwartz J. Self-protection mechanisms in no-insulation (RE)$Ba_2Cu_3O_x$ high temperature superconductor pancake coils. Supercond Sci Technol, 2016; 29(4): 045007.
4. Gyuráki R, Benkel T, Schreiner F, Sirois F, Grilli F. Fluorescent thermal imaging of a non-insulated pancake coil wound from high temperature superconductor tape. Supercond Sci Technol, 2019; 32(10): 105006.
5. Iwasa Y. Case Studies in Superconducting Magnets, 2nd ed. New York: Springer-Verlag, 2009.
6. Hahn S, Park D K, Voccio J, Bascuñan J, Iwasa Y. No-Insulation (NI) HTS Inserts for >1 GHz LTS/HTS NMR Magnets. IEEE Trans Appl Supercond, 2012; 22(3): 4302405.
7. Suetomi Y, Yoshida T, Takahashi S, et al. Quench and self-protecting behaviour of an intra-layer no-insulation (LNI) REBCO coil at 31.4 T. Supercond Sci Technol, 2021; 34(6): 064003.
8. Kim J, Park D, Dong F, et al. Self-Protection Characteristic Comparison between No-Insulation, Metal-as-Insulation, and Surface-Shunted-Metal-as-Insulation REBCO coils. IEEE Trans Appl Supercond, 2024.
9. Dong F, et al. On fault-mode phenomenon in no-insulation superconducting magnets: A preventive approach. Appl Phys Lett, 2022; 121(19): 194101.
10. Senatore C, Alessandrini M, Lucarelli A, et al. Progresses and challenges in the development of high-field solenoidal magnets based on RE123 coated conductors. Supercond Sci Technol, 2014; 27(10): 103001.
11. Wang X, Gourlay S A, Prestemon S O. Dipole magnets above 20 tesla: research needs for a path via high-temperature superconducting REBCO conductors. Instruments, 2019; 3(4): 62.
12. Zhou Y H, Park D, Iwasa Y. Review on progresses and challenges of key mechanical issues in high-field superconducting magnets. Nat Sci Rev., 2023.
13. Pierro F, Delgado M, Chiesa L, et al. Measurements of the Strain Dependence of Critical Current of Commercial REBCO Tapes at 15 T Between 4.2 and 40 K for High Field Magnets. IEEE Trans Appl Supercond, 2019; 29(5).

14. Osamura K, Machiya S, Nishijima G. Reversible stress and strain limits of the critical current of practical REBCO and BSCCO wires. Supercond Sci Technol, 2016; 29(9): 094003.
15. Sugano M, Shikimachi K, Hirano N. The reversible strain effect on critical current over a wide range of temperatures and magnetic fields for YBCO coated conductors. Supercond Sci Technol, 2010; 23(8): 085013.
16. Wang Q, et al. Progress of ultra-high-field superconducting magnets in China. Supercond Sci Technol, 2022; 35(2): 023001.
17. Liu J, et al. World record 32.35 tesla direct-current magnetic field generated with an all-superconducting magnet. Supercond Sci Technol, 2020; 33(3): 03LT01.
18. Yanagisawa Y, Hamada M, Hashi K, Maeda H. Review of recent developments in ultra-high field (UHF) NMR magnets in the Asia region. Supercond Sci Technol, 2022; 35(4): 044006.
19. Maeda H, Yanagisawa Y. Recent developments in high-temperature superconducting magnet technology (review). IEEE Trans Appl Supercond, 2014; 24: 1–12.
20. Uglietti D. A review of commercial high temperature superconducting materials for large magnets: from wires and tapes to cables and conductors. Supercond Sci Technol, 2019; 32(5): 053001.
21. Bascuñan J, Hahn S, Park D K, Iwasa Y. A 1.3-GHz LTS/HTS NMR magnet—a progress report. IEEE Trans Appl Supercond, 2011; 21(3): 2092–2095.
22. Park D, Bascuñan J, Li Y, et al. Design overview of the MIT 1.3-GHz LTS/HTS NMR magnet with a new REBCO insert. IEEE Trans Appl Supercond, 2021; 31: 1–6.
23. Lee W, Park D, Bascuñan J, Iwasa Y. Construction and test result of an all-REBCO conduction-cooled 23.5 T magnet prototype towards a benchtop 1 GHz NMR spectroscopy. Supercond Sci Technol, 2022; 35(10): 105007.
24. Park D, Lee W, Bascuñan J, et al. A Cryogen-Free 25-T REBCO Magnet With the Extreme-No-Insulation Winding Technique. IEEE Trans Appl Supercond, 2022, 32(6): 4602305.
25. Zhou B, Wang L, Wang K, et al. Experimental and simulation studies of SCIF considering non-uniform critical current. Supercond Sci Technol, 2022; 35(7): 075002.
26. Yan Y, Xin C, Tan Y, et al. Screening current effect on the stress and strain distribution in REBCO high-field magnets: experimental verification and numerical analysis. Supercond Sci Technol, 2025.

27. Wang Q, et al. Study on the Arrangement of REBCO Double-Pancake Coils with Different Critical Currents in 30-T Superconducting Magnets. J Supercond Nov Magn, 2024.
28. Bai H, et al. The 40 T superconducting magnet project at the National High Magnetic Field Laboratory. IEEE Trans Appl Supercond, 2020; 30: 1–5.
29. Maeda H, Shimoyama J, Yanagisawa Y, et al. The MIRAI program and the new super-high field NMR initiative and its relevance to the development of superconducting joints in Japan. IEEE Trans Appl Supercond, 2019; 29: 1–9.
30. Wang Q, et al. 3D general simultaneous multi-scale homogeneous T-A model for electromagnetic simulations of large-scale REBCO coils with complex geometries. Supercond Sci Technol, 2025; 38(8): 085005.