Reprinted from:

JOURNAL OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS – JOURNAL DES MATERIAUX NUCLEAIRES

Volume 72, Nos. 1 & 2, March 1978

RADIATION CONSIDERATIONS FOR SUPERCONDUCTING FUSION MAGNETS *

M.A. ABDOU

Applied Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439, USA

pp. 147–167

NORTH-HOLLAND PUBLISHING COMPANY - AMSTERDAM

RADIATION CONSIDERATIONS FOR SUPERCONDUCTING FUSION MAGNETS *

M.A. ABDOU

Applied Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439, USA

Superconducting magnets are believed to be necessary for fusion power reactors. High flux levels of neutrons and secondary gamma rays in these reactors require extensive radiation shielding to protect the components of the super-conducting magnets from intolerable radiation damage and energy deposition. In this paper, radiation environment for the magnets is characterized for various conditions expected for tokamak power reactor operation. The radiation levels are translated into radiation effects using available experimental data. The impact of the tradeoffs in radiation shielding and the change in the properties of the superconducting magnets on reactor performance and economics is examined. It is shown that (1) superconducting magnets in fusion reactors will operate at much higher radiation level than was previously anticipated; (2) additional data on radiation damage is required to better accuracy than is presently available in order to accurately quantify the change in properties in the superconducting magnet components; and (3) there is a substantial penalty for increasing (or overestimating) the shielding requirements. Therefore there is a strong incentive to explore all important options that lead to lower radiation damage at a given radiation level.

Des aimants supraconducteurs sont estimés nécessaires aux réacteurs de puissance de fusion. Les niveaux de flux élévés et les rayons gamma secondaires dans ces réacteurs exigent des écrans contre les radiations volumineux pour protéger les composants des aimants supraconducteurs vis-à-vis de dommages par irradiation intolérables et de déposition d'énergie. Dans ce travail, l'environnement d'irradiation pour les aimants est caractérisé en fonction des diverses conditions qu'on peut attendre pour l'exploitation d'un réacteur de puissance de type tokamak. Les niveaux d'irradiation sont traduits en effets d'irradiation en utilisant les données expérimentales disponibles. L'impact des dommages dans les écrans contre les radiations et la modification des propriétés des aimants supraconducteurs sur les performances et les aspects économiques du réacteur sont examinés. Il est montré que (1) les aimants supraconducteurs dans les réacteurs de fusion fonctionneront à un niveau de radiation beaucoup plus élevé qu'il n'avait été antérieurement prévu; (2) des données complémentaires sur les dommages dus aux radiations doivent être obtenues avec une meilleure précision que celles disponibles actuellement afin de mesurer quantitativement les variations de propriétés des composants des aimants supraconducteurs; et (3) il faut payer un prix substantiel pour accroître (ou surestimer) les exigences des dispositifs d'écrans contre les radiations. Ainsi, tout ceci incite fortement à explorer toutes les options importantes qui conduisent à diminuer les dommages par radiation pour un niveau donné de radiation.

Es wird angenommen, dass supraleitenden Magnete für Fusionsleistungsreaktoren notwendig sind. Der hohe Fluss an Neutronen und sekundärer γ-Strahlung in diesen Reaktoren erfordert eine starke Strahlenabschirmung zum Schutz der Komponenten für die supraleitenden Magnete vor untolerierbarer Strahlenschädigung und Energieabgabe. In dieser Arbeit wird die Strahlenumgebung der Magnete für verschiedene Zustände charakterisiert, die beim Betrieb des Tokamaks erwartet werden. Das Strahlungsniveau wird auf Bestrahlungseffekte mit verfügbaren experimentellen Daten übertragen. Die Aus-wirkungen der Nachteile der Strahlenabschirmung und der Eigenschaftsänderungen der supraleitenden Magnete auf das Reaktorverhalten und die Ökonomie wird untersucht. Es wird gezeigt: (1) Supraleitende Magnete in Fusionsreaktoren können bei einem sehr viel höheren Strahlungsniveau betrieben werden als früher erwartet wurde; (2) weitere Daten für Strahlenschäden sind für eine höhere Genauigkeit, als derzeitig verfügbar ist, erforderlich, um die Eigenschaftsänderungen der supraleitenden Magnetkomponenten genau quantifizieren zu können; (3) es ergibt sich eine hohe Pönale für zuneh-mende (oder überschätzte) Abschirmerfordernisse. Deshalb besteht ein starker Anreiz dafür, alle Wahlfreiheiten zu erkunden, die zu einer niedrigeren Strahlenschädigung bei gegebenem Strahlungsniveau führen.

1. Introduction

Fusion reactors based on magnetic confinement employ a variety of magnets for initiating, driving, confining, and shaping the plasma. Many of these magnets are large in size and are required to provide a high field. Although fusion reactors appear to be viable with normal magnets, the development of superconducting magnets is believed to be necessary for these reactors on the grounds of better economics and reliability. Much of the energy liberated in a fusion reactor operated on the D—T or D—D cycle is carried away with neutrons. Therefore, knowledge of radiation effects in the components of superconducting magnets is of great importance to fusion reactor research and development.

The largest effort in the world fusion power reactor research and development program is devoted to tokamaks operated on the D—T cycle. The scope of this paper is limited to this class of reactors but many of the ideas can be extrapolated to other types of magnetic confinement reactors.

The need for radiation protection of superconducting magnets has been realized [1–5] by tokamak shield designers since the early stages of tokamak development. Attempts were made to derive tolerable radiation levels in superconducting magnets as a necessary step in arriving at a sound radiation shield design. Until recently there was a lack of information to permit quantifying the radiation effects in the components of the superconducting magnets. Refrigeration requirements were generally used as the limiting factor for shield design. The general guiding philosophy for shield designers was to reduce the radiation field at the magnet to the lowest possible level. Consequently, earlier iterations on tokamak reactor designs resulted in very thick radiation shields. Later, attempts were made to review the characteristics of the radiation environment in the superconducting magnets. Unfortunately, these reviews used the results of the earlier designs as a fixed target for tokamak reactors and arrived at a misleading conclusion that radiation effects in the magnet were negligible.

At present, a second generation of tokamak reactor designs is evolving [6]. This second generation of designs is based on a better understanding of the trade-offs and interrelations within and among reactor components. In addition, codes are becoming avail-

able that allow parametric analyses and economic comparisons of a wide range of design parameters and options [7]. These studies show that the overall reactor performance and economics favor shields that are considerably thinner than those employed in earlier designs. Consequently, the radiation level in the superconducting magnets is one to two orders of magnitude higher than was generally assumed in previous studies. These results have identified a greater need for more accurate information on radiation effects in the components of superconducting magnets than is presently known.

The next section provides a brief review of tokamak reactor systems with emphasis on the interrelation between radiation shield and various types of magnets. Section 3 examines the results of trade-off studies pertinent to the shield design and radiation effects in superconducting magnets. In section 4, radiation environment for the magnets is characterized for various conditions expected for takamak power reactor operation.

2. Review of takamak magnets and shields

The purpose of this section is to briefly review the major features of tokamaks; particularly, the geometrical relationship between the radiation shield and the various types of magnets. Figs. 1 and 2 show a perspective view and a vertical cross section of a typical tokamak reactor. The plasma is confined in a toroidal geometry with the cross section of the torus being circular, D-shaped, or doublet. In a D—T cycle, the fusion energy is liberated as kinetic energy of 3.5 MeV alpha particles and 14.1 MeV neutrons. The plasma region is surrounded by a vacuum vessel (first-wall) that serves as the vacuum boundary for the plasma chamber. The first wall is surrounded by a blanket that converts the kinetic energy of the neutrons into heat. The blanket has lithium in one form or another for tritium regeneration. The magnet shield surrounds the blanket. The basic function of the magnet shield is to provide the radiation attenuation necessary for protection of the components of the toroidal-field magnets.

2.1. Types of magnets

The toroidal-field (TF) coils constitute the largest magnet system in a tokamak. These coils generate a

Fig. 1. Perspective view of a tokamak.

Fig. 2. Vertical cross section of a tokamak with a representative neutral beam penetration.

strong steady-state toroidal magnetic field in the plasma region. The TF coils are closely packed on the inner side of the torus and the spacing between each pair of coils increases in the outward direction and reaches its maximum on the outside at the mid-plane. Each coil has a cross section that can be circular, oval or D-shaped. Constant tension D-shape is currently believed to be the most appropriate geometry for the TF coils. Tokamak operation requires a toroidal magnetic field at the plasma centerline of $\approx 4-8$ T which corresponds to a maximum magnetic field at the coil windings of $\approx 7-14$ T depending on the reactor design characteristics.

In addition to the toroidal-field coil system, tokamaks require a poloidal coil system. The poloidal coils vary in position and requirements but they have the common geometrical feature of being a concentric set of circles with the toroidal axis as the common axis. The ohmic heating (OH) coil system, a part of the poloidal coils, consists generally of a solenoid located inside the central core formed by the inner leg of the toroidal field coils and a number of smaller coils as indicated in figs. 1 and 2. The OH coils act as the primary of a transformer with the plasma as the secondary. Energizing the primary side induces and drives a toroidal current in the plasma. The plasma current, in addition to providing for initial plasma heating, produces a pulsed poloidal magnetic field which together with the steady-state toroidal field confine the plasma. The pulsed OH coils can be normal or superconducting. It has been shown that a pulsed superconducting magnet is generally superior to a pulsed normal magnet unless the maximum field for a normal coil could be designed so as to be twice as high as the maximum field for a superconducting coil [8]. The OH coil system as described above and as shown in figs. 1 and 2 is located outside the TF coil system. In this location, the winding condigurations can be arranged so that the pulsing fields and the torques imposed on the TF coils are minimized. In addition, they recieve less radiation than the TF coils do. However, another concept for tokamak reactor design has been proposed [9], in which the OH coils are located inside the bore of the TF coils. This concept is meritorius for several reasons but it causes the OH coils to be closer to the high radiation field.

A tokamak plasma requires a pulsed vertical field

to provide control on the position of the plasma column. This field is provided by the equilibrium-field (EF) coils. Lower ampere-turn and better coupling to the plasma can be obtained by placing the EF coils in the blanket as close as possible to the first wall. However, the high radiation field and the high temperature make it difficult to design even normal copper coils for placement in the blanket. Much easier assembly, maintenance, and replacement of the EF coils can be accomplished by placing them outside the TF coils. Whether these coils can be normal or superconducting and whether they are in a severe or moderate radiation environment will depend on their location either inside or outside the TF coils. Detailed studies remain to be carried out to determine the best compromise for the location and type of the EF coils. Knowledge of radiation effects in superconducting magnets provides an important contribution to these studies.

Tokamaks with doublet plasma require field-shaping coils (F-coils) to actively shape the plasma [10] (see fig. 3). Because of the extensive shaping capability requirements on these coils they must be sufficiently close to the plasma. Moving the F-coils away from the plasma increases significantly the total current requirements. On the other hand, coils located in proximity to the first wall will be subjected to a very intensive radiation field which will certainly shorten considerably the useful lifetime of any type of magnet. All poloidal coils such as the F-coils that are located inside the toroidal-field coils are extremely difficult to repair and replace. This is particularly complicated by the fact that remote handling is a necessity. Normal, cryoresistive, and superconducting magnet options have been considered [10] for the F-coils. Operation of normal coils will involve large Joule heating losses but superconducting magnets will also require a high refrigeration power requirement for removal of nuclear energy deposition. Radiation effects in superconducting coils are very large but they are also of considerable concern for normal coils as well. Therefore, the best option for the type of F-coils is not clear yet. However, designing workable and maintainable F-coils with tolerable power losses in an intense radiation environment appears at present to be the most challenging engineering problem for doublet tokamaks.

Fig. 3. Vertical cross section of a Doublet tokamak. (Reproduced from ref. [10]).

2.2. Material options for the magnets

The number of materials that have been proposed for superconducting fusion magnets is rather limited. These materials are discussed below to provide a guideline for priorities in experimental programs concerned with radiation effects in superconducting fusion magnets.

Both NbTi and Nb₃Sn have been proposed for the superconductor. NbTi is generally preferred because of its ductility but it has the disadvantage that the maximum practical magnetic field is limited to 8–10 T. Nb₃Sn can be operated at much higher field but its brittleness cast some doubt on its viability as a superconductor in large magnets. The brittleness of Nb_3Sn dictates that the magnets be designed to a relatively low strain level of ≈ 0.05 to 0.1%. At a low strain level, toroidal-field magnets with a peak field of 10–14 T are very thick and it becomes extremely difficult to design a workable OH coil system with a solenoid located in the central core [11]. It has been shown [6] that under these conditions tokamaks are best operated with NbTi superconductors in the range of 8–9 T. However, high-field superconductors such as Nb_3Sn remain as strong contenders for fusion magnets.

The toroidal-field magnet system in tokamaks has a tremendous amount of stored energy of $\approx 10^{10}-10^{12}$ Joules. Therefore, it is necessary that these

magnets be well protected and designed so that they do not quench. Cryostatically stable magnets are presently the preferred design option but intrinsically stable magnets have also been considered. Both copper and aluminum have been considered for the conductor stabilizer. Aluminum has a higher potential for lower intrinsic resistivity and magneto-resistance than for copper. In addition, the long-term radiation-induced activity in aluminum is much lower than that induced in copper. However, aluminum has a low yield stress and under some circumstances the resistivity increases excessively with strain. In addition, the radiation-induced resistivity in aluminum is approximately 2.5 times that in copper. At present, copper is assumed to be the preferred choice for near-term fusion magnets with aluminum as a very attractive long-term possibility.

Steel is generally considered to be the primary choice for structural materials in the magnet. However, aluminum alloys have been considered as the structural materials in magnets that employ aluminum stabilizers.

A variety of insulators are required in the magnets. Up to the present, only organic insulators have been considered for the TF magnets because they exhibit the ductility required for large coil windings. As will be shown later in this paper, the low threshold for radiation damage in organic insulators results in significant economic penalty for tokamaks. The higher threshold for radiation damage in inorganic insulators makes them attractive for fusion magnets but their brittleness presents a very serious limitation on their practical use, particularly in large coils such as the TF magnets. All coils that have to be located inside the blanket/shield must be designed, however, to employ inorganic insulators as it appears very doubtful that organic insulators can withstand the harsh radiation environment in the blanket/shield for a reasonably long operation time.

2.3. Radiation shield

Fig. 4 is a vertical cross section of a tokamak which is similar in many respects to fig. 2 but many of the engineering details are omitted to facilitate the following discussion. The sector of the blanket and shield on the inner side of the torus is normally called the inner blanket/shield. The rest of the

blanket and shield on the top, bottom, and outer regions of the torus is referred to as the outer blanket/shield.

The inner blanket/shield occupies the high magnetic field region where space is at a premium. Therefore, the main objective of the design for the inner blanket/shield is to provide protection for the TF coils with the smallest possible thickness, Δ_{BS}^i, from the first wall to the magnet. One means of accomplishing this goal is to use very efficient shielding materials. A combination of stainless steel (SS) and/or tungsten and boron carbide (B_4C) has been found to be a reasonably good choice for this purpose [12,13]. In addition, it is essential that shielding requirements for the TF coils are not overestimated. The next section presents results of the trade-offs concerned with Δ_{BS}^i.

The space restrictions are much less severe on the outer blanket/shield. The outer blanket incorporates the tritium breeding medium which generally results in lower attenuation efficiency than that in the inner blanket. Several materials have been proposed for use in the outer shield; e.g. lead, lead mortar, borated graphite, water, boron carbide, and nonmagnetic concrete. Combinations of two (high mass number and lighter material) or more of these materials provide good shielding compositions but they generally result in less attenuation efficiency than a mixture of stainless steel-boron carbide or tungsten-boron carbide generally employed in the inner shield. Therefore, the outer blanket/shield thickness. Δ_{BS}^o, is generally considerably greater than Δ_{BS}^i to provide the same level of radiation attenuation. In some design concepts, additional attenuation is provided for on the outside by further increase in Δ_{BS}^o in order to reduce the overall refrigeration power requirement in the TF magnets. Because of these considerations, toroidal-geometry, and the particular geometrical shapes of the TF magnets, the neutron and gamma ray fluxes vary from one position to the other along the circumference (in the poloidal direction) of the TF magnets. The maximum fluxes in almost all designs occur in the midplane at the inner side of the torus at the inner layer of the magnet that is closest to the shield, i.e. the location marked A in fig. 4. Neutrons and secondary gamma rays are also attenuated within the magnet (e.g. along lines C-D and A-B in fig. 4) as the composition of

Fig. 4. A simplified vertical cross section of a representative tokamak with circular plasma.

the magnet (copper or aluminum and stainless steel) is a good radiation attenuator.

Tokamak reactors require that the blanket and magnet shield accommodate a variety of penetrations, including those for vacuum pumping, auxiliary heating, divertor, and maintenance access. Many of these penetrations are large open regions which extend from the first wall radially outward through the blanket/shield and between the TF coils. Fig. 2 shows an example of penetrations for neutral beams. These penetrations seriously affect the attenuation efficiency of the magnet shield and cause considerable radiation streaming into the toroidal and poloidal coils. Special penetration shields have to be designed to protect the magnets and other reactor equipment [14,15]. However, even fully shielded penetrations

cause a considerable change in the characteristics of the radiation field within the magnets.

3. Radiation shield/superconducting magnet tradeoff

A very notable characteristic of a tokamak reactor is a strong and complex interface among reactor components. The interface between the toroidal field magnet and the radiation shield is particularly strong and involved. Understanding and accounting for this interface is extremely important for shield and magnet designers and those involved in information development for these reactor subsystems. This section delineates this interface and its important impact on the overall reactor performance.

A primary function of the blanket/shield system is to protect the superconducting toroidal-field coils from excessive radiation. The radiation level at the magnet depends on the composition and thickness of the blanket/shield. The problem of finding an effective shield composition has been examined in detail earlier [3,4,12] but the designer's choice is limited to available materials as well as engineering considerations. For the same shield composition, varying the shield thickness has many counteracting effects on the reactor performance and economics. The contradicting requirements on the shield thickness are discussed next as they demonstrate the large impact that radiation effects in superconducting magnets have on tokamaks. The discussion in this section should also clarify why the present generation of tokamak designs involve higher radiation levels as the magnets than those in earlier design generations.

3.1. Motives for smaller shield thickness

The power density in a tokamak can be written as

$$P \propto \beta_t^2 B_t^4 , \tag{1}$$

where β_t is the plasma kinetic-to-magnetic pressure ratio and B_t is the toroidal field strength at the center of the plasma. Thus, increasing B_t and/or β_t can result in significant increase in reactor power. Practical reactors operate with a power density of ≈ 1 to 10 MW/m^3. The magnetic field strength required to obtain a power density in this range depends strongly

on β_t. The plasma stability limit on β_t has not been established yet. Current investigation in the field of plasma physics indicates that β_t is likely to be in the range of 0.04 to 0.1. Therefore, the most desirable value for B_t is not certain at present. Tokamak reactor designs have considered B_t in the range 3–8 T.

A limit on B_t comes from technological constraints on the maximum practical magnetic field, B_m, at the TF magnet windings. The value of B_t depends upon B_m and upon the geometry according to

$$B_t = B_m \left(1 - \frac{1}{A} - \frac{\Delta_v}{R} - \frac{\Delta_{BS}^i}{R} \right) , \tag{2}$$

where A is the aspect ratio (typically,2.5–5), R is the major radius of the plasma torus (4–14 m), and Δ_v is the thickness of the scrape-off region between the plasma and first wall (0.1–0.5 m). The parameter Δ_{BS}^i is the distance in midplane on the inner side of the torus from the first wall to the TF coil windings. The largest portion of Δ_{BS}^i is occupied by the inner blanket/shield but it also includes maintenance clearance space, and the cryostat dewar, thermal and magnetic shield, and bobbin of the TF coils. The maximum toroidal field strength B_m is limited by the type of superconductors. Fields $B_m \lesssim 9$ T are achiev-


Fig. 5. Effect of inner blanket/shield thickness on (a) reactor gross electric power; and (b) reactor net electric power (= gross power − TF magnet refrigeration power).

able with NbTi superconductors but at higher fields Nb_3Sn would be required.

Eqs. (1) and (2) show the importance of the inner blanket/shield thickness, Δ_{BS}^i. For a given B_m, increasing the blanket/shield thickness reduces the field in the plasma region and results in a significant decrease in the reactor power. Curve a in fig. 5 shows the reactor power as a function of Δ_{BS}^i for a reactor with $A = 2.5$ and $R = 8$ m and blanket shield composition of $SS/SS-B_4C$. As can be observed from the graph, increasing Δ_{BS}^i from 0.8 m to 1.4 m reduces the power by roughly a factor of 2.

Another way to illustrate the importance of reducing the blanket/shield thickness on the inner side of the torus is to examine a reactor with a fixed aspect ratio, major radius, and magnetic field at plasma centerline. Under these conditions the reactor power output is fixed for the same plasma parameters. Two effects can now be noted if the blanket/shield thickness, Δ_{BS}^i, is increased:

(1) It is clear from eq. (2) that the maximum field, B_m at the TF windings increases. The cost of the TF magnet increases as $\approx B_m^2$.

Fig. 7. Central core radius as a function of inner blanket/ shield thickness for several size tokamaks ($A = 3, P_w = 3$ M/m^2, circular plasma).

(2) The thickness, Δ_m, of the TF magnet increases roughly as $\approx B_m$. If B_m exceeds ≈ 9 T then NbTi cannot be used and Nb_3Sn superconductor (or alternative) has to be employed. Because of Nb_3Sn brittle-


Fig. 6. Maximum magnetic field required to produce a fixed plasma power density as a function of the inner blanket/ shield thickness. Results care shown for several values of the major radius, R, aspect ratio of 3 and neutron wall load of 3 MW/m^2 for circular plasma.


Fig. 8. Maximum ohmic heating field required in several size tokamaks as a function of inner blanket/shield thickness ($A = 3, P_w = 3$ MW/m^2, circular plasma).

ness the maximum permissible strain is a factor of ≈ 2 to 3 lower than that with NbTi. This dictates a large increase in the magnet thickness since Δ_m is inversely proportional to the design strain. As shown in figs. 1 and 2, a central support cylinder is required to take up the compressive force pushing the TF coils toward the tokamak axis. The thickness of the support cylinder, Δ_{sp}, increases as B_m increases. The flux core radius, r_v, for the OH coils is given by

$$r_v = R - r_w - \Delta^i_{BS} - \Delta_m - \Delta_{sp} , \qquad (3)$$

where r_w is the minor radius of the first wall. Therefore, increasing Δ^i_{BS} increases also Δ_m and Δ_{sp} and results in significant reduction in r_v. The maximum ohmic heating field, B_{OH}, increases as r_v is decreased, $B_{OH} \approx 1/r_v^2$. Increasing B_{OH} increases the cost of the pulsed OH coils and more importantly the cost of the OH power supplies.

These effects are demonstrated numerically in figs. 6–8. Shown in these figures are B_m, r_v, and B_{OH} as functions of Δ^i_{BS} for $R = 6, 7, 8$, and 9 m. In calculating these results NbTi magnets with a design strain of 0.2% were employed for $B_m \leqslant 9$ T and Nb_3Sn magnets with a design strain of 0.1% were used at higher fields. In all cases shown in these figures, the plasma is circular with an aspect ratio of 3 and a fixed neutron wall loading of 3 MW/m^2.

3.2. Motives for larger shield thickness

All the effects discussed so far indicate very strong reasons for reducing the blanket/shield thickness. Magnet protection, on the other hand, requires increasing this thickness. The neutron flux, ϕ_m, at the inner TF coil winding is correlated to the neutron flux, ϕ_w, at the first wall by the approximate relationship

$$\phi_m = \phi_w e^{-\mu_{bs}\Delta^i_{BS}} , \qquad (4)$$

where μ_{bs} is an effective attenuation coefficient which depends strongly on the material composition of the blanket/shield and for typical shielding materials it varies from ≈ 0.08 cm^{-1} to ≈ 0.14 cm^{-1}. From magnet protection viewpoint, it is desirable to use a large Δ^i_{BS}. This conflicts with the deletorius effects that an excessively large Δ^i_{BS} has on reactor performance and economics. Therefore, a prudent compromise on Δ^i_{BS}, and hence the operating radiation level at the

magnet, has to be found. A crucial step for doing this is to accurately quantify the performance and economics effects of radiation on the superconducting magnets. An attempt to perform this is made next.

Radiation damage to the magnets is particularly important in three areas: (a) effects on the individual magnet components under steady-state irradiation; (b) possible synergistic effects in large superconducting coils; and (c) any effects that may result from periodic magnet annealing. In general, no data exists at the present time to evaluate effects in (b) and (c). On the other hand, very useful, but limited experimental informations are available with which to evaluate radiation effects in the magnet components. The components of concern are (1) the superconductor; (2) the normal (stabilizing) conductor; (3) isnulators; and (4) structural materials.

We will now utilize the available experimental information on radiation effects in individual magnet components to examine their impact on the magnet and reactor performance and economics. Our concern here is not to survey and investigate radiation damage in magnets but rather to study the implications of changes in crucial performance properties. The former is covered elsewhere in the *Proceedings* of this meeting.

3.2.1. Superconductor

It has been shown that high neutron fluences result in a change in the transition temperature T_c and the critical current density, J_c of superconductors. Furthermore, radiation effects in NbTi alloys are significantly different from those in Nb_3Sn compounds. To focus this discussion, we will consider only the case of NbTi. For NbTi, the change in T_c is very small, and the irradiation induced changes in J_c are quite sensitive to the metallurgical structure in the unirradiated material [16]. Results on the change in J_c have been reported in the literature as a function of neutron fluences. Fig. 9 shows the neutron fluence, ϕt, in a NbTi superconductor as a function of the inner blanket/shield thickness, Δ^i_{BS} for $I_w = 1$ and 30 $MW\text{-}yr/m^2$, where I_w, integral neutron wall loading, is the product of P_w, the neutron wall loading, and an operational time period, t_0. The composition of the blanket/shield is similar to that of fig. 5, i.e. stainless and boron carbide. The value of Δ^i_{BS} in this figure, and everywhere else in this paper, includes

Fig. 9. Maximum neutron fluence is TF magnet as a function of inner blanket/shield thickness.

provide for 10% of the blanket/shield volume as void to account for a variety of cooling, clearance, and other engineering requirements in addition to a fixed 0.05-m vacuum gap generally required in the TF coils for thermal insulation.

Experimental results for the change in the critical current density of NbTi with neutron fluence up to 5×10^{22} m^{-2} can be approximated [17] as

$$J_c = J_{c0} \, e^{-\alpha \phi t} , \tag{5}$$

where J_{c0} is the unirradiated value for the critical current density and $\alpha = 3.5 \times 10^{-24}$ m^2.

Fig. 9 shows three horizontal lines that are representative of the experimental results on the relative change in the NbTi critical current density, $\Delta J/J_c$ as a function of neutron fluences. As can be inferred from these results, no or little change in J_c occurs at fluences $\lesssim 10^{21}$ n/m^2. The decrease in J_c is moderate for fluences up to $\approx 3 \times 10^{22}$ n/m^2 where $\Delta J/J_c \approx -10\%$. At higher fluences, the decrease in J_c is relatively large for small increments in the neutron fluences.

The decrease in the critical current density can be accommodated by adding more superconductors to

produce the same ampere turn. This involves increasing the cost of the magnet but this increase can be offset by the benefits achievable when Δ_{BS}^i is reduced. Thus, the permissible decrease in the critical current density is not a fixed value but it is an economics problem that is amenable to optimization.

3.2.2. Normal conductor

Low temperature irradiation of normal conductors serving as the stabilizers in superconducting magnets results in an increase in the electric resistivity. The experimental data of Brown et al. [18] were used to derive the following formula for radiation induced resistivity in copper:

$$\rho_r = 3 \times 10^{-7} [1 - \exp(-563 \, d)] \; \Omega \, cm , \tag{6}$$

where the saturation resistivity for copper, ρ_s, is equal to $3 \times 10^{-7} \; \Omega$ cm and d is the total number of atomic displacements. A displacement energy, E_d, of 40 eV was used for copper. The value of E_d has very little effect except through normalization of the numerical factor (563) in the exponent of the exponential term in the above equation. A similar expression can be derived for aluminum:

$$\rho_r = 8 \times 10^{-7} [1 - \exp(-366 \, d)] \; \Omega \, cm , \tag{7}$$

where the value of E_d for aluminum was taken as 26 eV.

Fig. 10. Maximum radiation induced resistivity in copper stabilizer as a function of inner blanket/shield thickness.

Fig. 10 shows the maximum radiation induced resistivity in copper as a function of the blanket/shield thickness, Δ_{BS}^i, for integral wall loadings, I_w, of 1 and 30 MW yr/m^2. At small values of Δ_{BS}^i, the radiation induced resistivity is equal to the saturation value and does not change when Δ_{BS}^i is increased up to ≈ 0.6 m for $I_w = 30$ Mw yr/m^2. Further increase in Δ_{BS}^i reduces ρ_r rather rapidly.

Cryogenic stabilization criterion requires that the heat transfer from the stabilized superconducting matrix must be sufficient to transfer the I^2R heat generated in the stabilizing material when a flux jump occurs, i.e.,

$$I^2 \rho \leqslant aqP , \tag{8}$$

where I is the operating current in the stabilizer of a composite conductor which has gone normal, ρ is the total resistivity of the stabilizer, a is the normal conductor cross-sectional area, q is the heat flux, and P is the cooled perimeter of the composite. The total resistivity ρ is given by

$$\rho = \rho_0 + \rho_m + \rho_r , \tag{9}$$

where ρ_0 is the intrinsic resistivity, ρ_m is the magneto-restrictivity, and ρ_r is the radiation induced resistivity.

The increase in the resistivity of the stabilizer can be accommodated without violating the cryostability condition by adding more stabilizer and modifying the conductor design [19]. This results in an increase in the magnet cost. This increase in cost can be compensated for by the economics gain achievable with smaller Δ_{BS}^i. Thus, the problem of radiation damage to the stabilizer is primarily an economics consideration.

3.2.3. Magnet anneal

The experimental observation that most of the radiation damage to the superconductor and stabilizer can be recovered by magnet annealing brings another important factor into the performance and economic tradeoffs. The neutron fluence at the magnet varies, of course, linearly with the irradiation period, t_0, or equivalently, the integral neutron wall loading, I_w, is proportional to t_0, for the same neutron wall loading, P_w. From the results shown in figs. 9 and 10, it can be seen that for the same radiation induced change in the properties of the superconductor and stabilizer, reducing I_w (i.e.

reducing t_0 for the same P_w) permits the selection of a significantly smaller Δ_{BS}^i. Thus, it is logical that tokamak reactor designs plan on periodic magnet annealing. However, there are other additional problems involved here. Magnet warmup and cooldown require that the power plant be shut down. The downtime involved results in a reduced capacity factor for the plant and an increased cost of energy, depending on the necessary downtime for magnet anneal. The minimum time period required for magnet warmup and cooldown without inducing intolerable strains in large magnets has not been established yet. Preliminary estimates of approximately two to three months have been made but a detailed study is required to provide more definitive information. This study must also account for the accumulated effects, if any, resulting from repeating the magnet anneal several to tens of times during the plant lifetime (≈ 30 yr).

3.2.4. Insulators

Superconducting magnets employ a variety of electrical and thermal insulation. Organic insulators are believed to be necessary for large magnets since


Fig. 11. Variation of radiation dose in TF magnet insulators with inner blanket/shield thickness.

inorganic insulators are very brittle. There is a
serious lack of irradiation data on insulators at low
temperature [20]. It is known, however, that
organic insulators are much less resistant to radia-
tion damage than inorganic insulators. Furthermore,
radiation damage in these insulators is irreversible.
Therefore, the insulators in the TF coils must be
designed to function properly for the lifetime of the
plant, typically ≈ 30 yr. Fig. 11 shows the maximum
dose in the TF coil insulators as a function of Δ^i_{BS}
at 30 and 300 MW yr/m^2. Extrapolation of neutron
irradiation data suggests dose limits of $\approx 10^8$ rad and
$\approx 10^9$ to 5×10^9 rad for mylar and epoxy, respect-
ively. (Regions indicated by the letters M and E in
fig. 11.) Thus, the minimum Δ^i_{BS} is ≈ 1.0–1.3 m for
epoxy, and ≈ 1.28–1.48 for mylar. Region I in fig. 11
shows that with radiation damage limits on inorganic
insulators of $\approx 10^{12}$ to 5×10^{12} rad, the minimum
Δ^i_{BS} is ≈ 0.5 to 0.8 m.

3.2.5. Refrigeration requirements

Another effect in the superconducting magnets
that calls for a thicker shield is the refrigeration power
required to remove the nuclear energy deposition
since ≈ 300 W of electric power are required per watt
of thermal input to 4 K refrigerators. Curve b in fig. 5
shows the net reactor power, i.e. the gross reactor
power minus the power required to run the magnet
refrigerators, as a function of Δ^i_{BS}. At $\Delta^i_{BS} \approx 0.45$ m,
the reactor power is barely sufficient to run the refriger-
ators. At $\Delta^i_{BS} \approx 0.8$ m half the reactor power is wasted
on refrigeration requirements. At larger Δ^i_{BS}, the
refrigeration power requirements decrease rapidly.
The maximum net power occurs at $\Delta^i_{BS} \approx 0.91$ m.
The value of Δ^i_{BS} at which the net power is maximum
is not overly sensitive to reactor parameters but it
depends greatly on the material composition of the
shield. Examining curves a and b in fig. 5, one finds
that the maximum net power occurs when the frac-
tion of the reactor electrical output spent on the
refrigerators is $\approx 1.5\%$. This is about a factor of 15
higher than the limit on refrigeration power sug-
gested earlier in the literature [1–5].

3.3. Results of tradeoffs

An important conclusion to be made from the
results shown above is that the design of the magnet

shield in terms of material composition and thickness
must evolve from a tradeoff study for the particular
system. A system program [7] for fusion power
plants recently developed at Argonne National
Laboratory (ANL) has built-in capabilities for
performing this type of tradeoff studies. This sys-
tem program can parametrize performance and
economic variables of all components in a tokamak
power plant. All interrelations within and among reac-
tor components are mathematically modeled into
the program. For example, radiation levels at the
magnet, as predicted by a neutronics model, are
transformed into property changes of the magnet
components, which are fully accounted for in the
magnet design and hence the cost [11].

An extensive study of the tradeoffs in the magnet/
shield design has been carried out using the ANL
System Program. An example of the results is shown
in fig. 12. This figure shows the cost of energy as a
function of the inner blanket/shield thickness for
tokamaks with aspect ratio of 3 and neutron wall
loading of 3 MW/m^2. The blanket/shield material
composition is the same as that described earlier in
this section (stainless steel-boron carbide) with the
same provision for vacuum, engineering and mainten-

Fig. 12. Cost of energy in tokamak reactors as a function of
the inner blanket/shield thickness ($A = 3$, $P_W = 3$ MW/m^2,
circular plasma).

Table 1
Reference parameters for cases in fig. 11.

Neutron wall loading (MW/m^2)	3
Reactor thermal power (MW)	
R = 6 m	1950
R = 7 m	2620
R = 8 m	3390
R = 9 m	4260
Aspect ratio	3
Period between magnet anneals (yr)	11.4
Downtime for magnet anneal (days)	80

ance space. Results are shown for tokamaks with major radius R = 6, 7, 8 and 9 m. Annealing of the superconducting toroidal-field magnets was assumed to coincide with the first-wall replacement which occurs every 11.4 yr and requires downtime of 80 days. Niobium-titanium was employed for fields $\leqslant$9 T and Nb$_3$Sn was used for higher fields. The plant capacity factor, F, is 0.9. The reference parameters fixed for all cases in fig. 12 are shown in table 1.

The results in fig. 12 show that the minimum energy cost is obtainable with $\Delta_{BS}^i \approx 1$ m. The maximum values at the TF magnets for the radiation related parameters at the optimum blanket/shield thickness are shown in table 2. The results of these parametric studies show that with the present information, superconducting magnets can tolerate

Table 2
Radiation parameters (maximum values) in the TF superconducting magnet at Δ_{BS}^i = 1 m.

Neutron flux (/m^2 s^2)	1.4 $\times 10^{14}$
Gamma ray flux (/m^2 s)	9 $\times 10^{13}$
Maximum neutron fluence prior to magnet anneal (/m^2)	4.5 $\times 10^{22}$
Maximum gamma ray fluence prior to magnet anneal (/m^2)	2.9 $\times 10^{22}$
Radiation induced resistivity in copper (Ω cm)	1.05 $\times 10^{-7}$
Decrease in NbTi critical current density, $\Delta J/J_c$	~14%
Nuclear energy deposition (kW)	
R = 6 m	5.9
R = 7 m	7.9
R = 8 m	10.3
R = 9 m	12.9

neutron and gamma ray fluxes of $\approx 10^{14}$/m^2. Neutron and gamma ray fluences of 5×10^{22}/m^2 and 3×10^{22}/m^2, respectively can be expected. This level of radiation is much higher than has been predicted from earlier generations of tokamak designs that employed much thicker shields. At $\Delta_{BS}^i \approx 1$ m, the radiation induced resistivity is $\approx 10^{-7}$ Ω cm and the change in the NbTi critical current density is $\Delta J/J_c \approx -14\%$. Figs. 9–11 show that radiation effects in the magnet are very sensitive to Δ_{BS}^i in the neighborhood of $\Delta_{BS}^i \approx 1$ m and I_w = 30 MW yr/m^2. Therefore, there is a great demand for high accuracy on neutron and gamma ray transport calculations, nuclear data, and radiation damage information in the superconducting magnet.

Additional interesting remarks can be made about the results in fig. 12. Increasing Δ_{BS}^i beyond the optimum value increases the cost of energy due to the larger capital cost when B_m and B_{OH} increase. The relative increase in the cost of energy is more significant at smaller major radius, R. This can be readily explained by examining eq. (2) which shows that the ratio B_m/B_t increases as the ratio Δ_{BS}^i/R increases. In other words, the gradient of the TF field is steeper and the space on the inner side of the torus is more valuable for smaller size machines. On


Fig. 13. TF magnet thickness as a function of blanket/shield thickness (A = 3, P_w = 3 MW/m^2).

the other hand, decreasing Δ_{BS}^i below the optimum value results in a dramatic increase in the cost of energy that is not overly sensitive to R. This increase in the cost of energy results from an increase in the refrigeration power requirements and an increase in the capital cost of the magnet to accommodate the increased radiation level at the magnet. The radiation level at the magnet is not sensitive to R when the neutron wall load is fixed.

Fig. 13 shows the TF coil thickness as a function of Δ_{BS}^i for the same cases of fig. 12. For $\Delta_{BS}^i > 1$ m increasing Δ_{BS}^i increases the magnet thickness because of the increase in B_m (see fig. 6). The abrupt increase in the magnet thickness for $R = 7$ m and $R = 8$ m at $\Delta_{BS}^i \approx 0.9$ m and $\Delta_{BS}^i \approx 1.2$ m, respectively is due to the "switch" from NbTi to Nb_3Sn when B_m exceeds 9 T. The important observation to be made from fig. 13 is that for small values of Δ_{BS}^i the magnet thickness *increases* as Δ_{BS}^i is *decreased* despite the fact that B_m is smaller. The reason is primarily due to the additional amount of copper required at higher radiation level to compensate for the increase in ρ_r. A much smaller contribution to the increase in the magnet thickness comes from increasing the amount of super-conductor to compensate for the decrease in J_c.

In carrying out the parametric study discussed above, we purposely assumed that all insulators will perform satisfactorily for the lifetime of the plant in all cases. However, table 3 shows the actual dose in the TF magnet insulators as a function of Δ_{BS}^i at the end of plant life of 30 yr. Shown also in

Table 3
Effect of inner blanket/shield thickness on maximum dose to the insulators in the toroidal-field magnets. *

Δ_{BS}^i (m)	Dose to insulator at end of plant Life, 30 yr (rad)	Cost of energy (mills/kWh)
		$R = 6$
0.7	1.2×10^{12}	55.2
0.8	3×10^{11}	37.6
0.9	7×10^{10}	34.5
1.0	1.8×10^{10}	34.4
1.1	3.3×10^9	35.2
1.2	1.2×10^9	37.1
1.3	3×10^8	40.1
1.4	7×10^7	45.4

* Based on system with $A = 3$, $\kappa = 1$, $P_w = 3$ MW/m^2.

the table is the cost of energy for $R = 6$ m. For the optimum shield, $\Delta_{BS}^i \approx 1$ m, the maximum dose in the insulator is 1.8×10^{10} rad. Therefore, TF insulators that can function properly up to that dose level are required in order to operate tokamaks in economically optimum conditions. As mentioned earlier, radiation damage data on organic insulators at ≈ 4 K are lacking. Extrapolation of irradiation data at higher temperatures show that mylar can be operated up to a dose of $\approx 10^8$ rad (region M in fig. 11) and that epoxy-base insulators can withstand higher doses of $\approx 10^9 - 5 \times 10^9$ rad (region E in fig. 11). Table 3 shows that such limits would dictate the use of a thicker shield and result in higher costs of energy *than what* is achievable otherwise. Therefore, accurate low temperature irradiation data for organic insulators is necessary. These results may prove the need for development of new ductile and more radiation resistant insulators or new concepts for magnet design that can permit the utilization of inorganic insulators.

It should be recalled that the values of Δ_{BS}^i used in this section represent the actual physical distance from the first wall to the inner edge of the TF coil winding (location of maximum magnetic field) in the midplane. Thus, the dimension of Δ_{BS}^i includes not only the blanket/shield thickness but also the non-attenuating space for maintenance, clearance and thermal-insulation vacuum gap. For $\Delta_{BS}^i \approx 1$ m, the net thickness of the blanket/shield based on theoretical density of the shield materials is only 0.87 m.

4. Radiation characteristics in superconducting magnets

In the previous sections, typical characteristics of the radiation environments expected in tokamak superconducting TF magnets were given. The purpose of this section is to discuss in more detail the radiation levels and spectra at and within the tokamak magnets. It should be clearly noted that tokamak reactors are in a stage of active research and development. Present design concepts are continually revised and new ones are developed. Therefore, it is not possible to predict today all the specific features of the ultimate commercial tokamak power reactors that will prove the most attractive. To reach the goal

Fig. 14. Neutron and gamma ray fluxes as a function of depth on the inner side of a TF magnet.


Fig. 16. Hydrogen production as a function of depth on the inner side of a TF magnet.


Fig. 15. Atomic displacements as a function of depth on the inner side of a TF magnet.


Fig. 17. Helium production as a function of depth on the inner side of a TF magnet.

Fig. 18. Radiation dose in typical insulators as a function of depth on the inner side of a TF magnet.

of defining the most promising design point for a tokamak, a great deal of new knowledge has to be acquired and extensive experimental and analytical information needs to be developed. This information should cover a wide range of variables and a broad spectrum for each variable. An example of such information is the quantitative radiation effects in superconducting magnets. In the previous section we derived, based on present knowledge, an optimum design point and defined the corresponding maximum radiation levels in the TF magnets. These levels should not be considered as the maximum required for new experimental and analytical information. Accurate information that extends to higher radiation levels is needed in order to quantify to a better accuracy all the tradeoffs in tokamak designs. Results presented below should be useful in defining the range of interest for radiation environment in superconducting magnets.

Figs. 14—18 show the neutron flux and various radiation damage indicators in the elemental components of a TF magnet as a function of the spatial depth within the magnet. Prior to any specific discussion of these figures, one should note a few

general rules about the absolute values and the spatial dependence of radiation related parameters in the TF magnets. The maximum value of neutron and gamma flux, atomic displacement, gas production, or any other neutronics response rate in the magnet depends on (1) the material composition in the blanket shield; (2) Δ_{BS}^i and/or Δ_{BS}^0; and (3) the neutron wall loading. The results that we selected for presentation in these figures are based on the blanket/shield system that evolved from the tradeoff studies discussed in the previous section. The inner blanket/shield in this system consists of stainless steel and boron carbide with $\Delta_{BS}^i = 1$ m. Variation of the neutronics response values in the magnet with Δ_{BS}^i can be easily inferred from results in the previous section. There is approximately an order of magnitude reduction in the maximum values at the TF magnet for every ≈ 0.17 m increase in Δ_{BS}^i. Dependence of these values on the blanket/shield composition and specific design considerations is available in the literature (see for example, ref. [12]). All neutron and gamma ray fluxes, reaction, atomic displacement and nuclear heating rates, vary linearly with the neutron wall loading, P_w. Tokamaks will operate in the range of $P_w \approx 1 - 5$ MW/m². Time-integrated quantities such as atomic displacements and gas production are also linearly proportional to the operation time t_0, and hence they vary linearly with the integral neutron wall loading $I_w = P_w t_0 F$. The range of t_0 was discussed in the previous section. For radiation effects that can be recovered, a reasonable range for $I_w = 5-50$ MW yr/m² and for irreversible radiation effects, the range of interest is $I_w = 30-150$ MW yr/m². For convenience, fig. 14 is normalized to $P_w = 1$ MW/m² and figs. 15—18 are normalized to 1 MW yr/m².

Fig. 14 shows the total neutron flux and gamma ray flux within the TF magnet. There is a factor of 10 reduction in every ≈ 0.3 m. This attenuation factor depends on the amount of helium and vacuum space which was assumed here to be 15% of the magnet volume. Shown also in the figure is the neutron flux for neutrons with energies >8 MeV. About 2% of the neutrons at the edge of the magnet have such high energies. This fraction also varies with Δ_{BS}^i and the composition of the shield.

Fig. 15 shows the spatial distribution of atomic displacements in aluminum, copper and niobium in units of dpa/(MW yr/m²). Displacement energies

Fig. 19. Comparison of typical neutron spectra in tokamak magnets with typical experimental (fission) spectrum: (a) neutron spectrum in a magnet located 0.6 m away from first wall; (b) neutron spectrum in TF magnet with inner blanket/shield of SS and B_4C (Δ^i_{BS} = 1 m) and (c) neutron spectrum for the ANL low temperature facility.

employed in these calculations are 26, 40 and 60 eV for aluminum, copper and niobium, respectively. The radiation induced resistivity in copper and aluminum varies exponentially with the dpa level as discussed earlier in this paper. It should be noted here that the radiation induced resistivity is higher in aluminum than in copper because of the higher dpa and larger saturation resistivity in aluminum.

Hydrogen and helium production rates within the TF magnet are shown in figs. 16 and 17 for stainless steel, copper, aluminum and niobium. Helium and hydrogen productions in stabilizing materials (aluminum and copper) are higher than in the superconductor (Nb_3Sn or NbTi). Both are in the range of 10^{-4} to 10^{-3} appm/(MW yr/m^2). Thus, total gas produc-

tion in the range of 0.001 to 0.1 appm is expected in the TF magnet conductors at the end of plant life. The concentration of impurities due to all transmutations by nuclear reactions is heavily dependent on the neutron spectrum at the magnet but it is generally one to two orders of magnitude higher than the gas production. About 70% of all neutron transmuting reaction rates come from the (n,γ) reaction. The important impurities produced by nuclear transmutations are nickel, zinc and cobalt in copper; and silicon and magnesium in aluminum. The total impurity concentration in copper and aluminum is 0.01 and 0.002 appm/(MW yr/m^2), respectively. Thus, at the end of the plant lifetime, the maximum impurity concentration in the magnet is roughly 1 appm. Fig. 18 shows the total absorbed dose in two typical insulators, mylar and epoxy.

Fig. 19 shows three neutron spectra, A, B, and C. Curves A and B represent the neutron spectra obtainable in tokamaks with an inner balnket/shield of stainless steel—boron carbide in two locations. Location B is the innermost layer of the TF coil located 1 m away from the first wall. Location A is 0.6 m away from the first wall which is a typical location for the equilibrium field (EF) coils if they are located inside the shield. Curve C represents the neutron spectrum obtainable in the ANL low temperature fast flux facility [18]. Fig. 20 shows the fraction, $f(E_0)$, of the total neutron flux with neutron energies above E_0, as a function of E_0 for the same three fluxes, A, B, and C. The two figures show that a typical fission spectrum such as that of C can simulate very well the neutron spectra in tokamak superconducting magnets for energies below $\approx$5 MeV.


Fig. 20. The fraction, $f(E_0)$ of the total neutron flux with neutron energies above E_0 as a function of E_0 for the three cases A, B and C shown in fig. 19.

The fraction of neutrons above 0.1 MeV in C (90%) is considerably greater than in A and B ($\approx$60%). However, the fission spectrum (C) has a very small component (1.5%) above 5 MeV and essentially no neutrons above 8 MeV. The typical spectra in tokamak magnets (A and B) have $\approx$5% of the neutrons of energies >5 MeV. Many neutron induced reactions [e.g. (n, α), (n, p), (n, n'p), etc.] occur in typical magnet materials only at high energies. In addition, the recoil energy for a given reaction increases with neutron energy. Therefore, high-energy neutrons are more capable of producing radiation damage than low-energy neutrons. Thus, while fission spectra seem to be adequate for radiation damage experiments on superconducting magnets, the spectral differences in the fusion environments must be taken into account. It should be noted in this regard that the total neutron flux is a poor radiation damage indicator in the wide fusion spectra that extends from $\approx$0–15 MeV. Other radiation damage indicators, e.g. atomic displacements, that account, to some extent, for the energy dependence of the radiation effects should be used in correlating radiation damage and radiation levels. It would be useful to establish reference sets of damage functions for materials in superconducting magnets that can be used by radiation damage experimentalists and fusion reactor designers.

The neutron spectra at the TF magnet will change for other shielding material compositions. In general, the fraction of neutrons at high energy will decrease as the shield thickness is increased.

References

[1] Proc. of BNES Nuclear Fusion Conference, Culham (1969).
[2] A.J. Impink, Jr., in Technical Report No. 434, MIT Research Laboratory of Electronics, Cambridge, Mass. (1965).
[3] J.T. Kriese and D. Steiner, in ORNL-TM-4853, Oak Ridge National Laboratory (1973).
[4] M.A. Abdou and C.W. Maynard, in Proc. of the First Topical Meeting on the Technology of Controlled Nuclear Fusion, USAEC-CONF-740402-P1, Vol. 1 (1974), p. 685.
[5] G.M. McCracken and S. Blow, in CLM-R120, Culham Laboratory (1972).
[6] W.M. Stacey, Jr. and M.A. Abdou, in ANL/FPP/TM-83, Argonne National Laboratory (1977).
[7] M.A. Abdou, C. Dennis, D. Ehst, W.M. Stacey, Jr. and L. Turner, Argonne National Laboratory, ANL/FPP/TM-97.
[8] W.M. Stacey, Jr., M.A. Abdou, P.J. Bertoncini, C.C. Bolta, J.N. Brooks, K. Evans, J.A. Fasolo, J.C. Jung, R.L. Kuston, V.A. Maroni, R.F. Mattas, F.E. Mills, B. Misra, J.S. Moenich, A. Moretti, J.H. Norem, J.S. Patten, W.F. Praeg, P. Smelser, D.L. Smith, H.C. Stevens, L. Turner, S.T Wang, C.K. Youngdahl, in ANL/CTR-76-3, Argonne National Laboratory (1976).
[9] D.R. Cohn, D. Jassby, R. Parker and J. Williams, Proc. of the Second Topical Meeting on the Technology of Controlled Nuclear Fusion, USERDA-CONF-760935-P3 (1976), p. 931.
[10] D.W. Kearney, R. Bourque, W. Chen, J. Dalessandro, E. Hager R. Harder, B. McHarg, M. Mintz, S. Rosenwasser, K. K. Schultz, R. Thomas, GA-A13992, General Atomics (1976).
[11] L.R. Turner and M.A. Abdou, ANL/FPP/TM-88, Argonne National Laboratory (1977).
[12] M.A. Abdou, Nucl. Techn. 29 (1976) 7.
[13] M.A. Abdou, ANL/FPP/TM-81, Argonne National Laboratory (1977).
[14] M.A. Abdou, L. Milton, J. Jung and E. Gelbard, Proc. of of the Second ANS Topical Meeting on the Technology of Controlled Nuclear Fusion, USERDA-CONF-760935-P3 (1976), p. 848.
[15] R.T. Santora, T.S. Tang, R.G. Alsmiller, Jr. and J.M. Barnes, ORNL/TM-5874, Oak Ridge National Laboratory (1977).
[16] B.S. Brown, in Radiation Damage in Metals, N.L. Peterson and S.D. Harkness, eds. (American Society of Metals, 1975), p. 330.
[17] M. Soll, IPP-4/104, Max-Planck Institute für Plasmaphysik.
[18] B.S. Brown, T.H. Blewitt, T.L. Scott and A.C. Klank, J. Nucl. Mat. 52 (1974) 215.
[19] G.L. Kulcinski, R.G. Brown, R.G. Lott and P.A. Sanger, Nucl. Techn. 22 (1974) 20.
[20] C.A.M. Van der Klein, RCN-240, Reactor Centrum Nederland (1975).

Discussion

P. Sanger: 1) In a paper published several years ago (Nucl. Tech. 22 (1974) 20) we identified the high sensitivity of the stabilizer resistivity to neutron fluence as the dominant property change and analyzed the limitations it placed on the design of fusion reactor magnets. Your work here reaffirms our conclusions.

2) Are the resistivity increases calculated in your paper based on experiments using fast-neutron spectrums and if so on what basis were corrections made to account for the higher energy fusion-reactor spectrum? The reason for the question is based on the fact that recent studies show that the free defect production rates are roughly a third of the displacement rate and they are highly dependent on the PKA spectrum. A simple correlation based

on displacement cross sections may be inadequate and introduce large uncertainties in the actual resistivity increases to be expected.

3) Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to voice a word of caution about applying the results obtained for fusion reactors to superconducting magnets in other radiation environments, especially high energy proton accelerators. In particular the use of aluminum in fusion reactors is limited by a very high rate of resistivity increase. However, in experiments at Fermilab we found that the resistivity increase in aluminum was half the increase in copper for the same fluence. Aluminum then looks like an excellent candidate for a stabilizer in these accelerators since the resistivity increase is completely annealed out at room temperature.

M. Abdou: In response to your first comment, this work agrees with the work of Kulcinski, et al. as well as the work of other researchers in that it illustrates the importance of the radiation-induced resistivity, ρ_r, in the stabilizer. You should realize, however, that we conclude that other property changes for the other magnet components are also very important and cannot be neglected. I would also like to emphasize the fact that our study predicts an optimum ρ_r that is several times larger than previous tokamak designs tolerated. In other words, we find that it is more economically favorable for tokamaks to tolerate a high ρ_r in the magnet stabilizer with proper modifications to the magnet design; this permits a thinner inner shield and a smaller size tokamak.
Since our results indicate that it is economically favorable to tolerate a higher radiation level in the superconducting coils, the need for better correlation between the radiation environment characteristics and radiation effects becomes even more important. This relates to your second question. This problem is important not only for the magnets but for all reactor components, particularly the first wall. Radiation damage scientists are aware of the need for accurate correlations between the radiation damage and the radiation level. Until such correlations are developed, the designer has to attempt a reasonable approach. We found that a correlation between the resistivity and neutron flux is inadequate because the neutron flux is generally a poor indication of the characteristics of a radiation environment that covers a wide energy range of approximately 0–15 MeV. Atomic displacements represent a better response function because they account, to some extent, for the energy dependence. The paper discusses this point in more detail.
Regarding your third comment, I hope that some of the audience are involved in accelerator work to benefit from your word of caution.

B. Brown: What does the 5×10^{10} rad dose level in the insulators mean in terms of magnet performance?

M. Abdou: What we found in this study is that if we account for all radiation effects in the superconducting toroidal field coils except those for the insulators, we arrive at an optimum tokamak design with a specific radiation level at the magnet. This radiation level corresponds to a dose of $\sim 2 \times 10^{10}$ rad in the organic insulators. This means that in order for the insulators not to be the limiting factor on the shield, magnet, and reactor design, they must function properly for the lifetime of the magnet (~ 30 yr). What is not clear at present is whether currently available organic insulators can withstand this dose level at low temperatures. A serious effort is needed in this area. This effort should also include an attempt to define an acceptable end of life criteria for the variety of insulators required in various types of magnets.

A. Braginski: 1) Since shielding appears necessary to protect the conductor anyhow (i.e. prevent $+ \Delta\rho$ of the stabilizer, insulation degradation etc.) will introduction of a hypothetical new *radiation* hard superconductor be significantly beneficial to the optimized design?
2) Since $p \sim B_t^4$ will the use of a new material (superconductor) capable of operating up to e.g. 20 T be desirable, and under what conditions?

M. Abdou: The answer to your first question is yes. With our present understanding of tokamaks we do not tolerate excessive shielding and we pay for accommodating moderate radiation effects in the magnet. The economic penalty for the degradation in the properties of the superconductor is, to a large extent, independent of the penalty paid for the resistivity increase in the stabilizer. Therefore, a more radiation resistant superconductor is beneficial. Your second question is an important one because the question of the highest desirable magnetic field strength for tokamaks is currently of great interest to tokamak researchers. The relation $p \sim B_t^4$ cannot be taken as the only criterion in determining the desirable field strength because tokamaks are complex systems that have many interrelations. We performed a study on this subject at ANL (ANL/FPP/TM-83, 1977). We assumed that (a) NbTi can be operated up to 9 T; and (b) for fields higher than 9 T, Nb_3Sn, which is a brittle superconductor, is used with a permissible strain that is one-half of that for NbTi. We found from this study that the high fields generated by Nb_3Sn actually increases the cost of energy for tokamaks. The dominant factor was the dramatic increase in the cost of the ohmic heating power supply resulting from the large increase in the toroidal-field coil thickness associated with higher fields generated by Nb_3Sn. It is conceivable, however, that magnetic fields >9 T can be attractive for tokamaks if they are generated with a set of conditions quite different from those that we employed in our study. Further work to examine this question can be useful but it seems to me that conditions relating to the toroidal-field thickness will be extremely important. Thus, a new high field superconductor can potentially be attractive if it has a high critical-current density and a high transition temperature and if lower resistivity stabilizer and higher yield strength structural material can be developed.

H. Weber: What kind of insulating materials do you consider in your design studies at present?

M. Abdou: Several years ago, mylar was employed for the early generation of tokamak designs. At present, epoxy-base insulators are considered because it is believed that they have better radiation resistance than mylar.

E. Kramer: You point out that the radiation damage in the insulator is likely to be the most important limiting para-meter, which agrees with the conclusion drawn by Ullmaier several years ago. Is there now any research going on to identify the fundamental radiation damage mechanisms in polymeric insulators at low temperatures?

M. Cohen: (paraphrased) We were not aware of this problem until about a year ago. Experimental work on gamma and thermal neutron irradiation at helium temperature is beginning at Oak Ridge National Lab.