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ABSTRACT

Recent fusion reactor designs show the need for data on the resistance of demountable joints in superconductors. An experiment was set up to measure this resistance at different pressures. The resistance is calculated from the measured decay time of the current in a superconductive loop. This method proved to be much better than the usual volt-ammeter method. Calibrated compression washers were used to provide the pressure. A resistance of $1.5 \times 10^{-9} \Omega \cdot \text{cm}^2$ was achieved with silverplated joints 24000 psi. Data are provided for other contact materials.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

A. Background

When Kamerlingh Onnes liquified helium in 1908 and discovered in 1911 the superconductive state of matter he was certainly far from the thought that his pioneer work in low temperature physics might eventually be instrumental in the achievement of the highest temperature on earth. Superconductivity is the property of material in some range of temperature, magnetic field, current density and pressure to loose all resistance. It is not our purpose to go in detail into the phenomenon. In Appendix A some books on the subject are listed together with a brief comment to guide the interested reader. In the next chapter a brief review will be given.

The most widely used material of this moment is NbTi on which some more information can be gathered from (1). Data about the critical current density, in function of temperature and external magnetic field can be found in (2).

Another material which has higher critical current density and can be used in higher fields is Nb₃Sn. The material, however, is brittle and special methods have to be used to make it into useable conductors (3,4).
B. Superconductivity and Joints

While the phenomenon is known for many years, it is only recently that technological applications of superconductivity have appeared. An excellent review article on superconductivity and its application has been written by B.B. Schwartz and S. Foner (5). They report on four main areas of applications: electrical motors and generators; superconducting magnets, including those for magnetohydrodynamic and fusion power generation; power transmission and magnetic levitation for high-speed ground transportation. Focusing more on the fusion power application of superconducting magnet is the article by P. Komareck (6).

When using superconductors for application, one has to be aware of two major limitations.

The first one is the range of parameters at which superconductivity occurs. We will only consider ourselves with atmospheric pressures; for tests at higher pressure we refer to (7). At zero field, the change from normal to superconductive state is abrupt and no problem arise in defining a critical temperature and current. In the presence of a magnetic field superconductors behave in two different patterns. (A third pattern, the surface superconductivity does not occur for superconductive material embedded in metal). Type I superconductors go in the general case from the superconductive to the normal state
through an intermediate state in which normal and superconductive regions are intermixed (Fig. 1a). The superconductive regions do not contain any magnetic flux (Meisner effect) while the normal regions do. When we increase the magnetic field the normal regions will grow and the superconductive regions shrink. This intermediate state will not occur and the Type I superconductor will go from the superconductive to the normal state abruptly in the case of a long thick cylinder with parallel magnetic field. For type II superconductors the transition occurs through a so called mixed state (even for a cylinder) where the normal regions form an array of narrow cylinders of material in the normal state surrounded by the remaining superconductive material (Fig. 1b).

In a higher magnetic field the thickness of those normal filaments will not increase but more filaments will be formed. Each normal filament can be seen as the center of a vortex of current. A conduction current through the superconductor will cause the vortex line to move due to the Lorentz force. This motion would cause an electric field, and accordingly the sample has become resistive. However, motion of those lines can be prevented by metallurgical defects which pin the vortex
Figure 1a Intermediate State of superconducting Material

Figure 1b Mixed State of superconducting Material
lines. The sample retains its zero resistance properties up through the critical field $H_c^2$ where the transition to total normal state occurs. The domain in which a material is superconductive can be concisely shown in a three dimensional plot. Figure 2 gives the critical characteristics of high field superconductors (taken from Ref. 5).

The transition to normal state can occur inadvertently, due to heat generation by friction, sudden motion of the vortices (flux jump), etc. This would lead to unacceptable catastrophic results in case of magnets with large stored energy. In order to avoid these problems the superconductors are stabilized by dividing the superconductors into fine filaments and embedding it in a matrix of highly conducting normal metal (copper or aluminum). Several approaches are pursued (8). In cryostatic stabilization a low resistance path is provided for the current in case some part of the superconductive material goes normal. The cooling is sufficient enough to remove the ohmic heating, to prevent the normal region to extend and the conductor will be brought back to the superconductive state. Cryostatically stabilized conductors are safe against instability due to flux jumping and to mechanical origins (friction). Other stabilization methods provide
Critical characteristics of high-field superconductors. The critical current density $J_c$ (on a log scale) is shown as a function of the critical upper magnetic field $H_{c2}$ and the temperature $T$ for three readily available superconductors. A plot of $H_{c2}$ versus $T$ is also shown for the ultrahigh-field compound PbMoO$_3$. (After J. R. Gavaler and S. Foner.) Figure 2
stability against flux jumping but not against mechanical instability. They rely on the fine subdivision of the superconductor and on the embedding in a metal. The high thermal conductivity of the metal prevents a local flux instability to grow by removing the heat fast enough (adiabatic stabilization). The high electrical conductivity magnetically damps the motion of the vortices so that more time is allowed for heat conduction (dynamic stabilization).

The solution of this problem brings about the second limitation. Due to technological factors in the manufacturing, the superconductor are available in limited length only. If longer lengths are required, one has to come up with an acceptable way of making joints. A good state of the art in joint design is given in (9). Depending on the specific applications, some required characteristics of joints will be more emphasized than others. The report lists 6 basic characteristics.

1. Compatibility with cryogenic environment,
2. Strength,
3. Electrical characteristics,
4. Ease of fabrication,
5. Ease of inspection,
6. Cross-section dimensions.
Depending on the types of conductors to be joined, and the required characteristics, different bonding techniques and joint designs will be used. Where very low resistance is important and increased cross section a minor disadvantage one tries to come as close as possible to superconductor-superconductor contact by cold pressing of twisted superconductor wire in a metal sleeve (10), sometimes after stripping them first from the stabilization material (11). Other methods are spot welding (12,13), or butt welding (14). In the case a continuous cross section is given the priority, a scarf joint will be the candidate joint design. As bonding techniques we list ultrasonic welding (15), explosive welding (16). Electron beam welding, laser welding, are more advanced methods. Various types of soft solder, with different joint designs (lap, lap with reinforcement, scarf joint) give good results and have the advantage of easy fabrication (17). There are, however, other cases where it is not limited length of the superconductor which brings about the need of making a joint. In those cases other characteristics than listed above will be required. A switch between the terminals of a superconducting coil is necessary to allow its use in the persistent mode. For small coils the switch is constructed of a superconductor
which can be in its normal state (during the charging of the coil) and in its superconductive state (for the persistent mode). For large coils the energy losses during the charging process would be too high so that an actual disconnect is desirable (18,19). Requirements for those kind of switch are low resistance, ease of opening and closing the switch, withstanding of a sufficient number of switching operation, reliability (19). When very low resistance, rather than a compact switch is the goal special multilam louvered bands are used with success (20). In between the permanent joint and the switch we have demountable joints. This area seems to be very little explored and is the main topic of our thesis.

C. Demountable Joints

There are some specific applications where semi permanent joints are the type of joint that would best be suited. The joint is essentially made to carry current and its ability to be demounted is primary for non-electrical reasons (unlike the switch where the main reason is an electrical one).

A typical application is the removing of the current leads that charged up a superconducting magnet. These current leads present a very high heat input due to the good thermal conductivity and the connection with the outside world. Although part of the problem was circumvented by
by special designs (vapor cooled leads, allowance of a low thermal gradient) the problem would be circumvented altogether if the leads could be removed. Steady state magnets for mirror fusion machines would very much benefit from such a development.

Another application appeared as the likelihood of modular design of toroidal machines became more evident. In this application it is mainly the removal of the mechanical link that the superconductor achieves between the different modules that is the sought after property of the demountable joint.

The demountable joint is a type that has its own requirements different from the permanent joint and the switch. For a permanent joint very often the space allowance is quite strict, the low resistance, however, can be achieved by increasing the contact area (scarf joint) and very intimate bonding between the two surfaces. For a switch the lesser bonding is compensated by more freedom on the space allowance. A demountable joint doesn't have the generous space allowance of the switch nor the very intimate bonding of the two surfaces. This is the dark side. But it is not all bad. As the joint doesn't have to be switched frequently and rapidly, more rugged mechanical devices can be used and higher pressures applied.
The mechanical strength doesn't have to be provided by the joint itself, as in the permanent joint, but can be supplied through the support that provides the pressure. In the next chapter, when discussing our results we will have to compare our results with data from soldered joints and switches.
CHAPTER 2
THE MEASUREMENT OF SMALL RESISTANCE

A. General

Every relationship containing $R$, the resistance is a potential basis for a method to measure the resistance. Three come easily to mind. The usual ohms law, $V=RI$, is the basis of several methods, which are used for a wide range of resistance measurements. The relation $P = RI^2$ could be another basis. Measuring the power dissipated could allow to measure the resistance for a known current. Induction methods is the general name for the third series of methods. For low resistance (we are speaking of the order of $10^{-8}$Ω), of course, great care has to be taken in applying those methods: Contact resistance can be of the order of $10^{-3}$Ω.

The first method[21] developed into:

1. The volt and ammeter methods, where the voltage drop across potential taps is measured for a known current through the samples. This is the most widely used method but gives often rise to problems (the voltage to be measured are of the μV range).

2. The potentiometer method; the low resistance is compared with a standard resistance of the same order magnitude. Those standard resistances, however, are only
available to 0.001Ω.

3. Several bridge methods are reported. The Kelvin Double Bridge is less suitable for low temperature work since the thick copper leads that are essential for its use provide a high terminal input (22).

The second method is rather theoretical than practical at these power levels. For 1000A and $10^{-8} \Omega$ the power boils off $4 \times 10^{-3}$ cm$^3$ liquid helium per second. This is a volume of approximately 2.5 cm$^3$/sec of helium gas at room temperature and pressure.

The third method, although in recent years succeeded by the volt and ammeter method, because of its convenience is actually the most suitable one for low resistance measurements. Induction methods have definite advantages. One very important advantage is that no large current carrying leads have to be brought down into the dewar. However, as Meaden (22) writes "electrodeless induction methods have not as yet proved very popular for purposes of resistance measurement. This is perhaps because they are essentially comparison methods and do not always give the resistance directly and simply. In some cases, also, the auxiliary equipment is rather elaborate, and possibly the procedure is considered laborious". For resistances lower than $10^{-10}$ this method is the only available one. Three distinct approaches are feasible of which two are mainly designed for bulk material resistivity measure-
ments.

The introduction of an electrical conductor into the field of an inductor modifies the resistive and inductive components of the inductance. From this the resistivity of the sample can be calculated (23).

The second approach is that of the rotating magnetic field (24). The conductivity of the specimen is determined from the magnitude of the torque on the specimen by the rotating magnetic field.

A method that can be used for bulk materials as well as for loops is the eddy current method for measuring the resistivity of metals. For bulk materials the method is described in (25). The method can also be used for loops. As this is the approach that was pursued a more detailed description is given in the next paragraph.

B. Persistent Current Decay Measurement

With this method the resistance can be easily calculated from the decay rate of a current in a loop and the knowledge of the inductance of that loop. Lenz's law states that

\[- \frac{d\phi}{dt} = RI + \frac{dI}{dt}\]

\[\phi = \int \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S}\]
R  resistance of the loop
I  current in the loop
L  inductance of the loop
ϕ  flux due to external magnetic fields
B  external magnetic field
t  time
dS  surface element. The integral is performed over any surface that has the loop as its boundary. The unit vector on the surface is chosen in accordance with the direction of current and the right hand rule.

Suppose the external magnetic field is kept zero, or a constant, and that the current at some initial time is \( I = I_0 \). Then the solution of the equation is given by \( I(t) = I_0 e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}} \) where \( \tau = \frac{L}{R} \) is called the time constant of the system. On semilog paper the equation is a line \( \ln I = \ln I_0 - \frac{t}{\tau} \) from which slope, the time constant \( \tau \) can be measured. The inductance \( L \) of the loop can be measured or calculated (we will go into more detail when describing the experiment). The resistance then follows easily from \( R = \frac{L}{\tau} \).

Onnes was the first one to use the method in 1914.

More recently the method was used by Iwasa (26). As men-
tioned before the method is used mainly for extremely low resistance measurements \((10^{-14} \Omega)\). For our experiment, preliminary calculations based on data on the resistance of soldered joints and switches made clear that for suitable choice of the surface area of the joint and the inductance of the loop, we could achieve very comfortable time constants in the range of 2 to 200 sec for range of two decades of resistance values in the expected range.

The measurement of the decay rate of the circuit can be done in several ways. A Hall probe can be used which measures the magnetic field of the current in the loop. Another way is using a Ragowski coil. Integrating the output of the coil gives at any time the current through the loop. When the time constant of the system is large drift of the integrator can become a problem. The current can be measured at time intervals by moving a search coil in the field of the loop and integrating the output from zero field to maximum field.

We used a fixed search coil; its voltage or integrated voltage, depending on the situation, was recorded. Let us clarify the behavior of the system. The numbers 1, 2, 3 in Figure 3 refer respectively to the external magnets, the superconductive loop and the search coil. We use as notation \(L_i\) for the self inductance of the coil \(i\) and \(M_{ij}\) for the mutual inductance between coil \(i\) and \(j\). With the
Figure 3. Schematic Representation of the Magnetic Circuit.
correct sign of the mutual inductances the circuit is governed by the following equations:

\[ V_1 - R_1 I_1 = L_1 \frac{dI_1}{dt} + M_{12} \frac{dI_2}{dt} + M_{13} \frac{dI_3}{dt} \]

\[ V_2 - R_2 I_2 = M_{12} \frac{dI_1}{dt} + L_2 \frac{dI_2}{dt} + M_{23} \frac{dI_3}{dt} \]

\[ V_3 - R_3 I_3 = M_{13} \frac{dI_1}{dt} + M_{23} \frac{dI_2}{dt} + L_3 \frac{dI_3}{dt} \]

Those equations can be simplified in the following way.
The search coil 3 is connected to a high impedance amplifier so that no current is flowing \( I_3 = 0 \). The loop 2 is closed so that there is no terminal voltage \( V_2 = 0 \). Let us further consider ourselves only with the last three equations

\[ m_{12} \frac{dI_1}{dt} + l_2 \frac{dI_2}{dt} + r_2 I_2 = 0 \]

\[ V_3 = m_{13} \frac{dI_1}{dt} + m_{23} \frac{dI_2}{dt} \]

We can distinguish between two periods. First when the change of current in the external coils creates a changing flux, thus inducing a current in the loop 2 and a voltage in the search coil 3. Second when there is no
change in external magnetic field and the current in \(L_2\) decays exponentially. We look at the first case. If we assume \(\frac{dI_1}{dt} = -C\)

\[
M_{12}C = L_2 \frac{dI_2}{dt} + R_2I_2
\]

Solution

\[
I_2(t) = \frac{M_{12}C}{R_2} \left(1 - e^{-t/\tau}\right) \text{ with } \tau = \frac{L_2}{R_2}
\]

Let \(t_0\) be time at which the current in the external solenoid 1 becomes and remains zero. This time was much lower than the time constant \(\tau\) (this is not true in case the current carrying velocity of the joint is exceeded. This was never the case). Thus \(I_2 = \frac{M_{12}C}{R_2} \left(\frac{t_0}{\tau}\right)\) with \(C = \frac{I_1(0)}{t_0}\) and \(\tau = \frac{L_2}{R}\), we have that \(I_2(t_0) = \frac{M_{12}}{L_2} I_1(0)\).

In the same approximation

\[
V_3 = \frac{I_1(0)}{t_0} \left[-M_{13} + \frac{M_{23}M_{12}}{L_2}\right]
\]

\[
\int_0^t V_3 \, dt = \frac{I_1(0)}{t_0} \left[-M_{13} + \frac{M_{23}M_{12}}{L_2}\right] t
\]

During the second period
\[ L_2 \frac{dI_2}{dt} + R_2 I_2 = 0 \]

\[ V_3 = M_{23} \frac{dI_2}{dt} \]

with \( I_2(t_0) = \frac{M_{12}}{L_2} I_1(0) \)

Solution:

\[ I_2 = I_2(t_0) e^{-(t-t_0)/\tau} \]

\[ V_3 = -M_{23} \frac{R_2}{L_2} I_2(t_0) e^{-(t-t_0)/\tau} \]

\[ \int_{t_0}^{t} V_3 \, dt = -M_{13} I_1(0) + M_{23} I_2(t_0) e^{-(t-t_0)/\tau} \]

Figure 4 gives an idea of those solutions, with \( t_0 \) much exaggerated compared to \( \tau \). Recording the voltage from the search coil gives us immediately the time constant of the system. The current that was induced in the loop can be calculated from

\[ I_2(t_0) = \frac{1}{M_{23}} \left[ \int_{t_0}^{\infty} V_3 \, dt \right] \]

This is the correct result, even without the made approximation. Now that the theoretical basis is laid we can be more specific about the experiment itself.
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CHAPTER 3
THE EXPERIMENT

A. The Experimental Set Up

From the theory in the previous chapter it is clear that there are three main parts, the external magnet, the sample holder, and the search coil. These will be discussed separately after the reader has been familiarized with the complete set up.

Figure 5 gives an overall view of the experiment. The scale is 1/10. The two external solenoids, connected in series, encircle the bottom of the dewar. The sample holder is suspended in the dewar by a 1/2" stainless steel rod. Two more stainless steel rods are used to provide a passage through the insulation material for the wires and for the dip stick (stick used to measure the liquid helium level). The search coil itself, not visible in Figure 5 is located inside the sample holder; this will become clearer after the explanation of the holder. The dewar was supported by a wooden frame.

The two external magnets are commercially available solenoids (Alpha Scientific Laboratories, Inc., Model Solenoid Coils, Serial No. 732/3340-1 and no. 732/3340-2). Internal Diameter 6 inches, External Diameter 14 inches, thickness 2 1/4 inches. Both magnets were cooled with water (in series), the lower one was supported by an aluminum
cylinder, while the upper one rested on a wooden support which at the same time provided the spacing between the two magnets.

Figure 6 clarifies the design of the sample holder. The superconductive loop is supported by a thin walled cylinder of phenolic. Grooves in this cylinder secure the ribbon. The tube is partly cut out in order to support a 3/8" thick, flat stainless steel plate, again with grooves. A second plate can be bolted to the first one with two 1/2" bolts. The ribbon is led around the cylinder in the grooves. The joint is made by overlapping the two ends of the loop and clamping them between the two stainless steel plates. Two type of joints can be made. Figure 7 explains schematically the location of the grooves for the two types of joints.

The pressure applied on the joint can be adjusted by using one or more calibrated stainless steel compression washers. Solon stainless steel compression washers 8-M-89301 were used for this purpose.

Inner Diameter: 33/64"
Outer Diameter: 1 - 3/16"
Material Thickness: 0.089"
Deflection (flat): 0.023"
Load (flat): 2600 lb.
Type 301 stainless steel.
Figure 7. Two types of joint.
( superconductor shaded, top plate removed )
The stainless steel rod which supports the sample holder and the search coil is soldered to the brass piece at the top of the holder. The fitting in the brass piece at the bottom is a free fitting. This way it was possible to work on the sample holder alone, whenever needed (for example to put in a new sample, or to change the pressure). By unscrewing the four screws that attach the upper brass support to the plastic tube and sliding the stainless steel tube out of the lower brass holder, we can completely separate the sample holder from the rest. The upper brass support, as well as the search coil remain attached to the tube. More room is now available inside the tube to bolt and unbolt the nuts and the delicate search coil can remain in a safe place.

Figure 8 is a more detailed view of the search coil. The search coil was made of 45000 turns of #40 wire. Diameter 3.145 mills at 20°C. Resistance at 20°C 1.049.0Ώ per 1000 ft. Weight 0.02993 lb. per 1000 ft. The wires connecting the search coil to the amplifiers were a twisted pair of #24 wire. The total resistance was measured to be 19kΏ of room temperature.

B. The Measurements

1. Magnetic Field

First the field produced by the magnets was measured. Ten amperes d.c. was put through the coils (in series). A
Figure 8. Search Coil.
Scale 1/1
Hall probe was used to measure the field, the Hall probe was connected to a gaussmeter with digital read out. To locate the probe precisely in the Dewar (horizontally as well as vertically) we put it in a stainless steel tube which was held in position inside the Dewar by means of two quard rings, one at the top, in which the tube could slide, and one at the bottom, attached to the tube, sliding in the Dewar. Figure 9 gives the result on axis, the distance is measured from the inner bottom of the Dewar. At the left the location of the coils is indicated schematically.

2. Calibration of the Inductances

2.1 Self-Inductance of the Loop

Let us first consider some data about the loop. The ribbon was made by magnetic corporation of America

size .394"x.035"
W.O. No. M14-19
Billet No. 460
Cu-Superconductor Ratio 2.6/1
# Filaments 132
Twist 1.2 turns per inch
No insulation.

A typical cross section can be seen in Picture 1. Picture 2 shows an S.E.M. photograph of the surface, magnification 5000.
Figure 9. On Axis Magnetic Field.
Picture 1. Cross Section of the Superconductor.

Picture 2. Copper Surface. (5000X)
The white band at the bottom is 10\(\mu\)m long. Pictures 3 and 4 show in more detail the cross section (those two pictures were made from the ends of sample #12). The magnification is 50X.

The reader will remember that the loop was D-shaped (flattened where the joint was clamped between the plates). An exact calculation of the inductance would be much too complicated. Calculations were made in several idealized cases.

One filament can be approximated by a wire of elliptical cross section, with \(2a = 0.0325\) cm and \(2b = 7.5\times10^{-3}\) cm. The inductance of one filament is, for a circular loop with as radius the radius of the circular part of the real loop, \(4.9\times10^{-7}\)H. If all the filaments were perfectly coupled the inductance for the 132 filaments would also be \(4.9\times10^{-7}\)H.

The inductance for a circular loop, with a rectangular cross section, and distributed current is \(1.0\times10^{-7}\)H.

The inductance was finally measured with a Wayne Kerr Bridge. (Universal Bridge type B 221A Serial No. 1814). The design of the bridge is based on the transformer ratio arm principle. A full explanation of the theory of operation is given in Wayne Kerr Monograph No. 1, "The transformer Ratio-Arm Bridge" available on request from the Wayne Kerr Laboratories Limited, Chessington Surrey, England. The normal range of the transformer bridge ex-
Picture 3. Middle part of Cross Section (50X)

Picture 4. End part of Cross Section (50X)
tends down to \( L = 0.9 \text{mH} \). A low impedance adaptor, however enables us to measure inductances as low as \( 1 \times 10^{-8} \text{H} \).

For certain choice of settings on the bridge and on the adapter different ranges can be selected. The measurements were made at \( \omega = 10^4 \text{ cycles/sec} \). The skin depth at this frequency is \( \delta = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\omega \mu \sigma}} = 1.5 \text{mm} \). Recall that the ribbon is \( 10 \text{mm} \times 0.9 \text{mm} \). At this frequency the distribution of the current will be close to the current distribution in the superconducting state. We first measured a calibrated inductance of \( 15 \times 10^{-7} \text{H} \) to check the procedure, then the inductance of the loop was measured, the leads were as short as possible (2 cm) and twisted.

The range \( 0 - 1 \mu \text{H} \) (bridge on range 5, C on 0.1 and adaptor on range 1) was used with the first division at \( 0.02 \mu \text{H} \). The measured inductance was \( 2.0 \times 10^{-7} \text{H} \). The bridge could be equilibrated within \( 0.1 \times 10^{-7} \text{H} \). Then, with similar leads the inductance of a piece of wire 3cm long, \( \phi 1.5 \text{mm} \) was measured and was within the measurement error. The contributor of the leads can thus be neglected. For the calculation of the resistance the measured value of \( L = 2.0 \times 10^{-7} \text{H} \) was used.

2.2 The Mutual Inductances

From the end of the second chapter it is clear that \( M_{23} \) has to be known, in order to be able to calculate the induced current from the formula
\[ I_2(t_0) = \frac{1}{M_{23}} \left[ - \int_{t_0}^{\infty} V_2 dt \right]. \]

The mutual inductance \( M_{23} \) between the loop and the search coil is completely fixed by the geometry of the sample holder with the search coil, and independent of its position relative to the external magnets. \( M_{23} \) is thus really invariant. The mutual inductances \( M_{13} \) and \( M_{12} \) depend on the position of the sample holder relative to the external magnets. The sample was very precisely located for the calibration at the maximum of the magnetic field.

\( M_{13} \) was measured to check the design of the search coil and \( M_{12} \) can be used to have an idea of the maximum current that can be induced with the formula \( I_2(t_0) = \frac{M_{12}}{L_2} I_1(0) \).

In order to measure \( M_{23} \) a dummy sample was made. Rather than making a joint in the loop, the two ends where insulated from each other, leads were connected and brought up outside the Dewar. We put 1A through the loop, interrupted the current and integrated the voltage from the search coil.

\[ V_3 - R_3 I_3 = M_{13} \frac{dI_1}{dt} + M_{23} \frac{dI_2}{dt} + L_3 \frac{dI_3}{dt} \]

\[ - \int V_3 dt = M_{23} \times 1A. \]

The voltage was integrated with a voltage to frequency con-
verter and a counter with digital display.

To measure $M_{12}$ the same dummy sample was used. However, now the current was put through the external magnets, interrupted, and the voltage induced in the loop was integrated

$$V_2 - R_2 I_2 = M_{12} \frac{dI_1}{dt} + L_2 \frac{dI_2}{dt} + M_{23} \frac{dI_3}{dt}$$

$$- \int V_2 \, dt = M_{12} \times 1 \text{A}.$$

The measure $M_{13}$ no sample was inserted and a 1A current through the external coil was interrupted. The voltage from the search coil was integrated

$$V_3 - R_3 I_3 = M_{13} \frac{dI_1}{dt} + M_{23} \frac{dI_2}{dt} + L_3 \frac{dI_3}{dt}$$

$$- \int V_3 \, dt = M_{13} \times 1 \text{A}.$$

This method gives the correct inductances independent of any additional closed loop (like the Dewar for example). Indeed the current in such a loop is zero before the change of the magnetic field, and dies out for $t \to \infty$ so that any additional term $M_{ij} \frac{dI_j}{dt}$ will not contribute after integration. A Hall probe was located in the plane of the sample so that the sample holder could be lowered exactly
to the point of maximum filed of the external coils.

We obtained

\[ M_{12} = 4.0 \pm 0.5 \times 10^{-5} \text{H} \]
\[ M_{23} = 6.0 \pm 0.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{H} \]
\[ M_{13} = 0.15 \pm 0.02 \text{H}. \]

That \( M_{12} \) agrees with the calculation can quickly be verified. The field on axis for 10A through the coil 1 is maximum 340G = 0.034T. The area of the loop is approximately 100cm\(^2\) = 0.01m\(^2\). Using \( \phi_{12} = M_{12} I_1 = \iint_{\text{surface 2}} B_1 \cdot dS_2 \),
yields for the mutual inductance \( M_{12} = \frac{1}{I_1} x B_1 x S_2 \)
or \( M_{12} = \frac{1}{10} x 0.034 x 0.01 = 3.4 \times 10^{-5} \text{H} \). The difference being due, of course, to the fact that the field on axis is smaller than in the rest of the plane.

\( M_{13} \) can also be calculated. An average area is 10cm\(^2\) and we have 45000 turns. Thus \( M_{13} = \frac{1}{10} x 0.034 x 10 \times 10^{-4} x 45000 = 0.153 \text{H} \). A way to check \( M_{23} \) is using

\[ V_3 = -M_{23} \left( \frac{1}{t} \right) I_2(t_o) e^{-\left( t-t_o \right)/\tau} \]

At \( t=t_o \)
\[ V_3 = -M_{23} \frac{1}{t} I_2(t_o) \]

where \( I_2(t_o) \) can be estimated from

\[ I_2(t_o) = \frac{M_{12}}{L_2} I_1(0). \]
Take, for example, Figure 10, which is the recorded voltage of the search coil for a typical data point

\[ V_3 = -2.7 \times 10^{-3} \text{V} \]

\[ t = 200 \text{ sec.} \]

The calculated value of \( I_2(t_0) = 1000 \text{A} \). So that we can calculate \( V_3 \)

\[ V_3 = -\frac{6.0 \times 10^{-4}}{200} \times 1000 = -3.0 \times 10^{-3} \text{V}. \]

The agreement of the calculated value with the measured is a check for \( M_{23} \).

3. Behavior of the Ribbon Under Pressure

In order to check the behavior of the ribbon under different pressures, two samples of ribbon approximately 5cm long, were laid one above the other at an angle of 90° and pressed together. The contact area is then 1 cm².

The following table gives an overview of our findings. Note that the yield strength (0.2% Y.S.) of NbTi is approximately 68000 psi (1) and the yield strength of copper is in the range 10000 to 26000 psi. The pressure was applied and removed immediately. One sample was subjected to the pressure of 19400 psi for 2 hours and did not show any dif-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applied Force (kg)</th>
<th>Pressure (psi)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12000</td>
<td>77500</td>
<td>Thickness reduced, large lateral flow of the copper. Definite impression marks. The superconductors gives a pattern at the contact surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000</td>
<td>58000</td>
<td>Light pattern at the contact surface, light lateral flow of the copper, marks on the copper by the pressure plates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>38700</td>
<td>Pattern only at the sides of the contact surface, light lateral flow, marks on outer surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>32300</td>
<td>Same pattern, no lateral flow, marks on outer surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>25800</td>
<td>idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>19400</td>
<td>idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>16000</td>
<td>idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>12900</td>
<td>No more pattern at contact surface only slight marks on the outer surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>9700</td>
<td>Slighter marks on the outer surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>No marks on the outer surface.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ference with the sample where the pressure was removed immediately.

4. Measurements of the Resistance

4.1 Soldered Joint

Our first sample was a soldered joint to check the proper operation of the whole system. The voltage from the search coil was amplified and recorded on a x.y recorder with the time in the x direction and the amplified voltage in the y direction. The charts were numbered in sequence, the scales were written down, as well as the current in the external coils. Figure 10 is not from the soldered joint (it is from sample No. 4), but is representative for those cases in which the voltage was recorded. In (a) we located the pen, and in (b) we traced the zero line. The voltage oscillations in (c) are due to the fact that the current, although regulated, still has some ripple. In (d) the current in the outer coil was interrupted, giving at first a very high voltage (out of scale), afterwards the current decays exponentially until (e), where current was put through a wire wrapped around the superconductor. This drives the superconductor normal. A very rapid \( \frac{dT}{dt} \) gives us an out-of-scale voltage and in (f) \( \frac{dT}{dt} = 0 \). The current decayed completely to zero. May we suggest the reader compares this with the graphs at the end of Chapter 2 (Figure 4b) keeping in mind that in
Chapter 2 the time $t_0$ was grossly exaggerated compared to $t$.

The heater was put off. The current through the outer coils restored (at the same or a different value). The heater is activated again to damp out the current induced; the procedure can be started over again.

The way the joint was made was by cleaning the surfaces with a nylon sponge, fluxing and tinning them separately. We then pressed them together and heated them. A regular soldering iron was used. Solder was of the 50/50 type. The contact area was $3.6 \text{mm}^2$. Microscopic inspection of the joint afterwards revealed some air bubbles, and an uneven thickness of the solder layer (between 40$\mu$m and 10$\mu$m). We refer to the pictures 5,6,7,8. Picture 5 shows a cross section of the soldered joint under a 40x magnification. So does Picture 6. The darker areas are the filaments of NbTi. One can see an airbubble at the joint surface in Picture 6. Picture 7 shows the solder near the air bubble under a 200x magnification. The thickness of the solderlayer is smaller at some places (Picture 8, same magnification 200x). The measured resistance were in the range $1.5 \times 10^{-9} \Omega$ to $2.6 \times 10^{-10} \Omega$ so that we had time constants from 120 to 750 sec. The induced current was not measured. At those time constants the drift of
the integrator would become a problem. Figure 11 summarizes the results.

4.2 Silver Plated Joint

A first sample (#2) was made in the following way. The copper surface was first rubbed with a nylon sponge until it was shiny. It was then put for 10 min. in a mixture of nitric and sulfuric acid (brite dip #2); it was rinsed with water and dried with acetone. A silver electrode was used to electroplate it. The electrode was covered with cloth, and this cloth was moistened with an electrolyte. The plating was done by rubbing the electrode several times gently over the surface that would provide the joint. The sample was rinsed and dried with a piece of cotton wool. The joint was clamped between the stainless steel plates, three shims of 0.016" each were used to diminish the depth of the grooves. One compression washer was used for each of the two bolts. The voltage was measured and time constants in the range 375 sec to 401 sec obtained for resistances of $5.3 \times 10^{-10} \Omega$ to $5.0 \times 10^{-10} \Omega$. The contact area was measured when the sample was taken out. The contact area can easily be distinguished from the rest by its shiny look. We measured $1.4 \text{cm}^2$. In this case the joint stuck together but could easily be loosened with a screwdriver. Figure 12 summarizes the results for the
surface resistivity.

The same sample was left in the open air for one day, rebolted and new measurements were made (#3). Higher resistances were obtained. Figure 13 summarizes the results.

In order to check the reproducibility of the results, a new silver plated sample was made. In making the joint the same procedure was used except that the sample was silverplated in an electrolytic bath. The thickness of the plating was smaller. The thickness was actually so small that the color of the copper underneath the silver gave a slight tint to the plated surface. More will be said later about the difference in plating method. The voltage was amplified and recorded.

This time measurements were also made were the voltage was integrated and recorded. A regular operational amplifier with a capacitor in the feed-back loop was used as integrator. Figure 14 is a typical recording of an integrated voltage (although it is from another sample).

We again suggest the reader to compare this with the sketches at the end of the second chapter, (Figure 4d). In (a) the drift of the amplifier was adjusted if needed. The current in the external coils is interrupted in 0 giving a sudden drop (b). The current in the loop decays exponentially until (c) where the heater was put on. This drives
Figure 13. Silverplated Joint #3, surface resistance.
the superconductor normal and the current goes rapidly to zero. We continue to record the integrated voltage at the end in order to check again the drift of the amplifier. \( I_2(t_0) \) can be calculated easily from the integrated voltage. Remember that:

\[
I_2(t_0) = \frac{1}{M_{23}} \left[ - \int_{t_0}^{\infty} V_3 \, dt \right]
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{M_{23}} \left[ \int_{0}^{t_0} V_3 \, dt - \int_{0}^{\infty} V_3 \, dt \right]
\]

We can plot \( I_2(t_0) \) as a function of \( I_1 \). The relation should be linear as long as the current carrying capacity of the joint is not exceeded. We can also compare this to

\[
I_2(t_0) = \frac{M_{12}}{L_2} I_1(0)
\]

where we had \( M_{12} = 4.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{H} \) (±0.5x10\(^{-5}\))

\[
L_2 = 2.0 \times 10^{-7} \text{H} \) (±0.1x10\(^{-7}\))
\]

so that \( \frac{M_{12}}{L_2} = 200 \pm 35 \). From Figure 5 we obtain \( I_2 = 145 I_1 \). If we take into account the uncertainty on \( M_{23} \), which comes through in the calculation of \( I_2 \) we obtain \( I_2 = (145 \pm 12) I_1 \). There is a difference which does not fall within the uncertainties of the measurements. This difference can be due to several factors. \( M_{12} \) too high, \( L_2 \)
too low, $M_{23}$ too high. Remember that $M_{12}$ as well as $M_{13}$ depends on the location of the sample holder in the magnetic field, while $M_{23}$ only depends on the fixed geometry of the sample holder. From the integrated voltage $M_{13}$ can be calculated using $M_{13} = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\infty V_3 \, dt$. Lower values (0.12 - 0.13H) than the previous measurements (0.15H) might mean that the location of the sample holder was not exactly the same as when the inductances were calibrated. This would also mean a lower $M_{12}$ which could account for the difference. If we assume (worst case) that the total difference is due to an $L_2$ which would be larger in the superconductive state than what we measured in the normal state then it would mean that $L_2 = 2.75 \times 10^{-7}$H rather than the measured $L_2 = 2 \times 10^{-7}$H. The impact on this for the resistance calculating would be an increase of 37.5%. The surface resistivity are summarized on Figure 16.

4.3 Copper Joint

We also investigated a regular copper to copper joint in order to check whether a copper to copper contact could achieve the same low resistance as the silverplated contact. The surface was prepared in the following way.
- cleaned with a nylon sponge,
- cleaned with acetone to remove any oil
  staining.
- put in brite dip #2 for 20 min.
- cleaned with nylon sponge and water,
- dried with aceton,
- it was then put in a tank with boiling
  freon. The vapors condensed on the
  surface and removed the thin residue acetone
  leaves.

Four 0.016" shims were used and the joint clamped together
with one washer for each bolt. Figure 18 gives the results
for the surface resistance. The area was 1.43cm². The
_calculated I₂ as a function and I₁ appears on Figure 17.
We obtain I₂ = 145 I₁ which agrees with what we found for
the silverplated joint.

The sample was left overnight in the Dewar with the
two surfaces still in contact. We were led to the conclu-
sion that oxygen had condensed in the Dewar and formed CuO₂ on
the contact surfaces on the basis of two observations:

i) the sample holder was stuck in the Dewar,

ii) when this problem was solved and the measure-
  ments resumed, much higher resistances were
  obtained.
Measurements were made with 2 compression washers (#6), 1 compression washer (#7), 2 compression washers again to see if the bolting and unbolting had any effect on the measurements (#8) and 3 compression washers (#9). The sample was left overnight in helium and some measurements were done again (#10) yielding the same results. The results are summarized in Figure 19 and Figure 20.

In order to see whether the data for a clean surface could be reproduced, new measurements were made. The surface was again rubbed with the nylon sponge, put in brite dip for 15 sec, rinsed with water, dried with acetone and cleaned with freon vapor. The data are summarized on Figure 17 and Figure 18 for comparison (#11). To see whether unbolting and rebolting the sample had any influence on the measurements, new measurements were made after the sample had been taken out, unbolted, rebolted, and put back again (#12). Figures 17, 18.

Measurements were also made for a sample where a piece of copper (38/1000 thick) was inserted between the two surfaces to be jointed. We obtained $R = 1.5 \times 10^{-8}$ N. It was not possible to relate this quantitatively to the previous measurements because when we unbolted the sample it was noticed that when the joint was made the copper piece had moved slightly so that the geometry was too complicated to make calculations. Compared with the normal joint, we
Figure 20. Oxidised Copper Joint, Surface Resistance.
have two additional resistances. First one more contact resistance, second the resistance in the additional copper piece. The results are compatible with the assumption that for a normal joint the resistance is due for the major part to the contact resistance.

4.4 Summary of the Results

We give briefly an overview of the different samples.

#1 Soldered (50/50 solder).

#2 Silverplated.
The surface was first cleaned with a nylon sponge, put in brite dip, rinsed with water and dried with acetone. Silverplated by hand, rinsed and dried. This sample was so clean that when we unbolted the joint it was still sticking together.

#3 Same sample, allowed to oxidize in the air for 1 day.

#4 Silverplated, same procedure as for sample #2 except that the silverplating was done in an electrolytic bath.

#5 Clean copper to copper surfaces.
Cleaned with a nylon sponge, brite dip, water and acetone, freon vapors were used to remove the film left by the acetone.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>Surface Condition</th>
<th>Area of Joint</th>
<th>Time Constant</th>
<th>Resistance</th>
<th>Current Density</th>
<th>Pressure</th>
<th>Contact Resistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sq. cm^2</td>
<td>sec</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>A/cm^2</td>
<td>psi</td>
<td>Ω cm^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Soldered joint</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.5x10^-9</td>
<td>850+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.2x10^-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Silver plated</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>5.1x10^-10</td>
<td>2000+</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>7.1x10^-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Silver plated oxidized</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.1x10^-9</td>
<td>2000+</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>1.5x10^-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>Silver plated</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.0x10^-9</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>1.5x10^-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>Copper freshly cleaned</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.5x10^-9</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>6.5x10^-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>Copper oxidized</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>9.8x10^-8</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>47000</td>
<td>1.4x10^-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>Copper oxidized</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.6x10^-8</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>5.0x10^-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>Copper oxidized</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>1.0x10^-8</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>47000</td>
<td>1.4x10^-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>Copper oxidized</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>7.9x10^-9</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>70000</td>
<td>1.1x10^-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>Copper oxidized</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>8.0x10^-9</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>70000</td>
<td>1.1x10^-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#11</th>
<th>Copper freshly cleaned</th>
<th>0.22</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>4.0x10^{-9}</th>
<th>1500</th>
<th>24000</th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>5.6x10^{-9}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>Copper clean</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.7x10^{-9}</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>5.2x10^{-9}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>Copper sandwich</td>
<td>2x0.15</td>
<td>2x1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.5x10^{-9}</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Nd measured. Estimated from $I = \frac{M_{12}}{L_2}$ $I_1$

* This is not a maximum current density but the maximum current density at which the measurements were made.

+ Dependent on current
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

1. Discussion

1.1 Soldered Joint

As reported previously an extensive library search did not provide much data. Data for soldered joints are reported in (9), (17).

Both used the volt-ammeter method. In the report (9) recorder traces of voltage in function of current are reproduced. The voltage traces are erratic and a relatively wide spread in data for current sweeps at identical conditions are reported. A special modificatin of the sample (saw-cut) to give a higher joint resistance and an easier to measure voltage drop did not yield the desired results. All this is in sharp opposition with our experiment. In our case the data could be easily measured, once the experiment was set up and we would tend to conclude that it is worthwhile to use this more elaborate method for future measurements of the resistivity of soldered joints.

Let us compare the results. Reference (9) obtained that for 50/50 solder at zero field the surface resistivity is of the order of \(1 \times 10^{-8}\) to \(2 \times 10^{-8}\) \(\Omega\) cm\(^2\). They have a solder thickness (b) of 100\(\mu\)m and a copper path length (a) of two times 150\(\mu\)m. At 16kG and 4.2k they calculate the
joint surface resistivity with

\[ \rho_{cu} \text{ (copper bulk resistivity OHFC, } R/R = 150) = 1.7 \times 10^{-7} \Omega \text{cm} \]

\[ \rho_{so} \text{ (solder bulk resistivity 50/50 solder)} = 2.2 \times 10^{-6} \Omega \text{cm} \]

\[ \rho_s = 2\rho_{cu} a + \rho_{so} b \]

\[ = 2 \times 1.7 \times 10^{-8} \times 0.015 + 2.2 \times 10^{-6} \times 0.010 \]

\[ = 0.051 \times 10^{-8} + 2.20 \times 10^{-8} \]

\[ = 2.251 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \text{cm}^2 \]

Doing the same calculation, in our case with

\[ a = 100 \mu \text{m} = 0.01 \text{ cm} \]

\[ b = \frac{40 \mu \text{m} + 10 \mu \text{m}}{2} = 25 \mu \text{m} = 0.0025 \text{ cm} \]

\[ \text{(we take an average solder thickness)} \]

\[ \rho_s = 2 \times 1.7 \times 10^{-8} \times 0.01 + 2.2 \times 10^{-6} \times 0.0025 \]

\[ = 0.34 \times 10^{-9} + 5.5 \times 10^{-9} \]

\[ = 5.8 \times 10^{-9} \Omega \text{cm}^2 \]

Although the 50/50 solder is superconducting at zero field and 4.2k, the surface resistivity of a soldered joint drops by a factor of only 2 to 3 going from 8T to 0T (27).

Our measured values 1\times10^{-9} \Omega \text{cm}^2 to 5.5\times10^{-9} \Omega \text{cm}^2 are consistent with this calculation. A new and interesting result is the dependence of the resistance on the induced current.
Reference (17) gives a surface resistivity of $1.06 \times 10^{-8}$ \(\Omega \text{cm}^2\) for 50/50 solder of \(T = 4.2k, B = 7\) Tesla. As the joint resistance component due to the solder is the most important part and no solder thickness was given it is difficult to compare this with our data. However, assuming that the same solder thickness was achieved and again taking into account the decrease of the surface resistivity with decreasing magnetic field, we conclude that our data agree with previously published results.

1.2 Silverplated Joint

Let us summarize briefly the results from the literature

D. Hay (28) obtained a surface resistivity of $2 \times 10^{-10} \Omega \text{cm}^2$, for a current density of 1000A/cm$^2$ at a pressure of 3000 psi.

J. Zär (18) made measurements for three silver plated samples obtaining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ρ_s at 1000 psi (\Omega \text{cm}^2)</th>
<th>at 4000 psi (\Omega \text{cm}^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>$1.05 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$8.8 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>$1.2 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>$4.5 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>$8.7 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>$7.0 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leaving #1 untouched for three weeks yielded

\[ \begin{align*}
#1 & \quad 3.3 \times 10^{-7} & \quad 5.9 \times 10^{-8} \\
\end{align*} \]

The decrease of the logarithm of the surface resistivity with pressure was linear for the clean samples and more rapid for the oxidized sample.

We obtained at 24000 psi

\[ \begin{align*}
#2 & \quad 7.1 \times 10^{-10} \Omega \text{cm}^2 \\
#3 & \quad 1.5 \times 10^{-9} \Omega \text{cm}^2 \\
#4 & \quad 1.5 \times 10^{-9} \Omega \text{cm}^2 \\
\end{align*} \]

The value of \(1.5 \times 10^{-9} \Omega \text{cm}^2\) is consistent with a logarithmic extrapolation of the data Zar obtained in the range 1000 to 4000 psi. Additional measurements in the intermediate pressure range would be necessary to support or invalidate the assumption that the surface resistance for a clean silverplated conductor is of the order of \(1.1 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \text{cm}^2 \times 10^{-0.035 \frac{P}{1000 \text{psi}}}\). This yields \(1.0 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \text{cm}^2\) at 1000 psi, \(8.0 \times 10^{-9} \Omega \text{cm}^2\) at 4000 psi, and \(1.7 \times 10^{-9} \Omega \text{cm}^2\) at 24000 psi.

Several S.E.M. pictures were made in order to further investigate the nature of the silverplating. Picture 9 shows an unpressed portion of the hand plated surface. The magnification is 5000 (the white bar below is 10\( \mu \)m long) and the surface is tilted at a 15° angle. Comparison of
this picture to picture 2 (copper surface) makes clear that the silverplating provides a rough regular surface. The roughness is slightly higher for the handplated surface (Picture 9) than for the surface that was plated in a bath (Picture 11). This seems to hold also for the parts of the surface that were pressed (Picture 10, Picture 12). Notice the effect on the surface roughness of pressing the surfaces together (compare Picture 9 and 10 for the handplated sample and Picture 11 and 12 for the sample plated in a bath). Picture 13 shows the pressed surface of Sample 4 (bath plated) at a lower magnification. We want to point out the uneven distribution of the pressure.

Pictures were also made of cross sections in order to measure the thickness of the silverlayer (Picture 14, 15, magnification 20,000). However, no definite boundary between copper and silver could be designated. It seems that some alloying has taken place. Further investigations with microprobe are being done. One feature can be pointed out. The depth of the cracks is for the handplated sample (Picture 14) larger than for the other (Picture 15) which agrees with the higher original roughness. The high roughness of the handplated joint can be the reason its sticking together (sample #2) due to mechanical interlocking of the surfaces. A higher resulting contact area would then account for the lower resistance.
Picture 9. Silverplated surface, unpressed, sample #2 (5000X).

Picture 10. Silverplated surface, pressed, sample #2 (5000X).
Picture 11. Silver plated surface, unpressed, sample #4

Picture 12. Silver plated surface, pressed, sample #4
Picture 13. Silverplated surface, pressed, sample #4 (1000x).
1.3 Copper to Copper Contact

Zar (18) obtained the following results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\rho_s \Omega \text{cm}^2$</th>
<th>$\rho_s \Omega \text{cm}^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at 1000 psi</td>
<td>at 3000 psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper, freshly cleaned</td>
<td>$9.5 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>$6.3 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper, cleaned</td>
<td>$6.1 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>$2.7 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R. Holm and W. Meissner (29) in their very interesting article from 1932, in which they also prove that bare superconductor -- superconductor contacts have zero resistance, obtained the values $2.5 \times 10^{-9} \Omega \text{cm}^2$ at 57000 psi for very clean copper surfaces (they also observed the fact that the surfaces were sticking together), $1.2 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \text{cm}^2$ at 57000 psi for a surface that did not stick together. Note that the values of the resistance are always at a pressure equal to the yield strength of the material. This is a consequence of their method, and the quoted results are always the surface resistivity between two surfaces of bulk material.

Our values are
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>$\Omega cm^2$ at 24000 psi</th>
<th>$\Omega cm^2$ at 47000 psi</th>
<th>$\Omega cm^2$ at 7000 psi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copper fully cleaned</td>
<td>6.5x10^{-9}</td>
<td>5.6x10^{-9}</td>
<td>5.2x10^{-9}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper oxidized (1 day)</td>
<td>5 x 10^{-8}</td>
<td>1.4x10^{-8}</td>
<td>1.1x10^{-8}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our values seem to be significantly lower than those obtained by Zar and more in accordance with what R. Holm and W. Meissner obtained. It is, however, clear from our data and those of Zar that the oxide layer has an enormous influence on the surface resistance. Comparing the data points for sample 5, 11, 12 on Figure 18 also show that the scattering of the data points is reduced after the joint has been subjected to very high pressure.

### 1.4 Other Contact Materials

Zar (18) also reports results for materials we did not test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>$\rho_s (\Omega \cdot cm)^2$ at 1000 psi</th>
<th>$\rho_s (\Omega \cdot cm)^2$ at 4000 psi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tin on copper clean</td>
<td>2.0x10^{-6}</td>
<td>1.5x10^{-6}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold plate on copper</td>
<td>1.4x10^{-7}</td>
<td>5.7x10^{-8}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold plate, untouched</td>
<td>1.06x10^{-6}</td>
<td>4.3x10^{-7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indium on copper</td>
<td>2.0x10^{-7}</td>
<td>1.0x10^{-7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver and gold</td>
<td>2.8x10^{-7}</td>
<td>1.3x10^{-7}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Holm and Meisner (29) report for

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Au-Au} & \ (3.7-10.6) \times 10^{-9} \ \Omega \text{cm}^2 \quad \text{at 38000 psi} \\
\text{Sn-Sn} & \ (7.8-35) \times 10^{-9} \ \Omega \text{cm}^2 \quad \text{at 78000 psi} \\
\text{Pt-Pt} & \ 0.3 \times 10^{-9} \ \text{cm}^2 \quad \text{at 380000 psi}
\end{align*}
\]

*This Pt had been very carefully outgassed prior to the test.*

Other materials that have been used for superconducting switches are: in ref (30) Nb-Babbit (4.5%Sn, 1.5%Sb, 85%Pb), in ref (31) Pb, Nb, NbSn, and in different combinations. For scrapped Pb contacts, \(6.4 \times 10^{-9} \ \Omega \text{cm}^2\) was obtained at 1125 psi.

1.5 Components of the Resistance.

The resistance between two stabilized superconductors consist of three parts. First the resistance of the interface between superconductor and copper. Second the resistance of the copper matrix itself. The third contribution is that due to the surface resistance. Plating the surface introduces two additional components: the resistance of the interface between the copper and the plating and the resistance of the plating itself. This does not contribute significantly to the total resistance.

The interface resistance can be reduced by annealing (31). Heat treatment at 500°C reduces the interface resistance significantly. Elevation of the annealing temperature above 700°C must be avoided as it leads to the
formation of an intermetallic compound (CuTi) with abrupt rise in the resistance. Interface resistance of the order of $1 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \text{cm}^2$ were reported. A more recent study (32) shows that samples constructed of very fine filaments have a transverse resistivity in the range of a few $10^{-9} \Omega \text{m}$, which is much higher than the resistivity of the copper matrix itself. This resistivity decreases as the filament diameter increases.

The resistance of the copper matrix itself is negligible in most cases. Data about the resistance of copper at low temperature, and different magnetic fields can be found in (33) (34).

The contact resistance depend very much on the mechanical properties of the material and the electrical properties of its oxides, and eventually sulfides. The best results hitherto were obtained with Ag.

2. Conclusion

We are confident that, with silverplated surfaces, we can achieve a joint with $\sigma = 1.5 \times 10^{-9} \Omega \text{cm}^2$, carrying 2000A/cm². The applied pressure was 24000 psi or 1700 kg/cm². It would be interesting to look at pressures between 24000 psi, and 4000 psi (measurements made by Zar) in order to see whether the resistivity does indeed follows a logarithmic dependence with pressure.
APPENDIX A

An excellent introduction to the subject is


With an emphasis on the applications we have


Focusing almost entirely on the applications is


Keeping an equilibrium between the scientific theories and the applications


A comprehensive and authoritative book with less emphasis on the applications is

Appendix A (cont'd)

Looking more into the physics and the theories are


Extensive works on the subject are
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