for such applications as ion therapy [4, 5] and high energy physics [6]. CCT magnets offer good field quality suppres-

sion of the higher harmonics, and may be constructed to

deliver dipole, quadrupole and higher-order fields by super-

position of appropriately-wound coils. As each conductor

is located in a separate channel, the Lorentz forces are in-

tercepted by the ribs and the spar. Because the forces are

not accumulated, little or no pre-stress is required. In our

downstream-scanning gantry optics design [1] we have de-

Table 1: Superconducting Dipole Requirements for 350 MeV

Gantry (with spot scanning downstream of the final

The obtained efficiency of a CCT magnet is limited be-

cause of the non-zero rib thickness at the midplane [4] and as

a result of the cancelling solenoidal components. Although

more conductor is required for a CCT when compared with

a conventional magnet of the same field, the overall cost is

approximately 20% less expensive [7] due to much lower

provides good passive shielding; however, active shielding might also be used. An actively-shielded magnet replaces the

iron yoke with additional CCT dipole windings surrounding

the main coils, but with opposite polarity to the main coils to

cancel the stray fields. Removing the iron yoke eliminates its

contribution to the magnet mass, particularly the cold mass

if a cold yoke is used. An active-shielded magnet may also

be more reliably modelled as the fields are only determined

CCT DIPOLE DESIGN

In this work a NbTi strand was assumed of 0.825 mm

diameter and non-Cu/Cu ratio of 0.51; the operating current

and number of strands were chosen such that the operating

point of the magnet stay below 80% of the superconductor

load line. The skew angle of the main coils was optimised

for the required total length of the magnet. The chosen midplane rib thickness was the minimum value possible to

withstand forces created in the strand winding process. In the

CCT magnets conventionally employ an iron yoke that

Value

0.52 m

30 deg

33 mm

1.46 Tm

termined dipole requirements as given in Table 1.

Parameter

Magnetic length

Bending angle

Integrated field

total number of components required [2].

Clear bore radius

SUPERCONDUCTING DIPOLE DESIGN FOR A PROTON COMPUTED **TOMOGRAPHY GANTRY**

E. Oponowicz*, H. L. Owen

University of Manchester/Cockcroft Institute, Manchester, United Kingdom

dipole [1])

Abstract

title of the work, publisher, and DOI Proton computed tomography aims to increase the accus), racy of proton treatment planning by directly measuring proton stopping power. This imaging technique requires a proton beam of 330 MeV incident kinetic energy for adult pa-2 tients. Employing superconducting technology in the beam $\frac{1}{2}$ delivery system allows it to be of comparable size to a con-5 ventional proton therapy gantry. A superconducting bending magnet design for a proton computed tomography gantry is proposed in this paper. The 30 deg, 3.9 T canted-cosinetheta dipole wound with NbTi wires is used to steer 330 MeV protons in an isocentric beam delivery system which rotates around the patient. Two methods of magnetic field shielding are compared in the context of proton therapy facility requirements; traditional passive shielding with an iron yoke work placed around the magnet and an active shielding option utilising extra layers of the superconducting coil.

INTRODUCTION

distribution of this The main goal of employing superconductivity (SC) in particle therapy gantry design is the reduction of overall size and mass. In carbon-ion systems where the beam rigidity to È be transported can be as much as 6.6 Tm, significant reductions in size and mass are obtained from using SC magnets; 2019). however for proton therapy up to 250 MeV (around 2.4 Tm) the gantry size reduction is limited by such things as main-0 taining a minimum nozzle length, so that SC magnets have limited benefits. Gantries capable of transporting protons up to 350 MeV for computed tomography (2.9 Tm) may benefit or from SC fields, and we show here a design of such a gantry a suitable for retrofitting to a 250 MeV normal-conducting U treatment room. Several groups have developed realistic 2 designs of dipoles with sufficient aperture for beam scan- $\frac{1}{2}$ ning at fields above 3 T. Our present design examines the g use of canted-cosine-theta (CCT) dipoles to be used in a for $\frac{1}{2}$ a proton computed tomography gantry [1]; an NbTi-based ECCT dipole delivering up to 4.6 T bore field was tested b at LBNL [2] and a Toshiba-manufactured superconducting gantry for carbon ion therapy has been in operation at NIRS used since 2017 using 2.8 T dipoles [3].

CANTED COSINE THETA

work may A canted-cosine-theta magnet consists of a pair of concentric, nested conductor coils oppositely skewed such that : the solenoidal field is cancelled and the transverse field components sum. In recent years several groups have shown interest in this concept; such magnets have been designed

Content **THPMP054** 3574

þ

MC8: Applications of Accelerators, Technology Transfer and Industrial Relations

by the Biot-Savart contributions.

General Assumptions

ewa.oponowicz@manchester.ac.uk

10th Int. Particle Accelerator Conf. ISBN: 978-3-95450-208-0

active-shielded case, the tilt angle of the shielding coils was optimised using FIELD 1.9.1 code developed at CERN, which is based on Biot-Savart calculations (see Table 2). Magnetic fields in both cases (passive and active) were modelled using OPERA-3D version 19 [8].

Table 2: CCT Dipole Parameters Common for both Passive and Active Designs

Parameter	Value
Tilt angle of the main coil	31.8 deg
Min. midplane rib thickness	0.3 mm
Strand diameter	0.825 mm

Passive Shielding Design

A conventional design of a double-layer CCT dipole with iron yoke is presented in Fig. 1 and its basic properties in Table 3. The field quality in the good field region is better than 10^{-4} . The superconductor operating point at 4.5 K is 64% makes it a robust magnet and therefore likely safe to operate in clinical use. The maximum bore field in the dipole is 3.9 T (Fig. 2); the iron yoke enhances the central field by approximately 0.8 T whilst shielding the stray flux. Stray fields of 0.5 mT extend up to 0.45 m in longitudinal direction (see Fig. 3).

Table 3: Design Parameters of the Passively-shielded CCT **Dipole** Case

Value
268 A
4.2 T
8x2
74 mm
270 kg
1.14 km



Figure 1: Layout of CCT double-layer (passive) dipole with iron yoke, modelled in OPERA; magnetic flux in Tesla.



Figure 2: Dipole (normal B1 and skew A1) field components along the passive magnet design, modelled in OPERA.

Active Shielding Design

In the actively-shielded case, the yoke is removed and replaced with additional cancellation coils; this solution is found to require more than 2.5 times more superconducting wire. Parameters are shown in Table 4. To perform acceptable field cancellation we find that the outer coils must be located at a large radius (Fig. 4), thereby requiring a relatively-large cryostat. Using an active shield winding consisting of one superconducting strand in each layer, we find that the field cancellation is not as good as can be achieved in the passive case; the 0.5 mT isosurface extends more than 1 m from the magnet centre, which is clearly not acceptable.

Table 4: Design Parameters of the Actively-shielded CCT **Dipole** Case

Parameter	Value
Engineering current	283 A
Peak field in the conductor	5.0 T
Number of strands	11x2
Tilt angle of the shielding coil	62.17 deg
Inner radius of the shielding coil	220 mm
Total length of the SC strand	2.74 m

DISCUSSION

We find that a conventional passively-shielded design offers better reduction of the stray field than an activelyshielded design of a 3.9 T dipole. Whilst the voke weight of the passive design is obviously larger it may sit outside the cryostat and therefore allow a relatively small cold volume. In contrast, the rather large diameter of the outer coils in the active case would require a much larger cryostat, increasing the cold volume and thereby possibly also cancelling out the weight advantage compared to the passive design. Overall, it

must 1

work 1

of

ion

but

stri

ij

6.

201

used under the terms of the CC BY 3.0 licence (©

é

may

from this

Content

maintain attribution to the author(s), title of the work, publisher, and DOI



Figure 3: Stray fields (blue) extending beyond the iron yoke (green): 0.5 mT iso-valued surface (modelled in OPERA). The fields extend an acceptably-small distance from the magnet (much less than 5 Gauss at a distance of 1 m). Axes scale shown in meters.



Figure 4: Layout and field strength in the actively-shielded magnet option, modelled in OPERA; the shielding coil lies around 220 mm from the central beam axis; field strength is indicated by colour in Tesla.

appears the use of extra coils for shielding purposes is more complex and less efficient than just using a yoke. However, one could further examine the active shielding coil to try to improve its efficiency, for example by utilising more complex winding geometries. If the cold mass is not such a factor, it might also be possible to utilise a hybrid solution where a thinner yoke is used outside the outer active coils to suppress the remainder of the stray field. Because of its simplicity and likely lower cost, we have

Because of its simplicity and likely lower cost, we have chosen the passive shielding option for use in our proton CT gantry design. The total cold mass and dimensions of the cryostat are significantly smaller in the passive shielding case, particularly if warm yoke is considered. More detailed cryogenics solutions, forces and thermal analysis for this bending magnet are the next steps to be undertaken.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement No 675265, OMA - Optimization of Medical Accelerators.

The authors would like to thank Glyn Kirby and Jeroen van Nugteren (CERN TE-MSC-MDT) for useful discussions.

REFERENCES

- E. Oponowicz and H. L. Owen, "Superconducting Gantry Design for Proton Tomography", in *Proc. 8th Int. Particle Accelerator Conf. (IPAC'17)*, Copenhagen, Denmark, May 2017, pp. 4795–4797. doi:10.18429/JACoW-IPAC2017-THPVA140
- [2] S. Caspi, "A 16T Canted-Cosine-Theta (CCT) An option for the FCC", presented at the 16T Magnets Technology Meeting 03, CERN, Geneva. Switzerland, Nov. 2015.
- [3] Y. Iwata *et al.*, "Superconducting Gantry for Carbon-Ion Radiotherapy", in *Proc. 9th Int. Particle Accelerator Conf.* (*IPAC'18*), Vancouver, Canada, Apr.-May 2018, pp. 1232– 1236. doi:10.18429/JACoW-IPAC2018-TUZGBF1
- [4] L. N. Brouwer, "Canted-Cosine-Theta Superconducting Accelerator Magnets for High Energy Physics and Ion Beam Cancer Therapy", PhD thesis, UC Berkeley, CA, USA, 2015; CERN, Geneva, Switzerland, Rep. CERN-ACC-2016-0017.
- [5] S. Caspi, "The Canted-Cosine-Theta (CCT) Dipole Program", presented at the 4th Annual Meeting of the Future Circular Collider Study, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, Apr. 2018.

MC8: Applications of Accelerators, Technology Transfer and Industrial Relations

- [6] G. Kirby, J. van Nugteren, and M. Koratzinos, "LHC HL orbit corrector 5 Tm CCT", https://www.researchgate.net/ project/LHC-hi-Lumi-orbit-corrector-5Tm-CCT
- [7] G. Kirby, private communication.
- [8] OPERA, https://operafea.com