ML methods for superconducting magnets

Elisa Stabilini

Supervisor: Emanuela Barzi (FNAL) Cosupervisor: Reed Teyber (LBNL)

Final presentation September 28, 2023

Fermilab

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲屋▶ ▲屋▶ 差 少久の

DEGLI STUDI DI MILANO

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Table of Contents

- 1 Theoretical introduction
 - Superconducting materials
 - Quenching
- 2 Data Analysis
 - Feature anlysis
 - K-means clustering

3 Conclusions

Superconducting materials

- Super-conducting materials: materials that can achieve a zero-resistance state for particular values of temperature, magnetic field, and current density
- Quench: sudden and irreversible transition of a portion of conductor to resistive state in a superconducting magnet [SZ19]
- Due to large stored energy magnets can be damaged by quench (e.g. localized heating, high voltage).



Figure 1: Superconducting region for different alloys magnets

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三 うの()

Magnet training

- Spontaneous quenches happen below the expected magnet performance
- Magnets training: it takes several quenches before reaching nominal performance
- Current is increased until quench happen (current ramp)
- More current ramps constitute a thermal cycle
- Magnets mentioned here are Canted-Cosine-Theta (CCT) subscale magnets
- Sub-scale magnets present lot of diagnostics, including quench antenna (QAs)





Figure 2: Example of QA on a subscale magnet

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Quench antenna

- Quench antennas provide information on events location and time
- QAs measure $V = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} (\int B \mathrm{d}A_i)$
- A change in the voltage can occur for different reasons:
 - mechanical (epoxy cracks, friction, slipping)
 - electromagnetic (current redistribution, flux jumps)



Figure 3: Model of QA on the CCT magnet at LBL

イロ ト イヨ ト イヨ ト ・ ヨ ・ うへつ

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

∃ \0<</p>\0

Table of Contents

- **1** Theoretical introduction
 - Superconducting materials
 - Quenching
- 2 Data Analysis
 - Feature anlysis
 - K-means clustering

3 Conclusions

Global signal analysis

Dataset Data from two different CCT subscale magnets from LBNL:

- sub2: NHMFL mix-61 baseline (standard) epoxy impregnated magnet
- sub4: CTD 701X ultra tough (epoxy-non-epoxy) impregnated magnet

Parameters tuning

- different threshold depending on the sampling frequency
- different filters for the different magnets



Figure 4: Raw data registered from QA1 for ramps in different thermal cycle

Event detection - different antenna



Elisa Stabilini (Fermilab)

イロン 不良 とうせい うけいしゅ

Event Samples



Figure 6: Samples of events from different ramp from the first thermal cycle - magnet sub_2

First Features Study

- The results presented here refers to data from QA1 antenna for the 23 current ramps of the 1st thermal cycle
- Considered three groups of features: **voltage** features, **signal** features and **frequency** features.
 - Voltage: max_volt, min_volt, norm, abs_max, diff_t_Mm, full_integral, arclen
 - Signal: time_80, time_50, time_20
 - Frequency: occ_1000, cwt_lead, num_peaks



Figure 7: Heat-map of the correlation matrix for the mentioned features. We are looking for non-correlated features.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Principal Component Analysis

- Principal Component Analysis (PCA) for dimensional reduction: all features are taken into consideration
- particularly important due to the data set size
- PCA retaining at least 90% of the information
- Explained Variance Ratio (EVR):
 - ▶ Comp_1 : 0.650817
 - ▶ Comp_2 : 0.140681
 - ▶ Comp_3 : 0.094779
 - ▶ Comp_4 : 0.046818

Feature Contributions to Principal Components



Figure 8: Heatmap representing features contributions to each PCA component

K-means clustering

- Clustering performed over all events identified along 1 complete thermal cycle (sub2, thermal 1 - 23 ramps)
- Final choice for number of clusters determined using:
 - ► Silhouette Score: 4 clusters (0.748)
 - Number of negative silhouette score: 4 clusters (5 points)
 - ▶ K-Elbow: 4 clusters
 - ▶ WSS cross validation: 4 clusters (WSS score of 18.16)



Figure 9: K-Elbow plot

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三 うの()

Clustering results





0.035

0.0010

0 0005

0.0000

-0.0005

Event 16

0.040

0.045

+2.071e2



KMeans Clustering in 3D



Figure 10: 3D cluster representation in PC space

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □□ - のへで

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

э

Event Samples from clustering



Figure 11: Samples of events from different ramp from the first thermal cycle - magnet sub 2 after clustering

Feature boxplots







Figure 13: Boxplot of the lead frequency value and of the occurrence of 1kHz frequency in each cluster

Feature distribution across clusters



Figure 14: Integral value and reach of 20% of the maximum voltage distribution

Figure 15: Lead frequency distribution in CWT analysis and occurrence of 1kHz frequency

Elisa Stabilini (Fermilab)

400

Cluster distribution in time







Figure 16: Example of events distribution for ramp A06_00014 - thermal 1

Figure 17: Example of events distribution for ramp A15_00002 - thermal 1

Figure 18: Example of events distribution for ramp A24_00012 - thermal 1

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Table of Contents

- **1** Theoretical introduction
 - Superconducting materials
 - Quenching
- 2 Data Analysis
 - Feature anlysis
 - K-means clustering



・ロト・西ト・山田・山田・山下

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Results

- Development of a tool that can consistently label events and detect similarity between events
- There is a very large increase in events in **sub2** after the thermal cycle, which needs to be better understood
- Remarkably similar events which has implications on the underlying disturbances better understanding is needed in the future
- The low number of events in QA3 and QA4 are likely due to the orientation of antennas with respect to the field direction
- **sub4** virgin ramp shown to have more events than the baseline magnet, as a result of the impregnation material mechanics

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三 うの()

What's next

- Physics:
 - More work is necessary to understand the variation of clusters across the magnet data
 - Try to locate the signal source
 - ▶ Compare properties and feature of the two magnets sub2 and sub4
- Algorithm:
 - ▶ Using both acoustic and quench antenna data to improve results
 - Test different clustering techniques to improve efficiency and flexibility of the model
 - ▶ Improve hyper-parameter tuning depending on different data features
 - ▶ Try to implement an adaptive algorithm

Thank You!

References I

- [Aki+19] Takuya Akiba et al. "Optuna: A Next-generation Hyperparameter Optimization Framework". In: Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. 2019.
- [D13] Bergstra J. Yamins D. Cox D. "Making a Science of Model Search: Hyperparameter Optimization in Hundreds of Dimensions for Vision Architectures". In: *TProc. of the* 30th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2013) (2013).
- [Lin+22] Marius Lindauer et al. "SMAC3: A Versatile Bayesian Optimization Package for Hyperparameter Optimization". In: Journal of Machine Learning Research 23.54 (2022), pp. 1–9. URL: http://jmlr.org/papers/v23/21-0888.html.
- [SZ19] Daniel Schoerling and Alexander V. Zlobin, eds. Nb3Sn Accelerator Magnets. Springer International Publishing, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-16118-7. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007%2F978-3-030-16118-7.
- [Vir+20] Pauli Virtanen et al. "SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python". In: Nature Methods 17 (2020), pp. 261–272. DOI: 10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2.

Feature distribution along ramps



Figure 19: Example of feature distribution along different ramps



Figure 20: Example of feature distribution along different ramps

Dataset details

Data from two different CCT subscale magnets from LBNL

sub2: standard epoxy impregnated magnet

- 3 different thermal cycles
- 3 different sampling frequency: 10 kHz, 20 kHz, 25 kHz respectively for the 1st, 2nd, 3rd thermal cycle
- data from all antennas (QA1 QA6)

sub4: epoxy-non-epoxy impregnated magnet

- 1 thermal cycle
- $\bullet\,$ sampling frequency: 25 kHz
- $\bullet\,$ data coming from antenna QA1 QA5

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三 うの()

Global signal analysis details

- different threshold depending on the sampling frequency
- different filters:
 - ► sub2: high pass filter with 4500 Hz cutoff frequency
 - ► sub4: band stop filter with 4000 5000 Hz cutoff frequency
- different thresholds:
 - $\blacktriangleright~0.5~{\rm mV}$ for 10 kHz and 20 kHz
 - ▶ 1 mV for 25 kHz sampling frequency



Figure 21: Raw data registered from QA1 for ramps in different thermal cycle