Dynamic Modelling of the High Temperature Superconducting HT5 2020 Maglev System Using Different E-J Constitutive Laws Nocelling Ye Hong, Jun Zheng*, Zhichuan Huang, Li Wang, Jingzhong Zhao, Zigang Deng Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu, China * jzheng@swjtu.edu. cn

Introduction—In an attempt to figure out which common E-J constitutive laws of the HTS bulk is more desirable in the numerical modelling. In this paper, for the permanent magnet guideway (PMG)-HTS bulks maglev system, the dynamic modelling results and efficiencies of three different E-J constitutive laws include the power law model (PLM), the flux flow and creep model (FFCM), and the flux flow model (FFM) are compared. The finite element method with *H* formulation of Maxwell's equations and coupled with heat transfer module is considered. The ALE formulation is applied to achieve the relative motion between the PMG and the HTS bulks so as to simulate the variable magnetic field under dynamic operation of the vehicle. The levitation force, the AC loss and the temperature variation of the bulks under different high-speed conditions are discussed. The results indicate that the PLM has the advantages of reliability and higher efficiency compared to the other two constitutive laws.

Equations

E-J constitutive laws compared. The power law model (PLM): $\boldsymbol{E} = E_{\rm c} \frac{\boldsymbol{J}}{\boldsymbol{J}} \left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{J}|}{\boldsymbol{J}} \right)^{\prime}$ ✓ <u>The flux flow and creep model (FFCM)</u>: $=\begin{cases} 2\rho_{\rm c}J_{\rm c}\sinh\left(\frac{U_0}{kT}\frac{|\boldsymbol{J}|}{J_{\rm c}}\right)\exp\left(-\frac{U_0}{kT}\right)\frac{\boldsymbol{J}}{|\boldsymbol{J}|} & 0 \le |\boldsymbol{J}| \le J_{\rm c} \\ \rho_{\rm c}J_{\rm c}+\rho_{\rm f}J_{\rm c}\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{J}|}{J_{\rm c}}-1\right)\frac{\boldsymbol{J}}{|\boldsymbol{J}|} & |\boldsymbol{J}| > J_{\rm c} \end{cases}$ E =✓ <u>The flux flow model (FFM):</u> $0 \leq |\boldsymbol{J}| < J_{\rm c}$ $E = \langle$ $\int \rho_{\rm f} J_{\rm c} \left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{J}|}{I} - 1 \right)$ $\left| \boldsymbol{J} \right| \geq J_{\rm c}$

Conclusion

- ◆ The results of the PLM and the FFCM are consistent and reasonable.
- ◆ The PLM has higher efficiency in computation and simple form, it is the recommended model, while the FFM is not recommended.
- ◆ The temperature rise inside the HTS bulks under high speed operation (high frequency) is very small, less than 1 K.
- The frequency changing has little influence on the AC loss of the HTS bulks, which shows the high-speed and ultra-high-speed operation potential of the HTS maglev.

Besides, we are promoting the high-speed ejection test of the HTS maglev 1:10 prototype vehicle, which can reach 334.8 km/h at present. The diameter of the tube with vacuum pumping system is 4.2 m, and the length of it is 142.6 m. The lateral offset of the vehicle model: $< \pm 1.5$ mm (183 km/h, with acceleration of 3g).



Results: with different *E-J* **constitutive laws** (a)Air HTS Bulk (l/m) CH MH PM U U Iron ⊙ X 5 Hz — FFCM — FFM — PLM Infinite element domain 40 Hz ----- FFCM - - - FFM · · · · · PLM **Figure1:** Geometrical configuration of the Time (s) HTS maglev system 2000 -Frequency 5 Hz Amplitude 1 mm 1800 1800 Attenuation 1600 1600 1400 1400 1200 1200 — FFM — PLM 1000 L 1000 120 150 120 130 140 Time (s) Time (s) □ Calculation efficiency of different *E*-*J* constitutive laws

under vibration frequencies of 5 Hz and 40 Hz.

Frequency f	FFCM	FFM
5 Hz	3 h 38 s	3 h 8 min 52
40 Hz	5 h 30 min 56 s	6 h 47 min 12

