



Consider the B-field a distance  $z$  from a current sheet (flowing in the  $+x$ -direction) in the  $z = 0$  plane. The B-field has:



- A. y-component only
- B. z-component only
- C. y and z-components
- D. x, y, and z-components
- E. Other

What is  $\oint \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{l}$  around this purple (dashed) Amperian loop?




- A.  $\mu_0(|I_2| + |I_1|)$
- B.  $\mu_0(|I_2| - |I_1|)$
- C.  $\mu_0(|I_2| + |I_1| \sin \theta)$
- D.  $\mu_0(|I_2| - |I_1| \sin \theta)$
- E.  $\mu_0(|I_2| + |I_1| \cos \theta)$

Stoke's Theorem says that for a surface  $S$  bounded by a perimeter  $L$ , any vector field  $\mathbf{B}$  obeys:


$$\int_S (\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \cdot d\mathbf{A} = \oint_L \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{l}$$

Does Stoke's Theorem apply for any surface  $S$  bounded by a perimeter  $L$ , even this balloon-shaped surface  $S$ ?



- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. Sometimes

Rank order  $\int \mathbf{J} \cdot d\mathbf{A}$  (over blue surfaces) where  $\mathbf{J}$  is uniform, going left to right:




- A.  $\text{iii} > \text{iv} > \text{ii} > \text{i}$
- B.  $\text{iii} > \text{i} > \text{ii} > \text{iv}$
- C.  $\text{i} > \text{ii} > \text{iii} > \text{iv}$
- D. Something else!!
- E. Not enough info given!!

Much like Gauss's Law, Ampere's Law is always true (for magnetostatics), but only useful when there's sufficient symmetry to "pull B out" of the integral.

So we need to build an argument for what  $\mathbf{B}$  looks like and what it can depend on.

For the case of an infinitely long wire, can  $\mathbf{B}$  point radially (i.e., in the  $\hat{s}$  direction)?


- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. ???



Continuing to build an argument for what  $\mathbf{B}$  looks like and what it can depend on.

For the case of an infinitely long wire, can  $\mathbf{B}$  depend on  $z$  or  $\phi$ ?


- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. ???



Finalizing the argument for what  $\mathbf{B}$  looks like and what it can depend on.

For the case of an infinitely long wire, can  $\mathbf{B}$  have a  $\hat{z}$  component?

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. ???



For the infinite wire, we argued that  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}) = B(s)\hat{\phi}$ . For the case of an infinitely long **thick** wire of radius  $a$ , is this functional form still correct? Inside and outside the wire?

- A. Yes
- B. Only inside the wire ( $s < a$ )
- C. Only outside the wire ( $s > a$ )
- D. No