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The RFQ Injection Line Configuration & References

The RFQ Injection Line - MEBT

No any beam diagnostics in RIL (?): a) Between ion source & LEBT; b) Between LEBT & RFQ; c) Between RFQ & MEBT;

Front of DTL: Toroid; BLM; Emittance probe

MEBT consists of: 1 buncher (2-gap with grid-foc); 2 sets of q-doublets (for matching) 4 sets of steerers in both planes
Problem description by C.Y.Tan (20/Jun/2017)

• The **present transmission** (2017) from the H- source to the beginning of Tank 1 is **rather poor** during normal ops.

• Although the best efficiency that was seen just after installation (Jun/2013) was 65 mA at L:ATOR and 36 mA at L:T01IN, these numbers were not routinely seen during operations since then

![Image of LEBT meter readings](image)

*at the LEBT (L:ATOR), entrance of Tank 1 (L:T01IN) and Tank 3 (T03IN)*

• The goal is to improve the transmission efficiency from the source to Tank 3 with the **base line of 28 mA at L:T01IN** that is seen during normal operations.
Possible ways for problem resolving by C.Y.Tan

The parameter search for improving the efficiency must always include the laser notcher.

Possible configurations to be considered:

1) Checking the present MEBT design and if element locations are optim.
   1a) need for reinstallation of dipole correctors at RFQ exit

2) “RFQ+Tank1” (completely removing the MEBT)
   2a) it was considered in [1], but was tech. risky w/o knowing details

3) “RFQ+DS-doublet+Tank1” (removing UpS Doublet & Buncher)
   3a) DnS Doublet gives some focusing before Tank1 quads
Possible ways for problem resolving (continued)

4) Completely replacing the FNAL RFQ with the LANL RFQ

*MWS file for LANL 4-rod RFQ is available from S.Kurennoy*

4a) LANL has a similar 4-rod RFQ that has the same Win/out=35/750keV.

**Differences between FNAL & LANL 4-rod RFQ:**

4a1) LANL RFQ is ~30cm longer & improves upon the FNAL design, i.e. LANL RFQ removed the dipole kick of the beam at exit (? x’=y’=0)

4a2) In principle, the LANL RFQ should not have an energy error, but it has not been tested with beam yet.

4b) Redo items 1 to 3 above to see if it is worth replacing the FNAL RFQ with the LANL RFQ.

**VK’s add-ons:** a) just borrow whole LANL tank; b) borrow LANL electrodes & build own clone using LANL drawings; c) RF design & mech. build for a new “symmetrical” 4-rod RFQ borrowing either LANL or FNAL **thick** electrodes.
Simulations & meas done during design of Inj-Line

- LEBT: simuls with TRACE-2D (linear beam envelopes); w/o tracking in real fields (bell-shape & non-linearities; gas-focusing)
- Beam emittance was measured only once (before assembling whole Inj-Line) & traced to RFQ entry. (VK: beam $\varepsilon$, $\beta$, $\alpha$ for diff. params?)
- RFQ: simuls with PARMTEQM (ideal two-term potential function assuming sin-modulated hyperbolic electrodes fed with ideal time-varying quadrupolar RF potentials: $+V;-V;+V;-V$)
- Real simuls done at LANL by Kurennoy helped to resolve 4-rod RFQ problems [1-3]; only for operating point at 60mA
- MEBT: simuls with TRACE-3D (lin. beam envelop.) & with PARMILA2 (exe only, ideal Qs and RF-fields w/o real field with expanded fringe fields and non-linearities)
- Routine emittance meas at entry Tank1 are possible, if needed (?)
- Tanks1-3: simuls with historical PARMILA lattice (out of reality [1]) used as a criterion for matching MEBT beam

VK: the above items are a standard for 4-vane RFQ with a good beam quality, but for 4-rod RFQ (???)
Illustration of non-ideal fields in LEBT & MEBT

Measured Bz & Bx fields of solenoids at 400 A. [1, Fig 4.18]

Q-field gradient at r=1cm vs z [1, Fig 4.101]
z=0 is symmetry plane of doublet

Buncher DT with grids. [1, Fig 4.92]
Overview of peculiarities of Schempp’s 4-rod RFQ

Peculiarities cover the following:
• RFQ design (cell parameters)
• Transfer from ideal-to-real electrodes
• Electrode excitation in 4-rod RFQ: dipole field & distortions in radial matcher

Comments:
• “Dipole” problems were recognized from late 1980s
• Dipole: resolving is continuing since 1995- up to 2010s
• R-Matcher: copy of 4-vane RM electrode geometry
• Possible alternatives (symmetrical 4-rod structures)
RFQ designs: classical vs Schempp’s

Classical Design for High-Current RFQ: LANL Four-Section Procedure

New design approach by A, Schempp et al. optimized for compact RFQs

started from 1988 & developed in 2000s:
A. Schempp, Design of Compact RFQs, EPAC-88;
C. Zhang,..., A. Schempp, Linac 2004;
Check FNAL design vs I inj

Input beam parameter by manufacturer [1, fig.4.45]

Well matched beam !!!

Excellent beam transmission up to 120mA; twice higher of nominal 60mA !!!
Transfer from ideal-to-real electrodes

Real electrodes always differ from ideal (sin-modulated hyperbolic) electrodes
Inspect PARMTEQM long. cell-end coordinates vs CST model Ez field

Quite excellent coincidence between real electrode long modulation & design data provided by PARMTEQM (for inside cells)
Transfer from ideal-to-real electrodes

Electrode cut at entry – measured gap ~7mm, while simple surface rounding within cells “2R”÷”4R” (RM)

(ejected “1R”)

Electrode abrupt cut at exit – measured exit gap ~11.3mm corresponds to cell “102F”
Electrode excitation in RFQ resonators

Symmetric “ideal” quadrupolar electrode feeding in 4-vane RFQ

“Specific” electrode feeding in Schempp’s 4-rod RFQ led to dipole field in regular part field distortions in radial matcher (e.g. Ez)

Since real electrodes differ from ideal it may be interesting to study performances of FNAL RFQ electrodes in an ideally excited structure like 4-vane RFQ (time-varying quadrupolar RF potentials: +V;−V;+V;−V)

Such simulation could be performed as CST PS for RF fields calculated in CST EM Studio project allowing to assign time-varying potentials to electrodes (Electro-quasi-static simulator)
“Dipole-field” & Radial matcher problems

Detailed overview and discussion in APC seminar:
V.Kapin, “Overview of 4-rod RFQs peculiarities”, 4-Apr-2013
https://indico.fnal.gov/event/6375/

“Dipole” problems were recognized from late 1980s:
V.Kapin, in Proc. EPAC, 1994; J.Klabunde et al., in Proc. Linac 1994

Curved Ref. Orbit – sum of const. “beam offset” & “coherent osc.”:

RM electrode shape suggested for split-coaxial RFQ suits to 4-rod RFQ:
S.Arai, Split Coaxial RFQ, GSI-81-11, 1983
Alternative RM as quarter-wave resonator built in 4-rod RFQ:

Obvious problem elimination – usage symmetrical structures (e.g. like Split-Coaxial RFQ and other examples presented in my APC-seminar)
Problem treatments by Schempp’s group

Up to now Schempp’s 4-rod RFQ:

- Minimization of “dipole field” (since 1995- up to 2010s)
- R-Matcher: a copy of RM electrode geometry used in 4-vane RFQ (ignoring a difference in vane excitation: “0, V” instead of “+V, -V”)

As result by 2012: 4-rod RFQ for FNAL has voltage amplitude between neighboring electrodes in 4 quadrants: 1.26; 1.54; 1.27; 0.97  => considerable dipole fields!!!
**4-rod vs 4-vane: Schempp’s tests in 1988**

**PERFORMANCE OF THE DESY RFQs**

A. Schempp, M. Ferch, P. Schastok, H. Klein,

Institut für Angewandte Physik, J.W. Goethe Universität, 6000 Frankfurt/M., FRG

---

**Fig. 2:** Schemes of 4Vane- and 4Rod- RFQs

Two RFQs have been built as injectors for the 50 MeV H⁻-Linac for the HERA project at DESY. A 4-Vane RFQ as well as a 4 Rod RFQ deliver 750 keV H⁻. The RFQ design is summarized by: input energy 18 keV, output energy 750 keV, total length 118 cm, frequency 202.56 MHz, inter-vane voltage 70.5 kV, beam current 20 mA.

**Fig. 7:** RFQ output current $I_{RFQ}$ as function of Ion source current $I_s$.

4 Rod RFQ, the maximum $I$ current 36 mA.
4 Vane RFQ maximum current 43 mA.
Approaches for Transmission Improvement in FNAL RFQ Injection Line (see Tan’s formulations)

Possible sources of transmission degradation:
either physical degradation of components or wrong tuning-matching procedures could not reach original parameters

- Physical degradation (test either visually or measure parameters on bench): spare quads, solenoids, buncher, and RFQ (!)
- Wrong tuning-matching procedures due to changed conditions (some of parameters are out of original range, e.g. LEBT beam depends on parameters including ion source regimes, vacuum conditions etc.)

In the latter case there is need to understand details of beam losses and consider a possibility to re-utilize lost beam improving/optimizing operating conditions in MEBT (& LEBT)

=> Realistic simulations in real fields for all components (RFQ, quadrupoles, buncher)
Choice of simulation tools for problem resolving

- Trace-2D/3D for linear matching in LEBT/MEBT
- PARMILA (old) – multi-particle tracking in MEBT/DTL and calculate acceptances of DTL (a “target”-value for linear matching with Trace)
- Due to an increase beam size after RFQ & bell-shape fields in magnets => need for tracking in real fields => ready for usage code is the Particle Studio (PIC-solver) of CST

- Details for CST simulation for FNAL 4-rod RFQ in LANL:
- E/M fields by MWS -> import to Particle Studio;
- Initial particle distribution by PARMILA2 converted to *.pit of PS
- Since PS – is not specialized beam dynamics code, it no built-in diagnostics; then convert *.pit at RFQ exit to PARMILA format
- Time consuming (order ~24hrs for one RFQ pass at TD-server), license for PIC is busy frequently; => very restricted simul. conditions
Kurennoy’s CST model for FNAL 4-rod RFQ

Manufacturer (Kress GmbH) CAD models of FNAL 4-rod RFQs was imported in CST.

**model C** (configuration with new thin vanes) - with different beam pipes
UpS= {∅31.75; L=50}mm and DnS= {∅100; L=100}mm attached to the RFQ cavity;
$L"C"$model=50+1200+100=1350$mm
Preparation of 4-rod RFQ model

Model has been \textit{rotated} to adjust to FNAL Linac Coordinates to exclude a need for coordinate Rotations in Injection Line simulations.

\textbf{Field amplitude} for CST model has been Adjusted to nominal electrode voltage $U=72\text{kV}$
Preparation of 4-rod RFQ model (continued)

Fields has been exported to PS. Example for z=297mm (end cel90);

CST allows extended aperture in comparison with PARMTEQM (not as circle/rectangular inscribed within pole tips)

RF phase for imported fields has been Adjusted with injected beam having 360deg. Extend: before/after
Input beams: Measured traced to CST model entry

Measured emittances has been traced to RFQ model entrance with TRACE-3D. Then, for the obtained TWISS parameters PARMILA generated distribution

Original measured emittances overlapped with TRACE-2D ellipces at emitt. probe

PARMILA distribution overlapped with Trace 2D emittances of measured emittances at entry MWS model
Input beams: ParmteqM (manufacturer) to CST entry

Comparison of Trace-2D ellipses for measured emittances with manufacturer distribution used for PARMTEQM simulations

**Figure 4.45:** The initial phase space distribution at the entrance of the RFQ.

PARMILA generated distribution overlapped with Trace 2D emittances for of "ParmteqM" (manufact) distribution

Original ParmteqM distribution overlapped with Trace2D ellipses
5-bunch trains are used for non-zero beam currents

Total number of particles in structure for ParmteqM (manufacturer) distribution during simulations for $I=0$ (upper plot) & 70mA (bottom plot)

We use the 3-rd bunch for export to next external code (e.g. PARMILA)

V. Kapin, PIP meeting, Feb-2018
Simulation of RFQ parameters vs I injected beam

Use 2 distributions: ParmteqM (manufacturer) as a matched large emittance; Measured emittance as a mismatched small emittance beam

Results obtained after post-processing CST *.pit files at RFQ exit to PARMILA format

For nominal beam current \( I_{\text{inj}} = 60\,\text{mA} \):

a) ParmteqM (manufacturer) distribution – 35mA at RFQ exit (60%);
b) Measured distribution – 28mA (45%)

One point of plots ~24hrs !!!

Most parameters are worse in comparison to the ideal ParmteqM simulation
Another parameters vs I injected beam

“Longitudinal” Losses (energy < 700keV) & long emittance vs I inj

Transverse unnormalized and normalized emittances
Another parameters vs I injected beam

Beam average position and angle in X-plane vs I inj

Beam average position and angle in Y-plane vs I inj
Another parameters vs I injected beam

Beam RMS sizes vs I inj for X and Y planes

Beam RMS sizes vs I inj for Phi and W coordinates
On-going simulations and tasks

- MEBT simulations Trace-3D for ideal fields
- DTL acceptance from old PARMILA model (parts IDs !)
- Multi-particle simulations in MEBT with old PARMILA with parameters derived by TRACE-3D
- CST model for real fields in MEBT and tracking
- ideal excitation of existing thick electrodes to complete plots vs linj for both matched & mismatched beams: a) ideal electrodes & ideal RF voltages (ParmteqM) b) real electrodes & ideal RF voltages (CST EM/PS) c) real electrodes & real RF voltages (CST MWS/PS)
- implement a new notch aperture (rerun some results)
On-going: previous FNAL DTL studies by VK

- V. Kapin, "TraceWin Lattice for FNAL Drift-Tube Linac: Status", talk on 30-Jul-2014 at PIP General Meeting, 2014, Beams-doc-4646-v1
On-going: mismatched vs matched beam to DTL

Blue ellipses - DTLs acceptances; red ellipses: Total 5-rms beam Emittances (unnorm.)

2014 - TraceWin

V. Kapin, PIP meeting, Feb-2018
Losses %: matched vs mismatched ($I_{\text{inj}}=1\text{mA} & 45\text{mA}$)

Also slides for an increased acceptances for smoothed quadrupole strength along DTL $G(nq)$

V.Kapin, PIP meeting, Feb-2018
On-going: DTL L-acceptance from old PARMILA

$I_{beam}=0$, $x=y=0$, $xp=yp=0$

Adapt Parmila to calculate L-acceptance parameters at injection (survived):

- $\Phi_{\text{mean\_deg}} = 4.168$ [deg]
- $W_{\text{mean\_MeV}} = 0.770$ [MeV]
- $\sigma_{d\Phi_{\text{deg}}} = 55.8$ [deg]
- $\sigma_{dW_{\text{MeV}}} = 0.041$ [MeV]
On-going: DTL X-acceptance from old PARMILA

I=0, y=0, yp=0, PhiS, W=0.75MeV

X-acceptance parameters at injection:
- Phi\_mean\_deg = -32 [deg];
- W\_mean\_MeV = 0.750[MeV];
- sigma\_x\_cm = 0.406 [cm];
- sigma\_xp\_rad = 0.027 [rad]
- ex\_rms\_un\_cm\_rad = 5.758E-03 [cm.rad];
- ex\_rms\_norm\_cm\_rad = 230E-06 [cm.rad]
- beta\_x\_cm = 28.732E+00 [cm]; alfa\_x = 1.611[-]
On-going: DTL Y-acceptance from old PARMILA

Y-acceptance parameters at injection:
- Phi_mean_deg = -32 [deg];
- W_mean_MeV = 0.750 [MeV];
- sigma_y_cm = 0.701 [cm];
- sigma_xp_rad = 0.018 [rad];
- ey_rms_un_cm_rad = 5.484E-03 [cm.rad];
- ey_rms_norm_cm_rad = 219E-06 [cm.rad];
- beta_y_cm = 89.5 [cm];
- alfa_x = 2.059[-]

Beta & alfa => Ellipse
=> Reduce Emittance till Minimal losses
=> Ellipse (“target”-function) for TRACE 3D at MEBT exit
PARMILA feature for losses analysis

Coord\textsubscript{ini all} particles.out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X-X'</th>
<th>Y-Y'</th>
<th>X-Y</th>
<th>Phi-W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coord\textsubscript{ini surv} particles.out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X-X'</th>
<th>Y-Y'</th>
<th>X-Y</th>
<th>Phi-W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARMILA feature: R & L losses

Location of lost particles (for R & L – collimation)

V. Kapin, PIP meeting, Feb-2018
New Laser Notcher Aperture (drawing by Kevin Duel)

Notcher was installed ~ in summer of 2014

New diaphragm with i.d. 12mm has been installed recently (Feb of 2018)

The notcher is inserted inside of exit pipe with length of 100mm assumed in CST model

Exit field distortion ?
Conclusion

CST model for FNAL RFQ is adapted for beam dynamic analysis and post-processing:

- RF fields by CST coincide well with ParmilaM cell length
- Exported RF fields agrees with results in Kurennoy report
- Amplitude and phase of exported RF fields are tuned and nominal exit beam parameters are obtained
- Beam parameters for manufacturer beam and measured beam vs the current of the injected beam are obtained
- Mismatched beam shows transmission drop to 45% for 60mA
- Matched beam corresponds to best exp. parameters (Tr~60%)
- Further simulation procedure is overviewed and preparation for MEBT optimization are under a way
- Next: Learn controls for RIL and suggest both simulations in LEBT and experimental studies (IS+LEBT calibrations vs many params)