Studies at SLAC's ESA of the transverse kicks due to collimator wakefields

Stephen Molloy, Mike Woods, Ray Arnold, SLAC
Nigel Watson, Mark Slater, Birmingham
Luis Fernandez, Carl Beard, Daresbury Lab
Jonny Smith, Lancaster
Justin Greenhalgh, George Ellwood, RAL
Adriana Bungau, Roger Barlow, Manchester

WakeFest 2007,
(also given at IRENG07, SLAC, 18th Sept, 2007)

Motivation for Measurement

- Collimators near ILC IR will cause wakefields
  - Amplify incoming jitter.
  - Dilute emittance.
  - Reduce luminosity.
- Previous studies have shown the complexity of analytical calculations, even in simple cases.
- Goal is to measure the transverse kick for a range of collimator specs, and compare with simulations.
  - Try to improve agreement to ~10%.

Experimental Setup

Beam Energy	28.5 GeV
Charge	~1.5e10
Bunch Length	0.3 – 1 mm
x Size	~1 mm
y Size	~100 um



- Collimators placed in wakefield ‘sandwich’.
  - Five slots, allowing four collimators plus extra slot for uninterrupted beam operation.
- Collimator to be tested inserted using X-mover.
- FFTB magnet controllers allow control in y, z, and dy/dz.
  - Readbacks give micron-level position information.

Experimental Setup

Beam Energy	28.5 GeV
Charge	~1.5e10
Bunch Length	0.3 – 1 mm
x Size	~1 mm
y Size	~100 um



Concept of Experiment







Concept of Experiment



Collimators (Run 1)

Slot	Side view	Beam view	
1			α=335mrad r=1.9mm
2			α=335mrad r=1.4mm
3			α=335mrad r=1.4mm
4			α=π/2rad r=3.8mm

Slot	Side view	Beam view	
5			α=π/2rad r=1.4mm
6			α=168mrad r=1.4mm
7			α_1=π/2 rad α_2=168mrad r_1=3.8mm r_2=1.4mm
8			α_1=298mrad α_2=168mrad r_1 =3.8mm r_2 =1.4mm

- Collimator #1 is identical to one from a previous test.
- Analytical prediction for #7 and #8 is identical, but 3D simulation hints at differences.
- #3 will have a much larger resistive component than the others.
- This set explores a wide range of taper angles.

Collimators (Run 1)



Collimators (Run 2)

Collim.#	Side view	Beam view	Revised 27-Nov-2006
6			α=166mrad r=1.4mm (1/2 gap)
10			α=166mrad r =1.4mm
11			α=166mrad r =1.4mm
12			α=166mrad r=1.4mm

Collim.#	Side view	Beam view	Revised 27-Nov-2006
13			$\alpha_1=\pi/2$ rad α_2=166mrad r_1=4.0mm r_2=1.4mm
14			$\alpha_1=\pi/2$ rad α_2=166mrad r_1=4.0mm r_2=1.4mm
15			$\alpha_1=\pi/2$ rad α_2=50mrad r_1=4.0mm r_2=1.4mm
16			non-linear taper r=1.4mm

- Collimator #6 identical to #6 from Run 1.
- This set investigates the effect of material and surface finish on the kick.
- #16 tested a smooth impedance change.

Collimators (Run 2)



All fabrication/design aspects:
George Ellwood, Joe O'Dell, Justin Greenhalgh (RAL)

Collimators (Run 2)

Collimator 16

Nigel Watson / Birmingham

Data Analysis





- Kick should be odd function.
- Fit data to 3rd-order polynomial, with quadratic term set to zero.
- Kick factor is the linear term.

Analytical Prediction

Geometric wake

$$\alpha = \theta_T b_1 / \sigma_z$$

For tapered collimators, the prediction depends on the "regime".

- α << 1 – *inductive regime*
- α >> 1 – *diffractive regime*

Typical values in our experiment

$$\theta_T = 324, 289, 166, 50 \text{ mrad}$$

$$b_1 = 4.0, 1.4 \text{ mm}$$

$$\sigma_z = 1.0 - 0.3 \text{ mm}$$

α = 1 – 30 – Collimators are in the intermediate or diffractive regimes.

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0 b_1^2}$$

$$\kappa = 1.35 \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0} \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{b_1^2}$$

Resistive wake

Flat collimator

$$\kappa = F_G \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \frac{r_e m_e c^2}{e^2} \frac{L}{r^3} \sqrt{\frac{1}{Z_0 \sigma \sigma_z}},$$

Tapered collimator

$$\kappa = F_G \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \frac{r_e m_e c^2}{e^2} \frac{1}{r_1^2 \tan\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{1}{Z_0 \sigma \sigma_z}}$$

EM Simulations with GdfidL















Jonathan Smith, Lancaster

Misalignment of spoiler jaws



Problem…


Dependence on col1 kick at 0.5mm with mesh
data
fit excluding main outlier
Transverse Kick (V/pC/m)
-10000
-8000
-6000
-4000
-2000
0
0
0.05
0.1
0.15
0.2
0.25
0.3
0.35
0.4
1/<cells per sigma z>


Dependence on col1 kick at 0.5mm with mesh
data
fit excluding unexpected points
Transverse Kick (V/pC/m)
-10000
-8000
-6000
-4000
-2000
0
0
0.05
0.1
0.15
0.2
0.25
0.3
0.35
0.4
1/<cells per sigma z>

Results

Predictions made for 0.5 mm bunch length.

3D modelling does **not** include resistive effects.

Coll.	Measured Kick Factor / V/pC/mm (Linear Fit)	Measured Kick Factor / V/pC/mm (Linear & Cubic Fit)	Analytic Prediction Kick Factor V/pC/mm	3-D Modeling Prediction Kick Factor V/pC/mm
1	1.4 ± 0.1 (1.0)	1.2 ± 0.3 (1.0)	2.27	1.63 ± 0.37
2	1.4 ± 0.1 (1.3)	1.2 ± 0.3 (1.4)	4.63	2.88 ± 0.84
3	4.4 ± 0.1 (1.5)	3.7 ± 0.3 (0.8)	5.25	5.81 ± 0.94
4	0.9 ± 0.2 (0.8)	0.5 ± 0.4 (0.8)	0.56	0.8
5	3.7 ± 0.1 (7.9)	4.9 ± 0.2 (2.6)	4.59	6.8
6	0.9 ± 0.1 (0.9)	0.9 ± 0.3 (1.0)	4.65	2.12 ± 1.14
7	1.7 ± 0.1 (0.7)	2.2 ± 0.3 (0.5)	4.59	2.87 ± 0.53
8	1.7 ± 0.3 (2.0)	1.7 ± 0.3 (2.2)	4.59	2.39 ± 0.89
13		4.1 ± 0.4 (0.8)		3.57 ± 0.98
14		2.6 ± 0.4 (1.0)		3.57 ± 0.98
15		2.0 ± 0.3 (1.8)		2.51 ± 1.16
16		1.3 ± 0.3 (1.0)		2.35 ± 1.50

- Good agreement with PT's previous measurement of #1.
- Analysis not yet complete on all collimators.
- Some anomalies,
  - Why do #1 and #2 have the same measured kick factor?
  - Why is the measurement for #14 lower than #13?

Further Work

- Determine maximum kick allowable in the different ILC parameter sets.
  - Include collimator wake kicks in BDS tracking studies.
  - Enhance analytical prediction to allow fast turnaround between new collimator suggestion and tracking studies.
- Determine reasons for disagreement between experiment and simulation.
  - Necessary to add resistive wake to simulations?