# High-Power Targetry for Muon Production

Michael Hedges

NuFact 2024

2024-09-17

FERMILAB-SLIDES-24-0252-AD

## Outline

- Muon production target constraints & wish list
- Expectation vs Reality
- Target material considerations (radiation damage)
- (very briefly) Takeaways and future timelines

#### How we make muons



#### How we make a **muon beam**



#### Muon production target wish list

# Maximize production

# Long-lived (in a beam)

## Compact

#### Muon production target wish list



## Early target failures: limited beam power

Figs adapted from F. Pellemoine



(will be worse for muon targets In smaller volumes)



SNS target vessel (ORNL)







MINOS NT-02 target failure: radiation-induced swelling (FNAL)



MINOS NT-01 target containment water leak (FNAL)



Horn stripline fatigue failure (FNAL)

#### How do targets fail?



#### Thermal effects



Small iridium rod at CERN HiRadMat



Cycle fatigue



Horn stripline fatigue failure (FNAL)



#### **Radiation Damage**



MINOS NT-02 target failure: radiationinduced swelling (FNAL)

#### How do targets fail?



#### Thermal effects



Small irridum rod at CERN HiRadMat



Cycle fatigue



Horn stripline fatigue failure (FNAL)





MINOS NT-02 target failure: radiationinduced swelling (FNAL)

## Radiation Damage (Non-ionizing)

- Damage to atoms within the target
- Solids: summarized with units of Displacements Per Atom (DPA)
  - DPA > 1~ is where effects are operationally noticeable
- Transmutation/Fragmentation
- Changes in
  - Thermal & physical properties
  - Creep & swelling
  - Fracture toughness (worsening)

#### Worse for smaller targets!



# A case study for immediate next-generation muon-production experiment

## Simulate Radiation Damage (FLUKA)

- Mu2e proton beam:
  - 8 GeV (KE) protons, sigma = 1mm beam radius (gaussian beam)
  - 1.4e20 Protons on Target (POT) / year in nominal operation (8 kW beam)
- Consider cylindrical target with radius = 3 mm, length = 220 mm
- How does DPA look for different target materials?
  - Assume full year of running (1 replacement / yr)
  - Plot x vs z heatmap of DPA / proton in central slice of y to capture peak DPA in beam center

• NB: These are preliminary, exploratory plots: over-interpret at your own risk! 2024/09/17 M. T. Hedges - NuFact 2024 12

#### Slicing to find peak DPA



#### Slicing to find peak DPA





z [cm]

#### Inconel (Ni alloy)

USRBIN inconel-cylinder 50



#### Titanum Zirconium Molybenum (> 99% Mo)



Tungsten

USRBIN w-cylinder 50



z [cm]

## BUT THE MUON YIELDS!!!!



Source: IMCC meeting, talk on fluidized tungsten targets (2023) https://indico.cern.ch/event/1250075/c ontributions/5348859/attachments/267 0245/4628813/IMCC\_fluidizedtungsten-target\_v1.pdf

## G4Beamline yield validation



#### Source: Madeleine Bloomer, Emory University FNAL Undergraduate Summer Intern (2024)

Muons per Proton vs. Atomic Number



Muons per Proton vs. Density



#### G4Beamline yield validation

Source: Madeleine Bloomer, Emory University FNAL Undergraduate Summer Intern (2024)



https://pdg.lbl.gov/2024/AtomicNuclearProperties/

Muons per Proton vs. Atomic Number



Density (g/cc)



- Increasing target density worsens peak radiation damage faster than muon production increases
- Good news! Lower density targets also absorb less energy, and (usually) run less hot
- Fewer beam studies done with mid-density targets (e.g. TZM)
- Fun fact: Inconel was the material for FNAL antiproton source!

#### Wouldn't Inconel (Ni) melt? FNAL Pbar note 683

• Pbar group expected a small beam would cause a "molten channel" to form in the target and decrease antiproton yield

While the Nickel target was in use, the proton beam intensity at times reached 5.0E12 protons per pulse with a RMS beam size of  $\sigma_{xy} = 0.15$ , 0.16. The beam models, as represented by figure 1, would estimate a peak energy deposition of 1,500 joules/gram. This should be above the melting point of nickel and should have led to antiproton yield reduction towards the end of the beam pulse. This would be consistent with the lack of yield improvement at the smallest spot sizes, previously mentioned. Unfortunately, beam measurements have not shown this effect.

https://lss.fnal.gov/archive\_notes/pbarnote/fermilab-pbar-note-683.pdf

#### Wouldn't Inconel (Ni) melt? FNAL Pbar note 683

• Pbar group expected a small beam would cause a "molten channel" to form in the target and decrease antiproton yield

#### Can we utilize this further with two-phase (molten core) targets??

While the Nickel target was in use, the proton beam intensity at times reached 5.0E12 protons per pulse with a RMS beam size of  $\sigma_{xy} = 0.15$ , 0.16. The beam models, as represented by figure 1, would estimate a peak energy deposition of 1,500 joules/gram. This should be above the melting point of nickel and should have led to antiproton yield reduction towards the end of the beam pulse. This would be consistent with the lack of yield improvement at the smallest spot sizes, previously mentioned. Unfortunately, beam measurements have not shown this effect.

https://lss.fnal.gov/archive\_notes/pbarnote/fermilab-pbar-note-683.pdf

