

Design and simulation of 6D ionization cooling lattices for Muon Accelerators

Diktys Stratakis Brookhaven National Laboratory

Thanks to: V. Balbekov, J. S. Berg, R. Fernow, S. Khan, R. Palmer, P. Snopok, H. Witte

MAP Collaboration Meeting

June 21, 2013

Outline

- Introduction to the tapering concept
- Present a promising 6D cooling lattice
 - A <u>tapered</u> Guggenheim Lattice
- Evolution to a straight (snake-type) Guggenheim
 - I will show that you I can transform the Guggenheim to a straight lattice with no parameter changes! Yes, it works!
- Lattice Details
 - Identify the required rf, voltage, B-field, radius, absorber length
- Evaluate Performance
 - Track particles : Carry out a full "front-to-end" simulation
- Review magnet & engineering feasibility

Cooling Requirement



- Ionization cooling is the only feasible option
- Longitudinal cooling through emittance exchange
- Simultaneous transverse & longitudinal cooling

RFOFO Cooling Concept





4

- Tilt coils to generate dispersion
- Emittance exchange on a wedge absorber
- Ring evolved to a helix to avoid injection/extraction issues

Palmer et al., PRST-AB 8, 021021 (2005); Snopok & Hanson , IJMPA 8, 021021

Tapering



- Lattice parameters such as rf freq., cell length, focusing strength, absorber length, change with distance
- Keep emittance above equilibrium
- Tapering pros:
 - More dispersion, faster cooling
 - Impressive constant cooling efficiency
 - Shorter than untapered channels
 - Method is not restricted to a Guggenheim
- We can transform it to a straight lattice with no changes (R_FOFO)

Stages of the Guggemheim



- 17 tapered stages are enough
- Each stage consist of a series of identical cells
- Only four different frequencies are necessary
- Highest B is ~18T, conservative grad.~23 MV/m for 805 MHz

Example: Stage 11



110.14

Particle Tracking & Performance



- Cools to MC baseline parameters. We start with a real distribution from the post-merger (100,000 particles)
- Notice that Q is flat all the way (importance of tapering)
- Transmission ~45% with decays, windows, stochastics. 8

Cooling Limitations due Space-Charge



- 20% particle loss after z>200 m due space-charge
- Thus, we avoid cooling longitudinally below 2 mm

D. Stratakis, R. Palmer and D. Grote, Proc. of IPAC 2013, p. 759

Critical B-Field limits



- All simulations use realistic fields calculated from coils.
- Our lattice fields are below or close to the critical limits of existing magnet technology. 10

Engineering Studies (H. Witte)



• Preliminary studies with COMSOL

Von-Mises Stress (H. Witte)



Convert to a straight Guggenheim

- Conversion from Guggenheim to Rectilinear_FOFO
 - Good news: Only minor variations of the Guggenheim lattice parameters are needed



Design a late stage with R_FOFO



This is the worst case!



Last Stage with a R_FOFO



- Cools towards the baseline requirements for a MC with a >40% transmission!
- Initial distribution is the output of Stage12 of Guggenheim

Summary

- Some additional things to remember:
 - A Guggenheim can become **straight** with the <u>same</u> parameters!
 - This is a front-to-end complete simulation. We include rf and absorber windows, muon decays and stochastics.
 - We reach close to the baseline MC requirements with T>45%!
 - We use realistic fields calculated from coils
 - "Low" < 19 T fields (worse case is 18.6 T on coil and 17 T on axis)
 - Current densities within limits including a moderate safety factor
 - Only 4 rf: 201,402,603,805 MHz. Conservative 23 MV/m 805 MHz
 - Notable <u>flat & high cooling efficiency</u>. 6D drop by a 1/1000 factor.

- Encouraging results look encouraging from preliminary studies!
- This work is submitted to Phys. Rev. ST-AB