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## Abstract

Formula of the rms transverse mode size of the XFEL radiation is derived. Derivation uses information on the XFEL transvese coherence. Derived formula agrees well with the simulation result.

## DERIVATION

In this paper, the rms transverse mode size of the X-ray free electron laser (XFEL) radiation based on self amplified spontaneous emission (SASE) [1, 2, 3] is derived using the information on the transverse coherence of the radiation [4]. In general, the rms mode size of a coherent radiation is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{c}=\sqrt{\lambda /(4 \pi) Z_{R}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\lambda$ is the radiation wavelength and $Z_{R}$ is the Rayleigh length. Obviously, the XFEL mode size $\left(\sigma_{r}\right)$ must have the form of $\sigma_{c}$ with proper $Z_{R} . \quad Z_{R}=2 L_{G}$, where $L_{G}=$ $\lambda_{u} /(4 \pi \sqrt{3} \rho)$ is the one dimensional gain length, has been generally used to give rough estimation for $\sigma_{r}$ [5], which we denote as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{d}=\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{4 \pi} \frac{2 \lambda_{u}}{4 \pi \sqrt{3} \rho}} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Although $\sigma_{d}$ is often used as a substitute for $\sigma_{r}$, it will be shown below that it is not. The derivation here uses the information of the transverse coherence of the XFEL radiation. We will consider only the cases in which $\sigma_{r}$ is comparable to the rms electron beam size $\sigma_{x}$, not including the two extreme cases, $\sigma_{x} \gg \sigma_{r}, \sigma_{r} \gg \sigma_{x}$, which were discussed in literatures [5].

Saldin et al. [6] computed the XFEL degree of transverse coherence as a function of

$$
\begin{equation*}
z=\frac{2 \pi \epsilon}{\lambda}=\frac{2 \pi \sigma_{x}^{2}}{\lambda \beta_{0}} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\beta_{0}$ is the $\beta$-function that is optimized to give shortest saturation length. The result is shown in Fig. 1 and $\beta_{o}$ is given by [6]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta_{o}=\frac{11.2}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{I_{A}}{I}\right)^{1 / 2} \frac{(\gamma \epsilon)^{3 / 2} \lambda_{u}^{1 / 2}}{\lambda K[J J]} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $[J J]$ denotes the following combination of bessel functions,

$$
\begin{equation*}
[J J]=J_{0}\left(\frac{K^{2}}{4+2 K^{2}}\right)-J_{1}\left(\frac{K^{2}}{4+2 K^{2}}\right) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$
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Figure 1: Graph of the degree of the transverse coherence versus $z=2 \pi \epsilon / \lambda$. (Ref. 6)

To make use of Fig. 1 to derive $\sigma_{r}$, we fix $\lambda$ to a hard X-ray value. Then, $z$ is proportional to $\sigma_{x}^{2}$. As $z$ grows $\sigma_{x}$ grows while $\sigma_{r}$ would not grow much since $\lambda$ is fixed. Hence, when $z$ is large (far right side of Fig. 1), $\sigma_{x}$ must be much larger than $\sigma_{r}$ and the degree of transverse coherence is low. When $z$ is very small (far left side of Fig. 1), $\sigma_{x}$ must be much smaller than $\sigma_{r}$ and the degree of transverse coherence is low again. The peaked part of the graph must correspond to that $\sigma_{x}$ is nearly same as $\sigma_{r}$. Note, from Fig. 1 , that the maximal transverse coherence is achieved at

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{2 \pi \sigma_{x}^{2}}{\lambda \beta_{o}}=0.8 \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is quite reasonable to assume that this maximal transverse coherence is achieved when $\sigma_{r}=\sigma_{x}$. Therefore, we see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{r}^{2}=\sigma_{x}^{2}=0.8 \times \frac{\lambda \beta_{o}}{2 \pi} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

To compare this expression with $\sigma_{d}$, note that the FEL parameter $\rho$ is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\rho & =\left[\frac{1}{8 \pi} \frac{I}{I_{A}}\left(\frac{K[J J]}{1+K^{2} / 2}\right)^{2} \frac{\gamma \lambda^{2}}{2 \pi \sigma_{x}^{2}}\right]^{1 / 3} \\
& =\left[\frac{1}{8 \pi}\left(\frac{I}{I_{A}} \frac{K^{2}[J J]^{2}}{\gamma^{3}}\right) \frac{\lambda_{u}^{2}}{8 \pi \sigma_{x}^{2}}\right]^{1 / 3} \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

where we used the resonance condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda=\frac{\lambda_{u}}{2 \gamma^{2}}\left(1+\frac{K^{2}}{2}\right) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using Eq. (4) and (6), we find that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{I}{I_{A}} \frac{K^{2}[J J]^{2}}{\gamma^{3}}=\frac{11.2^{2} \lambda_{u} \epsilon^{3}}{2 \lambda^{2} \beta_{o}^{2}}=\frac{62.7 \lambda_{u} \sigma_{x}^{2}}{\beta_{0}^{3}}\left(\frac{0.8}{2 \pi}\right)^{2} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then $\rho$ is simplified to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho=\left[\frac{1}{(4 \pi)^{3}} \frac{40.1}{4 \pi}\left(\frac{\lambda_{u}}{\beta_{0}}\right)^{3}\right]^{1 / 3}=\frac{1}{4 \pi}\left(\frac{40.1}{4 \pi}\right)^{1 / 3} \frac{\lambda_{u}}{\beta_{o}} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\beta_{o}$ is simply given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta_{0}=\frac{1}{4 \pi}\left(\frac{40.1}{4 \pi}\right)^{1 / 3} \frac{\lambda_{u}}{\rho} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using this result in Eq. (7), it is straightforward to see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{r}^{2}=2.0 \times \frac{\lambda}{4 \pi} \frac{2 \lambda_{u}}{4 \pi \sqrt{3} \rho}=2.0 \sigma_{d}^{2} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{r}=1.4 \sigma_{d} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Table 1: Parameters of the PAL-XFEL.

| Electron energy $(\mathrm{GeV})$ | 3.7 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Peak current $(\mathrm{kA})$ | 3 |
| Normalized emittance $(\mu \mathrm{rad})$ | 1.0 |
| Undulator period, $\lambda_{u}(\mathrm{~cm})$ | 1.5 |
| Undulator parameter, $K$ | 1.49 |
| Average $\beta$ function $(\mathrm{m})$ | 10 |
| Radiation wavelength $(\AA)$ | 3 |
| FEL parameter, $\rho$ | $5.7 \times 10^{-4}$ |
| 1-D gain length, $L_{G}(\mathrm{~m})$ | 1.19 |
| Saturation length, $L_{\text {sat }}(\mathrm{m})$ | 45 |

## COMPARISON WITH SIMULATION

Although this was obtained with the condition $\sigma_{r}=\sigma_{x}$, it does not mean that Eq. (14) is valid only when $\sigma_{r}=\sigma_{x}$. It is important to note that the condition $\sigma_{r}=\sigma_{x}$ was used only to derive the mode size using Fig. 1 and Eq. (14) is actually applicable to a wider range of $\sigma_{r}$. This is verified by simulation. As a demonstration, we consider PAL-XFEL that was under proposal at Pohang Accelerator Laboratory, Korea [7]. According to the PAL-XFEL parameters listed in Table 1, we find

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{2 \pi \epsilon}{\lambda}\right)_{P A L}=2.89 \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

From Fig. 1, we see that the PAL-XFEL degree of transverse coherence is approximately 5.6 , which is fairly off the maximal transverse coherence. It is easy to get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\sigma_{d}\right)_{P A L}=\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{4 \pi} \frac{2 \lambda_{u}}{4 \pi \sqrt{3} \rho}}=7.5 \mu \mathrm{~m} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\sigma_{r}\right)_{P A L}=10.5 \mu \mathrm{~m} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$



Figure 2: Simulated radiation profile of the PAL-XFEL.
The simulated radiation profile of PAL-XFEL is shown in Fig. 2 and its mode size is shown in Fig. 3. Both were simulated by GENESIS code [8]. Measuring the mode size from Fig. 3, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{r} \cong 10 \mu \mathrm{~m} \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that this number agrees well with the above $\left(\sigma_{r}\right)_{P A L}$ obtained by the formula of Eq. (14).

## CONCLUSION

Comparison with the simulation shows that the derived formula Eq. (14) is fairly accurate.
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Figure 3: Simulated transverse mode size of the PALXFEL.

## REFERENCES

[1] A. M. Kondratenko and E. L. Saldin, Part. Acc. 10 (1980) 207.
[2] R. Bonifacio, C. Pellegrini, and L. Narducci, Opt. Commun. 50 (1984) 373.
[3] J. B. Murphy and C. Pellegrini, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A 237 (1985) 159.
[4] T.-Y. Lee, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. 47 (2008) 4595.
[5] See, e.g., Z. Huang and K.-J. Kim, Phys. Rev. ST Accel. Beams 10 (2007) 034801.
[6] E. L. Saldin, E. A. Schneidmiller, and M. V. Yurkov, Proceedings of FEL 2006 (2006) 206.
[7] T.-Y. Lee, Y. S. Bae, J. Choi, J. Y. Huang, H. S. Kang, M. G. Kim, D. H. Kuk, J. S. Oh, Y. W. Parc, J. H. Park, S. J. Park, and I. S. Ko: J. Korean Phys. Soc. 48 (2006) 791.
[8] S. Reiche, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A 429 (1999) 243.


[^0]:    * Work supported by the Korean Ministry of Education, Science and Technology
    $\dagger$ tylee@postech.ac.kr

