# NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS OF TRANSVERSE BEAM DIFFUSION ENHANCEMENT BY THE USE OF ELECTRON LENS IN THE TEVATRON COLLIDER

V. Previtali, G. Stancari, A. Valishev, Fermilab, Batavia, IL 60510, USA D. Shatilov, BINP, Novosibirsk, Russia

#### Abstract

Transverse beam diffusion for the Tevatron machine has been calculated using the Lifetrac code. The following effects were included: random noise (representing residual gas scattering, voltage noise in the accelerating cavities) lattice nonlinearities and beam-beam interactions. The time evolution of particle distributions with different initial amplitudes in Hamiltonian action has been simulated for 6 million turns, corresponding to a time of about 2 minutes. For each particle distribution, several cases have been considered: a single beam in storage ring mode, the collider case and the effects of a hollow electron beam collimator.

# **INTRODUCTION**

The aim of this work is to evaluate the diffusion coefficient for the tevatron antiproton beam with the use of the tracking code Lifetrac [1], and compare it with the experimental results. The diffusion equation, introduced in the first section, is the foundation for the analysis of both the experimental data [2] and the simulation data. The limitations of this approach are investigated, and the diffusion coefficient results are presented and compared with the experimental results previously published [3]. In the last section the results of frequency map analysis for the beam beam case, with and without electron lens [4], are presented.

### THE DIFFUSIVE MODEL

Given the large number of independent processes contributing to the dynamics and smearing phase-space structure (noise, beam-beam, orbit jitter, etc.), we assumed that the overall particle dynamics could be described using a diffusive model. The time evolution of the particle distribution function  $\rho$ , both for beam core particles and beam tails, is therefore believed to follow the well-known diffusion equation:

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (D \,\nabla(\rho)) \tag{1}$$

The diffusion equation is derived from the continuity equation, which requires that the change in particle population  $\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t}$  is equal to the flux  $\phi$  of incoming particles

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot \phi \tag{2}$$

and from the semi-empirical Fick's law

**05 Beam Dynamics and Electromagnetic Fields** 

$$\phi = -D \,\nabla\rho \tag{3}$$

which states that the flux is proportional to the gradient of the population itself via a proportionality factor D. In order to understand the physical meaning of the diffusion coefficient D it is important to define the space in which the density function  $\rho$  is considered. In literature different approaches have been explored. The obvious choice to consider  $\rho = \rho(x, y, z)$ , i.e. the density function in the physical space, has been analyzed in detail in Ref. [5]. In a single dimension, the diffusion equation reads as:

$$\frac{\partial \rho(W)}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial W} \left( \frac{4D_{ph}(W)}{\beta} W \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial W} \right) \tag{4}$$

where the Courant Snyder invariant (single particle emittance)  $W = (x^2 + p_x^2)/\beta = (x^2 + (\beta x' + \alpha x)^2)/\beta$  has been introduced. In the given formulation the general case of  $D_{ph} = D_{ph}(W)$  has been taken into account, however it has been shown that, in case of a purely Brownian motion, the diffusion coefficient in the physical space is independent on the particle emittance W.

It can also be convenient to consider the diffusion equation in the action space, where the Hamiltonian action J in the plane z for a single particle is defined as:

$$J = \frac{z_{max}^2}{4\beta_z} \tag{5}$$

for the generic z direction. This approach is particularly useful when analyzing experimental data, where only the particle maximum displacement  $z_{max}$  is known [2]. For linear machines it is straightforward to show the relation between the single particle emittance and the action, i.e. W = 4J. In this case Equation 4 becomes:

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \left( \frac{D_{ph}}{\beta} J \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial J} \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \left( D_J(J) \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial J} \right) \qquad (6)$$

where the diffusion function  $D_J$  in the action space is introduced. It follows that, in case of brownian motion in the physical space,  $D_J(J)$  is expected to be linear in J, and inversely proportional to the local beta function.

For a thin particle distribution in the range  $J - \delta < J < J + \delta$ , the function  $D_J$  can be considered constant, and the local diffusion equation becomes:

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = D_J \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial^2 J} \tag{7}$$

where the diffusion coefficient  $D_J$  can be calculated as [6]:

$$D_J = \frac{\Delta J^2}{2\Delta t} \tag{8}$$

ISBN 978-3-95450-115-1

The analysis of both the experimental results [2, 3] and the simulation data are based on Equation 7.

D02 Non-linear Dynamics - Resonances, Tracking, Higher Order



Figure 1: Evolution in time of a narrow distribution in the  $J_2$  space,  $7\sigma$  amplitude, collision case, no electron lens.

# WORKING IN A COUPLED MACHINE

It is worth noticing that the Tevatron is a coupled machine, therefore it is not possible to treat the vertical, horizontal and longitudinal motion independently. However, for a linear machine, it is still possible to define three uncoupled planes, i.e. the eigenmodes of the one turn matrix, where the three normalized particle amplitudes  $A_1, A_2, A_3$  [7] are invariants of the motion. When a strong nonlinearity (e.g. beam-beam effect) is included in the simulation, it generates a beating of the particle amplitudes. To compensate for the beating, the average amplitude over a large number of turns is considered.

#### SIMULATION PARAMETERS

The code Lifetrac[1] has been used to calculate the diffusion coefficient for anti protons in the Tevatron. Narrow bi-Gaussian distributions in the average amplitude space have been used as an input. The initial distribution width is about .02  $\sigma$  in both planes and its center is  $(n\sigma_1, n\sigma_2)$ , for n between 1 and 8. The population is of 1000 particles per distribution, tracked (with full 6D treatment) for a total number of turns of  $6 \times 10^6$  (equivalent to about 2 minutes). Different machine configurations have been considered: the single beam (purely random noise) and the collider mode, with and without electron lens. For amplitudes larger than  $8\sigma$  it has been observed that, in the collision case, the particles gain large amplitudes (above  $50\sigma$ ) within few turns. This sudden particle loss is in good agreement with the experimental observation of the dynamic aperture. It has been verified that the observed aperture limitation disappears when removing the parasitic IPs from the simulation, thus proving that the Tevatron dynamic aperture is defined by the presence of parasitic IPs.

#### SIMULATION RESULTS

A typical evolution of the particle distribution in Hamiltonian action space  $J_2$  is shown in Figure 1. For each distribution rms width of the distribution is calculated and its evolution in time is considered: in Figure 2 the squared

ISBN 978-3-95450-115-1



Figure 2: Time evolution of the the particle distribution width in the action space  $J_2$ .

width of the distribution is plotted versus time, for the three considered configurations, same initial amplitude  $(7\sigma)$ . It can be noticed how the expected quadratic behavior (from Equation 8) is verified only for the single beam, while in the other two cases the diffusion is faster - which is typical of resonance driven diffusion. In order to compare the different cases, the local diffusion coefficient  $D_2$  is always calculated trough a quadratic fit of the distribution width, intended as a very conservative estimation when electron lens is included.

The summary results for the coefficient  $D_2$  versus the action  $J_2$  are presented in Figure 3. The results for the other direction are similar. For the first curve (single beam case) the only source of diffusion in the code is a random noise matrix: in this case the linear dependency of  $D_2(J)$  (predicted by Equation 6) is verified. Including the beam-beam effect (second curve) leads to diffusion coefficient values which are about a factor two to five larger. In the third curve, finally, the electron lens is activated, and it effect on the beam diffusion is clearly visible: for amplitudes lower than  $3\sigma_2$  the core is untouched, while in the electron lens range (amplitudes larger than  $4\sigma_2$ ) the diffusion coefficient is greatly enhanced. A moderate increase in diffusion coefficient for the  $3\sigma_2$  case is justified



Figure 3: Diffusion coefficient  $D_2$  versus the Hamiltonian action in the eigenmode 2.

05 Beam Dynamics and Electromagnetic Fields D02 Non-linear Dynamics - Resonances, Tracking, Higher Order

BV



Figure 4: Frequency map analysis for the Tevatron, collision case, without electron lens (left) and with electron lens (right).

by the fact that, as previously explained, the amplitude indicated on the x axis is intended to be the average amplitude, meaning that some of the particles can actually reach a physical aperture larger than the inner electron lens radius.

It is worth noticing that the overall diffusion coefficient  $D_u$  perceived by a vertical collimator (such as in the experiment described in [3]) is determined by the behavior of all the particles sitting in proximity to the collimator edge. In the normalized average amplitude space the collimator edge describes a curve  $y_{coll}$ , and the total diffusion coefficient is a combination of the local diffusion coefficient for all the particles positioned along this curve. The proper calculation would require a full sampling of the amplitude space, meaning massive computational resources. In this article we only compare some representative points of the amplitude space with the experimental results presented in Ref. [3, Figure 5]. The experimental data are measured with the collimator scan method for the collision case, with no electron lens, and they are here compared to the second curve in Figure 3. While the comparison for the particles in the beam core is encouraging (same order of magnitude), for amplitude between 4 and  $8\sigma_y$  the experimental values are up to a factor  $10^5$  larger than the simulated data. This large difference is not yet understood.

In order to overcome the complexity of performing a full sampling of the amplitude space, an alternative approach has been explored, i.e. the frequency map analysis. FMA is a convenient way to identify the machine resonances either in the tune or in the amplitude space. The quality factor of an FMA is the diffusion index  $i_d$  [8], which is equal to the jitter of the main betatron tune in logaritmic scale. Even if there is no explicit relation between the diffusion index and the diffusion coefficient, the FMA is still a useful method for a qualitative evaluation of the diffusive behavior. The comparison between the FMA plots with and without electron lens (Figure 4) shows clearly the effect of the device, which generates a dense region of additional resonances in the beam halo area, leaving the beam core unaffected.

# SUMMARY

The diffusion coefficient for some representative points in the amplitude space has been calculated by fitting the time evolution of delta-like particle distributions using the diffusion equation, for different machine conditions. The results confirm a strong efficiency of the electron lens as an halo diffusive enhancer, leading to diffusion coefficients which are at least a factor 10K higher than the values obtained for the collision case. This result is confirmed by the Frequency Map Analysis, which shows a clear intensification of resonance lines for particle amplitudes larger than the electron lens inner radius. If compared with past experiments, the simulations successfully reproduce the diffusion coefficients for the beam core, but still present a large discrepancy for halo particles, still under investigation.

#### REFERENCES

- D. Shatilov et al., "Lifetrac code for the weak-strong simulation of the beam-beam effects in Tevatron, PAC05, Knoxville, Tennessee USA, May 2005, TPAT084, p.4138.
- [2] G.Stancari, "Diffusion Model for the Time Evolution of Particle Loss Rates In Collimator Scans: A Method for Measuring Stochastic Transverse Beam Dynamics in Circular Accelerators," PAC11, San Sebastian, Spain, September 2011, WEODA02 p. 1939, arXiv:1108.5010.
- [3] G. Stancari et al., "Measurements of Transverse Beam Diffusion Rates in the Fermilab Tevatron Collider," PAC11, San Sebastian, Spain, September 2011, TUPZ033 p. 1882.
- [4] G. Stancari et al., "Collimation with hollow electron beams," Phys. Rev. Lett. 107(2011) 084802.
- [5] D. Edwards and M. Syphers, An Introduction to the physics of high-energy accelerators, Wiley, New York, USA (1993).
- [6] K. Mess and M. Seidel, "Collimators as diagnostic tools in the proton machine of HERA," Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A351(1994) pp. 279285.
- [7] V. Lebedev and S. Bogacz, "Betatron motion with coupling of horizontal and vertical degrees of freedom," JINST 5(2010) p. 10010.
- [8] J. Laskar., "The chaotic motion of the solar system: A numerical estimate of the size of the chaotic zones',' Icarus 88, no. 2 (1990), pp. 266 291.

#### ISBN 978-3-95450-115-1

# **05 Beam Dynamics and Electromagnetic Fields**