H. TIMKO, CERN BE-RF

BEAM INSTABILITIES AFTER INJECTION TO THE LHC

CO-AUTHORS: T. ARGYROPOULOS, I. KARPOV, E. SHAPOSHNIKOVA



OUTLINE

INSTABILITIES AT LHC INJECTION

- MEASUREMENTS
- MECHANISM
- FIRST SIMULATION
 SCANS



NOMINAL INJECTION SCHEME

- Bunch parameters
 - 1.15×10¹¹ ppb, 1.6 ns (4-sigma equivalent FWHM) at injection
- Extraction from the SPS bucket
 - 7 MV at 200 MHz and 1 MV at 800 MHz
- Injection into the LHC bucket
 - 6 MV at 400 MHz
 - 'Matched' would be ~2MV
 - Increased voltage to avoid losses



Simulated bunch at SPS extraction



LIU & HL-LHC

- LHC Injectors Upgrade (LIU): 2019-2020
 - Recommissioning: 2021
 - RF upgrade in SPS; up to 10 MV will be available
 - Gradual intensity increase: 2022-2023
 - Expect to increase also the intensity in the LHC

- High-luminosity LHC (HL-LHC): 2024-2025
 - Recommissioning: 2026
 - Targeted intensity: 2.3×10¹¹ ppb at LHC injection



<section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><text>



MEASUREMENTS

OBSERVATIONS IN THE LHC



INJECTION OSCILLATIONS

- Long-lasting injection oscillations were seen since the first start-up with beam in the LHC
 - No harmful effect on the beam
 - Not studied in much detail back then





Injection transient signals during LHC beam commissioning 5th November 2009



OSCILLATIONS THROUGH RAMP

- Observations in 2017 concerning injection oscillations
 - Patterns of dipole oscillations along the ring survive the ramp
 - Mystery: how can the oscillations remain after 13 million turns of phase noise injection for the controlled emittance blow-up?





OSCILLATIONS THROUGH RAMP

- Correlation with the time spent on flat bottom
 - Batches injected later have a larger amplitude of oscillations, also at arrival to flat top
 - Full damping of oscillations requires about an hour at flat bottom





8

TOWARDS HL-LHC INTENSITIES

- Dedicated single-bunch measurements: (0.8-2.2)×10¹¹ ppb
 - Using the nominal injection voltage of 6 MV
 - Instability develops after injection, leading to flat bottom losses







PLITUDE OF OSCILLATIONS

- Stable phase measurements show only 10° phase oscillations peak to peak; 400 MHz RF component
 - Misleadingly small...
- Non-rigid dipole oscillations are seen on the bunch profiles



Peak oscillates with 50° pk-pk

CERN

INSTABILITY FORMATION

SIMULATION STUDIES



MECHANISM

- Large mismatch at injection \rightarrow island formation
 - Local loss of Landau damping





INSTABILITY FORMATION

- Mismatch between bucket height and momentum spread
- In simulations with 1.15×10¹¹ ppb, the instability occurs:
 - For a nominal bunch length (1.6 ns at injection), occurs with increased injection voltage (10 MV)
 - For shorter bunches (e.g. 1.4 ns) at nominal RF voltage (6 MV)
- In measurements, the instability occurs aready for the nominal bunch length and injection voltage, at an intensity of 1.9×10¹¹ ppb injected



OPTIMUM INJECTION VOLTAGE?

- Best working point for the RF voltage in Run 3 and HL-LHC?
 - To keep SPS-LHC transfer losses low, prefer higher voltage
 - In the future, up to 10 MV at 200 MHz might be used for SPS extraction
 - Scaling the nominal LHC voltage, this would call for 8.6 MV
 - To prevent from instabilities and subsequent flat bottom losses, a lower voltage is desirable
- Other factors that play a role in the choice of the voltage
 - RF power consumption
 - Close to or beyond its limits with 8.6 MV and 2.3×10^{11} ppb
 - Controlled emittance blow-up during the ramp
 - Indispensable for operation
 - Difficulties with controlling the bunch length expected at high intensities
 - Interaction with flat-bottom instabilities to be studied



PARAMETER SCANS

FIRST SIMULATION STUDIES



SIMULATION SETUP

- The 'optimum' voltage is thus a compromise between acceptable losses (at injection and flat bottom) and sufficient damping of injection oscillations
- Simulations at nominal intensity
 - Using present LHC impedance model at 450 GeV
 - Flat bottom losses were determined from the separatrix, after firstturn capture losses
 - Oscillation amplitude from average bunch position after damping of the initial injection errors





HB2018, 19th June 2018

OPTIMUM VOLTAGE SCANS (1)



Using a binomial distribution function of action with exponent 1.5; fitted from measurements

Orange crosses = undamped cases Red crosses = growing oscillation amplitude



OPTIMUM VOLTAGE SCANS (2)



Using a binomial distribution function of action with exponent 5.0; to enhance the tail population

Orange crosses = undamped cases Red crosses = growing oscillation amplitude



PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS

- Injection voltage: 4 MV could be a good compromise for nominal bunch intensity and bunch length
 - More stability margin
 - Would be beneficial also for reducing the RF power consumption
- To be verified experimentally



BEAM PHASE LOOP

- Presently operational scenario: averaging the phase error measurements of all bunches
 - Efficient RF noise reduction for physics
 - Concerning injection errors, however:
 - Only the first batches are efficiently re-centred; for batches injected later, the phase loop is less and less efficient
 - Batches already circulating in the machine get kicked at new injections
 - Phase loop not taken into account in simulations
- If necessary, injection oscillations could be damped by applying a batch-by-batch correction on individual batches



CONCLUSIONS

- Injection oscillations can develop into instabilities and can lead to losses
- Need to determine optimum voltage considering losses, stability and RF power consumption
- First simulation studies performed; experimental verification underway

감사합니다.

