Beam Tests of a High Pressure Gas-Filled Cavity for a Muon Collider

Muon Coll d=2km

> LHC d=8.4km

> > ILC I=30km

Tom Schwarz AP©0000 ‡Fermilab

On behalf of the MAP Collaboration

CLIC

=50km



VLHC

d=74km

Why a Muon Collider?



uon C

ILC I=30km

CLIC

l=50km

VLHC d=74km

Why a Muon Collider? • Compact







CLIC

=50km

VLHC d=74km

Why a Muon Collider?

Compact
 Narrow Energy Spread



Muon Collider Challenges

- Muons are produced via decay of other particles
 - requires a large proton source (MW)
- Muons emerge from production with a large 6D phase
 6D Cooling
- Muons decay quickly need rapid cooling and ramping



Muon Ionization Cooling

 Beam squeezed by solenoids while losing momentum
 → Only restored longitudinally





6D Cooling

- Cool longitudinally as well
- Helical cooling channel → muons with higher momentum experience more material



Cooling Channel for a Muon Collider

 Maximum stable gradient degrades with increased magnetic field





- Utilize high pressure gas to mitigate breakdown from field emission
- Use a high pressure test cell to study breakdown properties of materials





- Utilize high pressure gas to mitigate breakdown from field emission
- Use a high pressure test cell to study breakdown properties of materials











400 MeV H⁻ beam

- Primary I.5x10¹² H⁻/beam pulse
- I0 µs beam pulse length
- ~ 20% Acceptance through collimators
- $H^- \rightarrow H^+$ at vacuum window and cavity wall





Instrumentation

- **RF Power 201 MHz (5 MW) and 805 MHz (12 MW)**
- 4 Tesla Solenoid (250W LHe Cryo-plant)
- Instrumentation: Passive measuring of beam position, toroids counters, optical signals, spectrometer, in-cavity probes (developing acoustic sensory)

MTA Beamline and Apparatus



MTA Beamline and Apparatus



Beam Effects in HPRF Test Cavity

- Studying beam effects in test cavity with 40 µs of RF (800 MHz) at various gradients (5-30 MV/m) and no B-Field
- Test cavity filled with high pressure gaseous H² (up to 100 atm)
- I0 μs of beam fired mid-way through 40 μs of RF
- Toroid outside cavity measures timing & # protons
- RF pickup probe in cavity measures effect on E-field



Beam Effects in **HPRF** Test Cavity

- As beam enters cavity, gaseous hydrogen is ionized and electrons are released - about 2000 per proton
- **Electrons begin to absorb the energy stored the cavity**
- **Equilibrium reached when** the energy absorbed by the electrons is balanced by the klystron pumping energy into the cavity



Energy loss per electron is related to the electric field in the cavity and the electrons drift velocity

$$E_{loss} = q \cdot E_{Field} \cdot v_{drift} \cdot \frac{1}{f_0} \quad \ \ \text{per RF cycle}$$

Total energy loss observed in the cavity is of course dependent on the total # electrons

$$\mathbf{N_{e-}} = \left\langle \frac{\mathbf{dE}}{\mathbf{dx}} \right\rangle \cdot \frac{\rho_{\mathbf{gas}}}{\mathbf{35 \ eV}} \quad \text{per cm beam travels in gas}$$
$$-\left\langle \frac{dE}{dx} \right\rangle = Kz^2 \frac{Z}{A} \frac{1}{\beta^2} \left[\frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{2m_e c^2 \beta^2 \gamma^2 T_{\max}}{I^2} - \beta^2 - \frac{\delta(\beta\gamma)}{2} \right]$$



Total energy loss observed in the cavity is of course dependent on the total # electrons

$$\mathbf{N_{e-}} = \left\langle \frac{\mathbf{dE}}{\mathbf{dx}} \right\rangle \cdot \frac{\rho_{\text{gas}}}{\mathbf{35 \ eV}} \quad \text{per cm beam travels in gas}$$
$$-\left\langle \frac{dE}{dx} \right\rangle = Kz^2 \frac{Z}{A} \frac{1}{\beta^2} \left[\frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{2m_e c^2 \beta^2 \gamma^2 T_{\text{max}}}{I^2} - \beta^2 - \frac{\delta(\beta\gamma)}{2} \right]$$

Energy loss per electron is related to the electric field in the cavity and the electrons drift velocity

@ 25 MV/m

$$E_{loss} = q \cdot E_{Field} \cdot v_{drift} \cdot \frac{1}{f_0} \left(\begin{array}{c} \textbf{E}_{loss} \approx \textbf{4x10}^{-17} \textbf{J} / \textbf{cycle} \right) \right)$$

Total energy loss observed in the cavity is of course dependent on the total # electrons

$$\mathbf{N_{e-}} = \left\langle \frac{\mathbf{dE}}{\mathbf{dx}} \right\rangle \cdot \frac{\rho_{\text{gas}}}{\mathbf{35 \ eV}} \quad \text{per cm beam travels in gas}$$
$$-\left\langle \frac{dE}{dx} \right\rangle = Kz^2 \frac{Z}{A} \frac{1}{\beta^2} \left[\frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{2m_e c^2 \beta^2 \gamma^2 T_{\text{max}}}{I^2} - \beta^2 - \frac{\delta(\beta\gamma)}{2} \right]$$



Energy loss per electron is related to the electric field in the cavity and the electrons drift velocity

@ 25 MV/m

$$E_{loss} = q \cdot E_{Field} \cdot v_{drift} \cdot \frac{1}{f_0} \left(\begin{array}{c} \textbf{E}_{loss} \approx \textbf{4x10^{-17} J / cycle} \\ \textbf{F}_{loss} \approx \textbf{4x10^{-17} J / cycle} \end{array} \right)$$

Total energy loss observed in the cavity is of course dependent on the total # electrons

$$\mathbf{N}_{e-} = \left\langle \frac{\mathrm{dE}}{\mathrm{dx}} \right\rangle \cdot \frac{\rho_{\text{gas}}}{35 \text{ eV}} + \mathbf{N}_{e-} \approx 2000 \text{ / proton}$$
$$\mathbf{H}^2 @ 100 \text{ atm}$$
$$-\left\langle \frac{\mathrm{dE}}{\mathrm{dx}} \right\rangle = Kz^2 \frac{Z}{A} \frac{1}{\beta^2} \left[\frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{2m_e c^2 \beta^2 \gamma^2 T_{\text{max}}}{I^2} - \beta^2 - \frac{\delta(\beta\gamma)}{2} \right]$$

Prediction vs Experiment

- Electrons absorb energy as predicted in first 100 ns
- Afterwards, electron recombine with free ions in the gas (H³⁺, H⁵⁺...)
- Recombination rate can be empirically determined by fitting a model to the data

$$\frac{dn_e}{dt} = \frac{dn_{e,beam}}{dt} - \beta n_e n_{ions}$$



$\beta \approx 1.2 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}$

Beam Loading

- How does this translate into beam loading in a possible muon collider? → What is the relative gradient each bunch in the train will experience?
- Cooling Channel
 - 3.5x10¹² μ 's per bunch
 - 12 bunches
 - 60 ns bunch train



Beam Loading

- How does this translate into beam loading in a possible muon collider? → What is the relative gradient each bunch in the train will experience?
- Cooling Channel
 - 3.5x10¹² μ's per bunch
 - 12 bunches
 - 60 ns bunch train



Using Electronegative Gases

- Absorbing electrons is the key → recombination rate of H² is too slow
- Dope gaseous H² with an electronegative gas (0.01% of SF₆) to absorb free electrons



Using Electronegative Gases

- Absorbing electrons is the key → recombination rate of H² is too slow
- Dope gaseous H² with an electronegative gas (0.01% of SF₆) to absorb free electrons
- Small amount of SF₆ drastically improves performance

$$\frac{dn_e}{dt} = \frac{dn_{e,beam}}{dt} - \beta n_e n_i - \alpha n_e$$
Capture Time
SF₆ < nano second



Using Electronegative Gases

- Attachment cross-section for SF_6 is such that most electrons in the cavity should be removed within a few RF cycles
- Why the loss in energy still?
- SF₆⁻ absorb little energy due to mass
- However, H³⁺, H⁵⁺, etc. will still remove energy
- **Still investigating**



Muon Collider d=2km

- Unfortunately, SF₆ freezes at liquid N₂ temperatures and is corrosive → O² is also a great electronegative gas
- Add 1% of Air (0.2% O₂)
- Similar Performance to SF₆
- Very safe → much lower concentration than lowest explosive level of O₂ in H₂



Magnetic Field Test

- Putting it all together
- Gradient set to 25 MV/m, B-Field at 3 Tesla, using 100 atm H² and 1% Air - in a high intensity proton beam
- No effective difference in performance!
- Successful demonstration of beam in a 25 MV/m HPRF cavity in a 3 Tesla B-Field



In a Muon Collider

- How does this translate into beam loading in a possible muon collider? → What is the relative gradient each bunch in the train will experience?
- Prediction 1.0 **Cooling Channel** 0.9 $H_2 + I\%$ Air • 3.5x10¹² μ 's per bunch **200** atm 0.8 E/E_0 **12** bunches 0.7 H_2 60 ns bunch train 0.6 0.5 Last Bunch 8 10 2 12 4 6 < 5% Reduction \ddagger of bunches 31

Summary

 Successfully demonstrated HPRF cavities can achieve a high gradient within a strong magnetic field

>50 MV/m and B ~ 3 Tesla

- Difficult to maintain stable gradients bunch-to-bunch due to gas-beam interactions
- Successfully demonstrated the use of electronegative gas dopants as a technique to mitigate these beam effects



Thanks!!

 Successfully demonstrated HPRF cavities can achieve a high gradient within a strong magnetic field

>50 MV/m and B ~ 3 Tesla

- Difficult to maintain stable gradients bunch-to-bunch due to gas-beam interactions
- Successfully demonstrated the use of electronegative gas dopants as a technique to mitigate these beam effects





enhances the breakdown process

MTA Beamline and Apparatus

