

Pranab K. Saha J-PARC/JAEA (Japan)

IMCC Annual meeting, UJCLab in Orsay (France) June 19-22, 2023

Background of this talk

A high intensity proton driver is needed for the Muon Collider.

Intensity: ~ 2 MW \rightarrow Higher than existing to date.

The challenges are thus beyond those facing in the running machines to date.



A high-energy and high-intensity SC H⁻ linac with successive charge-exchange injection into a storage ring* are in consideration.

(* A rapid cycling synchrotron (RCS) could also be an option)

Overview of the operational issues in a high-intensity proton driver (J-PARC RCS) and high-energy stripping challenges are presented.

High-power H⁻ charge-exchange challenges

The H⁻ charge exchange injection (CEI) is an efficient way to increase the proton beam power with multi-turn injection into a synchrotron or storage ring. The beam loss can be kept sufficiently lower as compared to p injection.

A stripper foil is conventionally used for an H⁻ stripping to proton. However, this becomes complicated and have several following issues, especially dealing with high-intensity beam.

- Lifetime of the stripper foil.
- Maintaining and controlling the partially stripped (H⁰) and unstripped H⁻ and their proper disposal.
- Excited state of H⁰ and the beam loss from H^{0*} decays outside the aperture.
- Stripped electron collections.
- Beam loss, especially uncontrolled ones caused by the foil scattering.

 \rightarrow An optimum transverse painting (TP) at injection is needed to minimize foil hitting of the circulating beam during multi-turn injection.

.

Overview of running high-intensity (MW class) proton machines

- SNS in Oak Ridge: 1.4 MW designed
- RCS at J-PARC : 1 MW designed

Parameter	SNS in Oak Ringe	J-PARC RCS
Туре	Storage ring	Synchrotron
H ⁻ IS peak (mA) & inj. beam power (MW)	< 40 1.4	> 50 0.133
Inj. pulse (ms)	1	0.5
H ⁻ stripping type & stripping efficiency (%)	Multi-turn H ⁻ CEI by foil 95%	Multi-turn H ⁻ CEI by foil 99.7%
Ein / Eout (GeV)	1 / 1	0.4 / 3
Beam power (MW)	1.4* (1.5 E14/pulse)	~1** (~1E14/pulse)
SC tune shift	~0.1	~0.15

* 1.55 MW to date. Upgrading for > 2 MW (By increasing inj. beam energy and peak current)
** ~ 1 MW to date. Demonstrated 1.5 MW potential. Studying towards 2 MW!
(By increasing injection pulse length & peak current)

• A multi-MW beam power is thus not that far!

• A higher injection energy has a significant benefit for SC mitigation.

Higher injection energy benefits for SC mitigation



✓ This experimental data clearly show a significant gain from a higher injection energy as well as excellent ability of injection painting.

IMCC Annual meeting



J-PARC H⁻ stripping issues at high-intensity operation

• Unstripped H⁻ (Controlled)

Determine by the foil thickness and those missing the foil. Initially negligible (1E-5%), but problems when a foil degradation occurs and using a smaller size foil. Operational limit from the waste beam dump temperature.

• Partially stripped H⁰ and their excited states (H^{0*}) losses (Partially uncontrolled):

H⁰ yield depends on the foil thickness. H^{0*} decays determined by the injection chicane design. H⁰ yield: 0.3% (400 W). H^{0*} decay outside the aperture : 6W (Extreme case) Recently chicane bump field is reduced by 20%.

At the SNS: Foil inside a magnet. Decays immediately. Loss negligible. Otherwise > 2000 W loss could occur!

• Stripped electron collection (Controlled):

No issues so far. (SNS had problems at earlier commissioning stage)

• Foil lifetime (Controlled so far) P.K. Saha et al., PRAB 23, 082801 (2020)

Foil degradation determines the practical foil lifetime.

Temporary solution: Inserting the foil more to the beam. Foil hitting (scattering) rate increases.

At present ~1 month at 0.9 MW opr. Foil magazine can hold 15 foils.

Foil scattering beam losses (Partially uncontrolled):

Several sources/mechanisms. Determined by the foil thickness & size, and foils hits. TP minimizes the foil hits.

- Single Large angle Coulomb scattering: An additional injection collimator was installed in J-PARC.
- Energy straggling, Multiple scattering, Nuclear interaction: Determined by the foil thickness.
- Foil hitting rate of the circulating beam: Minimized by the trans. inj. painting and the foil size.

 \rightarrow One of the main issues at J-PARC at high-intensity operation.

Foil scattering beam loss issues

- Already achieved the designed 1 MW beam power and tested for a short time operation.
- Maximum Longitudinal and Transverse paintings (LP and TP) are applied for SC mitigation.
- The TP creates uniform beam distributions and also minimize foil hitting rate.
- \rightarrow A higher TP reduced foil hitting rate, but TP area depends on the machine aperture, lattice design, realistic machine errors and imperfections.

→ Barely reached to the design TP of 216π mm mrad. The average foil hits/proton is ~ 7.



ullet Estimated beam loss at 1MW: \sim 0.2% (0.3 kW) << Collimator limit (4 kW)!

However, residual radiation at the injection area caused by the uncontrolled beam loss due to foil scattering of the circulating beam is rather high.

Reduction of the foil scattering beam loss is a top priority!

Reduction of the foil scattering beam losses

+

- Minimize vert. inj. beam size by manipulating vert. beta (β_v) of the injection beam.
- Minimize vertical size of the stripper foil.



P.K. Saha Measured foil scattering beam loss

Optimize vert. transverse painting w.r.t. the smaller inj. β_y .



Optimization of vertical painting matching with injection beam. (y': -3.3 → 2.82 mrad)
→ Minimize number of large amplitude particles.
→ Reduce beam loss.

Foil hitting rate (uncontrolled beam loss) 30% reduced. The total beam loss at the injection, collimator and 1st arc sections are 40% reduced in average.

Latest beam loss mitigation at 1 MW

S-BLM signal (Arb. units) 0 0 0 00 01 Based on numerical simulations and extensive beam 2020 1 MW org: $\beta_y = 8 \text{ m}$ 2022 1 MW Run#90 best: $\beta_y = 2.2 \text{ m}$ studies following optimizations were implemented. Minimized injection beam and the foil sizes. Optimized betatron tunes. Time structure of the beam loss ✓ Optimized transverse and longitudinal paintings. Comparison: 2020 & 2022 ✓ Optimized correction of v_x -2 v_y = -6 resonance. ✓ Reduced $3v_x = 19$ effect by SB × 0.8 field (reduced K2 field intrinsic in the SB, H0* decays) 15 5 10 20Time (ms) \blacklozenge The residual beam loss is estimated to be ~0.05%.

 \rightarrow The residual beam loss is dominated by the foil scattering.

• We will try to further reducing the foil size.

 \rightarrow Unstripped H⁻ beam power at the waster beam dump is an issue.

◆ To eliminate foil scattering beam losses and foil lifetime issues, we are **developing laser stripping of H⁻ charge-exchange injection.**

1 MW operation can be achieved with a negligible beam loss!!

H⁻ stripping challenges at high-energy & high-intensity MC case: 5-10 GeV, 2 MW

Earlier studies: Project-X design study at Fermilab (HB 2008, 2010 WS, David Johnson) H- energy : 8 GeV with stripping injection



1.6 times higher at 1 GeV as compared to 0.4 GeV!

Foil scattering and foil lifetime issues should be further seriously concerned!

Needs careful injection design:

- Project-X (8 GeV) inj. case. David Johnson, HB 2008
- H2 should be moderate.

Circulating protons

 \cdot H3 should be stronger to stripping H0* immediately.

Stripping efficiency and H⁰ excited states loss



Stripping efficiency of 8 GeV H- as a function of foil thickness (Cross sections ref. W. Chou et al., NIMA 590, 1-12 (2008))

A foil thickness of 700 μg/cm² gives H+ : 99.79% H0 : 0.21% H- : ~10-6%



Some of the H0 are in excited states (H0*). Decays passing through a magnetic field due to $E = \beta \gamma c B$

E is higher for a high-energy beam.

The decay rates depend on the strength of the magnetic field.

 \rightarrow Higher at higher H- energy

At 8 GeV, $H0^* > 2$ are subjects to concern.

Next generation H⁻ stripping injection

To overcome the issues and limitations associated with foil stripping as well as to realize next-generation multi-MW proton accelerator, we have to established an alternate method of H^- stripping.

→ Laser stripping?

Laser stripping (LS) of H⁻ beam

SNS (Oak Ridge): Laser-assisted H⁻ stripping

- High field magnets for stripping.
- UV laser (355 nm) for H^0 excitation.
- \cdot 10 $\mu s\,$ stripping demonstrated.
- Studies for implementation are underway.



8 GeV H⁰ excitation. Higher H⁻ energy is suitable. P.K. Saha



J-PARC: H⁻ stripping by using only lasers

- IR lasers for stripping. Deep UV laser (~200 nm) for H⁰ excitation.
- \cdot Demonstrated 40 μs H $^{-}$ neutralization at 3 MeV.
- A POP test at 400 MeV stripping expected in 2024.

To reduced the laser energy, a multi-reflection cavity systems has been developed at J-PARC. Seeder energy \sim 1/N, where, N = no. of reflections. N = 32 achieved. Next trail for N = 64.



Summary

- The H⁻ stripping injection issues associated with stripper foil at J-PARC are discussed.
- The beam loss at the designed 1 MW has been reduced to an extremely low level to remain mainly the foil scattering beam losses.
- The foil scattering uncontrolled beam losses and the corresponding residual radiation at high-intensity operation is one of the concerning issues.
- To overcome the foil issues, a laser stripping of H⁻ is under development.
- Based on the J-PARC and SNS results so far, a multi-MW beam power for the MC can be achieved without serious issues.
- However, the H⁻ stripping at higher energy and higher intensity becomes more complicated and challenging.
- The injection system has to be designed more carefully.
- A laser stripping at higher H⁻ energies would be more feasible.

Extra slides

Implementation of a smaller β_{y} and a smaller foil



IMCC Annual meeting