

Beam Manipulations with Stable Islands and Bent Crystal Near the 3rd-order Resonance in the SPS Dora Veres, Hannes Bartosik, Massimo Giovannozzi, Konstantinos Paraschou, Frederik van der Veken, Francesco Maria Velotti Thanks: SPS OP, Bjorn Lindstrom, Stefano Redaelli



Motivation

• Test a new approach to slow extraction that combines particle trapping in stable islands with channeling by a bent crystal to reduce losses on the extraction septum (for details see this paper or this talk)





Short Parallel MDs

- Preliminary studies at 100 GeV of creating and trapping in stable islands near the 3rd-order resonance
- Phase space with islands detected and reconstructed by kicking the beam
- Trapping achieved by sweeping the tune across the resonance, as well as by radial steering
- Measurement results in excellent agreement with simulations





Dedicated MD – Goals

- First attempt at a proof-of-principle test without extraction to protect septa
- Demonstrate particle transport in stable islands to the crystal (TECA.41777)
- Channel particles by crystal onto the collimator (TCSM.51932)
 - Channelled beamlet intercepted by positive collimator jaw in the same turn as channelling or two turns later by the negative jaw
 - Use the scraper (BSHV.11771) as secondary bottleneck to reconstruct channelled distribution from collimator linear scan



Dedicated MD – Machine settings

- Optics: LHC Q26
- Tune: $Q_x = 26.31$, $Q_y = 26.11$
- Chromaticity: $Q'_x = -13.8, Q_y = -0.6$
- Energy: 100 GeV
- Energy ramp at flat top: 0.33 GeV over ~4 s
- Non-linear elements:
 - LSE.40602: $k_2 = 0.4 \text{ m}^{-3}$ (extraction sextupole to drive resonance)
 - LOF: $k_3 = -6.0 \text{ m}^{-4}$ (octupoles to ensure presence of stable islands)

• Beam:

- No. of bunches: $4 \rightarrow$ debunched at flat top
- Intensity: 1e10 p/b
- Emittance: $\epsilon_x^* \simeq 0.8 \,\mu\text{m}, \epsilon_y^* \simeq 0.8 \,\mu\text{m}$
- 3 closed orbit bumps:





- Stable islands visible in wire scanner profiles
- Beam intensity is steadily depleted
- Clear difference in the start of losses with and without crystal
- Losses only at collimator and/or scraper depending on the setup



- Stable islands visible in wire scanner profiles \checkmark
- Beam intensity is steadily depleted
- Clear difference in the time of the start of losses with and without crystal
- Losses only at collimator and/or scraper depending on the setup





hollow beam

- Stable islands visible in wire scanner profiles \checkmark
- Beam intensity is steadily depleted
- Clear difference in the time of the start of losses with and without crystal
- Losses only at collimator and/or scraper depending on the setup





- Stable islands visible in wire scanner profiles √
- Beam intensity is steadily depleted
- Clear difference in the time of the start of losses with and without crystal
- Losses only at collimator and/or scraper depending on the setup





- Stable islands visible in wire scanner profiles
- Beam intensity is steadily depleted \checkmark
- Clear difference in the start of losses with and without crystal \checkmark
- Losses only at collimator and/or scraper depending on the setup





- Stable islands visible in wire scanner profiles
- Beam intensity is steadily depleted
- Clear difference in the start of losses with and without crystal
- Losses only at collimator and/or scraper depending on the setup X

- Losses observed at:
 - TCSM (BLMR.52020, BLML.52108, BLMR.52108)
 - TECA (BLMR.41804)
 - additional bottleneck upstream of TECA (BLMR.41607)
- Scraper was not exposed



Dedicated MD – Expectations and results TECA alignment

- Position fixed only angular alignment necessary
- Done automatically using tool developed by Francesco
- Minimum step 30 µrad critical angle is 20 µrad at 100 GeV
- Crystal aligned 180 µrad off from expected
- Skew planes?





Direct quantitative comparisons based on BLM signal magnitudes are not possible

- + 200 Hz BLM closest to TCSM is already ${\sim}30\,\text{m}$ downstream
- BLM closest to TECA is ${\sim}10\,\text{m}$ downstream
- Total losses in ring change as a function of collimator and crystal settings





Direct quantitative comparisons based on BLM signal magnitudes are not possible

- + 200 Hz BLM closest to TCSM is already ${\sim}30\,\text{m}$ downstream
- BLM closest to TECA is ${\sim}10\,\text{m}$ downstream
- Total losses in ring change as a function of collimator and crystal settings





- Simulation without closed orbit error and with measured TECA angle
- Crystal bending 160 µrad instead of 174 µrad (see this talk by Francesco)





Dedicated MD – Expectations and results Simulation without closed orbit error and with measured TECA angle

- Crystal bending 160 urad instead of 174 urad (see this talk by Francesco)



- I SS4 bottleneck is likely a combination of two sources (at QD and at BLM) that may differ depending on different scenarios and settings
- We observed that the I SS4 bottleneck could be removed by a different bump at the crystal \Rightarrow to be fixed next time!



2024 experience

Issues

- Complicated measurements with many ingredients that can fail individually
- No possibility to do full test in parallel MDs \Rightarrow limited time
- Difficult to reconstruct actual losses with lack of BLM calibration in special conditions
- Difficulty retrieving wire scanner data at low intensity with islands
- We were unable to use the full scheduled time during the dedicated MD due to issues with the cycle and the usual interruptions from LHC fills

Highlights

- Many opportunities for short parallel MDs with generally good availability
- Great flexibility from SPS OP and parallel users in accommodating requests
- Dedicated MD could be extended into the night to make up for lost time



2025 requests

- Despite some issues, we observed several expected features successfully in 2024 MD, BUT some open questions remain \Rightarrow we would like to repeat a refined measurement
- Ideally 2 dedicated MD slots to
 - · better measure and correct closed orbit,
 - · measure crystal position in nonresonant conditions
 - repeat 2024 procedure with refined orbit bump at crystal
- No extraction needed
- · Would be ideal during beam commissioning period



Thank you!



Dedicated MD – Approach

- Large $Q'_{\mathsf{x}} \Rightarrow$ different δ_p particles "see" different phase space
- Changing $p_0 c \Rightarrow$ changing $Q_x \Rightarrow$ trapping in stable islands
- Risk of recapturing particles in the core ⇒ kick beam at the start to deplete the origin of phase space





