



Are large-aperture NbTi magnets compatible with $1e35$??

Elena Wildner,
Christine Hoa, Emanuele Laface, Guido Sterbini
CERN



Contents

- Scenarios from Phase I upgrade
- Results Phase I
- Q0 option
- Optimization Phase I
- Extrapolation to Phase II
- Checks
 - ◆ Crossing angle
 - ◆ D0 option
 - ◆ Tas opening
- Conclusion



Scenarios Phase I

- **Symmetric Large Aperture**

LHC Project Report 1000: “A Solution for Phase-one Upgrade of the LHC Low-beta Quadrupoles Based on Nb-Ti”


J. P. Koutchouk, L. Rossi, E. Todesco

- **Compact Low Gradient Final Focus System**

LHC Project Report 1008: “Low Gradient, Large Aperture IR Upgrade Options for the LHC compatible with Nb-Ti Magnet Technology”


O. Brüning, R. De Maria, R. Ostojic


- ◆ Proposed layout
- ◆ Layout adapted to available cable



Integration


“Symmetric” and “Compact”







Layout

IP1 **Symmetric**




IP1 **Compact**







Magnet data

Magnet	MQXC	IRQB	IRQA	IRQF	IRQE
Config.	Symmetric	Compact1	Compact1	Compact2	Compact2
Gradient [T/m]	120	91.5	68.3	91.5	68.3
Aperture [mm]	130	170	220	130	170
Peak Field [T]	8.7	8.6	8.4	6.8	6.8
Layers	2	2	2	1	1



Magnet models, "Symmetric"





Magnet models, "Compact 1"




1 X IRQB

3 X IRQA


|Btot| (T)

170 mm Aperture

220 mm Aperture




Courtesy: F. Borgnolutti



Magnet models, "Compact 2"


1 X IRQF

130 mm Aperture




3 X IRQE


170 mm Aperture



|Btot| (T)




Courtesy: F. Borgnolutti



Model (cont.)

- Detailed models for future optimization
 - ◆ Magnets with insulation and more detailed cable
 - ◆ Tas
- Aluminum collars
 - ◆ Improves the total heat deposition, not peaks
- The magnet yokes are 27 cm



Model (cont.)

- Betastar = 0.25 m
- Crossing angle 220 microrad, **vertical**
- “Fluka” used for the energy deposition calculations
- 5000 particles for “Compact” 1&2, 10000 for “Symmetric”

“FLUKA: a multi-particle transport code”,

A. Fasso`, A. Ferrari, J. Ranft, and P.R. Sala,
CERN-2005-10 (2005), INFN/TC_05/11, SLAC-R-773


“The physics models of FLUKA: status and recent developments”,


A. Fasso`, A. Ferrari, S. Roesler, P.R. Sala, G. Battistoni, F. Cerutti, E. Gadioli,
M.V. Garzelli, F. Ballarini, A. Ottolenghi, A. Empl and J. Ranft,
Computing in High Energy and Nuclear Physics 2003 Conference (CHEP2003), La Jolla, CA,
USA, March 24-28, 2003



TAS distance to IP

The TAS essentially protects the first magnet





TAS aperture

Depends on β

$$D_{\min} = 1.1 \cdot (9 + 2 \cdot 10) \sigma + 2(d + 3\text{mm}) + 2 \cdot 1.6\text{mm}$$

β beating

Beam size

orbit

Spurious disp. orbit

Beam sep.

Mech. tol. and alignment

41 mm diameter, same for all 3 cases




Results, what we consider


■ Cable


- ◆ We make the binning for the scoring so that it corresponds to a maximum volume of equilibrium for the heat transport (cable transverse size, with a length of around 10 cm)
- Total power deposited in the magnets
 - ◆ Important to know the volume of the magnet (the model has to be realistic)
- The power deposited per meter of magnet

N.B. For the *total* energy deposited we need a "realistic" design of the magnet







One cable: power deposition






Peak power density




Compact 1 (large aperture) favorable

IR'07 CARE-HHH-APD Workshop, Elena Wildner



Total heat loads

Good for comparison between cases only:
Magnet design not optimized for the scenarios







Integration, Q0

Q0 Option, for Phase II


“A Q0 Doublet optics for the LHC Luminosity Upgrade”, E. Laface, W. Scandale, C. Santoni





Layout, Q0

- Q0 is inserted before the triplet
- The triplet optics is modified








Magnet data, Q0

Magnet	L* [m]	Length [m]	Gradient [T/m]
Q0A	13.0	7.2	240
Q0B	20.8	3.6	196
Q1	25.8	8.6	200
Q2	37.1	11.5	172
Q3	52.0	6.0	160


Magnet	β Max [m]	D _{min} [mm]
Q0A	2300	57.0
Q0B	4300	68.5
Q1	5780	75.2
Q2	5820	75.4
Q3	5770	75.1



Magnet models, Q0





P. Limon, G. Kirby (design & field maps)





Results Q0, cable


Reference value for LHC cable: 4.3 mW/cm³







Limit LHC Cable




Reference value for LHC cable: 4.3 mW/cm³





Results triplet (Q0 case), cable



Reference value for LHC cable: 4.3 mW/cm^3



Power density, Q0



Reference LHC

11/15/2007

IR'07 CARE-HHH-APD Workshop, Elena Wildner



Total power in the magnets


- Difficult to estimate without a complete design of the magnet (influence of the size of the yoke)
- Q01 106 W (14.7 W/m)
- Q02 42.5 W (11 W/m)
- For the triplet only cable and collar simulated.




How to make it work : Liner

**Material choice and thickness should be optimized!
In this example it is taken as stainless steel 2 cm thick.**


**No crossing angle in this example.
This case was calculated for $L = 1.0 \cdot 10^{35} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$**



Example from previous study:




**Elena Wildner: “Heat deposition and backscattering for one of the configurations of the IR for LHC upgrade”,
Internal Note CERN/AT/MCS/ Mars 2007**



Possible improvements: Mask

Optimization needed.

In the example the mask is taken as 10 cm long 1 cm thick tungsten ring



”Symmetric” layout





Implementation in model

”Symmetric” layout

1 cm MASK in
tungsten


2cm LINER in
stainless steel

Cables






Peaks, with mask



- Same total heat loads in the magnets
- -36 % decrease of the peak:
21.5 mW/cm³ to
13.6 mW/cm³




Peaks, with mask and liner



- Mask 1cm in tungsten
 - ◆ 21.5 mW/cm³ to 13.6 mW/cm³
 - ◆ -36 % decrease of the peak:
- Liner 2cm in stainless steel
 - ◆ -95% decrease of the peak
 - ◆ 21.5 mW/cm³ to 1.1 mW/cm³



Total, with mask and liner



■ Mask 1cm in tungsten

◆ Same heat loads


■ Liner 2cm in stainless steel

◆ Decrease of the heat loads <27%




10 E 35

- Calculated Layouts based on Phase 1 upgrade
- Extrapolated Luminosity 10 E35 could be possible by optimizing liners and masks to manage 5 times higher deposited power for all scenarios.
- Energy evacuated from liner (cooling tubes)
- Impact of crossing angle a problem?
- Magnetic arrangements to lower the deposition:
 - ◆ D0 may help?





TAS/ noTAS

Q1, TAS 40 mm aperture




Q1, no TAS






Variation of TAS aperture

”Symmetric” layout






Half crossing angle


Peak power density →

↓
Total heat loads

FLUKA	142.5 microrad	220 microrad
	Power deposition (W)	Power deposition (W)
TAS	40	41.2
BP	15.4	16.8
TAS	321.2	315.6
Q1	46.5	48.2
Q2a	54.9	59.7
Q2b	50.0	48.3
Q3	60.4	69.4
TOTAL QUADS	211.9	225.7





- Same total heat loads in the quadrupoles
- Increase of the peak in Q2



Insertion of D0



D0 (Close to experiment)
Aperture 15 cm
Length 2 m
Gradient 3T/m (vertical)
3 m from experiment








Longitudinal overview, D0

”Symmetric” layout






Projection along magnet axis





Peak in TAS

”Symmetric” layout





Peak of deposited energy with D0

Peak in second magnet, red with D0 on







Peak of deposited energy with D0




N.B. Peaks in horizontal plane !





Summary

- Scenarios overall similar: they all have high peak deposition
- “Compact 1” (large aperture) most favorable
- A liner of 2 cm reduces the deposited peak energy to ~1 mW/cm³ along the magnets (checked case: “Symmetric”).
- For the option Q0 we may need some more optimization (larger apertures).
- We may improve even more by magnetic arrangements (like D0)
- Crossing angle has a limited impact (<15 %)
- Optimization for $L = 10 \text{ E } 35 \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$ seems a possibility (magnets)
- Backscattering to experiments?



Acknowledgements

Jean-Pierre Koutchouk

Francesco Broggi

Ezio Todesco

Franck Borgnolutti

Francesco Cerutti