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### Design parameters of the J-PARC RCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circumference</td>
<td>348.333 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super-periodicity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection</td>
<td>Charge-exchange, Multi-turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection period</td>
<td>0.5 ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection energy</td>
<td>181 MeV ⇒ 400 MeV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraction energy</td>
<td>3 GeV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition rate</td>
<td>25 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic number</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bunches</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles per pulse</td>
<td>2.5e13 - 5e13 ⇒ 8.3e13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output beam power</td>
<td>300-600 kW ⇒ 1 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition gamma</td>
<td>9.14 GeV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dipoles</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quadrupoles</td>
<td>60 (7 families)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sextupoles</td>
<td>18 (3 families)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steerings</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF cavities</td>
<td>12 (11 at present)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Linac upgrade:**
- Installation of ACS in 2013 Summer-Autumn:
  - Injection energy 181 MeV ⇒ 400 MeV
- Replacement of IS and RFQ in 2014 Summer:
  - Intensity 5.0E13 ⇒ 8.3E13/pulse

We plan to start 1-MW beam tuning from Oct. 2014.
History of the RCS output beam power

- Beam commissioning of the linac; November 2006~
- Beam commissioning of the RCS; October 2007~
- Startup of the MLF user operation; December 2008~

The RCS output beam power has been steadily increasing following:
- Progression of beam tuning,
- Hardware improvements,
- Careful monitoring of the trend of residual activation levels.

- Maximum output beam power demonstrated so far: ~540 kW
- Current output beam power for the routine user program: ~300 kW

*** Output beam power is now limited by the capability of the neutron target.
High intensity beam trial of up to 540 kW

- Date: Nov. 2012
- Injection beam:
  - 181 MeV/24.5 mA/0.5 ms/0.60 chopper beam-on duty factor
  - \(4.5 \times 10^{13}/\text{pulse}\), corresponding to 540 kW output at 25 Hz.
- Operating point: (6.45, 6.42)

In this experiment, we measured:
- Injection painting parameter dependence of beam loss
- Intensity dependence of beam loss
- Time structure of beam loss
- Transverse & longitudinal beam profiles, and bunching factor . . . . .

In this talk, we present the above experimental results together with the corresponding numerical simulation results.
Beam loss reduction by injection painting
Transverse painting

Transverse painting makes use of a controlled phase space offset between the centroid of the injection beam and the ring closed orbit to form a different particle distribution of the circulating beam from the multi-turn injected beam.

Horizontal painting
by a horizontal closed orbit variation during injection

Vertical painting
by a vertical injection angle change during injection

Circulating beam ellipse with a painting emittance of $100\pi$ mm mrad

Injection beam ellipse (6$\pi$ mm mrad)

Closed orbit variation for painting

Injection angle change for painting

Primary collimator aperture
(324$\pi$ mm mrad)

Ring acceptance
(486$\pi$ mm mrad)

“Correlated painting”

$\varepsilon_{tp} = 0\sim216\pi$ mm mrad
Longitudinal painting makes use of a controlled momentum offset to the rf bucket in combination with superposing a second harmonic rf to get a uniform bunch distribution after the multi-turn injection.

Uniform bunch distribution is formed through emittance dilution by the large synchrotron motion excited by momentum offset.

The second harmonic rf fills the role in shaping flatter and wider rf bucket potential, leading to better longitudinal motion to make a flatter bunch distribution.

Longitudinal painting

Additional control of longitudinal painting; phase sweep of $V_2$ during injection

$$V_{rf} = V_1 \sin \phi - V_2 \sin \{2(\phi - \phi_s) + \phi_2\}$$

Phase sweep of the second harmonic rf

The second harmonic phase sweep method enables further bunch distribution control through a dynamical change of the rf bucket potential during injection.
**Numerical simulation setup**

*Simpsons* (PIC particle tracking code developed by Dr. Shinji Machida)

**Imperfections included:**

- **Time independent imperfections**
  - Multipole field components for all the main magnets:
    - BM \( (K_{1~6}) \), QM \( (K_{5, 9}) \), and SM \( (K_8) \) obtained from field measurements
  - Measured field and alignment errors

- **Time dependent imperfections**
  - Static leakage fields from the extraction beam line:
    - \( K_{0,1} \) and \( SK_{0,1} \) estimated from measured COD and optical functions
  - Edge focus of the injection bump magnets:
    - \( K_1 \) estimated from measured optical functions
  - BM-QM field tracking errors
    - estimated from measured tune variation over acceleration
  - 1-kHz BM ripple
    - estimated from measured orbit variation
  - 100-kHz ripple induced by injection bump magnets
    - estimated from turn-by-turn BPM data

- **Foil scattering:**
  - Coulomb & nuclear scattering angle distribution calculated with GEANT

*Time-dependent imperfections can be included easily, because “Simpsons” takes “time” as an independent variable.*

We improve calculation model following the progression of beam experiment in collaboration with Dr. S. Machida, discussing space-charge effect and its combined effects with imperfections.
Transverse painting

Numerical simulations

Transverse beam distribution just after beam injection (at 0.5 ms)

100$\pi$ transverse painting
Longitudinal painting

Longitudinal beam distribution just after beam injection (at 0.5 ms)

No longitudinal painting

\[ \frac{V_2}{V_1} = 80\% \]
\[ \phi_2 = -100 \text{ to } 0 \text{ deg} \]
\[ \Delta p/p = 0.0\% \]

\[ \frac{V_2}{V_1} = 80\% \]
\[ \phi_2 = -100 \text{ to } 0 \text{ deg} \]
\[ \Delta p/p = -0.1\% \]

\[ \frac{V_2}{V_1} = 80\% \]
\[ \phi_2 = -100 \text{ to } 0 \text{ deg} \]
\[ \Delta p/p = -0.2\% \]
Tune footprint at the end of injection

Numerical Simulation

- No transverse painting
- No longitudinal painting
- 100\(\pi\) transverse painting
  - Full longitudinal painting
  (\(V_2/V_1=80\%, \phi_2=-100\) to 0 deg, \(\Delta p/p=-0.2\%\))

Particles here suffer from emittance dilutions, leading to beam loss.
Emittance growth mitigation by painting

We experimentally investigated the effectiveness of injection painting on the beam loss reduction for 540 kW intensity beam.
### Beam loss reduction by painting

**Measurements (DCCT)**

**Calculations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>$\varepsilon_{tp}$ ($\pi \text{ mm mrad}$)</th>
<th>$V_2/V_1$ (%)</th>
<th>$\phi_2$ (deg)</th>
<th>$\Delta p/p$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Beam loss takes place only for the first 4 ms in the low energy region for all the cases.
- Beam loss of ~30% observed with no painting (ID1) was decreased to ~2% by the combination of $100\pi$ transverse painting and full longitudinal painting (ID8).
- Most of the remaining 2% beam loss was well localized at the collimator section.
- The 2% beam loss corresponds to 650 W in power, which is still less than 1/6 of the collimator limit of 4 kW.
Beam loss reduction by painting

Beam survival: output intensity (DCCT) / input intensity (SCT76)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>$\varepsilon_{tp}$ ($\pi$ mm mrad)</th>
<th>$V_2/V_1$ (%)</th>
<th>$\phi_2$ (deg)</th>
<th>$\Delta p/p$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ID1⇒ID8  Beam loss reduction by painting
ID8⇒ID11  Beam loss increase caused by large transverse painting ($\varepsilon_{tp}>150\pi$) due to the dynamic aperture limit.
Intensity dependence of beam loss, bunching factor, extraction beam profile...
Measurements vs. Calculations: Bunching factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Power (kW)</th>
<th>Duration (µs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>539 kW</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433 kW</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326 kW</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217 kW</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 kW</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measurements vs. Calculations: Time structure of beam loss

Scintillation type BLM @ Collimator

SBLM signal (Arb.)

Beam loss (%)

Normalized to be 2%

0.7 ms : Time (ms)
End of foil scattering

The beam loss appears only for the first 4 ms in the low energy region:

(A) mainly from foil scattering during injection
(B) Origin? · · · to be discussed later
Measurements vs. Calculations: Intensity dependence of beam loss

Painting parameter ID8:
- 100π transverse painting
- Full longitudinal painting

539 kW (Li pulse 500 µs)
433 kW (Li pulse 400 µs)
325 kW (Li pulse 300 µs)
217 kW (Li pulse 200 µs)
104 kW (Li pulse 100 µs)
Measurements vs. Calculations

Extraction beam profile at 3 GeV

MWPM @ extraction beam line

Intensity dependence of RMS beam width

- Measurements
- Calculations
Discussions for ~2%-loss remaining for 540-kW intensity beam
Possible causes of ~2-% loss remaining for 540-kW intensity beam

Calculations
539 kW (500 µs)

Includes all imperfections

Δ~+1.6%
by 100-Hz ripple induced by injection bump magnets

Δ~+0.3%
by 1-kHz BM ripple; collimator aperture reduction caused by orbit variation

Δ~+0.5%
by foil scattering

0.7 ms:
End of foil scattering
100-kHz resonance ripple induced in the ceramic vacuum vessel screening strips by injection bump field

FFT of BPM signal

Side-band peak excited by 100-kHz ripple

Time structure of the side-band peak power

This fast ripple excites additional betatron resonances at 0.2 (0.8) during injection (first ~1 ms).
Effect of 100-kHz ripple

Tune footprint calculated at the end of injection

- 104 kW (100 µs)
- 217 kW (200 µs)
- 326 kW (300 µs)
- 433 kW (400 µs)
- 539 kW (500 µs)

◆ 100-kHz ripple makes additional betatron resonances at 0.2 (0.8).
◆ A part of beam particles reaches to 0.2 lines due to space-charge tune depression, where the effect of ripple builds up, leading to emittance growth.

The situation for higher intensity beam is more severe, because the 100-kHz ripple directly affect the tail part of the beam.
Effect of 100-kHz ripple

Beam profile calculated at the end of injection (plotted in log scale)

Larger beam halo/tail formation takes place for higher intensity beam, leading to beam loss.
Possible scheme for further beam loss reduction
Re-optimization of operating point

◆ **OP1**: Current operating point
- Systematic resonances of \( v=6, 2v_x+2v_y=24 \) and \( v_x+2v_y=18 \) strongly affect the beam, though their effects can be mitigated sufficiently by painting.
- 100-kHz ripple (0.2 resonances) also strongly affect the beam.

◆ **OP2**: Alternate operating point
- Half integer lines of \( v=5.5 \) can affect the beam, but the effect of low-order systematic nonlinear resonances (3rd & 4th) can be decreased.
- No chromatic correction is necessary.
- Larger dynamic aperture
  ⇒ Larger transverse painting (150\( \pi \)) is available.
- Effect of 100-kHz ripple
  (0.8 resonances in this case) is less.
OP1 vs. OP2: Time structure of beam loss

Numerical simulations

**OP1**, $100\pi$ transverse painting + full longitudinal painting

**OP2**, $150\pi$ transverse painting + full longitudinal painting

We will try “OP2” in the next high intensity trial experiment (Apr. 15-20).
**OP1 vs. OP2: Effect of 100-kHz ripple**

Tune footprint calculated at the end of injection:
- OP1: 0.2
- OP2: 0.8

Less particles on 0.8 lines.

Beam profile calculated at the end of injection:
- Horizontal
- Vertical

No 100 kHz ripple
- With 100 kHz ripple

Halo/tail formation caused by 100-kHz ripple can be mitigated at “OP2”.

Beam profile calculated at the end of injection:
- Horizontal
- Vertical

No 100 kHz ripple
- With 100 kHz ripple

Halo/tail formation caused by 100-kHz ripple can be mitigated at “OP2”.
Reference:

Summary

1) Modeling of high intensity proton synchrotron and quantitative benchmarking between experiment and simulation becomes feasible.
2) Key factors are, to include all known imperfections in addition to the correct modeling of transverse and longitudinal dynamics, injection process, space charge tune spread, etc.
3) Several beam loss mitigation idea were proposed with help of simulation and verified by experiment.
4) Based on the study, there is a good reason that we could use simulation as a tool of the performance improvement in future.