UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Beyond LHC
The Path Towards Future Accelerators

Roger Ruber

Dept. of Physics and Astronomy

Particle Physics Division

31-Oct-2013

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Outline

This lecture

- technologies for a future linear collider
- highlights of related research

Sections

1. circular versus linear colliders
2. accelerating gradient
3. radio frequency power generation
4. R&D projects for a future linear collider

1: Particle Collider History

Fixed Target



Collider



$$E_{CM} = \sqrt{2\left(E_{beam}mc^2 + m^2c^4\right)} \quad << \quad E_{CM} = 2\left(E_{beam} + mc^2\right)$$

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Hadron versus Lepton Colliders

hadron collider at the frontier of physics



- huge QCD background
- not all nucleon energy available in collision

lepton collider for precision physics



- well defined CM energy
- polarization possible

after LHC → lepton collider

- energy determined by discoveries
- consensus E_{cm} ≥0.5 TeV





Circular versus Linear Collider



Circular Collider

many magnets, few cavities → need strong field for smaller ring

high energy → high synchrotron radiation losses ($\propto E^4/R$)

high bunch repetition rate → high luminosity



Linear Collider

few magnets, many cavities → need efficient RF power production

higher gradient → shorter linac

single pass → need small cross-section for high luminosity:

(exceptional beam quality, alignment and stabilization)

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Cost of Circular & Linear Accelerators



Circular Collider

- $\Delta E_{turn} \sim (q^2E^4/m^4R)$
- cost ~ aR + b ΔE
- optimization: $R \sim E^2 \rightarrow$ cost ~ cE^2

LEP200: ΔE ~ 3%; 3640 MV/turn

LHC: Bmag limited

Linear Collider

- E ~ L
- cost ~ aL

Accelerator History

A question of

- linear vs circular
- hadron vs electron
- acceleration technology
  - DC, RF, wakefield

Projects/Ideas

- linear electron collider
- circular electron collider
- electron – proton collider
- circular proton collider



Electron – Proton Collider

For e.g. deep inelastic scattering studies

(strong and electro-weak interaction,
the internal structure of the proton/neutron)

- use existing LHC for the proton beam
- new electron accelerator
  - in LHC tunnel, new ring on top of existing LHC ring
  - straight electron linac
  - re-circulating electron linac with energy recovery



Circular Collider Ideas

TLEP (also LEP3)

- electron – positron collider
- 240 GeV centre-of-mass
  - new 80km tunnel
- for
  - accurate Higgs measurements
- compared to linear expect
  - higher luminosity,
  - many interaction points,
  - lower cost (main cost will be the tunnel)

VLHC

- proton – proton collider
- 33 TeV (HE-LHC)
  - in LHC tunnel
  - Bmag = 20T
- 80~100 TeV (VHE-LHC)
  - new 80km tunnel
  - Bmag = 16-20T
- main challenge: magnets
  - ongoing research



UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Outline

1. Colliders
2. Cavities
3.
4.

Linear Collider R&D



1. high energy → high accelerating gradient
2. high luminosity → high current & small beam size
3. efficient radio frequency power production
4. feasibility demonstration

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Outline

1. Colliders
2. Cavities
3. RF power
4. Projects

2. Accelerating Gradient



Accelerating Gap and Gradient

Gap voltage required for acceleration

- cannot be DC,
  because no staging possible



- use cavity with RF field (Maxwell equations)

$$\nabla \times \vec{E} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\vec{B} \qquad \oint \vec{E}\cdot \mathrm{d}\vec{s} = -\iint \frac{\partial \vec{B}}{\partial t}\cdot \mathrm{d}\vec{A}$$

- breakdown limit
  (vacuum, Cu surface, T_{room})

$$24.67\sqrt{f} = E_c e^{-\frac{4.25}{E_c}}$$

$\rightarrow$ high E_c requires high f



- frequency f determines cavity shape

Drift Tube Linear Accelerator Structure

Low velocity particles

- for velocity < 0.4 c (50 keV e^-; 100 MeV p)
- standing wave
- drift tube size and spacing adapted to
  - RF frequency
  - particle speed



Drift Tube Linac: How It works



Courtesy E. Jensen

electric field





UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Outline

1. Colliders
2. Cavities
3. RF power
4. Projects

Example of Drift Tube Linacs





Disk-loaded Accelerating Structure

In free space,

electro-magnetic wave travels faster than particles

→ couple wave to resonating structures

→ particle velocity equal to phase velocity



Example shows standing wave structure (v_{group}=0) with

- π phase advance per cell



UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Outline

1. Colliders
2. Cavities
3. RF power
4. Projects

Superconducting RF Cavities (SRF)





Advantages Superconducting RF

Very low losses due to tiny surface resistance
→ standing wave cavities with
low peak power requirements

- High efficiency
- Long pulse trains possible
- Favourable for feed-backs within the pulse train

- Low frequency
→ large dimensions (larger tolerances)
large aperture and small wakefields

⇒ Important implications for the design of the collider

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Progress in SCRF

Record **59 MV/m** achieved with single cell cavity at 2K

Limitations:

- Field Emission
  - due to high electric field around iris
- Quench
  - surface heating from dark current, or
  - magnetic field penetration at "Equator"
- Contamination
  - during assembly
    → improve surface treatment



Example 9 cell cavities in operation at DESY (FLASH/XFEL):

- R&D Status ~30-35 MV/m
- DESY XFEL requires <23.6> MV/m
- ILC requires <31.5> MV/m



Normal Conducting Accelerator Structures

E_{acc} limited by breakdown RF-field
- > 60 MV/m



Higher gradients than SCRF cavities, but requires
- very high frequency: >10 GHz
- very short pulse lengths: < 1μs



- high ohmic losses
  → travelling wave
  (unlike standing wave in SCRF or low gradient NCRF)

- fill time $t_{fill} = \int 1/v_G \, dz$
  order <100 ns (~ms for SCRF)

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

High Frequency Structures

CLIC type
T18_vg2.4_disk

designed at CERN
build by KEK
tested at SLAC

E_{acc} = 106 MV/m
- 11.424 GHz
- 230 ns pulse length
- 10^{-6} breakdown rate (BDR)

Frequency	11.424	GHz
Cells	18+input+output	
Filling Time	36	ns
Length	29	cm
Iris Dia. a/λ	15.5~10.1	%
Group Velocity: v_g/c	2.61-1.02	%
S_{11}/ S_{21}	0.035/0.8	
Phase Advace Per Cell	2π/3	
Power Needed <E_a>=100MV/m	55.5	MW

3. RF Power Source

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Outline
1. Colliders
2. Cavities
3. RF power
4. Projects

Electromagnetic Waves

- static electron
  → electric field

- moving electron
  → electromagnetic
  wave

- constant electron beam
  → static electric field
  + static magnetic field

- bunched electron beam
  → electromagnetic wave





UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Klystron Microwave Amplifier

- vacuum tube amplifier by electron density bunching
- 200 MHz – 20 GHz
- <1.5 MW ave.; <150 MW peak



electron bunching





UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Two-beam Acceleration Concept

- 12 GHz modulated and high power drive beam
- RF power extraction in a special structure (PETS)

→ only passive elements

- use RF power to accelerate main beam
- compress energy density







UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Drive-beam Generation by Beam Gymnastics



UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET

Outline
1. Colliders
2. Cavities
3. RF power
4. Projects

Drive Beam Generation



Courtesy A. Andersson

UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET

Outline
1. Colliders
2. Cavities
3. RF power
4. Projects

4: Projects for a Future Linear Collider

Basic Layout of a Linear Collider



The ILC and CLIC

LHC should indicate which energy level is needed

ILC International Linear Collider

- superconducting technology
- 1.3 GHz
- 31.5 MV/m
- E_{CM} = 500 GeV
- upgrade to 1 TeV

CLIC Compact Linear Collider

- normal conducting technology
- 12 GHz
- 100 MV/m
- E_{CM} = 3 TeV



TevaTron
2 TeV
6.3km

LHC
7 TeV
27km



ILC
1 TeV
35km

Courtesy Sandbox Studio / interactions.org

Source: New Scientist

ILC: The International Linear Collider

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Baseline:

- 2 x 250 GeV superconducting linac
- $2\text{x}10^{34}$ $cm^{-2}s^{-1}$ (14 mrad X-angle)
- polarized electron photo-gun
- undulator positron source at 150 GeV
- 5 GeV damping rings (C=6.7 km)
- 4.5 km long beam-delivery system to make spot sizes of 640 x 5.7 nm

Parameter	Value
C.M. Energy	500 GeV
Peak luminosity	$2\text{x}10^{34}$ $cm^{-2}s^{-1}$
Beam Rep. rate	5 Hz
Pulse time duration	1 ms
Average beam current	9 mA (in pulse)
Average field gradient	**31.5 MV/m**
# 9-cell cavity	14,560
# cryomodule	1,680
# RF units	560



UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET

Outline

1. Colliders
2. Cavities
3. RF power
4. Projects

Linear Collider Siting

- Where to build?
- Deep/shallow tunnel
- Geometry
  - Laser straight?
  - follow curvature?



FIGURE 2.13. Geology and tunnel profiles for the three regional sites, showing the location of the major access shafts (tunnels for the Asian site). Top: the Americas site close to Fermilab. Middle: the Asian site in Japan. Bottom: the European site close to CERN.

CLIC: Compact Linear Collider

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Outline
1. Colliders
2. Cavities
3. RF power
4. Projects



Main Linac	
C.M. Energy	3 TeV
Peak luminosity	$2x10^{34}$ $cm^{-2}s^{-1}$
Beam Rep. rate	50 Hz
Pulse time duration	156 ns
Average field gradient	**100 MV/m**
# accelerating cavities	2 x 71,548

Φ4.5m tunnel

CTF3: CLIC Test Facility

- demonstration **drive beam generation**
  (fully loaded acceleration, frequency multiplication)
- evaluate **beam stability & losses** in deceleration
- develop **power production & accelerating structures**
  (damping, PETS on/off, beam dynamics effects)



Demonstration Beam Re-combination

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Outline

1. Colliders
2. Cavities
3. RF power
4. Project

- **delay loop** (DL) gap creation (for CR extraction) and doubling frequency + intensity
- **combiner ring** bunch interleaving (delay loop bypass, instabilities)







Demonstration Two-beam Acceleration

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Outline

1. Colliders
2. Cavities
3. RF power
4. Projects

Two-beam Test Stand







Construction supported by the Swedish Research Council and the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation

Two-beam Test Stand



Two-beam Acceleration

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Outline

1. Colliders
2. Cavities
3. RF power
4. Projects





W. Farabolini



Acceleration as function of power is **close to nominal**

RF Waveform Distortion on Breakdown



S. Fukuda/KEK

- Pulses with breakdowns not useful for acceleration (beam kick and instabilities)
- Low breakdown rate required (< 10^{-6}) for useful operation

Beam Kick Measurements

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Outline

1. Colliders
2. Cavities
3. RF power
4. Projects





Estimated error

- beam position: 10 μm, angle: 7 μrad
- kick position: 31 μm, angle: 11 μrad
- relative energy change from kick: $32\text{x}10^{-6}$

(see M. Johnson, CLIC Note 710, CERN-OPEN-2007-022)

RF Breakdown: a Reliability Issue

UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Outline

1. Colliders
2. Cavities
3. RF power
4. Projects

Conditioning required

- to reach nominal gradient

but

- damage by excessive field

Physics phenomena not yet completely understood!







UPPSALA UNIVERSITET

Acknowledgements

For the contribution of material and advice, without which I would not have been able to make this presentation. My grateful thanks to

- Alex Andersson, Erik Adli, Erk Jensen, Hans Braun, Andrea Palaia, Daniel Schulte, Frank Tecker, Wilfrid Farabolini, Walter Wünsch, Akira Yamamoto and Volker Ziemann

Some illustrations and photos courtesy

- CERN, KEK and Symmetry Magazine