



**High
Luminosity
LHC**

Optics aspects and luminosities

**R. De Maria with G. Arduini, D. Banfi, R. Bruce, X. Buffat,
P. Campana, B. Di Girolamo, I. Efthymiopoulos, S. Fartoukh,
M. Fitterer, M. Giovannozzi, R. Lindner, Y. Papaphilippou,
T. Pieloni, E. Thomas, D. Tommasini, P. Schwarz,
A. Valishev, G. Wilkinson.**

Motivation and summary

- How beam optics couple luminosities of the experiments?
- Can LHCb run at $1-2 \cdot 10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$ without degrading ATLAS and CMS luminosities and without machine layout changes?
- What are the implication of the new LHCb detector layout on the machine from the optics point of view?

Table of contents

- Baseline scenario recap
- First scan on luminosity scenarios:
 - Integrated Luminosity sharing depending on LHCb max allowed luminosity and LHCb β^*
 - Filling schemes and beam-beam considerations
- LHCb β^* reach with or without IP shift.
 - Layout, optics, aperture: max crossing angle vs β^*
 - Long range issues: min crossing angle vs β^* (first evaluations)
- Wrap-up and next steps.

Nominal pp luminosity scenario

	IP1	IP5	IP8	IP2
Bunch population	2.2 10 ¹¹			
Emittance [$\mu\text{m}/\gamma$]	2.5 10 ⁻⁶			
Colliding bunches	2736		2524	2452
β^* [m]	0.15		3	10
IP Crossing angle [μrad]	± 590	590	-230 ¹	± 340
Ext. Crossing [μrad]	± 590	590	-500 ¹	± 480
Crossing plane	V	H	H	V
Max allowed avg. pile-up	140		4.5	n/a
Lev. Luminosity [$10^{34}\text{cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$]	5.3		0.2	0.002
Levelling time	7h		>10h	
Levelling method	β^*		separation	
Integrated Luminosity [fb^{-1}/γ]	260		10.4	0.01

¹ assuming LHCb $B_y < 0$ for the other polarity the external crossing angle could be reduced at the cost of operational complications at each polarity swap.

E. Metral *et al.*, CERN-ACC-NOTE-2015-0009

Integrated luminosities

Levelled luminosity LHCb [$10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$]	Opt fill length (IP1/5) [h]	Integrated luminosity ATLAS/CMS [fb^{-1}/y]	Integrated luminosity LHCb [fb^{-1}/y]	β^* IP8 [m]	Levelling time IP8 [h]
0.2 (nom.)	9.3	261	10.4	3	9
1	9.1	258	28	3	0.5
1	9	257	37	2	3
1	8.8	256	47	1	6
2	9.1	258	28	3	0
2	8.9	257	41	2	0
2	8.5	253	70	1	2


- Scaling and impact of additional burn-off without aperture constraints
- Integrated luminosity in Atlas/CMS substantially independent from LHCb one
- No levelling in LHCb if low β^* not reachable.

G. Arduini

Filling schemes

- Filling schemes 12 SPS injections:
- 2808-72 colliding bunches in IP1 and IP5, 12 non colliding bunches;
- Non colliding bunches or IP8/IP2 private bunches will be lost if have the same population of the other and not enough tune spread.


Filling scheme	Total	IP1-5	IP2	IP8
BCMS: 48b 6 Ps inj, 12 SPS inj	2604	2592	2288	2396
Standard: 72b 4 Ps inj, 12 SPS inj	2748	2736	2452	2524



Filling schemes with IP8 shift


X. Buffat

Head-on (HO) and long-range (LR) collisions



	IP1&5	IP2	IP8 (shifted)
72b	2736	2466	2544 (2513)
72b+	2808	2255	2186 (2163)
80b	2800	2727	2626 (2592)
80b+	2880	2380	2350 (2342)

No big difference for IP8 shift.



Not possible to fully avoid strong pacman and super-pacman effects in IP2 and 8 (regardless of the shift)

Beam-beam effects

HO interactions create:

- tune spread beneficial for instabilities
- when coupled strong with nonlinearities (LR effects, triplet field imperfections, residual arc sextupole/octupoles aberrations) and Q' beam current/luminosity lifetime reductions
- when coupled with noise, increased emittance growth,
- β -beating and dynamic β effects
- Parallel separation reduces head-on effects as luminosity

LR interactions create

- tune spread: important without HO collision
- nonlinearities: stronger with small β^* (large β at the interactions point) and small crossing angle,
- tune shifts, orbit effects and chromaticity effects
- and those effects are bunch dependent due to pac-man.

Levelling strategies

β^* and parallel separations (to extent bunches are stables) are effective levelling mechanism however:

- β^* leveling important to reduce the effect of the LR in IP1/IP5
- β^* leveling is operationally difficult for keeping IP orbit stable during optics transitions (solvable with effective IP orbit feedback).
- simultaneous β^* leveling in IP8 and IP1 is even more complicated since ATS scheme couples the two insertion (needs to commission N^2 optics transition or anticipate luminosity evolutions and freeze β^* steps in both IP1 and IP8).

After LS4 LHCb might need to run full head-on from the beginning, differently from the nominal scenario.

Can this change the overall preferred levelling strategy?

If head-on limited, separation leveling can helps.


If LR limited, β^* leveling helps, besides it would also allow savings in pick dose if geometrical crossing angle can be reduced during the first part of the fill .

LHCb new layout




A previous scenario with 3.74 m and 7.48 m shift, no additional dipole was developed by B. Schmidt and S. Fartoukh.

E. Thomas , R. Lindner
 IP8 displaced by 3.74 m towards Point 7
 "D1"(new) (0.9 - 1.2 Tm) at 2 m from IP8 to Point 7
 "D2"(LHCb) (~4.0 Tm) at 2 m from IP8 to Point 7

"Standard LHCb"




LHCb+ = "Standard LHCb" + displaced IP + a D1 dipole with opposite field



Internal Bump

Orbit at top energy




Crossing angles for flat machine

	Nom	Upg.
x' [μ rad]	± 135	± 118
y' [μ rad]	± 1.81	± 1.58

Based on **MBNW** of 1.1 Tm
Range allowed 0.9-1.2 Tm.

Stronger MBXWS.R8 (+37%):
+10% possible at the cost of field quality (P. Schwarz).

Can it be replaced with stronger one?





Other options: not closed bump or shifted IP crossing to be recovered with external bumps can save replacing MBXWS -> may complicate operations.

Update Layout



Element	Specification	Pos. nominal	Pos. "upgrade"
MQXA.1L8	205 T/m, 6.37m	-26.15 m	-26.15 m
L*		-22.965 m	-22.965 m
BPMSW.1L8		-21.595 m	-21.595 m
MBXWS.1L8	1.41 T, 0.78 m	-20.765 m	-20.765 m
MBXWH.1L8	1.24 T, 3.4 m	-5.25 m	-5.25-3.74 m
IP8N		n/a	-3.74 m
MBNW ("D1")	0.9-1.2 Tm	n/a	2-3.74 m
IP8		0 m	0 m
MBLW.1R8 ("D2")	3.636 T, 1.1m	5.25 m	5.25 m
MBXWS.1R8	1.9 T, 0.78 m	20.765 m	20.765 m
BPMSW.1R8		21.595 m	21.595 m
MQXA.1R8	205 T/m	26.15 m	26.15 m

Optics with IP shift

2m, ATS round



3m, ATS round



Beam 1

Beam 2



Difficult to reduce it below 1.8 m.
Right triplet not well matched
-> aperture bottleneck could be smoothed with triplet strength.

Triplet powering scheme has a limited range for Q1 Right (6450A@ 205T/m):
For <185 T/m and 600 A Q1 trim not sufficient

Is it worth change/double trim power converter?

For injection aperture we need detail on the new vacuum chambers.

Crossing scheme



Used same philosophy of present operation to control the LR:

at injection with parallel separation

at collision use large H crossing angle with bad polarity

For the good polarity possible to reduce the angle or reduce β^* for higher luminosity and higher pile-up the beginning of the fill.



Is it worth/desirable?

Alternative strategy, e.g. 45° , 90° crossing plane not considered at the moment.


Any preference from the experiment side?

Apertures with IP shift


2m, 390 μ rad



3m, 600 μ rad



Beam 1



Beam 2

With worst (for aperture) spectrometer polarity and no IP transverse shift.

For $\beta^*=2$ m: 350 μ rad limit full crossing due to TCDDM for Beam 2 and 380 μ rad limited in triplet for Beam 1.

For $\beta^*=3$ m: 600 μ rad limit full crossing due to TCDDM for Beam 2 and triplet for Beam 1.

Can we have a movable jaw for the TCDDM?

Aperture and optics with IP shift allow smaller β^* reach.

Maximum allowed ext. crossing angle

β^* [m]	Ext. angle [μrad]	Ap. IP nominal [$\sigma_{\text{TCCDM}}/\sigma_{\text{MCBX}}$]	Ap. IP shift [$\sigma_{\text{TCCDM}}/\sigma_{\text{MCBX}}$]
3	-500	15.7/19.0	15.2/15.4
2	-500	12.8/15.5	11.2/13.0
2	-600	10.3/12.6	8.5/10.1
1	-300	12.5/14.2	n/a
1	-400	10.7/12.9	n/a

- IP shift has larger β^* for the same aperture.
- The mask TCCDM should be replaced with a movable device if possible.
- For injection, no change with respect to the baseline if bump is closed. Details of the new vacuum chambers are needed.

Shall we aim at 12σ in IR8 like in IR1 and IR5?

Minimum crossing angle to be found looking at beam-beam LR effects.

IP8 Crossing angle scans





HLLHC V1.0: effect of IP8



IPI & IP5 only HLLHC V1.0 optic

Int ppb I0	DA No Err No IP8
1.0	8.41
2.2	6.42




Full head-on from IP8 DQ = - 0.01

Three cases for IP8 LR at 3m β^* :


- $\alpha_{IP8} = 610 \mu\text{rad} \rightarrow$ all LR $d_{sep} > 43 \sigma$
- $\alpha_{IP8} = 290 \mu\text{rad} \rightarrow$ 2 LR with $d_{sep} 20\sigma$ all others LR $d_{sep} > 38 \sigma$
- $\alpha_{IP8} = 70 \mu\text{rad} \rightarrow$ 2 LR with $d_{sep} 5\sigma$ all others LR $d_{sep} > 15 \sigma$

D. Banfi, J. Barranco, T. Pieloni
WP2 meeting 20/3/2015


IP8 Crossing angle scans




HLLHC V1.0: effect of IP8



IPI & IP5 only HLLHC V1.0 optic



IPI&5 + IP8



	No IP8	IP8 610μrad (neg spectr)	IP8 290μrad (pos spectr)	IP8 70μrad (pos spectr)
1.0	8.41	8.07	7.93	7.72
2.2	6.42	6.28	6.06	5.86

LHCb spectrometer add +/- 270 μrad, depending on polarity

Full head-on from IP8 DQ = - 0.01

Three cases for IP8 LRs at 3m β*:

- α_{IP8} = 610 μrad → ΔDA = -0.35@2.2e11 (0.14@1.0e11) σ
- α_{IP8} = 290 μrad → ΔDA = -0.5@2.2e11 (0.36@1.0e11) σ
- α_{IP8} = 70 μrad → ΔDA = -0.7@2.2e11 (0.56@1.0e11) σ





D. Banfi, J. Barranco, T. Pieloni
 WP2 meeting 20/3/2015

10

Margins in DA available w.r.t. baseline in IP8 crossing angle if not taken by Q', MO, pacman.



Long range with new layout




X. Buffat


Beneficial effect of the new dipole

Minimum crossing angle due to LR


$\beta^* = 3$ m
Without shift



$\beta^* = 3$ m
With IP shift






$\beta^* = 2$ m
With IP shift



Legend:
half external
crossing angle

$B_y < 0$



X. Buffat

Pacman dependent shift is the dominant issue for reducing β^* .

Footprint give first indications, DA simulations with crossing angle scan and impact of pacman necessary to formulate a specification.

Wrap-up

- Assuming substantially more luminosity in LHCb have a limited impact in Atlas/CMS luminosities.
- The new LHCb experimental scheme can be implemented in the machine, with stronger MBWXS on the right.
- The TCDDM on the right limits the β^* reach of IP8 before the triplets, a movable device would be beneficial.
- Increasing range in the Q1 trim, will allow more optimal optics.
- The β^* reach and therefore expected integrated luminosity depends:
 - on the minimum crossing angle allowed by beam-beam effects
 - the minimum aperture allowed by collimation system.
- Next step:
 - evaluation of the pacman effects on orbit, tune shift, Q' shifts and noise
 - weak-strong simulations for several pacman classes to estimate the minimal crossing vs β^*
 - collimation studies with additional aperture bottleneck