Alternative tuning methods for a DQW crab cavity

Silvia Verdú-Andrés | Brookhaven National Laboratory | 29 June 2016

Expected frequency evolution – from atelier till operation



STUDY a) Tuning by squeezing cavity waist

Main characteristics:

- Use of belt.
- Can be performed before welding the last wall of the helium vessel.

Body used to simulate deformation:

- Ring torus [r=Rmi-1 mm, R = Rma+30 mm, C=(0, 0, 0) mm] and scale factor of 1.28 in x on outer walls.
- Deformation max. depth 1 mm.

Tuning range: 0.11 MHz/mm

• +115 kHz for max. deformation of 1 mm



STUDY b) Tuning by pressing on internal walls of bowl

Main characteristics:

Unidirectional tuning

Body used to simulate deformation:

- ring torus [r=25 mm, R = 88 mm, C=(0, 95, 0) mm] deformation depth is 3.2 mm
- At two sides of the bowl; symmetric deformation

Tuning range: 0.03 MHz/mm

• +81 kHz by pressing on (both) internal walls of bowl when deformation depth is 3.2 mm

At two sides of the bowl; symmetric deformation

STUDY c) Tuning by clamping inductive region

Bodies used to simulate deformation:

- INTERIOR BOWL : Ring torus [r=25 mm, R = 88 mm, C=(0, 95, 0) mm] deformation max. depth 3.2 mm;
- OUTER WALL: Ring torus [r=60 mm, R = 95 mm, C=(0, 92, 245) mm] deformation max. depth 5.4 mm

Tuning range: 0.03 MHz/mm

 +85 kHz by clamping in inductive region for max. deformation depth of 3.2 mm in interior wall <u>and</u> max. deformation depth of 5.4 mm in outer wall.



STUDY #4 - Tuning by pulling/pushing beam pipes



Applied displacement [mm] to cavity ports and calculated new frequency [kHz] (ACE3P):

$$\Delta f = 140(d_1 - d_2) + 580(d_3 + d_4) - 800d_5 - 380d_6$$



0.14 MHz/mm

Summary I



Any other method that I did not mention?

Summary II

- Further studies needed to:
 - 1) evaluate feasibility of deformation given the stiffness of the cavity and
 - 2) determine how other regions will deform in basis of the method used to cause the required deformation and the support points chosen.
- The tuning range should be re-evaluated for a cavity model with a realistic deformation.
- Additional RF simulations need to be performed to analyze electric field offset, multipoles, HOMs, etc.
- Need to define the characteristics of a tool capable of performing such kind of deformations.

Others - MIP

 Need CERN to review (removed steps about tooling, added resonator frequency controls): <u>https://edms.cern.ch/document/1569808/3</u>

ightarrow In parallel, construction of "Niowave cavity parts MIP"

Back-up

Penetration and rotation of FPC coupler

One of the optimization goals for the FPC hook design was to provide a FPC hook shape with reduced sensitivity of the coupling to assembly tolerances. In consequence, the frequency shifts associated to the assembly of the FPC are small: a penetration change of +-0.5mm, or a displacement of +-1mm in x or z direction or a rotation of up to +-15 degrees only shifts the cavity frequency by 1 kHz at most. These parameters are shown in Fig. ##. The coupling and the dissipated power are however pretty sensitive to some of these parameters, being particularly sensitive to the hook penetration, the displacement of the coupler in x direction and the hook rotation. The dissipated power increases by about 6 Watts for a penetration variation of +-0.5 mm, about 1.6 Watts for a displacement of +-1 mm in the x direction and about 0.8 Watts for a rotation of +-15 degrees. Table ## summarizes these values. The variation of the FPC assembly parameters is therefore not recommended for tuning the cavity frequency, as it provides a very small tuning range at expenses of increasing the dissipated power in the coupler, a critical aspect due to the heat load limitations for this project.

#5 – Rotation of HOM filters (from B. P. Xiao)

The rotation of HOM couplers by 5 degrees only changes the fundamental frequency by 1 kHz. The tuning sensitivity is low and the rotation may have an undesired impact on the impedance spectrum. Therefore this tuning method is not recommended.