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overview

• emittance preservation through the cycle
  • injected emittances
  • blow-up during injection, ramp & squeeze
  • emittances & roundness at the start of Stable Beams

considering ...

• the impact of different beam types
  • BCMS, 8b4e, 8b4e BCS, ...
  • the 2.51 TeV cycle
• the different emittance data sources & their caveats
emittance measurements

• operational: BSRT
  • continuous measurement throughout the cycle
  • main source of data in the following
  • good performance in 2017 with some caveats (degradation)
    • see Georges’ talk!

• additional at injection: wire scanners
  • first ~200 bunches
  • reference measurement!

• additional in collisions: luminosity, emittance scans, luminous region
  • independent of beam instrumentation
  • only in Stable Beams
    • if levelling, after the levelling period if levelling in IP5
injected emittances

good agreement ( < 10%) between BSRT and Wire Scanners!

... so we can trust the BSRT data at flat bottom.
injected emittances
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injected emittances by beam type

achieved injected emittances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beam Type</th>
<th>BCMS</th>
<th>8b4e</th>
<th>8b4e BCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1H</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1V</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2H</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2V</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convoluted</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

predicted emittances from injectors:

25 ns BCMS (like 2016)      \( 1.7 \) (1.4)
25 ns BCMS (max. intensity) \( 1.9 \) (1.6)
8b4e (like 2016)            \( 1.8 \) (1.6)
8b4e (max. intensity)       \( 2.4 \) (2.1)

*(B. Mikulec - Chamonix 2017)*

Emittances in parentheses should be achievable, to be demonstrated operationally.
emittance evolution at flat bottom

- BSRT data: difference of first and last scan of each bunch
  - normalized by time at injection (bunch by bunch!)
  - relative – only weakly dependent on the BSRT calibration

- strong intra-beam scattering at injection energy, mainly H
  - we can model this ...
emittance evolution at flat bottom

emittance growth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[um/h]</th>
<th>BCMS</th>
<th>8b4e</th>
<th>8b4e BCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H meas.</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H model</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V meas.</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- IBS model [Fanouria et al.] predicts 0.3-0.5 um/h in H
  - extra blow-up:
    ~0.6 um/h (BCMS)
    ~0.2 um/h (8b4e)
  - electron cloud effect?
- V emittance growth not (yet) explained by the model
  - IBS + coupling?
extra blow-up at flat bottom: electron cloud?

BCMS 25ns
(H emittance growth, average of all fills)

pattern looks convincing!
(and the contribution of ~0.5 um/h is in the right order of magnitude)

8b4e
(H emittance growth, average of all fills)
emittance growth during the ramp?

- BSRT: last point at flat bottom compared to first point at flat top
  - no continuous emittance measurement during the ramp
  - dependent on the absolute BSRT calibration at flat bottom & flat top!
  - exclude bad measurements (BSRT degradation, affecting mostly flat top)
emittance growth during the ramp?

- B1 grows more than B2
- ~ no growth in the 2.51 TeV ramp
  ("modulo BSRT calibration")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[um]</th>
<th>BCMS</th>
<th>8b4e</th>
<th>8b4e BCS</th>
<th>2.51 TeV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1H</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.82?</td>
<td>-0.01?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1V</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.11?</td>
<td>0.68?</td>
<td>-0.14?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2H</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.04?</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2V</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.10?</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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emittance (non-)evolution at flat top

• BSRT values after the ramp and at the start of collisions
  • relative – only weakly dependent on the BSRT calibration

• BSRT calibrated in collisions
  • optics in IR4 change (only) slightly during the squeeze
  • small residual effect possible due to optics change

• ~ zero emittance evolution at flat top before collisions
  • end-of ramp
    = start of collisions!
  • in collisions, we have complementary measurements
emittances at the start of collisions

- additional measurements
  - emittance scans (IP 5)
  - ATLAS luminous region data
  - emittance from absolute luminosity
    - H/V from ATLAS/CMS ratio
    - levelling after fill 6263
      - luminosity & emittance scan data taken after levelling
      - corrected for SB emittance growth (Stefania’s talk - next)

- good agreement in general
  - BSRT degradation clearly visible
  - complementary measurements are important!
emittances at the start of collisions

**Int. Ramp Up (BCMS)**
- BCMS 25ns
- 8b4e
- 8b4e BCS
- 2.51 TeV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[um]</th>
<th>BCMS</th>
<th>8b4e</th>
<th>8b4e BCS</th>
<th>2.51 TeV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H emittance scan</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V emittance scan</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H BSRT</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7 (?)</td>
<td>1.3 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V BSRT</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7 (?)</td>
<td>1.6 (?)</td>
<td>1.2 (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
beam roundness in collisions

- **2016**: ATLAS/CMS luminosity ratio of ~0.95

- **2017**: ATLAS/CMS luminosity ratio of ~1

![Graph showing emittance scans]  
**BSRT (emittance scans agree)**

significantly non-round beams

beams ~round
putting it all together: the full cycle

- BSRT at flat-bottom
  - less sensitive to degradation
  - calibration easier
  - agrees with wire scanners

- emittance scans at flat top
  - end of ramp = start of collisions: blow-up negligible
  - agrees with emittances reconstructed from absolute luminosities
  - distinction of B1/B2 not possible
putting it all together: the full cycle

Int. Ramp Up (BCMS)
BCMS 25ns
8b4e
8b4e BCS
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emittance evolution during the cycle

- most blow-up occurs during the ramp!
  - in particular for the “small” BCS type beams
  - H and V likewise – indications from BSRT that beam 1 is worse than beam 2
  - 2.51 TeV ramp better in this respect!
### Relative Emittance Blow-Up [%]

(Flat bottom from BSRT, flat top from emittance scans)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCMS</th>
<th>H [%]</th>
<th>V [%]</th>
<th>8b4e BCS</th>
<th>H [%]</th>
<th>V [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>flat bottom</strong></td>
<td>15 % 0.3 um</td>
<td>9 % 0.1 um</td>
<td><strong>flat bottom</strong></td>
<td>17 % 0.2 um</td>
<td>15 % 0.15 um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ramp</strong></td>
<td>5 % 0.1 um</td>
<td>22 % 0.4 um</td>
<td><strong>ramp</strong></td>
<td>43 % 0.6 um</td>
<td>45 % 0.6 um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>21 % 0.4 um</td>
<td>31 % 0.5 um</td>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>68 % 0.8 um</td>
<td>68 % 0.7 um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injection - collisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>injection - collisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.51 TeV</th>
<th>H [%]</th>
<th>V [%]</th>
<th>2.51 TeV</th>
<th>H [%]</th>
<th>V [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>flat bottom</strong></td>
<td>6 % 0.1 um</td>
<td>3 % 0.05 um</td>
<td><strong>flat bottom</strong></td>
<td>16 % 0.2 um</td>
<td>11 % 0.1 um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ramp</strong></td>
<td>12 % 0.3 um</td>
<td>20 % 0.4 um</td>
<td><strong>ramp</strong></td>
<td>8 % 0.1 um</td>
<td>8 % 0.1 um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>19 % 0.4 um</td>
<td>24 % 0.45 um</td>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>25 % 0.3 um</td>
<td>21 % 0.2 um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injection - collisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>injection - collisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**same beams (8b4e BCS), but different ramp:**
- Factor of ~6 less blow-up!

- 2.51 TeV ramp is ~3 times shorter
- Does the majority of the blow-up occur after 2.51 TeV?
- Better emittance preservation with PPLP?

**not straightforward to tell!**
- No operational emittance measurement during the ramp (for physics beams)
- Optics during the ramp not well known (between matched points)
conclusions

• injected emittances
  • ~1.7 um for BCMS, ~1.9 um for 8b4e and ~1.2 um for BCS
  • consistent with predictions of injectors

• blow-up at flat bottom
  • H: IBS (~0.4 um/h) + extra blow-up (0.2-0.6 um/h), likely electron cloud related
  • V: 0.2-0.5 um/h, not fully understood (e-cloud + coupling? + ?)

• the most blow-up occurs during the ramp!
  • up to ~45% for 8b4e BCS - < 10 % in the 2.51 TeV cycle
  • beam 1 worse than beam 2

• emittance in collisions
  • ~2 um for BCMS, ~2.3 um for 8b4e, ~1.9 um 8b4e BCS (~1.4 um in the 2.5 TeV cycle!)
  • beams round, consistent with ATLAS/CMS luminosity ratio
  • complementary emittance measurements are crucial
“emittance” scans in 2017

- emittance measurements as in 2015 & 2016
  - CMS V (separation) plane better than H (crossing)
    - impact of the longitudinal distribution – compensation improved

- extra usage:
  - CMS luminosity monitor tracking (“mini-VdM” scan, see Jamie)
  - beam-beam long-range observations, consistent with (improved) simulations

n.b. reproducible for the 2017 “zoo” of filling schemes!
putting it all together: the full cycle

- BSRT at flat-bottom
  - less sensitive to degradation
  - calibration easier
  - agrees with wire scanners

- emittance scans at flat top
  - end of ramp = start of collisions: blow-up negligible
  - agrees with emittances reconstructed from absolute luminosities
  - distinction of B1/B2 not possible