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Cooling in the UK

- UK cooling studies focus on Neutrino Factory
  - This is muon collider front end
- I won't talk about MICE
- Aim is to have a practical, costed, engineered solution ready in ~3-4 years
  - Ready for IDR in 2010
  - Ready for CDR in 2012
- Study ISS/FS2A cooling channel design
  - Effect of reduced gradient
- Look at ways to mitigate the effect of RF in high B-field
  - Even if MTA produces a good result with 200 MHz cavity in B-fields, should we believe it?
    - A statistic of 1
  - If MTA produces a bad result we need to be ready to manage it
Cooling with Reduced Gradient

- NF cooling channel RF is
  - 15.25 MV/m @ 200 MHz
  - Sitting in ~2.4 T field

- It looks like this is tough to achieve
  - Kilpatrick Limit is at 17 MV/m
  - But 2.4T field limits what can really be done
    - Palmer's simulations indicate might only get ~7 MV/m
      - Many caveats, esp that FS2A coils sit on a field flip

- First: what is the difference in cooling performance between G4MICE and ICOOL?
- Second: How well can the FS2A cooling channel cope with a reduced gradient?
- Third: Scheme(s) to mitigate this problem
Simulation in G4MICE

- Movie 1 (generated by G4MICE/povray interface)
  - Simulate using ISS beam
Transmission in Cut

- Plot number of muons in 30 mm acceptance with $150 < E_{\text{tot}} < 300$ MeV
- Shows number of muons that would make it into an accelerator chain
  - Initially 383 muons in this cut
- G4MICE with the constant energy phasing model does very well
  - Much better than ICOOL
- Why is this?
Lithium Hydride Model

- For 1 cm LiH:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LiH</th>
<th>ICOOL</th>
<th>G4MICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in $E$ [MeV]</td>
<td>1.823</td>
<td>1.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final RMS $E$ [MeV]</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final RMS $x'$</td>
<td>0.00782</td>
<td>0.00633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lithium Hydride Model

- For 1 cm LiH (PDG = Particle Data Group formulae)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ICOOL</th>
<th>G4MICE</th>
<th>PDG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in $E$ [MeV]</td>
<td>1.823</td>
<td>1.682</td>
<td>1.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final RMS $E$ [MeV]</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final RMS $x'$</td>
<td>0.00782</td>
<td>0.00633</td>
<td>0.00597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Material Model - Comments

- G4.8.2 estimates significantly less energy loss and multiple scatter compared with ICOOL
  - G4 seems to agree better with PDG values
  - Better models are available in ICOOL
    - For comparison with ISS, I use the ones that came with the deck
      - dE/dx with density effect
      - Bethe version of Moliere scattering with Rutherford limit
      - Vavilov energy straggling
  - ICOOL uses less dense LiH
    - But this should push the physical processes in the opposite direction
    - Both codes compare well with MuScat
      - There was no LiH in MuScat
  - Note the discrepancy and push on to look at cooling with reduced RF peak field
- Study effect of changing the peak RF voltage on the cavity
  - Keep all cavities at same voltage
  - Vary RF phase and Lithium Hydride thickness
    - Aim is to keep the energy loss from material the same as energy gain from cavity
  - Use alternate G4MICE phasing model now
    - Set energy gain independent of RF phase
    - G4MICE figures out the appropriate peak field
- As I change LiH thickness, stretch material into vacuum region
  - Keep material out of RF cavity
First I adjust LiH thickness
- Set peak field to give reference particle constant energy
- Plot \( \frac{\text{peak number of muons in cut}}{\text{input number in cut}} \)
  - Cut is on \( 150 < E < 300 \text{ MeV} \) and \( \text{Amp} < 30 \text{ mm} \) (excluding tails)
- Cooling performance vs LiH thickness

Improved transmission at lower phase
- RF bucket is larger
- Peak field is greater to keep energy gain the same
The same plot but now x-axis is the peak field required to get the appropriate thickness

- Phasing RF at 30° gives a superior performance than RF at 40°
- Difference is quite significant
  - 20% on the number of muons i.e. 2 years of running for a Neutrino Factory
- At 17 MV/m best performance is ~ factor 2.1 in number of muons
- At 7 MV/m best performance is ~ factor 1.45 in number of muons
Alternate Lattices

- Trying some alternate lattices to mitigate the problem of RF in B-field
- Also worry about maintainability of the system
  - For NF, a cooling channel that gives ~ factor 2 increase in number of muons but is broken half the time the time is a waste of money
- Three lattices:
  - (i) Stretched SFoFo lattice
  - (ii) Stretched SFoFo lattice with recirculators on the end
  - (iii) Stretched SFoFo lattice with tilted solenoids for bends => ring
- Much more space to move around
  - RF cavities can be taken away from magnetic fields
- Achromatic over $\sim 50$ MeV/c
- Limited by dynamic aperture of $\sim 80$ mm amplitude
  - Need to bring this up a bit
Dynamic aperture

- Movie 2 (generated by G4MICE/analysis interface)
Stretched SFoFo Lattice

- At the Kilpatrik limit, I get < 45% increase in number of muons
  - ~Same as FS2A with limited RF
Recirculating Lattices

- Recirculation is plausible (but not easy)
  - Longer lattice => time for kickers
  - More vacuum => space for kickers
  - But tricksy solenoid fringe fields to navigate
- Problem - getting dynamic aperture high enough
SFoFo Ring

- Movie 3
SFoFo Ring

- With idealistic beam...
  - 0 longitudinal emittance
  - \sim 20 \text{ mm} initial transverse emittance
- ...Cooling channel shows reasonable performance over 3 turns
- Difficult to get polychromatic beam through
  - Would allow us to take advantage of emittance exchange
  - Nb apologies for poor statistics & effect of tails \Rightarrow “fuzzy” plots

15 mm Amp cut

30 mm Amp cut
Schedule

- Aim for Neutrino Factory Interim Design Report 2010
- Conceptual Design Report 2012
- This dictates schedule
  - Need to start engineering design work ~2010
  - Might want to start ramping the activity now/soon
- After 2010, conceptual work has to be upgrade or fallback for NF
  - A lot to do in 1 or 2 years
- Some hard work to be done!
- Dedicated NF Front End & Acceleration workshop on Sunday and Monday
  - Here at J-Lab
  - For detailed and free flowing discussion
  - All welcome - no registration fee
  - Feel free to sign up