Update on transverse stability studies for the 200MHz cavity HOMs

D.Amorim

Thanks to N.Biancacci, K.Li, E.Métral, B.Salvant

LIU-SPS beam dynamic WG meeting

06/04/2017

- Introduction
- Impedance model used and stability simulations parameters
- Simulations results and remarks
- Conclusion and next steps

- Impedance model used and stability simulations parameters
- Simulations results and remarks
- Conclusion and next steps

- Need to reduce the 620MHz longitudinal HOM
- Doing so might modify the 940MHz transverse HOM
- We want to assess the transverse stability margin supposing this mode grows when optimizing the 620MHz HOM
- Method: transverse stability simulations with DELPHI, crosschecked with Sacherer formula
- Follow up of the presentation on the 2/03/2017 meeting

- Impedance model used and stability simulations parameters
- Simulations results and remarks
- Conclusion and next steps

Impedance model used

• Existing SPS impedance model, the 200MHz cavities are replaced by a single HOM

- Resonator parameters
 - $f_{res} = 938.493 MHz$
 - Resonance frequency chosen to fall on top of a coupled bunch mode line (worst case scenario)
 - Quality factor: 1000/10000/60000
 - Scan in shunt impedance: $10 \le R_s \le 10^8 M\Omega/m$

Impedance model used

- Existing SPS impedance model stops at 1.9GHz
- Extended the base model up to 10 GHz to properly cover the higher azimuthal modes
- Checked that the resonator impedance is properly sampled, especially for higher quality factors
- Checked that the addition of the resonator to the base model doesn't create discontinuities
- Ongoing work to include the transverse HOMs in the SPS impedance model
 - Simulations of the modes
 - Machine measurements (M.Beck)

Impedance model used



Stability simulations parameters

- Growth rates obtained with DELPHI
 - Vertical plane
 - 4620 bunches (5ns spacing)
 - Single bunch intensity $10^{11}ppb$
 - For fixed target experiment, single bunch intensity is $\sim\!10^{10}ppb$ but the results scale linearly with intensity
 - Zero chromaticity, no damper (conservative parameters)
- Crosscheck with Sacherer formula:
 - Approximate calculation of rise time and frequency shift:

•
$$\Delta \omega_m = j \frac{1}{|m|+1} \cdot \frac{e^2 \beta N_b}{4\pi m_0 \gamma Q_{y0} c \tau_b} (Z_{eff})_m$$

- With the effective impedance $(Z_{eff})_m = \frac{\sum_p Z(\omega_p) h_m(\omega_p)}{\sum_p h(\omega_p)}$
- h_m is the power spectrum
- The growth rate *GR* (in s⁻¹) is proportional to the real part of the transverse impedance

- Impedance model used and stability simulations parameters
- Simulations results and remarks
- Conclusion and next steps

DELPHI stability simulations results



2017-04-06

Sacherer formula results



of the resonator is seen at $1 \text{ G}\Omega/m \leq R_s$

Sacherer formula results



• Sinusoidal modes are used for Sacherer formula

• The HOM will mostly drive azimuthal modes number 4 and 5

Results of simulations

- The HOM falls on top of the $n_x=1451$ coupled bunch mode. Both DELPHI and Sacherer formula find this mode as the most unstable
- DELPHI simulations show a higher shunt impedance threshold for Q=60000 (factor 5 compared to the lower quality factor cases)
 - This could come from the fact that the HOM is not exactly on top of a CB mode line or that at lower quality factor, multiple CB lines are overlapped by the HOM
- For all quality factors studied, Sacherer formula gives a lower shunt impedance threshold compared to DELPHI
 - Sacherer formula might overestimate the growth rates caused by azimuthal modes higher than 0 as showed by N. Biancacci (<u>DELPHI studies on HOM driven growth rates and CB spectrum for</u> <u>crab cavities</u>)
- Once scaled with intensity (single bunch intensity of 10¹⁰ppb), the growth rate values for the baseline impedance are:
 - 1300 s⁻¹ (33 turns) for DELPHI results
 - 2200 s⁻¹ (19 turns) for Sacherer formula results
- This factor 2 on the baseline growth rates could also be explained by the overestimation of the higher azimuthal modes by Sacherer formula

- Introduction
- Impedance model used and stability simulations parameters
- Simulations results and remarks
- Conclusion and next steps

Conclusion

- New studies performed for a more critical case: HOM resonance frequency falling on top of a coupled bunch mode line
- For $f_{res} = 938.493 \ MHz$, Q=1000/10000/60000 no impact on the baseline until 1 G $\Omega/m \le R_s$ (Sacherer formula) or 10 G $\Omega/m \le R_s$

Next steps

- Add the transverse damper and chromaticity to reproduce existing observations
- Perform the simulations for the Q26 optics (used for fixed targets)
- Study the sensitivity to the HOM resonance frequency
 - Have the HOM falling either on top or between two coupled bunch mode lines
- Add to the model the other transverse HOMs identified: one at 460MHz with $Q \approx 70000$ (P. Kramer). Estimated shunt impedance needed to reduce the number of variables
- Better understand the differences between DELPHI results and Sacherer formula, as the last method can give a quick results
 - Study Sacherer with Gaussian modes

References

- 1) E. Shaposhnikova, *Resonant impedances in the SPS*, SL-Note 96-49 RF
- 2) N. Biancacci, Impact of transverse HOM on beam stability in the HL-LHC, 10/12/2014
- 3) N. Biancacci, *DELPHI studies on HOM driven growth rates and CB spectrum for crab cavities*, 25/03/2015
- 4) R.J. Lauckner and T.P.R Linnecar, *The transverse coupled bunch mode instability at 940MHz in the SPS*, 03/09/1980
- 5) K.Y.Ng, Coupling Impedances and Beam Instabilities in Accelerator Rings, 2015
- 6) C.Zannini, Electromagnetic Simulation of CERN accelerator Components and Experimental Applications, 2013

Comparison of DELPHI and Sacherer growth rates

DELPHI modes

N.Biancacci

- Study of the instability growth rate driven by a transverse HOM with $R_s = 1.6 M\Omega/m$ per crab cavity, Q = 1000 and variable frequency. This means a total Rs of $\approx 1.3 G\Omega/m$ for 16 cavities at $\beta_v = 3600$ m.
- Comparison with Sacherer sinusoidal modes with and without damper and Q' = 0.



- \rightarrow The damper can damp the mode 0 but not the mode 1.
- \rightarrow It could be confirmed with HEADTAIL simulations.

CB mode lines and impedance



2017-04-06

CB mode lines and impedance



2017-04-06