



Non-interceptive Profile Monitors: why?





MOTIVATIONS:

Provide a transverse profile measurement to

- support the tuning of high power beam
- maximize protons on target

REQUIREMENTS:

- stand high proton beam intensity
- have minimum impact on proton beam
- provide enough statistics

↓ ↓ IONIZATION PROFILE MONITORS (1 in Spokes, 3 in Medium β , 1 in High β)





IPM : Ionization Profile Monitor

PRINCIPLE OF OPERATION

proton beam ionizes residual gas

 \overrightarrow{E} separates $e^-/ions$





2 cages for 2D beam profile measurement



charge collection on read-out





REMINDER:



SOFTWARE CORRECTION

R. Wanzenberg, Nonlinear Motion of a Point Charge in the 3D Space Charge Field of a Gaussian Bunch.

A Gaussian bunch with total charge Q_b is moving with the velocity v_b along the z-axis of the laboratory frame K. The electric field of the bunch is calculated in the comoving frame and transformed into an electric and magnetic field in the laboratory frame K where the Lorentz-Force on a point charge Q_0 is calculated.

CODES:	
MATLAB (C. Thomas)	de)
SIMULATION STEPS:	
a single electron (or ion) is created in the center of the IPM: x= Gaus($0, \sigma_x$) y= Gaus($0, \sigma_y$) z = Unif(-2.5 mm, 2.5 mm)	•
in a first moment it is assumed that at creation time the electron (or ion) is at rest	
a proton bunch of total charge Q = 1.7 e^{-10} C and kinetic energy E_p is considered	
a time step <i>dt</i> is chosen by the program	
the displacement dx of the electron (or ion) is calculated by solving the motion equation (adaptive Runge Kutta Fehlberg method)	-
another time step <i>dt</i> is chosen by the program	
the displacement dx of the electron (or ion) is calculated by solving the motion equation (adaptive Runge Kutta Fehlberg method)	
time displacement time displacement	الحمر ا
when the y position of the electron (or ion) $y \ge y_{collection \ plate}$, the simulation stops	
at every dt passed, the following variable values were saved: t, x, y, z, v _x , v _y , v _z , a _x , a _y , a _z , fields info (lab and comoving frame)	
t and y are plotted and fitted with a spline to find the time t _{stop} when the electrode was reached	
t and x are plotted and fitted with a spline. $x(t_{stop})$ is extracted	
the procedure is iterated N times, to reach a statistical uncertainty of (100 $\frac{\sqrt{N}}{N}$) %	

Correction code

IPM PDR

31st January 2017, Lund



10 cm

DE LA RECHERCHE À L'INDUSTR











ESS PROTON BEAM PARAMETERS

- [90,2000] MeV Energy :
- $62.5 \text{ mA} = 0.0625 \times 6.242 \times 10^{18} \text{ p/s}$ Current peak:
- Pulse length: 2.86 ms
- Pulse frequency: 14 Hz (duty cycle 4%)
- Bunch frequency: 352.21 MHz

IPM GAS PARAMETERS

Composition : H₂ (79%), CO (10%), CO₂ (10%), N₂ (1%) [source: ESS vacuum group]

 10^{-9} mbar Pressure:

CHOSEN CODE PARAMETERS:





400

High β



Results forecast



[600 kV/m, 90 MeV, $\sigma_x = \sigma_y = 0.5$ mm, $\sigma_z = 0.75$ mm]

 e^{i} (f = 0.97 ± 0.01 ns)

 H_2^+ ($\bar{t} = 58.94 \pm 0.33 \text{ ns}$)

CO* (f = 219.9 ± 1.2 ns)

 N_{2}^{+} (f = 220.0 ± 1.2 ns)

CO₂⁺ (t = 275.7 ± 1.5 ns)

THE HEAVIER THE TEST PARTICLE:

the more time it spends in the field

- \rightarrow more time subjected to the elm field (+)
- → equal contributions from bunches before and after the particle coordinates (-)
- the more resistance it opposes to the elm field (-)

THE HIGHER THE PROTON ENERGY:

the higher the elm field (+)

the less time a bunch affects the trajectory of a test particle (-)



THE HIGHER THE ELECTRIC FIELD:

```
the fastest a test particle reaches the electrode (-)
```

The various parameters contribute in different way, sometimes increasing and sometimes decreasing the space charge effects felt by the test particles (focusing and defocusing effect). Therefore, it is impossible to foresee a priori (withouth calculations) the behaviour of the created ions in the field obtained by the sum of the external electric field and elm field.

IPM PDR

31st January 2017, Lund

10000

9000

8000

7000

6000

5000

4000

3000 2000



100

80

70

60

40

30

20

10

Results: heavier ion comparison





$$\overline{E} = 600 \text{ kV/m}$$

$$E_p = 90 \text{ MeV}$$

$$\sigma_{x_i} = \sigma_{y_i} = 0.5 \text{ mm}$$

$$\sigma_{z_i} = 0.75 \text{ mm}$$

CO+

Remarks:

14.9%

 $m_{N_2} \approx m_{CO}$ heavier particle = smaller Δx

x final

x initial

10000

0.5747

10000

0.4983

x (mm)

0.003892

0.004766

Entries

Mean

RMS

Entries

Mean

RMS





31st January 2017, Lund





Results: $f(E_p)$





 \overline{E} = 300 kV/m, σ_{y_1} = 3.2 mm, σ_{z_1} = 2.0 mm



















$E_p = 90 \text{ MeV}, \sigma_{x_i} = 0.5 \text{ mm}, \sigma_{z_i} = 2.0 \text{ mm}$





IPM PDR

DE LA RECHERCHE À L'INDUSTRI









Nominal ESS beam parameters and IPM setting:

$$\sigma_x = 2$$
mm - 3 mm

- $\sigma_y = 2$ mm 3 mm
- $\sigma_z = 2mm$

 $\blacksquare \overline{E} = 30 \text{ kV/m}$







SIMULATION STEPS (Slide 9):

in a first moment it is assumed that at creation time the electron (or ion) is **at rest**

 $\label{eq:check} \begin{array}{l} \textbf{Check assumption validity with Garfield} ++ (toolkit for simulations of particle detectors with gas and semi-conductors as sensitive medium) \end{array}$



























✓ GARFIELD++ provides different momenta distribution of the primary electrons for different incident proton beam energies and electric fields (v_e , θ_e , ϕ_e).

ELECTRONS:

- E_p = 90 MeV
- $\blacksquare \ \overline{E} = 300 \text{ kV/m}$
- $= \mathsf{x}_{i_{el}} = \mathsf{f}(\sigma_{\mathsf{x}_{i_{el}}}), \mathsf{y}_{i_{el}} = \mathsf{f}(\sigma_{\mathsf{y}_{i_{el}}})$
- $z_{i_{el}}$ uniformly \in [-5 cm, 5 cm]
- $\sigma_{\mathbf{x}_{i_{el}}} = \sigma_{\mathbf{y}_{i_{el}}} = 0.5 \text{ mm, } 1.4 \text{ mm,} \\ 3.2 \text{ mm, } 4.1 \text{ mm,} \\ 5.0 \text{ mm, } 10.0 \text{ mm}$
- $\sigma_{z_{i_{el}}} = 0.75$ mm, 2.0 mm, 10.0 mm
- **v**_{*i*_{el}} from GARFIELD++
- (θ , ϕ) from GARFIELD++

IONIZED MOLECULES:

- E_p = 90 MeV
- $\blacksquare \ \overline{E} = 300 \text{ kV/m}$

$$= x_{i_{ion}} = f(\sigma_{x_{i_{ion}}}), y_{i_{ion}} = f(\sigma_{y_{i_{ion}}})$$

$$z_{i_{ion}}$$
 uniformly \in [-5 cm, 5 cm]

$$\begin{tabular}{ll} $\sigma_{x_{i_{ion}}} = \sigma_{y_{i_{ion}}} = 0.5 \mbox{ mm, } 1.4 \mbox{ mm, } \\ $3.2 \mbox{ mm, } 4.1 \mbox{ mm, } \\ $5.0 \mbox{ mm, } 10.0 \mbox{ mm} \end{tabular} \end{tabular} \end{tabular}$$

• $\sigma_{z_{i_{ion}}} = 0.75$ mm, 2.0 mm, 10.0 mm

(
$$\theta$$
, ϕ) from GARFIELD++

cea



IPM PDR





The results from the IPM simulation code with the above initial conditions show:

- the space charge effect is lower for higher proton energies
- ionized molecules are less affected by space charge effects than electrons
- the initial momentum with which particles are created can be neglected for ionized molecules, but not for electrons
- if electrons are detected and the beam sizes are $\sigma_{x_i} = \sigma_{x_i}$ 3.2 mm and $\sigma_{z_i} = 2.0$ mm an error of about 35% is obtained (requirements not met)
- if electrons are detected and the beam size is smaller than 2 mm, the error on the beam width is higher than 35% (requirements not met)
- if ionized molecules are detected, in nominal conditions, not more than 4% error on the beam width is obtained
- as for ionized molecules here above H₂⁺ was meant. If the totality of the ionized molecules is considered with the appropriate weight, the previously given error improve by few %.