



Muon Collider Accelerator Design and Simulation 5 year Plan

R.C. Fernow BNL

MUTAC Review FNAL

7 April 2009





- NFMCC & MCTF joint 5-year plan calls for a muon collider Design Feasibility Study (DFS) to be completed in ~2013
- design and simulation work on accelerator systems will be a major part of this study
- last year a small group worked on preparing this simulation plan what design & simulation <u>tasks</u> need to be done how much <u>effort</u> might be required to accomplish it

Y. Alexahin	(FNAL)
C. Ankenbrandt	(FNAL, Muons Inc)
J.S. Berg	(BNL)
R. Fernow	(BNL)
H. Kirk	(BNL)
M. Zisman	(LBNL)





- (2009-2010)explore proposed alternative accelerator subsystems
simulate performance using defensible parameters
cross-check promising systems with ≥ 2 codes
- (2011) specify a baseline accelerator design optimize baseline, minimize work on alternatives simulate representative matching sections carry out representative tolerance studies
- (2012-2013) freeze accelerator design

 complete design of all transfer lines & matching sections
 do end-to-end simulations of all accelerator systems
 do detailed tolerance studies
 do necessary simulations for the DFS report





- Subsystem design & simulations proton driver target front end μ acceleration
 - collider ring
- 2. End-to-end simulations
- 3. Cost estimation





- envision using Project X as the proton driver
- assume a baseline Project X design independent of our efforts
- we would explore additions & modifications needed to meet our requirements proton beam power $\sim 4 \text{ MW}$
 - proton bunch length ~2 ns
 - time structure of bunches at target
- design new accumulator & compressor storage rings to provide flexibility
- investigate a combiner to allow >1 bunch on target simultaneously
- develop 1st order design concepts: parameters, layout, lattice optics, etc.
- evaluate intensity-dependent effects: space charge, electron cloud, etc.
- develop strategies to mitigate any intensity-dependent effects
- tracking studies with realistic errors









• benchmark results of MERIT experiment with simulations production rates disruption of mercury jet by proton beam jet shape distortions caused by magnetic field

- understand differences between MERIT & facility requirements
- study optimized nozzle designs



(jet disruption)





- front-end differs most from conventional facilities
- very difficult to manipulate the diffuse, short-lived bunch of muons
- \bullet uncertainty on the optimum way to prepare μ for acceleration
- much of our simulation work has addressed this system
- modeling fields, optimizing layout, increasing realism, studying errors

Front-end simulations

- 1. decay, bunching & phase rotation*
- 2. precooling*
- 3. 6D cooling
- 4. final cooling
- 5. front-end-code development*
- 6. breakdown in normal-conducting RF cavities*

*synergy with neutrino factory studies





Capture section

- capture π , allows decay to μ , forms bunches, reduces energy spread
- study Neuffer's new 12-bunch scheme
- study using alternating solenoid lattices for buncher & phase rotation
- study capturing at higher energy

Precooler section

- first stage of transverse cooling, similar to NF
- investigate Study 2a channel with $\text{LiH} \rightarrow \text{H}_2$ gas



(12-bunch layout)





- bulk of ionization cooling is done here
- study three main schemes, each with several variants Guggenheim channel Helical Cooling Channel (HCC) Helical FOFO-snake
- charge separation, recombination, bunch merging may be necessary



(Guggenheim) 7 April 2009





(Helical FOFO snake)

(HCC)





- reduces final ϵ_{TN} to 2 25 μm
- study two main schemes
 - 50 T solenoid channel
 - Parametric Ionization Cooling & Reverse Emittance Exchange (Muons Inc.)
- investigate other late stage possibilities low-β bucked coil lattice lithium lens channel conventional REMEX with wedges
- may need some high-energy bunch merging



(50 T channel)





- special codes are required for front-end system design combine aspects of particle interaction physics & beam transport
- novel designs frequently analyzed first with special-purpose codes
- successful ideas get incorporated into general purpose simulation codes ICOOL
 - G4Beamline (Muons Inc.)
- codes need continual upgrades
 - correct errors
 - handle new cooling configurations
 - resolve discrepancies





- there is a lot of uncertainty over performance of RF in strong B fields
- we want to use simulations to understand ongoing experimental measurements
- need to develop breakdown models
- one idea requires design of optimal magnetically-insulated cavities
- design of new cooling lattices needed for some proposals using gas-filled cavities using magnetically-insulated cavities



(magnetically-insulated cavity)





- need to accelerate μ bunches from 140 MeV to 750 GeV using e.g. {linac, RLA, FFAG, RCS}
- need complete lattice designs
- engineering studies of required magnets and RF
- study cost effectiveness of proposed schemes
- do single particle tracking
- study collective effects
 - e.g., impedance driven parasitic collisions



(racetrack FFAG)





- goal: to provide high luminosity $\mu^+\mu^-$ collisions
- 3 designs are currently being studied
- ring designs are strongly coupled with detector design
- need to carry out basic lattice designs of IR & arc cells
- examine chromatic correction schemes
- design special matching sections

e.g., injection, collimation, beam abort

- study dynamic aperture and coherent effects
- design RF systems and other needed hardware



(dynamic aperture)





- design all missing transfer lines & matching sections
- pass actual beam distributions from one section to next
- make high statistics runs
- understand any differences between codes
- study sensitivity to physics models (front end) e.g., π production, scattering, straggling
- study sensitivity to hardware errors e.g., fields, gradients, RF phases
- examine μ polarization
- make dedicated space charge study of critical areas





	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
PD	0.3	1	4.5	5	7.5	3.8
Т	1	1	3	4	0.5	0
FE	5.2	5.4	9.7	10.5	9.6	5
А	1	1	2.9	3.2	2.7	1.6
CR	0.4	0.4	2.8	6.1	6.6	2.6
Total	7.9	8.8	22.9	28.8	26.9	13

• these estimates draw on our experience from Study 1, Study 2, Study 2a and ISS

• this includes effort needed for end-to-end simulations, but not the cost estimate.





- DFS report on feasibility of building a muon collider
- Cost estimation

DFS report will provide necessary technical basis for 1st rough cost estimate for a 1.5 TeV muon collider set up Work Breakdown Structure requires assistance of engineers most of the effort in 2013

• R&D list

identify unresolved $\mu\mu$ issues that need further R&D





1. need for coordinated effort on benchmarking of key processes and cross-checking codes

there is a Muon Inc-BNL SBIR proposal to do this incorporated as task in the 5-year plan

 parametric studies of various scenarios → optimal choice of subsystem design typically done at some level for all good designs, done in detail for HCC incorporated as task in the 5-year plan

3. do significant simulations to more accurately evaluate performance of chosen MC scheme

incorporated as major task for year 3 of 5-year plan

4. results from MERIT should be used as a test bed for benchmarking codes with planned experiments

active program trying to compare MERIT results with simulations e.g. MHD code development, comparison with MARS incorporated as task in the 5-year plan





- have developed a 5 year plan for preparing a muon collider DFS
- outlined required tasks and estimated effort required
- will require a substantial increase in FTEs working in this area
- at end we will
 - 1) assesses feasibility of building a muon collider
 - 2) provide 1st defensible estimate of cost to build facility
 - 3) provide a list of key remaining R&D issues
- could provide HEP community with a powerful option for exploring the high energy frontier





- cooling or scraping?
- realistic Guggenheim



FIG. 15. (Color) The muons per incident proton on target into the accelerator normalized transverse acceptance of $A_T =$ 30 mm rad and normalized longitudinal acceptance of $A_L =$ 150 mm for a momentum cut $0.1 \le p \le 0.3 \text{ GeV}/c$.







cooling gives
x 3 more μ into
 same acceptance

Figure 5.13: Particle transmission: number of muons per incident proton on target in the buncher and cooling sections. Top curve is overall transmission; lower two curves are for 150 mm longitudinal acceptance with two different transverse acceptance cuts: (middle) 15 mm·rad transverse acceptance; (bottom) 9.35 mm·rad transverse acceptance. This result was obtained with ICOOL.







Figure 5.14: The muon-to-proton yield ratio for the two transverse emittance cuts, clearly showing that the channel cools, *i.e.*, the density in the center of the phase space region increases. Since the relevant yield μ/p_{15} no longer increases for $z \leq 110$ m, the channel length was set to 108 m. This is a Geant4 result.







- higher equilibrium emittance because of windows
- need to taper before 15 turns (HEMC 201 MHz uses 4 turns)

7 April 2009