



Fermilab

\bar{p} Note #427

SOURCES OF ACCUMULATOR COUPLING

F.E. Mills

August 26, 1985

The strength of the coupling resonance $\nu_z - \nu_x = 2$ is determined by the value of the complex quantity

$$C = (2\pi B\rho)^{-1} \int ds \sqrt{(\beta_x \beta_z)} [B' + B_s \{(\alpha_x - i)/\beta_x - (\alpha_z + i)/\beta_z\}] \exp i(\mu_z - \mu_x - \Delta\theta) \quad 1.1$$

where

B' = skew quad gradient

B_s = longitudinal field

μ = phase advance

α, β = CSL parameters

$\Delta = \nu_{z0} - \nu_{x0} - 2$

$\theta = s/R$.

$2|C|$ is equal to the minimum approach of the two fractional tunes. We can use this to estimate the contribution of various known errors to C . The observed value of $2|C|$ on the injection orbit is about 1.4×10^{-2} . It has been demonstrated that 30% of this is due to the extraction Lambertson magnet.

1. Currents which link the beam. The leads of each large dipole and of every quadrupole are such that the magnet current links the beam, giving rise to B_s . The quad currents alternate with the gradients and tend to cancel out. There is, however, a correlation between the sign of α and the quad polarity. On the other hand, the sign of α tends to change in the quads. Any real study of this contribution would be very detailed. The large dipole currents, which are about five times larger, can be easily estimated. Each current gives rise to $\int B ds = \mu_0 I = 1.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{Tm}$; $B\rho = 30 \text{Tm}$. Then each large dipole contributes about 8×10^{-6} to C . Even if all dipoles were in the proper phase, this would still be a negligible contribution to C .

2. Quadrupole tilts. The iron bodies of the quadrupoles were levelled to a precision of about 0.1 mrad, utilizing levelling notches stamped into each lamination. The tolerance on the parallelity of these notches to the mating surfaces was never relaxed during production of the laminations. Alternation of the laminations during stacking of the cores should further reduce the effect of errors. The parallelity of the poles to the mating surface was held to a similar precision ($< .001^\circ$). A quadrupole of strength B' , length L , and tilt angle ζ will contribute an amount

$$C_1 = \sqrt{(\beta_z \beta_x)} B' L \zeta / 2\pi B\rho. \quad 1.2$$

If the tilt angles are uncorrelated, the expectation value of the rms of the distribution of C will be

$$\sigma_C = \sqrt{N} \left[\sqrt{(\beta_z \beta_x)} B' L \right]_{\text{mean}} \sigma_\zeta / 2\pi B\rho \quad 1.3$$

Typically, $B L = 10 \text{T}$, $\sqrt{\beta_z \beta_x} = 15 \text{m}$, so $\sigma_C = 7 \times 10^{-4}$. The observed value is $10\sigma_C$.

A further check on tilts can be made by looking at the vertical dispersion, although the main contribution will be from the large quadrupoles where the horizontal dispersion is large. Let y be the difference in vertical orbit position for two orbits differing in momentum by $\delta = \Delta P/P$. Then

$$[y/\delta\sqrt{\beta_z}]_{\text{rms}} = (B' L \sqrt{S} / 2\pi B\rho \sin \pi\nu_z) \sigma_\zeta \quad 1.4$$

where $S = [1/2] \sum \beta_z \eta_x^2 \quad 1.5$

If we use the levelling precision for σ_ζ , we find an rms value of y , for $\delta = .01$, to be about 0.1 mm. If we use the value implied by the tune splitting, we find the rms of y to be about 1.5 mm, probably closer to reality. This should be measured again to see how closely the two measurements agree.

3. Dipole twists. Since the ends of each dipole are parallel to each other, there is a quadrupole of integrated strength θB_0 at each end of the magnet (θ is the half angle of the bend). If the magnet is twisted by an angle 2ξ , the skew quad strength is $\xi\theta B_0$. There are 60 dipole ends of $2.5^\circ(12)$, $5^\circ(12)$, and $7.5^\circ(18)$. The worst magnets are the early large dipoles, which had twists of $\xi = 2.5$ mrad. The contribution to C from each LD end is about 5×10^{-5} . Even if all ends miraculously contributed in phase, and were equally badly twisted, they could only contribute about 40% of the coupling. Survey data exists for tilts and twists of the dipoles. The actual contribution to C could be (somewhat laboriously) calculated.

4. Skew Sextupoles. It was observed that after the feet were welded on the large quadrupoles, some undesirable skew moments were measured, and in particular skew sextupole field in the quantity of $R = 2-6 \times 10^{-4}$ of the quadrupole field at the coil radius $r (\approx 3")$. This gives rise to a skew quadrupole which is dependent upon horizontal position. If the position is due to dispersion, then

$$B'_{\text{sext}} = 2\eta_x \delta B'_{\text{quad}} R/r \quad 1.6$$

or an equivalent quad rotation of $\xi = 2\eta_x \delta R/r$. For $\eta_x = 9m$, $\delta = .01$, $R = 4 \times 10^{-4}$ the angle is about 1mrad, or about ten times worse than the survey error. If this is a principal source of coupling, then the coupling will be strongly dependent on momentum, or radius. This should be measured by turning off the skew quad corrections and measuring the minimum approach of the fractional tunes at several momenta. Correction of this source will require a different strategy than quad sources.

5. Post Facto estimate of correction strength. The coupling at the injection orbit was corrected by application of about 35 Amps in each of two skew quads with the Lambertson off. The quads have an effective length of 26.6", and a strength of 0.5kg/in at 535 Amps. At nominal values of β (15m), the quads should provide a correction $2\Delta C = 1.6 \times 10^{-2}$, in reasonable agreement with the minimum fractional tune approach measured.

6. Preliminary conclusions. Since the coupling is small in the debuncher, and it has few large quads, the main candidate for the coupling, beyond the Lambertson, is the large quad. We should compare the prediction of quad tilts from the vertical dispersion with that from coupling, and measure the dependence of coupling on momentum to get the contribution of the skew sextupole in the large quad.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY DATA FOR
ACCUMULATOR TRIM DIPOLES†A.J. Lennox
7-11-85

VAX NAME	LOCATED BETWEEN	NEAREST QUAD	SERIAL NUMBER	DISTANCE TO NEAREST MAGNET*
A: V102	A1Q2 - A1Q3	A1Q2	NDA016	8 $\frac{7}{16}$ " to NSA037
A: V104	A1Q4 - A1Q5	A1Q5	NDA020	18 $\frac{5}{16}$ " to A1Q5
A: H105	A1Q5 - A1Q6	A1Q6	NDA009	17 $\frac{5}{8}$ " to A1Q6
A: V106	A1Q6 - A1Q7	A1Q7	NDA006	17 $\frac{7}{16}$ " to A1Q7
A: V109	A1Q9 - A1B9	A1Q9	NDA012	11 $\frac{9}{16}$ " to A1Q9
A: V209	A2B9 - A2Q9	A2Q9	NDA013	12 $\frac{7}{16}$ " to A2Q9
A: V206	A2Q7 - A2Q6	A2Q7	NDA008	19 $\frac{3}{4}$ " to A2Q7
A: H205A	A2Q6 - A2Q5	A2Q6	NDA010	17 $\frac{13}{16}$ " to A2Q6
A: V204	A2Q5 - A2Q4	A2Q5	NDA003	18 $\frac{1}{4}$ " to A2Q5
A: V202	A2Q3 - A2Q2	A2Q2	NDA030	8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " to NSA085
A: V302	A3Q2 - A3Q3	A3Q2	NDA027	6 $\frac{15}{16}$ " to NSA095
A: V304	A3Q4 - A3Q5	A3Q5	NDA019	19 $\frac{7}{16}$ " to A3Q5
A: H305	A3Q5 - A3Q6	A3Q6	NDA021	17 $\frac{5}{16}$ " to A3Q6
A: V306	A3Q6 - A3Q7	A3Q7	NDA001	19 $\frac{1}{8}$ " to A3Q7
A: V309	A3Q9 - A3B9	A3Q9	NDA029	12 $\frac{1}{16}$ " to A3Q9
A: V409	A4B9 - A4Q9	A4Q9	NDA011	12 $\frac{1}{8}$ " to A4Q9
A: V406	A4Q7 - A4Q6	A4Q7	NDA032	19 $\frac{3}{16}$ " to A4Q7
A: H405	A4Q6 - A4Q5	A4Q6	NDA018	18 $\frac{3}{8}$ " to A4Q6
A: V404	A4Q5 - A4Q4	A4Q5	NDB017	20 $\frac{5}{32}$ " to A4Q5
A: V402	A4Q3 - A4Q2	A4Q2	NDA031	15 $\frac{13}{16}$ " to A4Q2
A: V502	A5Q2 - A5Q3	A5Q2	NDA014	14 $\frac{9}{32}$ " to A5Q2
A: V504	A5Q4 - A5Q5	A5Q5	NDB038	19 $\frac{15}{16}$ " to A5Q5
A: H505	A5Q5 - A5Q6	A5Q6	NDA024	18 $\frac{1}{4}$ " to A5Q6
A: V506	A5Q6 - A5Q7	A5Q7	NDA004	17 $\frac{3}{4}$ " to A5Q7
A: V509	A5Q9 - A5B9	A5Q9	NDA025	11 $\frac{3}{4}$ " to A5Q9
A: V609	A6B9 - A6Q9	A6Q9	NDA005	12 $\frac{5}{8}$ " to A6Q9
A: V606	A6Q7 - A6Q6	A6Q7	NDA026	18 $\frac{3}{8}$ " to A6Q7
A: H605	A6Q6 - A6Q5	A6Q6	NDA022	18 $\frac{1}{8}$ " to A6Q6
A: V604	A6Q5 - A6Q4	A6Q5	NDA007	18 $\frac{3}{8}$ " to A6Q5
A: V602	A6Q3 - A6Q2	A6Q2	NDA028	7 $\frac{15}{16}$ " to NSA092

† Data taken by O'Boyle + Howat May 22-23, 1985, except A:V504 + A:V404 which were done by Lennox 7-11-85.

* Measured from dipole center to steel of nearest magnet.