### Forced DA in the LHC using AC Dipoles ICFA Mini Workshop on Dynamic Aperture

F. Carlier, E. Maclean, R. Tomas, M. Giovanozzi, T. Persson, and OMC Team November 1, 2017



# Direct DA measurements at top-energy are challenging

Two methods have been used for DA measurements in the LHC.

Measurements with beam heating (Injection & top-energy):

- Equally challenging at both energies
- Measure beam losses over time

• Used successfully at top-energy in the LHC

Single kick DA measurements (injection ONLY):

- Measure beam losses vs. kick amplitude
- Kicked bunches decohere, thus requiring many machine cicles
- Aperture kicker in the LHC **not allowed at top-energy**, for machine protection

Can we use another approach similar to single kicks?

### Forced dynamic aperture has been proposed as an alternative observable

Beam can instead be coherently excited in transverse plane using AC dipoles.

Procedure very similar to single kick DA measurements:

- Use AC dipoles to excite bunch transversely
- Measure beam intensity losses
- Characterise losses over kick actions

~~~

Measure DA under forced oscillations using AC dipoles:

### **Forced Dynamic Aperture**

 $\sqrt{\alpha}$ 

November 1, 2017

Provides alternative observable ( $DA_{forced}$ ) compared to free oscillation DA ( $DA_{free}$ )

### AC dipole vs. Single kick excitations

- AC dipole excitations considered **safe at top-energy** because of slow amplitude ramp-up
- No decoherence, so no recycling needed after excitations  $\rightarrow$  very fast!



- LHC has two AC dipoles per beam, one for each plane
- Allows to cover full range of amplitudes and angles

Nikief

 $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{A}$ 

< 行

### Direct amplitude detuning with AC dipole is altered

• Amplitude detuning is larger in plane of motion under forced motion

$$\Delta Q_x = \frac{q}{p} \frac{3B_4}{8\pi} \cdot \left(\beta_x^2 J_x^{\text{free}} + 2\beta_x \beta_x' J_x^{\text{forced}}\right)$$
  
$$\Delta Q_y = -\frac{q}{p} \frac{3B_4}{8\pi} \cdot \left(2\beta_x' \beta_y J_x^{\text{forced}} + 2\beta_x \beta_y J_x^{\text{free}}\right)$$
(1)



S. White, E. Maclean, R. Tomas, PRSTAB 16, 071002 2013

 $\sim$ 

Nillef

< 台

## Resonance conditions for forced oscillations are changed

Resonance condition in free motion is given by:

$$(j-k)Q_x + (l-m)Q_y = p$$
 (2)

Resonance conditions for forced motion are changed to:

$$\begin{aligned} (k_1 - j_1) \cdot Q_x + (k_2 - k_3 + j_2 - j_3) \cdot Q_x^{\mathrm{AC}} + \\ (m_1 - l_1) \cdot Q_y + (m_2 - m_3 + l_2 - l_3) \cdot Q_y^{\mathrm{AC}} = p \end{aligned}$$

(R. Tomas, PRSTAB, 5, 054001, 2002)

Larger number of resonances for forced motion

Free motion resonances still present



(Courtesy, E. Maclean)

Due to extra resonances and larger detuning with amplitude:

$$\mathit{DA}_{\mathit{forced}} \lesssim \mathit{DA}_{\mathit{free}}$$



### Forced dynamic aperture is of great interest

Important to improve understanding of motion under forced oscillations:

- Important for HL-LHC where forced DA might not be large enough for linear optics commissioning
- Forced motion arising from other harmonic sources, faulty power supplies, crab cavities, etc..

Forced DA has the potential to:

- Give estimate of lower bound on free DA
- Characterize nonlinear content of the machine
- Improve understanding of nonlinear model
- Validate nonlinear corrections

NW/N

## Action calculations in simulations & measurements

- Actions may not be trivialy described using initial conditions for forced oscillations.
- Actions are calculated from amplitude of main line of spectra from turn-by-turn data (A).
  - Used for all simulations & AC dipole measurements

$$2J_{x,y} = \frac{A^2}{\beta_{x,y}} \,. \tag{3}$$

- This may not be used for single kick measurements due to strong decoherence:
  - Use peak-to-peak amplitude of tbt signal instead A = P2P/2

 $\sim$ 

## Main line from turn-by-turn data for action calcuation

Main line (1,0) provides actions measurement. In this case AC dipole excitation





### Single particle DA tracking simulations

- Tracking simulations were done for Beam 1 with nominal top energy model of 2016 and magnetic field errors.
- Free DA, with actions from initial conditions (left), from main line (right)



Minimum DA defined as distance to first losses

 $\sim$ 

### Simulations of forced DA at top energy at various working points $(Q_x^{AC}, Q_v^{AC})$



- $DA_{forced} = 7.0 \sigma_{nom}$  $DA_{forced} = 7.8 \sigma_{nom}$
- Forced DA (6.2 7.8  $\sigma_{nom}$ ) smaller than free DA (12.1  $\sigma_{nom}$ )
- Forced DA shape and size varies for different working points

Nillef

< 台

 $\sqrt{\alpha}$ 

### Setup details for measurements at injection

Proof of principle showed at injection

- Single beam (Beam 1) with single pilot bunch  $(9 \cdot 10^9 \text{ protons})$
- Landau octupoles (MO) powered at 2 different strengths:
  - 40 A (18 m  $^{-4}) \rightarrow$  2016 operational strengths
  - 6.5 A (3  $m^{-4}) \rightarrow$  2012 operational strengths
- Transverse excitations in H & V planes with:
  - Single kicks using aperture kicker (MKA in LHC)
  - AC dipole

## Measure beam intensity losses with $\ensuremath{\mathsf{BCT}}$ as function of excitation amplitude



### Summary of excitations at injection

Main tunes and AC dipole working points used for measurements

- $Q_x, Q_y = 0.28, 0.31$
- $Q_x^{
  m AC}, \; Q_y^{
  m AC} =$  0.262, 0.296





### Vertical free & forced DA measurements

#### Landau octupoles at 40A (operational settings 2016)



• 
$$DA_{forced} \sim 2.4\sigma_{nom}$$
 and  $DA_{free} \sim 4.3\sigma_{nom}$ 

Limited by skew sextupolar  $3Q_{\gamma} = p$  resonance

### Forced DA measurement compared to multiparticle tracking simulations



- Geometrical rotational errors of multipoles needed to reproduce sources for  $3Q_y$  resonance
- Improved understanding of nonlinear model

 $\sim$ 

# Forced DA with reduced Landau octupole strengths

Landau octupoles at 6.5 A (comparable to 2012 settings)



- Measured increase of forced DA to  $\sim 6.7\sigma_{\it nom}$
- Still limited by  $3Q_y = p$  resonance

### Horizontal measurement of free & forced DA



• Forced DA at  $\sim 2.6\sigma_{nom}$  while free DA at  $\sim 5.2\sigma_{nom}$ 

• The approaching tunes drive multiple coupling resonances: free motion:

### Measurement setup at top-energy

First forced DA measurements at top-energy in the LHC

- Single beam: Beam 1
- Single pilot bunch with  $9\cdot 10^9$  protons

Three different measurement settings:

- 1. Landau octupoles at: 340 A (10.8 m<sup>-4</sup>)
- 2. Landau octupoles at: 450 A (14.3  $m^{-4})$
- 3. Landau octupoles at: 450 A (14.3  $\mathrm{m^{-4}})$ 
  - + Dodecapoles at: 76 A , (38000  $\mathrm{m^{-6}})$



### Overview of measurements in Beam 1

- Losses observed in the BCT data at each AC dipole kick (dashed lines)
- Only minimal blowup in Beam 1 H for vertical kicks in the BSRT data



Observed losses smaller than for injection measurements

 $\rightarrow$  machine protection

### First measurements of forced DA at top energy

- Small losses observed for the different octupole and dodecapole settings
- Forced DA reduces for increasing octupoles and dodecapoles
- As yet, no forced DA can be quantified  $\rightarrow$  first analyse WS and BSRT



Forced DA decrease observed for increased nonlinear sources

 $\sim$ 

### **Concluding remarks**

- First demonstration of forced DA measurements at injection and top-energy
- Changes in corrector magnet strengths have measurable impact on forced DA
- Nonlinear model understanding at injection improved with forced DA measurements
- Lower bound estimate on free DA given using forced DA measurements

