Importance of Coherent Beam-Beam Effects to the Compensation of Beam-Beam Tune Spread in Hadron Collider

Lihui Jin, Jack Shi
University of Kansas

INTRODUCTION

- A large beam-beam tune spread may lead to crossings of many high-order resonances. The compensation of the beam-beam tune spread has therefore been explored for a reduction of nonlinear beam-beam effects in hadron colliders.

- In this work, the importance of beam-beam tune spread to the chaotic coherent beam-beam instability was studied. It showed that in the nonlinear regime of beam-beam interactions, a beam-beam tune spread of a certain size is usually necessary to the stability of hadron beams.

- Recent beam experiments on HERA confirmed this conclusion.

- The study was conducted with a self-consistent beam-beam simulation with PIC method in model lattices of Tevatron and LHC.

measured coherent tunes with collisions with 1 and 2 IPs (expmts IA/B)

IA) collisions at H1 only



IB) collisions at H1 and ZEUS



observation: with collisions only at H1, the beam appears to lock onto the $Q_y + 3\,Q_x$ resonance thereby causing the increased positron vertical emittance; why this is not the case with 2 IPs is unclear

measured positron y emittance vs proton beam current (expmts. IA/B)

IA) collisions at H1 only



IB) collisions at H1 and ZEUS



observation: significant increase in positron emittance with proton current in experiment with collisions at H1 only

$\varepsilon_{p,x}$, $\varepsilon_{p,y}$, $\varepsilon_{e,y}$ v.s. Proton Bunch Current





ξ_c : $I_p \approx 170\ \mu A$



Collective Beam-Beam Instability:

When $\xi_e > \xi_c$ the proton emittance increases with the beam-beam parameter of the positron beam. In this case, $\xi_e >> \xi_p$.

Evolution of r.m.s. Beam-Size of the Antiproton Beam

TEVATRON MODEL

$(\nu_x, \nu_y) = (0.582, 0.574)$

$\xi_{\bar{p}p} = -0.01, \xi_{p\bar{p}} = -0.002$



Beam-size matched

Beam-size mismatched

The beam-size growth rate in the mismatched collisions is larger than that in the matched case.

"Bad" and "Good" of Beam-Beam Tune Spread

$$H = \nu \square I + H_{beam\text{-}beam}(I,\phi,t)$$

$$= \nu \square I + \underbrace{\langle H_{beam\text{-}beam} \rangle}_{\substack{\text{Average part} \\ \text{integrable} \\ \text{"linear"}}} + \underbrace{\{H_{beam\text{-}beam}\}}_{\substack{\text{Oscillating part} \\ \text{nonintegrable} \\ \text{"nonlinear"}}}$$

In near-linear regime,
$\langle H_{beam\text{-}beam} \rangle$ dominates beam-beam interactions.

In nonlinear regime,
$\{H_{beam\text{-}beam}\}$ is important.

Bad :

- **A large tune spread could result in crossings of bad resonance in case of a "bad" working point.**

Good:

- **In nonlinear regime, a larger tune spread could result in a stronger Landau damping that could suppress chaotic coherent beam-beam instability.**
- **Existence of a large tune spread reduces the possibility of trapping particles inside a resonance.**

Comment:

For high-intensity hadron beams, beam-beam interaction is likely to be in the nonlinear regime and the beam-beam tune spread does more good than bad to the beam stability, except in the case of bad working point.

Compensation of Beam-Beam Tune Spread with Electron Beams

$$H = \vec{\nu}\cdot\vec{I} + H_{\bar{p}p}(I,\phi,t) + H_{\bar{p}e}(I,\phi,t)$$
$$= \vec{\nu}\cdot\vec{I} + (<H_{\bar{p}p}> + <H_{\bar{p}e}>)$$
$$+ (\{H_{\bar{p}p}\} + \{H_{\bar{p}e}\})$$

e-beam compensation:

Reduce $(<H_{\bar{p}p}> + <H_{\bar{p}e}>)$

TEVATRON MODEL

$$(\nu_x, \nu_y) = (0.582, 0.574)$$
$$\xi_{\bar{p}p} = -0.01, \xi_{p\bar{p}} = -0.002$$

Tune Spread of the antiproton beam with or without the Compensation



Evolution of r.m.s. Beam-size of the Antiproton Beam



TEVATRON MODEL

$(\nu_x, \nu_y) = (0.582, 0.574)$

$\xi_{\bar{p}p} = -0.01, \xi_{p\bar{p}} = -0.002$

a : No compensation

b : 25% compensation

c : 50% compensation

d : Full compensation

At the nominal working point, the compensation of beam-beam tune spread with electron beams could damage the beam stability .

Evolution of r.m.s. Beam-size of the Antiproton Beam When Two Beams Have Different Tunes



TEVATRON MODEL

$\bar{p}: \quad (\nu_x, \nu_y) = (0.582, 0.574)$

$p: \quad (\nu_x, \nu_y) = (0.587, 0.579)$

a : No compensation

b : 50% compensation

c : Full compensation

- **When the tune split is big enough (0.005), the tune-spread compensation up to a certain degree could benefit the pbar beam.**
- **The fact that the tune of the p beam has an impact on the dynamics of the pbar beam confirms the existence of collective beam-beam effects in a strong-weak situation of beam-beam interactions.**

Tunes Close to the 4th-Order Resonance

Beam-Beam Tune Spread of the Antiproton Beam



No compensation



Half compensation



Full compensation

Crossing of a major resonance can be avoided with the tune-spread compensation .

⇩

Evolution of r.m.s. Beam-size of the Antiproton Beam



a: no compensation

b: 50% compensation

c: Full compensation

At a "bad" working point, a proper reduction of beam-beam tune spread could benefit beams.

Beam-centroid Motion of the Antiproton Beam

No compensation

Very strong Landau damping



50% compensation

Full compensation

Strong Landau damping

Weak Landau damping

⇩

- **A reduction of the beam-beam tune spread with electron beams could weaken the Landau damping that is important to the suppression of chaotic coherent beam-beam instability.**

- **At a "bad" working point, a reduction of the beam-beam tune spread could benefit beams if the weakened Landau damping is still enough to curb chaotic coherent beam-beam instability.**

2π-Cancellation Between p̄-p and p̄-e Collision

Evolution of r.m.s. Beam-size of the Antiproton Beam



a: no compensation

b: 25% compensation

c: 50% compensation

d: 75% compensation

e: Full compensation

Microscopic difference in the distribution of the e and p beam makes otherwise a perfect cancellation of beam-beam interactions failed in the full compensation due to the onset of the chaotic coherent beam-beam instability.

Chaotic Coherent Motion of the Antiproton beam with the full compensation





Compensation of Beam-Beam Tune Spread with Electron Beams

LHC MODEL

$(\nu_x, \nu_y) = (0.31, 0.32)$

$\xi_{pp} = 0.01,\ 2\text{IPs}$

Evolution of r.m.s. Beam-size of the proton Beam



a: no compensation

b: 50% compensation

c: Full compensation

Similar to Tevatron, at a "good"working point, the compensation of beam-beam tune spread could damage the beam stability.

Effects of the Tune-Spread Compensation on Beam Particle Distribution

No Compensation



Full Compensation



a. Initial Gaussian distribution

b. Projection in X

c. Projection in Y

The compensation of beam-beam tune spread could damage beams by inducing the chaotic coherent beam-beam instability that leads to a formation of beam halos.

Summary

評 In a hadron collider with high-intensity beams, the beam-beam interaction is likely to be in the nonlinear regime in which the chaotic coherent beam-beam instability is important. In this situation, having a larger tune spread could be better to the beam stability since it could result in a stronger Landau damping that could suppress the coherent beam-beam instability and, moreover, the existence of a large tune spread reduces the possibility of trapping particles inside a bad resonance.

評 In the case that the working point is close to major resonance, a compensation of the beam-beam tunes spread up to certain degree could improve beam dynamics if the Landau damping is still strong enough for the suppression of the coherent beam-beam instability after the compensation or the damage effects of the nonlinear phase-dependent beam-beam perturbations can be outweighed by the benefit of the tune-spread compensation.

Features of the Code

- Self-consistent beam-beam kicks in transverse space are calculated with PIC method.
  - Size of adaptive grid is matched with beam.
  - Large number of macro-particles is necessary for hadron beams in nonlinear regime of beam-beam interactions.

- Computing
  - dynamics of beam tune spread
  - dynamics of beam particle distributions

PIC Calculation of Beam-Beam Kick





The x-y space covered by an uniform mesh

ρ(x,y) obtained by 4-point-cloud in cell

The forces calculated at the grid points

The fields interpolated to the position of every particle