



A tale of three beams: towards stable and reproducible operation of the AWAKE facility

G. Zevi Della Porta^{1,2}, V. Bencini², S. Doebert², E. Granados², E. Gschwendtner², M. Martinez Calderon², S. Mazzoni², L. Ranc¹, E. Senes², M. Turner², F. Velotti², L. Verra² and the AWAKE Collaboration

¹ Max Planck Institute for Physics, Munich, Germany

² CERN, Geneva, Switzerland

Abstract

The Advanced Wakefield Experiment (AWAKE) relies on proton-driven wakefields created in a laser-ionized plasma to accelerate electrons. Accurate measurement and control of the optics, trajectory and timing of the three

beams—proton, laser and electron—is a fundamental requirement for successful operation of the facility. Continuous advances in both instrumentation and methods are necessary to improve operational stability, reproducibility and efficiency. Since the three beams have drastically different characteristics, their performance is

limited by different sources (such as thermal effects, magnetic hysteresis, current ripples, phase locking), requiring dedicated approaches. Recent improvements and measurement campaigns are described, highlighting the lessons learned. Finally, the challenges expected in future upgrades of the AWAKE facility are discussed.



Raw jitter of laser over ~1 hr

VLC_5 X component





New approach

- classical phase-space-tomography problem, equivalent to a rotation [8]
- Maximum Likelihood Maximum Expectation algorithm developed and commissioned using simulated beams and then validated with data
- Non-Gaussian beams can be fully described and then used to develop beam line optics



Challenging steering: jitter of laser trajectory is dominated by thermal fluctuations, preventing convergence at larger sample sizes. Accept this limitation, relax steering requirements, and rely on a wide beam to create a large plasma column.

| <i>VLC 5,</i> mm | RMS all data | RMS for 100 | RMS for 500 | RMS for 5000 |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | shot average | shot average | shot average |
| y actual | 0.2741 | 0.1038 | 0.0832 | 0.0766 |
| y random | 0.2741 | 0.0274 | 0.0123 | 0.0039 |
| x actual | 0.2772 | 0.0553 | 0.0281 | 0.0155 |
| x random | 0.2772 | 0.0277 | 0.0124 | 0.0039 |

Figure 19: Centroids on VLC 5 exhibiting trajectory fluctuations over an hour, x-dime Standard deviation of all shots and 100-, 500-, 5000-shot averages on virtual line, compared to expected RMS from random fluctuations [6]



ethipies, tand tay Sublet, Self-modulation and current fila- mentation instabilities of [8] K. M. Hock and A. Wolski, Tomographic reconstruction of the juil 4d transverse phase space, Nuclear

