# Step limit optimization inside the final focus

#### Alejandro Pérez INFN – Sezione di Pisa





SEZIONE DI PISA

#### Outline

#### Step limit optimization

- Step limit vs Beam optics
- Step limit vs Rad-Bhabha losses at beam pipes
- Step limit vs Rad-Bhabha rates on final focus boundary
- Summary

## **Step limit optimization strategy**

- Current default value of step limit (SL) parameter is 8mm
- Current final focus model: ±16m from IP
  - ⇒ execution time high (~25 mins/bunch-crossing)
- Want to optimize SL parameter, a trade-off between
  - Reasonable simulation results  $\Rightarrow$  SL as small as possible
  - Smallest execution time  $\Rightarrow$  SL as big as possible

#### Strategy:

- SL scan: 8, 16, 32 and 64 mm
- Check if simulation performances are similar for different SL values
  - Beam optics sampling
  - Losses rate (at beam pipes) of Rad-Bhabha
  - Rad-Bhabha rates at final focus boundaries
- Choose the highest SL value which gives reasonable results

## **SL vs Beam optics: Strategy**

- Use final focus v12 sf11 layout
- Generate particles (20k) with HER beam parameters at the IP:
  - All particles are generated at Z = 0 and at the nominal beam energy



- Feed this particles into Bruno which transport them through the FF B-field
- Scoring cylinders to study beam optics as a function of Z-coordinate
- Simulate for different SL values: 8, 16, 32 and 64 mm
- Check if different step limit values give similar beam parameters vs Z: <X>,
  <Y>, σ(X), σ(Y), ...
- Estimate execution time vs SL

#### SL vs Beam optics: Results (I)



#### SL vs Beam optics: Results (II)



#### SL vs Beam optics: Results (III)



#### **SL vs Beam optics: Summary**

- Very similar results for SL values 8, 16 and 32 mm (differences below 1%)
- SL = 64 mm seems to be too high value discarded



#### SL vs Rad-BhaBha Losses: Strategy

- Run Bruno with the final focus only (Rad-BhaBha generator)
- Remove everything (magnets, flanges, Plug ...) but beam pipes
- Replace beam pipes material with vacuum
- Simulate for different SL values:
  8, 16 and 32 mm
- Evaluate losses rates as a function of Z-coordinate for different:
  - Particle type:  $e^-$ ,  $e^+$  and  $\gamma$
  - Energy bins
  - Transversal energy bins
- Compare results for the different SL values



## SL vs Rad-BhaBha Losses: Results (I)



## SL vs Rad-BhaBha Losses: Results (II)



#### SL vs Rad-BhaBha Losses: Results (III)



Alejandro Pérez, Background meeting, Oct. 19th 2011

## SL vs Rad-BhaBha Losses: Results (IV)



#### SL vs Rad-BhaBha Losses: Results (V)



Background meeting, Oct. 19th 2011

## SL vs Rad-BhaBha Losses: Summary

 Similar results for other Z-ranges and for the other particles types (electrons and gammas). See links,

Positrons:http://www.slac.stanford.edu/~aperez/SuperB/SuperB\_Pisa/StepLimit\_Studies/RadB haBhaLosses/Comparing\_Losses\_HER\_Different\_StepLimits.eps

Electrons:http://www.slac.stanford.edu/~aperez/SuperB/SuperB\_Pisa/StepLimit\_Studies/RadB haBhaLosses/Comparing\_Losses\_LER\_Different\_StepLimits.eps

Photons:http://www.slac.stanford.edu/~aperez/SuperB/SuperB\_Pisa/StepLimit\_Studies/RadBh aBhaLosses/Comparing\_Losses\_Gamma\_Different\_StepLimits.eps

Results for SL = 8, 16 and 32 mm in agreement within 10%



#### SL vs Rad-BhaBha rates at FF: Strategy

- Run Bruno with the final focus only (Rad-BhaBha generator)
- Use nominal final focus geometry

- Simulate for different SL values:
  8, 16 and 32 mm
- Evaluate rates at final focus
  Boundary as a function of
  Z-coordinate for different:
  - Particle types:  $e^-$ ,  $e^+$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $n^0$
  - Energy bins
  - Transversal energy bins
- Compare results for different SL values



## SL vs Rad-BhaBha rates at FF: Results (I)



Alejandro Pérez, Background meeting, Oct. 19th 2011

#### SL vs Rad-BhaBha rates at FF: Results (II)



#### SL vs Rad-BhaBha rates at FF: Results (III)



## SL vs Rad-BhaBha rates at FF: Results (IV)



Alejandro Pérez, Background meeting, Oct. 19th 2011

## SL vs Rad-BhaBha rates at FF: Results (V)



Alejandro Pérez, Background meeting, Oct. 19th 2011

## SL vs Rad-BhaBha rates at FF: Results (VI)



Rate [MHz] / (5.0 cm)

#### Alejandro Pérez, Background meeting, Oct. 19th 2011

#### SL vs Rad-BhaBha rates at FF: Results (VII)



#### SL vs Rad-BhaBha rates at FF: Results (VIII)



## Step limit vs Rad-BhaBha rates at FF Summary

#### Similar results for other Z-ranges and for the other particles types (electrons and gammas). See links,

Positrons:http://www.slac.stanford.edu/~aperez/SuperB/SuperB\_Pisa/StepLimit\_Studies/RadB haBhaFFBoundary/Comparing\_FF\_boundary\_posi\_Different\_StepLimits.eps

Electrons:http://www.slac.stanford.edu/~aperez/SuperB/SuperB\_Pisa/StepLimit\_Studies/RadB haBhaFFBoundary/Comparing\_FF\_boundary\_elec\_Different\_StepLimits.eps

Photons:http://www.slac.stanford.edu/~aperez/SuperB/SuperB\_Pisa/StepLimit\_Studies/RadBh aBhaFFBoundary/Comparing\_FF\_boundary\_Gamma\_Different\_StepLimits.eps

Neutrons:http://www.slac.stanford.edu/~aperez/SuperB/SuperB\_Pisa/StepLimit\_Studies/RadB haBhaFFBoundary/Comparing\_FF\_boundary\_Neutron\_Different\_StepLimits.eps

#### Results for SL = 8, 16 and 32 mm in agreement within 10%



#### Summary

- Step limit optimization studies performed
- Studies point to use SL = 32mm
  - Negligible effect on beam parameters
  - Small effect (less than 10%) on Rad-bhabha losses and rates at FF boundary
  - Can reduce execution time by a factor of 2 w.r.t SL = 8mm
- Will set-up the nominal value of SL inside the final focus to 32mm



Alejandro Pérez, Background meeting, Oct. 19th 2011