# Tune-scans and working point optimization for colliding beams in HL-LHC

Dobrin Kaltchev (Triumf)

and

D. Pellegrini, N. Karastathis, Y. Papaphilippou (CERN)

(in conjunction with their talks at this meeting)

with the help of

Riccardo de Maria, E. McIntosh, A. Mereghetti (CERN)

CERN-TRIUMF HL-LHC collaboration



D. Kaltchev CERN-TRIUMF HL-LHC collaboration

## Outline

- 1 Tune-scan (TS) Procedure
- 2 Domains
- 3 1D (Linear) TS
- 4 Resonances new: 16th order
- 5 2D TS





## Tune-scan procedure: MadX+SixTrack environment

HL-HLC lattice V1.2, V1.3 collision settings

Initial coordinates: amplitude  $\mathbf{A}[\sigma]$  and real-space angle Beam-Beam + sextupoles + <octupoles> (HL-LHC)



Note: SixTrack adjusts tunes with beam-beam ON, i.e. "sharp edge"  $Q_{x,y}^{BB}$ :  $Q_{x,y}^{BB} = Q_{x,y}^{0} - \Delta Q_{x,y}^{BB}$ 





#### Tune-scan procedure: MadX+SixTrack env. Output from Six-Track OCT. = lattice octupoles

want to place footprint on the res. mesh

NO some SixTrack footprints: 1-12  $\sigma$ ; 10<sup>4</sup> turns; **tune=1** 

(here hue prop. to slope of dist. betw twins)





#### Tune-scan procedure: MadX+SixTrack env. Output from Six-Track OCT. = lattice octupoles

want to place footprint on the res. mesh

NO OCT. some SixTrack footprints:  $1-12 \sigma$ ;  $10^4$  turns; tune=1 (here hue prop. to slope of dist. betw twins)

 $\begin{array}{lll} \mbox{WITH} & \mbox{reduced size in direction } \bot \\ \mbox{OCT.} & \mbox{diagonal} \end{array}$ 







#### Tune-scan procedure: MadX+SixTrack env. Output from Six-Track OCT. = lattice octupoles

want to place footprint on the res. mesh

NO OCT. some SixTrack footprints:  $1-12 \sigma$ ;  $10^4$  turns; tune=1 (here hue prop. to slope of dist. betw twins)





survival turns for 2 twins
distance between twins
slope of dist. etc





#### Tune-scan procedure: MadX+SixTrack env. Output from Six-Track (LONG term) 10<sup>6</sup> turns BOINC or HTCondor

dynamic apert. (DA)

- = last surv part. =
- = Min[surv1,surv2]

Tune-scans (TS):

1D TS: DA-by-angle dep. on tune 2D TS: MIN DA over 20 angles dep. on tune

also chaotic border, but not reported here





## Old (<2010) studies – LHC

along Line  $\parallel$  diag., +0.01, OCT=0, low chrom.=2 losses =dips mostly in HOR. plane max. res. ord. = 13





#### D. Kaltchev CERN-TRIUMF HL-LHC collaboration

## Tune-scan procedure: HL-LHC Steps

1) Contour DA-by-angle. 2) Extend in 2D. 3) add octupoles + high. chr.



New-style "DA by angle" with contours





## Tune-scan procedure: HL-LHC Steps

1) Contour DA-by-angle. 2) Extend in 2D. 3) add octupoles + high. chr.



#### Correlate DA Maxima and Dips

with Resonances



#### New-style "DA by angle" with contours



Extend in 2D towards diag.(yellow)





## **Tune-scan procedure: Domains**

resonances 5-16 ord

clusters right to left: 16,13,10,7+14,11





## **Tune-scan procedure: Domains**

resonances 5-16 ord

clusters right to left: 16,13,10,7+14,11

1) Linear TS (no oct) along +0.01 line:  $\Delta Q^{\parallel} = 5 \ 10^{-4}$ HL-LHC V1.2 and LHC





## **Tune-scan procedure: Domains**

resonances 5-16 ord

clusters right to left: 16,13,10,7+14,11

1) Linear TS (no oct) along +0.01 line:  $\Delta Q^{\parallel} = 5 \ 10^{-4}$ HL-LHC V1.2 and LHC

2) 2D (oct., chr=15) near 1/3 base-line WP (Yannis, Dario, Nikos)

**HL-LHC V1.2 and V1.3**  $\Delta Q^{\parallel} = 2 \ 10^{-3}, \ \Delta Q^{\perp} = 2.3 \ 10^{-3}$ 





## **Tune-scan procedure: Domains**

resonances 5-16 ord

clusters right to left: 16,13,10,7+14,11

1) Linear TS (no oct) along +0.01 line:  $\Delta Q^{\parallel} = 5 \ 10^{-4}$ HL-LHC V1.2 and LHC

2) 2D (oct., chr=15) near 1/3 base-line WP (Yannis,Dario,Nikos) HL-LHC V1.2 and V1.3  $\Delta Q^{\parallel} = 2 \ 10^{-3}, \ \Delta Q^{\perp} = 2.3 \ 10^{-3}$ 

3) 2D (oct., chr=15) extended with params at end of level. *new candidate WP* near 10th ord cl. HL-LHC V1.3

 $\Delta Q^{\parallel} = 5 \ 10^{-4}, \Delta Q^{\perp} = 2.8 \ 10^{-3}$ 





## Linear TS (no oct) : DA by-angle "HL-LHC case 0"



Shown contours of constant dynamic aperture with color hue proportional to the angle (angle=0 part. launched in HOR plane) every second angle plotted

#### HL-LHC parameters (call this case 0):

- HLLHCV1.2; intensity: 1.1×10<sup>11</sup>; single HO replaces full crabs chr=3
- IR1,5 Xing half-ang = 295 μrad, β\* = 15 cm
- IR8  $\beta^{\star}$  = 1m, Xing half-ang =-135+250=-115  $\mu$ rad (LHCb spect. pol.=+1)
- IR2 β<sup>\*</sup> = 10m, hor. sep., Xing = 170 μrad
- emit<sub>n</sub>= 2.5  $\mu$ m, bunch length = 7.5 cm,  $\frac{\Delta p}{p}$ =2.7×10<sup>-4</sup>, bunch spacing 25 ns, chrom=3



# HL-LHC cases with $\Delta Q_x^{BB} \sim$ 0.02 and 0.03

are predicted to be already at optimum Vert. axis is only valid for case 0.



case	comment	tune shift	Qx0
0	<i>as scan made</i> $N_b = 1.1 \ 10^{11}$	0.0155	62.31
1	$N_b=$ 2.2 $10^{11}$ , no BB in IP8	0.022	62.3035
2	$N_b = 2.2 \ 10^{11}$ , with BB in IP8	0.033	62.2925

E.g. for Case 1: the predicted Qx0=62.31 - (0.022 - 0.0155)= 62.3035. It is seen to be exactly at optimum loc.!



#### "Delta-function" head (footprint shape → symmetries)

#### Linear TS (no oct) :

If only interested in optimum loc., then one scan is enough. A TS made with setup A can predict optimum tunes for setup B of different  $\Delta Q_x^{BB}$  since the head scans the **same resonances** at a distance = difference between the tune-shifts of B and A.

- 1) losses occur mostly near the high- $\sigma$  head
- 2) head's projection on the hor. axis is very

close to unperturbed tune point

naive table:	octupoles OFF ( $H \leftrightarrow V$ )
--------------	---

DA-loss	Active	escape	TS transl.
in setup A	point on	dir	symmetry
H plane	H wing	V	Н



Tune-scan line

Linear TS (no oct) – HOR plane dominates – H-wing scans resonances as " $\delta$  – function" 1D model is enough to predict dips



**Check the prediction** Perform TS with true setups of cases 1 and 2. *Min DA contours near 62.31 should (locally) look the same as on slide 10, and they do* 

<u>case 1</u>  $N_b = 2.2 \ 10^{11}$  BB in IR2,8 ON, CC ON (full),  $\beta^{\star}_{\rm IP8} = 3$ m with neg. polarity, Hirata ON.



CHECK: .31 falls at optimum

case 2 
$$N_b = 2.2 \ 10^{11} \ (\Delta Q_{\chi}^{BB} = 0.033).$$



CHECK: .31 falls near optimum (+ 0.002)



## Linear TS (no oct) – HL-LHC Footprint Slider

Near nominal WP one sees 16th ord (neglected before). Valid for LHC too, only DA scaled.





(d) HOR+VERT, 10th ord (e) VERT, 7(14) ord

For plots on the right, vert. black line shows  $Q_{x}^{0}$ .

Animations: t1 t2, t3 local: t1 t2 t3 🛞 TRIUMF (1990) D. Kaltchev

CERN-TRIUMF HL-LHC collaboration

## Linear TS (no oct) Resonance dips via distorted ellipse

3 or 2-IP HO Lie (CS) invariant in H plane agrees (wherever HOR plane dominates) Left: HL-LHC,  $1.1 \times 10^{11}$ ; Right: LHC as-built:





## Linear TS (no oct) Resonance dips via distorted ellipse

3 or 2-IP HO Lie (CS) invariant in H plane agrees (wherever HOR plane dominates) Left: HL-LHC,  $1.1 \times 10^{11}$ ; Right: LHC as-built:



<u>Bottom two:</u> Red curve – only near HOR plane. Blue peaks: high-order-harmonic amplitude of the **1D** Lie-inv. The 4/13 peak depends on  $\Delta \nu_{IP5-IP1}$  (=0 for 0.25× integer).



D. Kaltchev CERN-TRIUMF HL-LHC collaboration

## Two Head-On IPs Lie (Courant-Sn.) invariant continued



$$\frac{2 n c_n(A)}{\sin(n \mu_x/2)} \cos[n(\phi + \mu_x/2 + \Delta \mu_{51}/2)] \cos(n \Delta \mu_{51}/2)$$

 $c_n(A)$  = res coef (dr. terms), A=10  $\sigma_x$ ,  $\mu_x \equiv 2\pi Qx0$ ,  $\Delta \mu_{51} \equiv 2\pi \Delta \nu_{IP5-IP1}$ ,

 $\phi = 0.1 (arb.), \Delta v_{IP5-IP1} = 31.2104$ 

• Same finding: of 2 peaks near nominal 62.31, the 4/13 depends on  $\Delta \nu_{IP5-IP1}$ , the one above nom. does not.

TRIUMF 📖

D. Kaltchev CERN-TRIUMF HL-LHC collaboration

## Summary of Linear TS (no oct) along line || diag

- HL-LHC lattices w/o octupoles are already at optimum tunes for (these three) more-important scenarios (and for LHC)
- The role of 16-th ord resonances in HOR plane near nom WP (no octupoles, chr  $\sim$  3)
- Need of 2D Tune-scans (HL-LHC, with octupoles, chr = 15)



#### **2D TS (Min DA of 20 ang); near 1/3** still Q'=3, $I_{MO}=0$ , $\beta^*=15$ cm stays constant (NOT a leveling scenario)

1) 
$$N_b = 1.1 \times 10^{11}$$



- HL-LHC V1.2
- fraction\_crab=1
- IR1,5 Xing half-ang = 295  $\mu$ rad



#### **2D TS (Min DA of 20 ang); near 1/3** still Q'=3, $I_{MO}=0$ , $\beta^*=15$ cm stays constant (NOT a leveling scenario)

1) 
$$N_b = 1.1 \times 10^{11}$$
  
2)  $N_b = 2.2 \times 10^{11}$   
shift of opt WP = VER'  
no oct.  
DA  $\sim 6 \sigma$ 

- HL-LHC V1.2
- fraction\_crab=1
- IR1,5 Xing half-ang = 295 μrad





# 2D TS (Min DA of 20 ang); near 1/3

now with Q' = 15,  $I_{MO} = -570$ ,  $\beta^* = 20$  cm stays constant (NOT a leveling scenario)

1) 
$$N_b = 1.1 \times 10^{11}$$



- HL-LHC V1.2
- fraction\_crab=.75
- IR1,5 Xing half-ang = 295 µrad



# 2D TS (Min DA of 20 ang); near 1/3

now with Q' = 15,  $I_{MO} = -570$ ,  $\beta^* = 20$  cm stays constant (NOT a leveling scenario)

1)  $N_b = 1.1 \times 10^{11}$ 2)  $N_b = 2.2 \times 10^{11}$ shift of opt WP =  $\parallel$  diag (octupoles)



- HL-LHC V1.2
- fraction\_crab=.75
- IR1,5 Xing half-ang = 295 µrad



#### **2D TS (Min DA of 20 ang); near 1/3** Q'= 15, $I_{MO}=-570$ Beg. and End of leveling

Beg:  $\beta^*$ =46cm,  $N_b = 2.2 \ 10^{11}$ 



- HL-LHC V1.3 fraction\_crab=0.75 (190)
- IR1,5 Xing half-ang = 250 µrad
- IR8  $\beta^*$  = 3m, Xing half-ang =-135+250=-115  $\mu$ rad
- IR2  $\beta^{\star} = 10$ m, hor. sep., Xing = 240  $\mu$ rad

### **2D TS (Min DA of 20 ang); near 1/3** Q'= 15, $I_{MO}=-570$ Beg. and End of leveling

Beg: 
$$\beta^{\star}$$
=46cm,  $N_b$  = 2.2 10<sup>11</sup>

End:  $\beta^*=15$ cm,  $N_b = 1.2 \ 10^{11}$ shift || diag. agrees with N. Karastathis: Beg: (62.32,60.325) End: (62.315, 60.32) (for  $I_{MO}=-300$ )



- HL-LHC V1.3 fraction\_crab=0.75 (190)
- IR1,5 Xing half-ang = 250 µrad
- IR8  $\beta^*$  = 3m, Xing half-ang =-135+250=-115  $\mu$ rad
- IR2  $\beta^{\star} = 10$ m, hor. sep., Xing = 240  $\mu$ rad

## 2D TS, End Fill, Min DA 20 ang new WP candidate

Near 10th order res. cluster; Higher maximum by  $1 - 1.5 \sigma$ , but good region smaller





D. Kaltchev CERN-TRIUMF HL-LHC collaboration

### 2D TS (Min DA, 20 ang) – a new WP candidate



Left: Resonances of orders from 5 to 16 and the new possibly interesting region near the 10th-order res. cluster. **Right:** some resonance lines nearby:

 $\begin{array}{l} Qx-Qy=2\\ 13Qx-3Qy=629\\ 12Qx-2Qy=627\\ 2Qx-12Qy=627\\ 3Qx-13Qy=-597 \end{array} \begin{array}{l} 9Qx-6Qy=199\\ 10Qy=603\\ 6Qx+4Qy=615\\ 5Qx+5Qy=613 \end{array}$ 



## Thank You

spare slides



# SixTrack test: Crab Cav. in IP5 and IR1 want to see rotated bunch



ST tracking for about one synchr. oscillation: phase spaces at IP5 of HL-LHC for Xing ang=295, CC=ON, BB=ON with CO added. Plots remain the same if IP5  $\rightarrow$  IP1, changing also the axes X  $\rightarrow$  Y, PX  $\rightarrow$  PY. Red dashed line on the right plot shows the action of an ideal CC kick; Xini = 0, Yini=0.



#### SixTrack Test: Hirata kicks for BB ON in IR1,5 and 8 (look as expected)

Top: X and Y (m) after each of the 5 slices in IP5, 8 and 1, at the first turn of a particle starting at zero betatron amplitude. It has momentum offset 0.00027.

Bottom: accumulated PX and PY (rad) after each slice.





D. Kaltchev CERN-TRIUMF HL-LHC collaboration