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INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

• In response to concerns about electron cloud effects, especially at the B-factories, studies were undertaken at APS beginning in 1998 to directly measure the cloud electrons with positron and electron beams.

• Specialized electron detectors based on those first designed and utilized at APS are now widely implemented: PSR (LANL), BEPC (IHEP, P.R. China), KEK-B, SPS (CERN), AGS Booster (BNL).

GOAL OF STUDIES at APS

• Characterize electron cloud (EC) distribution for better prediction of machine conditions leading to collective instabilities and other cloud-induced effects.

• Identify and provide realistic limits on key ingredients in models:
  – surface effects (photoelectron and secondary electron yield coefficient ($\delta_{SEY}$), secondary electron (SE) distribution)
  – chamber geometry (antechamber, end absorbers)
  – machine parameters (bunch current, bunch spacing)
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MAJOR RESULTS

- Beam-induced multipacting (BIM) observed with both positron and electron beams
  - Cloud density rises exponentially over bunch train until saturation limit (thereafter rising linearly)
  - Amplification of cloud a strong function of bunch spacing \( t_b \);
    max at: \( e^+ \) beam, \( t_b = 20 \) ns; \( e^- \) beam, \( t_b = 30 \) ns
  - Amplification 20x less with electron beam
  - 20x rise in vacuum pressure with \( >1.5 \) mA/bunch (\( e^+ \) beam, 100 mA)
  - Conditioning effect: cloud proportional to \( \delta_{SE} \)

- BIM condition observed at APS not completely predicted by simple formula of resonance condition
  - BIM (per ISR, 1977) involves bunch current and bunch spacing vs. electron time-of-flight across chamber
  - “Optimal” BIM condition proposed is also a function of SE energy distribution

- Comparison of APS data with LBNL model in good agreement, provided assumed values for \( \delta_{SE} \) and SE energy distribution carefully chosen (M. Furman and M. Pivi, Proc. of 2001 PAC)

From measurements of the electron cloud distribution at the wall (density and energy), we can draw assumptions of electron cloud production mechanisms and details of beam-cloud interaction.
Cross-sectional view of vacuum chamber showing mounted detectors. Measured transmission through grids is \(~80\%\).

Theoretical transmission of a planar RFA

**Solid line** – ideal case for a parallel, nondivergent, monoenergetic beam of energy $U_0$.

**Dashed line** – transmission assuming the electrons originate from a point source from a parallel surface with an angular distribution, $P(\alpha)d\alpha = 2 \sin \alpha \cos \alpha d\alpha$, where $\alpha$ is the angle between the electrons and the surface normal.

**Dotted line** – transmission curve for a $\cos \alpha$ distribution.
Measured transmission of a planar RFA

**Top** – Monoenergetic electron beams directed along the axis of the analyzer for energies of 53 and 105 eV.

**Bottom** – Monoenergetic electrons (365, 1000 eV) scattered from an Al target. The inset shows the differentiated signal of the 365-eV beam near the transmission threshold.
ELECTRON CLOUD DISTRIBUTIONS: RFA
Collector current (norm) vs. retarding potential, e+ beam, 20 mA, 10 bunches, as a function of bunch spacing (units of $\lambda_{rf} = 2.84$ ns)
Electron energy distributions for e+ beam, 20 mA, 10 bunches, as a function of bunch spacing, $t_b$.
Amplification at $K_{pk}$ of Detected Cloud Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n(\lambda_{nr})$</th>
<th>$t_b$ (ns)</th>
<th>$K_{pk}$ (eV)</th>
<th>$r_{pk}$ (cm)</th>
<th>$t_{pk}$ (ns)</th>
<th>$t_{SE}$ (ns)</th>
<th>$K_{SE}$ (eV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bunch spacing “selects” part of cloud ($r = r_{pk}$) that gets amplified (i.e., $t_b = t_{pk}$); SE with energies $K_{SE}$ drift to position $r_{pk}$ between bunch passages.

Optimal condition when $K_{SE} = SE$ distrib. peak

Beam-induced multipacting (BIM) resonance condition [Gröbner (1977)]:

$$t_b = \frac{b^2}{c r_e N_b};$$ gives $t_b = 4 \lambda_{nr}$,

but observed to be $7 \lambda_{nr}$ at APS

Formalism overly simplified; should include SE distrib.

$r_e = 2.82 \times 10^{-13}$ cm, $m_e c^2 = 0.51$ MeV
Amplification of electron signal with bunch spacing

Explanation of narrow peak at $7 \lambda_{rf} = 20$ ns, as suggested by M. Furman and S. Heifets:

Optimal beam-induced multipacting resonance condition occurs when a secondary electron (SE) drifts towards the chamber center between bunch passages, then gets kicked by the beam to the wall with high energy, near the peak of the $\delta_{SE}(E)$ curve. If the SE distribution peaks around $K=2$ eV:

$$\left( \frac{v}{c} \right) = \sqrt{\frac{2K}{m_e c^2}} = 2.8 \times 10^{-3}.$$ 

Assuming SE drift time of 18 ns over vertical aperture, electron distance to beam $\sim 0.6$ cm. Drift time back to wall for high-energy ($\sim 400$ eV) kicked electron $\sim 1/10$ of this: total $\sim 20$ ns.
Comparison of 10 vs 2 bunches
e+ beam, 2 mA/bunch

10x higher amplification compared to 2 bunches

additional surface conditioning of 90 Ah, relative to above
Comparison of 2 mA vs 1 mA/bunch
e+ beam, 10 bunches

2 mA/bunch

1 mA/bunch

shorter energy tail
Comparison of positron vs electron beam, 2 mA/bunch, 2 bunches

![Graph showing comparison of positron vs electron beam flux rate vs electron energy](image-url)

**Positron beam**

**Electron beam**

Additional surface conditioning of 70 Ah, relative to above
Comparison of positron vs electron beam, 2 mA/bunch, 10 bunches

\[(I_c/I_b)_{\text{max}} \text{ at } \lambda_{\text{rf}} = 7\]

\[(I_c/I_b)_{\text{max}} \text{ at } \lambda_{\text{rf}} = 11\]

- shorter energy tail;
- i.e., cloud not getting as close to beam

Additional surface conditioning of 100 Ah, relative to above.
COMPARISONS OF ALTERNATE ELECTRON DETECTORS
### COMPARISON OF ALTERNATE DETECTORS, ELECTRONS COLLIDING WITH WALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type</th>
<th>pros</th>
<th>cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retarding field analyzer (RFA)</td>
<td>• Simple to construct</td>
<td>• Analysis of energy spectra complicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Large transmission (80%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plates; beam position monitors (BPMs)</td>
<td>• Readily available</td>
<td>• Biasing changes collection length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SE emission from surface affects measure of true flux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessel box analyzer (BBA)</td>
<td>• Direct analysis of energy spectrum possible</td>
<td>• Poor transmission; narrow angular acceptance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BPM measured signals: bench and in-situ

Signal produced from a BPM irradiated by 60 eV and 80 eV electrons as a function of bias voltage applied to the BPM.

In-situ BPM signals for e+ beam, 2 mA/bunch, 10 bunches, vary spacing ($\lambda_{rf} = 1, 10, 100$), as a function of BPM bias voltage.
Bessel Box Analyzer (BBA) schematic and measured transmission:

\[ \Delta V = (V_b - V_a) \] determines the pass energy

\[ 2.5^\circ < \theta_{\text{accept}} < 9.5^\circ \]

Spectrum of 340-eV electrons scattered from an Al surface using the BBA. The inset shows a detailed scan of the elastically scattered electrons.
BBA vs RFA (differentiated) at two different detector locations; electron beam, 20 bunches, 2 mA/bunch, $\lambda_{rf} = 11$

**Near end absorber (larger photoelectron component)**

**Far from end absorber (larger SE component)**
CALIBRATION OF RFA RESULTS
Electron cloud signal cut in half with an electron dose over 60 Ah. Assuming standard operation:

\[
\text{dose} = \left( \frac{I_c}{I_{c,0}} \right)_{\text{std}100 \text{mA}} \times 60 \text{ Ah} \\
= \frac{0.14}{1.25 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ mA}} \times 60 \text{ Ah} \\
= 1.5 \times 10^{17} \text{ e}^- \text{ cm}^2 = 2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ coul mm}^2
\]

consistent with CERN measurements: 
\( \delta_{\text{SYS}} \) reduced in half for similar doses
(N. Hilleret, et al.)
ESTIMATE OF MAX CLOUD DENSITY

\text{e+ beam, cloud in saturation}
\text{(> 30 bunches @ BIM spacing } \lambda_{rf} = 7)\text{)

• Vacuum pressure 20x higher than standard 100-mA operation (23 bunches, 4 mA/bunch, 153-ns spacing)

• Electron cloud density at saturation:

$$\langle v_e \rangle_{200\text{eV}} = 8.4 \times 10^8 \text{ cm/s}$$

$$n_e = \frac{I_c \text{ flux rate}}{\langle v_e \rangle} \times 15 \times 10^{-9} \left[ \frac{C}{s \text{ cm}^2 \text{ mA}} \right] \times \frac{100}{1.6 \times 10^{-19} \left[ \frac{\text{mA e-}}{C} \right]} \times \frac{1}{8.4 \times 10^8 \left[ \frac{s}{\text{cm}} \right]}$$

$$= 10^4 \left[ \frac{\text{e-}}{\text{cm}^3} \right]$$
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SUMMARY

- Energy spectrum of electron cloud (EC) obtained from differentiated RFA signal
  - Detector energy response a function of incident angle; not included in analysis
  - Features in spectra reveal details of beam-cloud interaction
  - Energy tail indicative of how close cloud electrons drift to beam center
- Amplification of cloud electrons at specific energies observed
  - Bunch current and spacing “selects” cloud energy detected
  - Observed spectrum may depend on detector location
- Optimal beam-induced multipacting (BIM) condition for multiple bunches includes SE energy distribution peak (EC established)
  - SEs produced between bunch passages drift near beam
  - SEs kicked by beam to energy, $K_i$, near peak of $\delta_{SE}(K_i)$
  - BIM resonance condition when drift times for low-energy SE plus high-energy kicked electron equal the bunch spacing
  - Optimal when EC fills chamber, resonance condition satisfied for $0<r<b$ for energies near peak of SE distrib.
- Positron beam
  10 bunches, 1 vs. 2 mA/bunch
  - Energy tail longest with 2 mA/bunch; vacuum pressure rise
  - Shorter tail (1 mA/bunch) = EC doesn’t drift as close to beam
  2 mA/bunch, 2 bunches vs. 10 bunches
  - Nonlinear EC growth: 10x higher amplification with 10 bunches compared to 2 bunches (BIM, < 50 eV)
• Positron vs. electron beam
  
  10 bunches
  - 10x higher EC amplification for e+ beam compared to e-beam at optimal bunch spacing
  - Few high-energy (> 150 eV) cloud electrons with e- beam (cloud doesn’t drift as close to beam)
  
  2 bunches
  - Cloud nearly identical for e+ and e- beams (accounting for surface conditioning)

• RFA vs. other detectors (electrons measured at wall)
  - RFA: drop in signal levels measured over time consistent with surface conditioning
  - BPM: difficult to interpret EC density and energy dependence for biased pickup
  - BBA: good theoretical energy resolution, but relatively small angular acceptance

• Alternate techniques
  
  At wall
  - Electron sweeper (per Macek, et al., at PSR)
  - Time-resolved, fast, amplified RFAs (per Macek, et al.)
  - Screened strip detectors in dipoles (per Cornelis, et al., SPS)

  In chamber volume
  - Pair of striplines: separate proton beam- \( (v_z) \) and electron cloud- \( (v_{x,y}) \) induced signals (per G. Lambertson)
  - Measure attenuation at cyclotron resonance of rf wave transmitted through cloud in dipole (per S. Heifets)
  - Measure cloud-induced tune shift (per F. Mills)