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## Emittance preservation in the CLIC BDS

- Control beam blow-up due to static imperfections
- so far we have dealt with magnet's displacements only
- Dispersion-free-steering algorithm works well in the Collimation section of the BDS ( A.Latina et al., CLIC-Note-753 )
- FFS is a highly non linear system
- Traditional algorithms fail to preserve the emittance growth in the FFS
- Emittance is not a good figure of merit
- Beam sizes and luminosity are better "reference"


## Dispersion-Free-Steering in the FFS

- DFS recovers few \% of the vertical emittance growth
- nominal emittance ~90 nm rad
- initial perturbed emittance $\sim\left[2 \times 10^{2}-3 \times 10^{3}\right] n \mathrm{~m}$ rad almost linear with misalignment
- no clear improvement with initial <rms> misalignment of the magnets
- slightly different values according to the dipole strength used in the response matrix computation


Inputs:

- Bpm resolution 25 nm
- \# machines 20
- Dipole strength [0.5:10] nrad
- DFS weight 10
- DFS iter 4
- $\Delta$ energy 0.4\%
- multipole on in the lattice


## FFS tuning

Strategy

- Maximize luminosity (Simplex-Nelder algorithm)
- The positions of all magnets used as correctors (except bending magnets)
- All magnets mis-aligned (except bending magnets)

Assumptions

- Pre-alignment accuracy: $10 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ rms over all FFS
- Two identical machines in simulation
- Orbit feedback working


## Results for the 3 TeV lattices

| pre- <br> alignment H\&V <br> [ $\mu \mathrm{m}$ ] | Relative <br> Success <br> rate \% | Absolute <br> Success <br> rate $\%$ | lattice | comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 55 | 80 | $L^{*}=3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ | nominal |
| 10 | 58 | 84 | $L^{*}=3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ | Higher energy <br> bandwidth |
| 10 | -- | 80 | $L^{*}=4.3 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |
| 8 | 81 | 90 | $L^{*}=6.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |

* by G. Zamudio

Relative success rate : normalized to the machine optimum luminosity Absolute success rate : normalized to nominal CLIC luminosity

Target: $80 \%$ of total luminosity

## Understanding the FFS

- FFS sensitivity (defined as $2 \%$ of luminosity loss) to quadrupole vertical displacement from some $\mu \mathrm{m}$ to some nm (final doublet magnets)
- ~3 order of magnitude different sensitivity between first magnets and last 20 m of FFS

Courtesy of J. Snuverink


## Tuning with different magnets displacement



| pre-alignment <br> H\&V $[\mu \mathrm{m}]$ | Relative <br> Success rate <br> $\%$ | Absolute <br> Success rate <br> $\%$ | lattice | comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 55 | 80 | $L^{*}=3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ | nominal |
| $2+10$ | 86 | $\sim 100$ | $L^{*}=3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |
| $2+20$ | 61 | 87 | $L^{*}=3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |

$10 \mu \mathrm{~m} r \mathrm{~ms}$ mis-alignment in the final doublet region is recoverable!

## Particle by particle correlations

One seed after tuning with less then $80 \%$ of luminosity compared to nominal bunch









Horizontal dispersion

## Tuning knobs for the CLIC FFs

|  | SF6 | SF5 | SD4 | SF1 | SD0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| kbx | $5.0896 e-08$ | $8.3265 e-08$ | $1.9497 e-08$ | $-5.1030 e-09$ | $-8.3832 e-09$ |
| kby | $2.4419 e-08$ | $-4.6016 e-08$ | $-6.824 e-08$ | $2.6682 e-08$ | $4.3790 e-08$ |
| kax | $-7.4743 e-08$ | $-6.4241 e-08$ | $-1.1848 e-08$ | $1.0964 e-08$ | $5.0877 e-09$ |
| kay | $-3.7286 e-08$ | $3.7516 e-08$ | $7.4639 e-08$ | $-2.1017 e-08$ | $-3.4491 e-08$ |
| kdx | $-1.0938 e-08$ | $8.6757 e-08$ | $2.5068 e-08$ | $4.8439 e-08$ | $9.5420 e-10$ |

E. Marin

Procedure (preliminary):

- scan of the knobs one by one starting always from the 100 different machines after tuning
- find the best knobs value for each machine
- apply the best values one by one and all together


## Horizontal dispersion knob scan



Maximum value of total luminosity taken

## $\alpha \times$ knob scan




## ay knob scan




Almost all the seed are well centered at 0

## $\beta \times$ knob scan




For some seed the trend with luminosity is not so clear...
Some other need to wide the knobs scan range

## By knob scan



Very hard to find any trend with luminosity...

## Overall luminosity gain



## Summary

| pre- <br> alignment H\&V <br> $[\mu \mathrm{m}]$ | Relative <br> Success <br> rate \% | Absolute <br> Success <br> rate $\%$ | lattice | comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 55 | 80 | $L^{*}=3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ | nominal |
| 10 | 58 | 84 | $L^{\star}=3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ | Higher energy <br> bandwidth |
| 10 | 65 | 87 | $L^{*}=3.5 m$ | Tuning + horizontal <br> knobs |

Design and tuning knobs improve the FFS performances

## Conclusion

- Tuning the CLIC-FFS using luminosity recover $80 \%$ of the machines to $80 \%$ of nominal CLIC luminosity
- New lattice with higher energy bandwidth ( $\pm 1.5 \%$ ) performs better: $84 \%$ of the seed reach $80 \%$ of luminosity
- First implementation of tuning knobs improves tuning results: $87 \%$ of the seed reach $80 \%$ of luminosity


## ...and outlook

- Improve the scan of the knobs procedure
- Alternate luminosity tuning with knobs
- Alternate Andrea's method (see next talk) with luminosity tuning and with knobs


## SPARES

## DFS in the BDS: reminder


test beam $98 \%$ nominal energy, $\omega_{1} / \omega_{0}=1 \mathrm{e} 5, \sigma_{\mathrm{bpm}}=0.1 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, misalignment $10 \mu \mathrm{~m}$


DFS in all the BDS (Collimation + Final Focus section) gives a huge final vertical emittance ...

DFS in the Collimation section gives a final vertical emittance $\Delta \varepsilon_{y}=0.7 \mathrm{~nm}$
A. Latina et al. CLIC-Note-753

## Final distribution of beam sizes at the IP



## CLIC BDS lattice @ 3 TeV


$L^{*}=3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ lattice

## Dispersion knob scan only



Mettere luminosity


## $a x$ knob scan only

kdx best $=-11.4043$ $\sigma_{\mathrm{x}}$ best $=53.4392 \mathrm{~nm}$
$\Delta \sigma_{x}=0.413416 \mathrm{~nm}$


Mettere luminosity


