Monitoring of the beam properties

A. Deur
Jefferson Lab

Summary of studies I did online.

$\Rightarrow$Analyses are incomplete.

$\Rightarrow$Hodgepodge of topics.

- Radiation monitoring
- Electron beam energy stability
- Photon beam transmission
- Diamond thicknesses
- Electron beam current monitoring

Radiation monitoring



Comparing Fall14 (10.1 GeV) Spring15 (5.5 GeV) and Fall15/Spring16 (12 GeV)

Rad. monitor dependences with radiator thickness



Spring 16 data: Mid Feb. 2016

Comparing Fall14 (10.1 GeV) Spring15 (5.5 GeV) and Fall15/Spring16 (12 GeV)

Rad. monitor dependences with radiator thickness



- (approx. values for Fall14. no error estimate)
- Similar levels in Fall15 and Spring 16. Worst than Spring 15.
- See expected linear dependence with RL for γ and n probes in tagger/ collimator cave.
- See expected log dependence for ICs. Rates now high enough for IC2 to show log dep.
- Spring15: IC0, IC1, IC4 insensitive to RL or beam current (unless the beam is not well tuned). Fall15: IC4 sensitive to both.
- Fall14, Fall15, Spring16:102_P2 very large and independent of RL. Beam hit tagger entrance? Compatible with low energy electrons background sometimes seen in hodoscope. (Spring15 RL-dependence fixed by adding tagger shielding)

Comparing before and after beam tune improvement during Spring 16 run

	March 8th	April 7th
Beam current	175 (210) nA	210 nA
photon probe, collim. cave	280 (336) mRem/h	294 mRem/h
neutron probe, Hall	0.26 (0.31) mR/h	0.27 mR/h
Up photon probe, tag. vault	175 (210) mRem/h	200 mRem/h
dwn photon probe, tag. vault	90 (108) mRem/h	110 mRem/h
neutron probe, tag. vault	8.5 (10.2) mR/h	10 mR/h

No significant changes seen on radiation monitors. However, new tune decreased background seen by FDC (allowed to run at higher current with less trips).

⇒Radiation monitors are useful only for assessing whether initial beam tune is acceptable.

Beam energy stability

Energy time dependence exhibit both slow drifts and jumps.



Rough energy time-dependence for the full run, binned in period of approximate stability:



Time	energy (HALLD:p) (MeV)	Note
02/13-02/15	12025±5	
02/16-02/21	12037±7	02/16: 0:00 to 8:30am: Steady 13MeV up drift
02/21-02/22	12013±3	jump from 12037 to 12013 MeV around midnight.
02/23-02/25	12134±3	Beam down for 16h. Came back at 12133 MeV
02/25-02/25	12061±2	jump down on 02/25 at 10am.
02/27-02/29	12100±2	
02/29-03/01	12108±8	noticeable systematic drifts
03/02-03/05	12098±5	
03/05-03/06	12102±5	
03/06-03/07	12097±5	
03/07-03/08	12085±8	
03/08-03/09	12087±1	
03/27-04/01	12107±14	slow systematic drift from 12093 MeV (03/27) to 12120 MeV (04/01)
04/01-04/04	12120±8	
04/07-04/11	12095±2	Beam down for 3days. Came back at 12095 MeV. Short times at 12101 MeV
04/11-04/17	12116±4	Beam down for 6h. Came back at 12115 MeV.
04/17-04/20	12124±5	Beam went down on 04/17 15:23. Came back at 12121 MeV, less stable, with overall systematic up drift.
04/20-04/25	12116±3	Short times at 12111 MeV

Beam energy stability

Energy is measured from the beam position in the Hall D ramp.

Drifts (typically a few MeV, at worst 10 MeV):

Seem to be real: They correlate with x-position (and not y) of the beam after tagger magnet (AD00c BPM in the beam dump).



Ex. data from Feb. 20th

Beam energy stability

Energy is measured from the beam position in the Hall D ramp.

The largest jumps (30 to 100 MeV) are believed to be artifacts:

- The beam pipe size cannot accommodate the change in orbits that would follow such jumps
- No x or y correlations with energy.



Change in y at the time of the jump. Then back to usual position. PID slow locks were implemented at that time.

Beam energy stability

Also looked if the energy jumps are correlated with electron beam positions and angles before tagger magnet. Change in y position in angle at the time of the jump (source of the jump?).

Time evolutions



Correlations during jump



Ex. data from Feb. 25th.
PID slow locks were implemented on Feb. 19th

Photon beam transmission

•Photon transmission optimized by x & y Act. Col. scans. (First thing done when beam is establish/re-establish after significant down time or retune.)

•Is transmission better for different radiators? (“50 μm” diamond vs “20 μm” diamond vs AL. radiator)

•Ongoing mystery during Spring run: RL-normalized event rates different for para and perp diamond orientation: up to 50% difference. (log entries: 3386252, 3389907). True for both “50 μm” diamond (e.g. Feb. 20th 10am) and “20 μm” diamond (e.g. Feb. 29th 3am).

- •Could electron beam hit different part of the diamonds? But “50 μm” diamond has no thicker frame.
- •Could beam profile be different for para and perp, and Act. Col. feedback imposes different electron beam positions? Flux change correlated with corrector magnet setting (log entry 3389907).
- •Beam scrapping? (unlikely at the 30% level: incoherent background similar for para and perp)

Photon beam transmission

If transmission is the same for different radiators, and if their RL are known, then intensity monitor signal and RL*I_{beam} should have a unique correlation slope.

Not true: 4 different slopes.



Slope values:



Jefferson Lab
Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility
Exploring the Nature of Matter

A. Deur. GlueX collaboration meeting. 05/09/2016

Monday, May 9, 2016

Photon beam transmission

⇒ Transmissions for different radiators are different

or

the effective RL are different from thicknesses listed in from U.Con. diamonds Table

or

Scrapping occurs (ruled out by polarimetry analysis)

Photon beam transmission

Similar effect seen on TagH counters vs RL*I_{beam}:

⇒rules out different transmission hypothesis.

⇒Problem with RL values.



Photon beam transmission

Effect not seen with TagH counters vs Int. Monit.:

Apparent wandering of the red spot:

Red spot is stable (follow bremsstrahlung spectrum).

Other spots get enhanced due to coherent peak.



Photon beam transmission



Photon beam transmission



Still see coherence at low energy (3.1 GeV)

(TagH counter at 11.9 GeV shows that difference in flux for 50 µm is not due to difference in polarization.)

Photon beam transmission

Influence of beam position and angle on photon flux



- Beam roughly on the same spot expect for "50 μm" perp and "50 μm" para for a short time.
- spots for 5C11B and A.C. are the same (consequence of slow feedback enabled).

Photon beam transmission

Beam position dependence with radiator type:



Same beam spot but different transmission.

⇒ Discrepancy not due to beam position and angle

Photon beam transmission

Once can estimate the effective diamond RL relative to Al. RL by aligning the spots.

(no coherence effect on BPM*RL).









BPM or intensity monitor non-linearity? BPM offset?

different beam backgrounds/transmission?

Poor fits? (χ^2 between 1.5 and 2)

Photon beam transmission

Current monitors linearities:



BPM correlations show very small offsets (<5nA typically)

Large BPM offsets when Int. Mon. involved (50 nA typically).

Int. Mon. non linearity?

Jefferson Lab
Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility
Exploring the Nature of Matter

Accuracy of current monitors

Verification of the normalization and accuracy of the current:



Accuracy of current monitors

Data: 04/11/16 18:00 to 04/12/16 6:00am

correlation y vs x	width/current (from RMS /from fit sigma)	slope y/x	offset (from dist./from fit) in nA
5C11B vs AD00C BCM	9.45% / 9.22%	1.012	4.1E-2 / 8.1E-2
AD00 BPM vs AD00C BCM	9.40% / 9.28%	0.103	4.9E-2 / -4.0E-2
5C11 vs AD00C BCM	9.47% / 9.22%	0.989	1.1E-1 / -1.7E-2
5C11A vs AD00C BCM	9.32% / 8.92%	0.967	5.8E-3 / -1.2E-4
AD00 vs AD00C BCM	9.33% / 8.93%	0.970	7.0E-3 / -6.2E-3
5C11 vs AD00C BPM tight correlation	0.13% / 0.13%	9.57	4.7E-2 / -5.3E-3
5C11 vs AD00C BPM medium correlation	0.63% / 0.63%	9.57	-1.1E-2 / -6.9E-3
5C11 vs AD00C BPM broader correlation	2.26% / 1.45%	9.57	-9.8E-3 / 8.8E-4
5C11A vs AD00C BPM	1.72% / 1.57%	9.36	-2.8E-3 / 1.6E-3
5C11B vs AD00C BPM (tighter correlation)	0.25% / 0.23%	9.81	-1.6E-3 / -2 E-3
5C11B vs AD00C BPM (broader correlation)	1.76% / 1.36%	9.81	1.3E-2 / 3.2E-3
AD00 vs AD00C BPM	1.72% / 1.57%	9.40	-5.0E-4 / 3.4E-3
5C11A vs 5C11	1.73% / 1.62%	0.978	2.6E-2 / 6.5E-2
AD00 vs 5C11	1.74% / 1.63%	0.981	-2.3E-1 / 2.3E-2
5C11B vs 5C11 (broader correlation)	1.62% / 1.25%	1.023	9.6E-2 / 6.7E-2
5C11B vs 5C11 (broader correlation)	1.62% / 1.25%	1.023	9.6E-2 / 6.7E-2
5C11B vs 5C11A	1.67% / 1.56%	1.047	4.6E-2/2E-3
AD00 vs 5C11A	0.074% / 0.065%	1.014	1.671/1.672
AD00 vs 5C11B	1.86% / 1.38%	0.958	-1.05E-1/-4.82E-2

Accuracy of current monitors

Data: 04/11/16 18:00 to 04/12/16 6:00am

correlation y vs x	width/current (from RMS /from fit sigma)	slope y/x	offset (from dist./from fit) in nA
5C11B vs AD00C BCM	9.45% / 9.22%	1.012	4.1E-2 / 8.1E-2
AD00 BPM vs AD00C BCM	9.40% / 9.28%	0.103	4.9E-2 / -4.0E-2
5C11 vs AD00C BCM	9.47% / 9.22%	0.989	1.1E-1 / -1.7E-2
5C11A vs AD00C BCM	9.32% / 8.92%	0.967	5.8E-3 / -1.2E-4
AD00 vs AD00C BCM	9.33% / 8.93%	0.970	7.0E-3 / -6.2E-3
5C11 vs AD00C BPM tight correlation	0.13% / 0.13%	9.57	4.7E-2 / -5.3E-3
5C11 vs AD00C BPM medium correlation	0.63% / 0.63%	9.57	-1.1E-2 / -6.9E-3
5C11 vs AD00C BPM broader correlation	2.26% / 1.45%	9.57	-9.8E-3 / 8.8E-4
5C11A vs AD00C BPM	1.72% / 1.57%	9.36	-2.8E-3 / 1.6E-3
5C11B vs AD00C BPM (tighter correlation)	0.25% / 0.23%	9.81	-1.6E-3 / -2 E-3
5C11B vs AD00C BPM (broader correlation)	1.76% / 1.36%	9.81	1.3E-2 / 3.2E-3
AD00 vs AD00C BPM	1.72% / 1.57%	9.40	-5.0E-4 / 3.4E-3
5C11A vs 5C11	1.73% / 1.62%	0.978	2.6E-2 / 6.5E-2
AD00 vs 5C11	1.74% / 1.63%	0.981	-2.3E-1 / 2.3E-2
5C11B vs 5C11 (broader correlation)	1.62% / 1.25%	1.023	9.6E-2 / 6.7E-2
5C11B vs 5C11 (broader correlation)	1.62% / 1.25%	1.023	9.6E-2 / 6.7E-2
5C11B vs 5C11A	1.67% / 1.56%	1.047	4.6E-2/2E-3
AD00 vs 5C11A	0.074% / 0.065%	1.014	1.671/1.672
AD00 vs 5C11B	1.86% / 1.38%	0.958	-1.05E-1/-4.82E-2

Accuracy of current monitors

Data: 04/11/16 18:00 to 04/12/16 6:00am

correlation y vs x	width/current (from RMS /from fit sigma)	slope y/x	offset (from dist. /from fit) in nA
5C11B vs AD00C BCM	9.4		
AD00 BPM vs AD00C BCM	9.4		
5C11 vs AD00C BCM	9.4		
5C11A vs AD00C BCM	9.1		
AD00 vs AD00C BCM	9.1		
5C11 vs AD00C BPM tight correlation	0.1		
5C11 vs AD00C BPM medium correlation	0.6		
5C11 vs AD00C BPM broader correlation	2.2		
5C11A vs AD00C BPM	1.7		
5C11B vs AD00C BPM (tighter correlation)	0.2		
5C11B vs AD00C BPM (broader correlation)	1.7		
AD00 vs AD00C BPM	1.7		
5C11A vs 5C11	1.7		
AD00 vs 5C11	1.7		
5C11B vs 5C11 (broader correlation)	1.6		
5C11B vs 5C11 (broader correlation)	1.6		
5C11B vs 5C11A	1.6		
AD00 vs 5C11A	0.0		
AD00 vs 5C11B	1.86% / 1.38%	0.958	-1.05E-1/-4.82E-2



Accuracy of current monitors

Data: 04/11/16 18:00 to 04/12/16 6:00am

correlation y vs x	width/current (from RMS /from fit sigma)	slope y/x	offset (from dist./from fit) in nA
5C11B vs AD00C BCM	9.45% / 9.22%	1.012	4.1E-2 / 8.1E-2
AD00 BPM vs AD00C BCM	9.40% / 9.28%	0.103	4.9E-2 / -4.0E-2
5C11 vs AD00C BCM	9.47% / 9.22%	0.989	1.1E-1 / -1.7E-2
5C11A vs AD00C BCM	9.32% / 8.92%	0.967	5.8E-3 / -1.2E-4
AD00 vs AD00C BCM	9.33% / 8.93%	0.970	7.0E-3 / -6.2E-3
5C11 vs AD00C BPM tight correlation	0.13% / 0.13%	9.57	4.7E-2 / -5.3E-3
5C11 vs AD00C BPM medium correlation	0.63% / 0.63%	9.57	-1.1E-2 / -6.9E-3
5C11 vs AD00C BPM broader correlation	2.26% / 1.45%	9.57	-9.8E-3 / 8.8E-4
5C11A vs AD00C BPM	1.72% / 1.57%	9.36	-2.8E-3 / 1.6E-3
5C11B vs AD00C BPM (tighter correlation)	0.25% / 0.23%	9.81	-1.6E-3 / -2 E-3
5C11B vs AD00C BPM (broader correlation)	1.76% / 1.36%	9.81	1.3E-2 / 3.2E-3
AD00 vs AD00C BPM	1.72% / 1.57%	9.40	-5.0E-4 / 3.4E-3
5C11A vs 5C11	1.73% / 1.62%	0.978	2.6E-2 / 6.5E-2
AD00 vs 5C11	1.74% / 1.63%	0.981	-2.3E-1 / 2.3E-2
5C11B vs 5C11 (broader correlation)	1.62% / 1.25%	1.023	9.6E-2 / 6.7E-2
5C11B vs 5C11 (broader correlation)	1.62% / 1.25%	1.023	9.6E-2 / 6.7E-2
5C11B vs 5C11A	1.67% / 1.56%	1.047	4.6E-2/2E-3
AD00 vs 5C11A	0.074% / 0.065%	1.014	1.671/1.672
AD00 vs 5C11B	1.86% / 1.38%	0.958	-1.05E-1/-4.82E-2

Accuracy of current monitors

Data: 04/11/16 18:00 to 04/12/16 6:00am

Cross-calibration: good within 5% (apart for AD00C BPM which is not calibrated)

Resolutions: within 2% except for AD00C BCM which is ~9.3%

Multiple peaks seen in some cases (AD00C vs 5C11, AD00C vs 5C11B, 5C11b vs 5C11)

BCM jitter

Trent Allison: Larger jitter seen on BCM is real. Not due to electronics. Only device seeing it due to high-bandwidth capacity. Other Hall D beam line devices for current monitoring (BPM) filter out the jitter.

Origins of the jitter:

- 10-20 kHz noise from injector
- 1.3 kHz of uncertain origin. Sometime absent
- 60 and 120 Hz fluctuations (largest contributor), usually linked to beam scrapping
- 0.3 Hz current lock feedback
- ...

Depends on time:

Data: 04/11/16 18:00 to 04/12/16 6:00am



Data: 04/24/16 18:00 to 04/12/16 6:00am



Summary

• Radiation levels similar to Fall 15. Larger than Spring 15. Believed to be due to higher energy (5.5 vs 12.0 GeV)

Summary

•Radiation levels similar to Fall 15. Larger than Spring 15. Believed to be due to higher energy (5.5 vs 12.0 GeV)

•Beam energy drifted by ~120 MeV throughout the run.

- •Slow drifts of tens of MeV can occur. Takes typically a day.
- •After beam down (maintenance, long down time, beam studies,...) beam does not necessarily come back at same energy.
- •Sudden jumps of several tens of MeV are artifacts.

Summary

- Radiation levels similar to Fall 15. Larger than Spring 15. Believed to be due to higher energy (5.5 vs 12.0 GeV)
- Beam energy drifted by ~120 MeV throughout the run.
    - Slow drifts of tens of MeV can occur. Takes typically a day.
    - After beam down (maintenance, long down time, beam studies,...) beam does not necessarily come back at same energy.
    - Sudden jumps of several tens of MeV are artifacts.
- Unexpected transmission and rate dependence with radiators (once normalized to known RL). Need more study.

Summary

•Radiation levels similar to Fall 15. Larger than Spring 15. Believed to be due to higher energy (5.5 vs 12.0 GeV)

•Beam energy drifted by ~120 MeV throughout the run.

- •Slow drifts of tens of MeV can occur. Takes typically a day.
- •After beam down (maintenance, long down time, beam studies,...) beam does not necessarily come back at same energy.
- •Sudden jumps of several tens of MeV are artifacts.

•Unexpected transmission and rate dependence with radiators (once normalized to known RL). Need more study.

•Determination of diamond thicknesses from rates:

"50 μm" diamond: ~40 μm, JD-70-119: ~30 μm

But not entirely satisfactory:

- •(Int. Mon. vs RL*I_{beam}) slopes differ by as much as 20%
- •Offsets of up to 2 GeV !
- •Done only with one sample of data

Non-linearity of the Int. Mon. or BPMs?

Summary

- Radiation levels similar to Fall 15. Larger than Spring 15. Believed to be due to higher energy (5.5 vs 12.0 GeV)

- Beam energy drifted by ~120 MeV throughout the run.
  - Slow drifts of tens of MeV can occur. Takes typically a day.
  - After beam down (maintenance, long down time, beam studies,...) beam does not necessarily come back at same energy.
  - Sudden jumps of several tens of MeV are artifacts.

- Unexpected transmission and rate dependence with radiators (once normalized to known RL). Need more study.

- Determination of diamond thicknesses from rates:

  "50 μm" diamond: ~40 μm, JD-70-119: ~30 μm

  But not entirely satisfactory:
  - (Int. Mon. vs RL*I_{beam}) slopes differ by as much as 20%
  - Offsets of up to 2 GeV !
  - Done only with one sample of data

    Non-linearity of the Int. Mon. or BPMs?

- BPM and BCM current meas. well calibrated, apart for AD00c BPM. Multi-peak spectra seen in some instances.

Summary

•Radiation levels similar to Fall 15. Larger than Spring 15. Believed to be due to higher energy (5.5 vs 12.0 GeV)

•Beam energy drifted by ~120 MeV throughout the run.

- •Slow drifts of tens of MeV can occur. Takes typically a day.
- •After beam down (maintenance, long down time, beam studies,...) beam does not necessarily come back at same energy.
- •Sudden jumps of several tens of MeV are artifacts.

•Unexpected transmission and rate dependence with radiators (once normalized to known RL). Need more study.

•Determination of diamond thicknesses from rates:

"50 μm" diamond: ~40 μm, JD-70-119: ~30 μm

But not entirely satisfactory:

- •(Int. Mon. vs RL*I_{beam}) slopes differ by as much as 20%
- •Offsets of up to 2 GeV !
- •Done only with one sample of data

Non-linearity of the Int. Mon. or BPMs?

•BPM and BCM current meas. well calibrated, apart for AD00c BPM. Multi-peak spectra seen in some instances.

•BCM fluctuations are real. Only device in Hall D line providing this information. Current fluctuations can be 10%. Vary with time.