Beam instrumentation at SuperKEKB

Gaku Mitsuka (KEK) for the KEKB beam monitor group

The 23rd KEKB Accelerator Review

8-10 July 2019







- Overview of the beam instrumentation at SuperKEKB
- Recent updates & future prospects in the SuperKEKB beam monitors
 - Optics measurements by gated turn-by-turn monitors
 - Beam size measurements by synchrotron radiation monitors
 - Bunch-by-bunch feedback system
 - Fast IP-orbit feedback system
- Summary

Beam abort system was reported by H. Ikeda.

The SuperKEKB beam instrumentation



Connection failure in MQC1LE/LP



- Most likely the outer conductor was damaged by strong crimping.
- Smooth operation with healthy three electrodes
- Plan to replace with new cables having a modified SMA connector in middle August



Gated_turn_by_turn_monitors (GTBT)



GTBTs' data pipeline







Phase advance and β function measurements



- β measurements are sensitive to GTBT gain calibration.
- Excitation by injection kicker gives better results than that by PLL, since PLL limits kick amplitude lower to avoid quick beam loss.
- Extended to investigations on chromatic coupling, K-modulation, etc.

Synchrotron radiation beam size monitors

"Visible" SR monitor







X-ray monitor



Beam size measurements in DR



- Horizontal beam size measurements by gated camera
 - The Bestfit damping time 11.5 ms is consistent with the design value (11 ms).
 - Refraction optics in Phase 1-2 was replaced with reflection optics in Phase 3.
 - Increased light intensity enabled a single-shot measurement.
- Bunch length measurements by streak camera
 - Well damped before the extraction ~40 ms

Bunch length measurements in HER & LER



• HER

Bunch Length [mm]

- Bunch length in Phase 3 increases faster than in Phase 2.
- Bunch length in Phase 2 is similar with MWI sim. in Phase 3 (thanks to D. Zhou).

• LER

- Similar results are obtained in the Phase 2 and 3 measurements.
- Sizable discrepancy between measurements and simulation remains.

10

Synchrotron radiation beam size monitors

"Visible" SR monitor



X-ray monitor





New X-ray monitor using Si-pixel sensor

US-Japan Collaboration (U. Hawaii, SLAC, Cornell U., and KEK)

- New system directly catching X rays by a silicon sensor can take bunchby-bunch snapshots.
- σ_y per bunch helps understanding of beam instabilities.

Silicon-pixel detector and spectrometer chips developed at SLAC



High-speed readout electronics developed at U. Hawaii



Testing Si-pixel X-ray monitor in HER



Temperature on the Cu heatsink has been measured in the detector box in HER.
No significant temperature increase was found after beam on (~4°C at 900 mA). Air cooling (instead of water cooling) would be good enough.
Dose inside the detector box ~15 Gy for 2 weeks
Plan to install Si-sensor and detector in summer shutdown, which will be operated together with the present camera-based system.



Bunch-by-bunch longitudinal feedback



- Work with Prof. John Fox in May 2019
- No apparent instability ~1 sec after FB turning off for filling by 2 (500 mA) and by 3 (575 mA)
- Damping ~1.7-1.9 ms are observed in excitedamp measurements.



• Damping rate almost linearly increases as FB gain.

Fast IP-orbit feedback system







Spectrum of canonical kick with FB off/on

17



FB on [K_p(proportional)=10, K_i(integral)=1000]

3rd and 5th harmonics of 230 Hz



- ~20 dB reduction of the osc. amp. found at 10Hz

- Luminosity drops down probably owing to large excitation at 230 Hz.
- FB on with changing K_p from 10 to 7
 - The peak 230 Hz peak gets tamed and luminosity keeps.
 - Reduction power < 30 Hz goes smaller.



- The MATLAB simulation shows a peak at 260 Hz (cf. at 230 Hz in data).
- Reduction powers are ~20 dB at 10 Hz in both sim. and the measurement.
- Future prospects
 - Need to understand the origin of the 230 Hz peak
 - Trying a new FIR filter with small group delay; changing a delay 1.1 to 0.2 ms improves a reduction power 11.6 to 20.4 dB at 20 Hz.

New ideas

- New GTBT monitors
 - 1st round of prototype testing this year
 - Embedded FFT in Zynq FPGA enables realtime phase and amplitude monitoring etc.
- Injection synchrotron oscillation monitor
 - checking injection related BGs in both rings with 12-bit resolution or more
- Synchrotron radiation beam size monitors
 - Good and old interferometers (since KEKB-era) will be renewed.
- Radiation monitors
 - RADFET+Raspberry pi = realtime and EPICS controllable rad. monitor.



- 1 out of 4 channels of each MQC1LE/LP seems damaged, although no significant effect to operation. Replacement with new cables in August.
- No other major problem in the beam monitors, work well over Phase 2&3
 - Promising capability of GTBTs for optics measurements
 - Well calibrated beam size monitors provide fundamental information to the beam commissioning, and may contribute to beam dynamics study.
 - Bunch-by-bunch FB system stably operated
 - Tuning of the fast IP-orbit FB underway, will be involved into daily operation if necessary
- R&D of new detectors are running in parallel.



Variation among 5 data sets



streak camera



23















A comparison of Phase 1 and 2 XRM measurement

At HER using URA mask

Phase 1		Parameters	Min. $\sigma_{y(meas)}$		
1	22 Jun 2016	I = 188~ 250mA, β_y = 7.64 m and 1576 bunches	32 UM		
2	24 Jun 2016	I = ~20 mA, β_y = 7.64 m and 1576 bunches	30 UM		
Phase 2					
1	16 Jun 2018	= 20 ~ 16 mA, β_y = 28 m 250 ~ 230 bunches	26 um		
2	04 Jul 2018	I = 40 ~ 30 mA, β_y = 28 m 64 ~ 42 bunches	21 UM		
3	10 JUI 2018	I = 100 ~ 63 mA, β_y = 7.64 m 788 bunches	14 UM		

	Phase 1	Phase 2	unit
σ_s	31.58 ± 0.72	6.6 ± 0.73	um

A good improvement, PSF factor is ~ 5 times smaller than phase 1.





Gate camera data (first to 10th turn)

Bunch length measurements in the MR



- MWI simulation shows thresholds are ~1.9 mA (LER) and 2.7 mA (HER).
- Measured bunch lengthening might be due to potential well distortion.
- The HER result is comparable with the simulation (Zhou and Ohmi), but huge discrepancy between measurements and simulation remains in the LER.

Blue line: Phase-2, 2018.07.04 Red line: Phase-3, 2019.05.20



14 modifications during Fall 2018

- Mostly aimed at making the alignment system more robust
- However the funds were released too late to implement them all before installation
- One that we could not do in time was making the primary mirrors so they could be opened and reset in situ

IP found in 3 of 4 telescopes at first scan



- However in a single shift, and before telescope 4 could be examined, a shifter sent all 4 primaries out of tolerance. They could not be reset because they could not be opened (we tried)
- We are modifying the primaries this summer and we have changed software to set hard limits to primary movement
- Nevertheless the new alignment system much improved and installation time is halved.



- Horizontal beam size measurements by gated camera
 - The Bestfit damping time 8 ms is slightly faster than the design value (11 ms).
 - Refraction optics in Phase 1-2 was replaced with reflection optics in Phase 3.
 - Increased light intensity enabled a single-shot measurement.
- Bunch length measurements by streak camera
 Well damped before the extraction ~40 ms

Horizoutal beam size [mm]

33