

## Demonstration of cascaded modulatorchicane pre-bunching for enhanced trapping in an Inverse Free Electron Laser Nicholas Sudar

UCLA Department of Physics and Astronomy

# Overview

**Review of pre-bunching** 

#### **Cascaded modulator-chicane pre-bunching**

- motivation
- design

The experiment

- Rubicon IFEL & pre-bunching
- The set-up, the results

#### Potential impact (Single buncher vs. Double buncher)

- harmonic content, current enhancement, high efficiency FEL, chirp problems

Conclusion



## The pre-buncher Single Buncher

- Single period, planar, halbach undulator
- Permanent magnet, variable gap chicane
- Laser imparts sinusoidal energy modulation
- Chicane dispersion converts to density modulation
- Chicane delay allows for control of injection phase





#### **Rubicon results**

# Single Buncher

#### **Rubicon IFEL experiment**

 $52 \text{ MeV} \rightarrow 95 \text{ MeV}$ 

Strongly tapered helical undulator

Period tapered (4 cm  $\rightarrow$  6cm) & gap tapered Increased fraction accelerated:  $30\% \rightarrow 60\%$ 

#### Nocibur high efficiency energy extraction

 $65 \text{ MeV} \rightarrow 35 \text{ MeV}$ 

45% decelerated – 30% efficiency Increased efficiency by factor of 3

#### RubiconICS

12 KeV X-Rays from 80 MeV



### The double buncher Simple model

Cascaded modulator-chicane modules for optical manipulation of relativistic electron beams

Erik Hemsing and Dao Xiang SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Menlo Park, California 94025, USA (Received 24 October 2012; published 28 January 2013)













5

#### Rubicon double buncher

design of the double buncher

$$p = \frac{\gamma - \gamma_r}{\sigma_{\gamma}} \quad A = \frac{k K K_l [J_0(\zeta) - J_1(\zeta)] N_w \lambda_w}{2 \gamma_r \sigma_{\gamma}} \quad \zeta = \frac{K^2}{4(1 + K^2)} \quad B = \frac{R_{56} \sigma_{\gamma} k}{\gamma_r}$$

- Double buncher parameters optimized relative to second modulation

- A1\*B1 = phase rotation of 1<sup>st</sup> energy modulation peak



- Comparison with single pre-buncher:

- Injection losses (detrapped particles) decrease by an order of magnitude: 20% to 2%

- bunching factor squared increases by a factor of 2





![](_page_7_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Figure_1.jpeg)

1<sup>st</sup> buncher

- 7 cm half period planar undulator
- electro-magnetic chicane

- R56 0-900 um

AW (cm)

2<sup>nd</sup> buncher

- 5 cm 1 period planar undulator
- variable gap permanent magnet chicane - R56 40-90 um

Rubicon undulator - 4-6 cm period – 11 period -

- helical undulator
- gap tapered
- resonant phase:  $-\pi/4$
- resonant energy: 52-82 MeV

#### Rubicon double buncher

design of the double buncher

$$p = \frac{\gamma - \gamma_r}{\sigma_{\gamma}} \quad A = \frac{k K K_l [J_0(\zeta) - J_1(\zeta)] N_w \lambda_w}{2 \gamma_r \sigma_{\gamma}} \quad \zeta = \frac{K^2}{4(1 + K^2)} \quad B = \frac{R_{56} \sigma_{\gamma} k}{\gamma_r}$$

#### **Design considerations**

- Original pre-buncher as second buncher
- Single laser/e-beam focus
- Choose half period, 7 cm period undulator for new buncher
  - large gap (laser diffraction)
  - close to optimal A2/A1
- A2 < initial bucket height
  - laser diffraction
  - planar vs. helical coupling

#### **Experimental parameters**

- energy spread: σγ/γ = 0.0015
- Laser power: 75 GW

- A1 ~ 5.1 (0.4 MeV) - B1 ~ 0.44 (R56 = 480 um) - A2 ~ 20 (1.6 MeV) - B2 ~ 0.075 (R56 = 80 um)

- A2/A1~ 3.9
- π/(A1\*B1) ~ 1.4
- π/(A2\*B2) ~ 2.1

![](_page_8_Figure_18.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Figure_19.jpeg)

# The double buncher Simulations

- **3-D simulation parameters**
- emittance: 2.5 um
- electron beam waist: 80 um
- electron beam waist position at entrance of 2<sup>nd</sup> buncher
- laser waist: 1.06 mm
- rayleigh range: 34 cm
- laser waist at center of Rubicon undulator

#### **Genesis – 3D Time Dependent**

![](_page_9_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_10.jpeg)

65 70 75

R56 (µm)

-0.6

injection phase (rad)

170 180

P0 seed (GW)

-0.8

150 160

140

80 85

-0.4

-0.2

190

50 55 60

-1.0

#### Rubicon double buncher Optimization

- After optimizing fine timing: scan over first pre-buncher chicane gap (only one buncher installed) varying injection phase and compression

- Set first chicane gap at peak: Scan over second buncher EM chicane current

lines show GPT
 simulation predictions
 with laser energy
 70-100 GW

![](_page_10_Figure_4.jpeg)

all shots from same run with 75 GW Simulation done with experimental e-beam and laser focusing

![](_page_11_Figure_1.jpeg)

E (MeV)

a) No laser (blue)

b) No pre-bunching: ~25% accelerated (red)

c) Single buncher: ~45% accelerated (yellow)

d) Double buncher: ~70% accelerated (green)

e) GPT Simulation: ~80% accelerated (blue)

![](_page_11_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_0.jpeg)

36 consecutive shots demonstrating IFEL double buncher stability. Note: top shot is the unaccelerated electron beam.

![](_page_12_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_0.jpeg)

#### Potential uses Harmonic content

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

Example: A2 = 5

5

15

5

p

20

![](_page_14_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### Potential uses Current enhancement

- Modulator-chicane prebunching with long wavelength lasers proposed for production of a current spike resulting in reduction of the gain length and pulse length for FEL's (e-sase)

- Double buncher peak current comparable to single buncher for small modulations

- Flat top distribution could be advantageous for pulse lengths comparable to slippage length

![](_page_15_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### Potential uses Chirp problems

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

Single buncher trapping: fTSB

100

## Conclusion

- Validation of cascaded modulator-chicane pre-bunching scheme.

- Demonstration of up to 96% initial trapping of a relativistic electron beam in an Inverse Free Electron Laser using cascaded modulatorchicane pre-bunching.

- Acceleration of 78% of the beam to final energy 52 MeV to 82 MeV

- Stable acceleration, stable output energy, good beam quality

- Harmonic content and current enhancement may be beneficial compared to single buncher

- Chirps are a problem!

![](_page_18_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### UCLA: P. Musumeci, J. Duris, I. Gadjev, Y. Sakai

ATF: I. Pogorelsky, M. Polyanskiy, M. Fedurin, C. Swinson, M. Babzien, K. Kusche, M. Montemagno, P. Jacob, G. Stenby, B. Malone, M. Palmer

Radiabeam: A. Murokh

Work supported by: U.S. DHS DNDO under Contract No. 2014-DN-077-ARI084-01, NSF grant 145583 and DOE grant No. DE-SC0009914

# Thanks