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## Outlines

* Introduction of CLIC
* Introduction of CLIC Test Facility
* Beam-halo and tail particles generation
* Beam Delivery System (CLIC,ILC)
* Linear Accelerator (CLIC,ILC)
* Drive Beam (CLIC)
* CTF3 Test Beam Line
* Post Collision Line


## World-wide CLIC / CTF3 collaboration

## http://clic-meeting.web.cern.ch/clic-meeting/CTF3 Coordination Mtg/Table MoU.htm

 24 members representing 27 institutes involving 17 funding agencies of 15 countries

## Major Parameters for Linear Collider



## CLIC - Basic Features

## CLIC TUNNEL CROSS-SECTION

## - High acceleration gradient: > $100 \mathrm{MV} / \mathrm{m}$

- "Compact" collider - total length < 50 km at 3 TeV
- Normal conducting acceleration structures at high frequency
- Novel Two-Beam Acceleration Scheme
- Cost effective, reliable, efficient
- Simple tunnel, no active elements
- Modular, easy energy upgrade in stages


Drive beam-95A, 240 ns from 2.4 GeV to 240 MeV

## CLIC Schematic



## CLIC vs ILC



- Based on superconducting RF cavities
- Gradient 32 MV/m
- Energy: 500 GeV , upgradeable to 1 TeV (possible GigaZ factory at 90 GeV or ZZ factory at $\sim 200 \mathrm{GeV}$ is also considered)
- Detector studies focus mostly on 500 GeV
- Based on 2-beam acceleration scheme (warm cavities)
- Gradient $100 \mathrm{MV} / \mathrm{m}$
- Energy: 3 TeV, though will probably start at lower energy ( $\sim 0.5 \mathrm{TeV}$ )
- Detector study focuses on 3 TeV


## Collider Parameters

| Parameter | Symbol | 3 TeV | 1 TeV | 0.5 TeV | ILC | Unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Center of mass energy | $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{cm}}$ | 3000 | 1000 | 500 | 500 | GeV |
| Main Linac RF Frequency | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{RF}}$ | 12 | 12 | 12 | 1.3 | GHz |
| Luminosity | L | 7 | 2.25 | 2.24 | 2 | $10^{34} \mathrm{~cm}^{-2} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ |
| Luminosity (in 1\% of energy) | $\mathrm{L}_{99 \%}$ | 2 | 1.08 | 1.36 |  | $10^{34} \mathrm{~cm}^{-2} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ |
| Linac repetition rate | $\mathrm{f}_{\text {rep }}$ | 50 | 50 | 100 | 5 | Hz |
| No. of particles / bunch | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 3.72 | 3.72 | 3.72 | 20 | $10^{9}$ |
| No. of bunches / pulse | $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 312 | 312 | 312 | 2670 |  |
| No. of drive beam sectors / linac | $\mathrm{N}_{\text {unit }}$ | 24 | 8 | 4 | - | - |
| Overall two linac length | $1_{\text {lina }}$ | 41.7 | 13.9 | 6.9 | 22 | km |
| Proposed site length | $\mathrm{l}_{\text {tot }}$ | 47.9 | 20.1 | 13.2 | 31 | km |
| DB Pulse length (total train) | $\tau_{\text {t }}$ | 139 | 46 | 23 | - | $\mu \mathrm{s}$ |
| Beam power / beam | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 14 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 10.8 | MW |
| Wall-plug power to beam efficiency | $\eta_{\text {wp-ff }}$ | 8.7 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 9.4 | \% |
| Total site AC power | $\mathrm{P}_{\text {tot }}$ | 322 | $\sim 150$ | $\sim 150$ | 230 | MW |
| Transverse horizontal emittance | $\gamma \varepsilon_{s}$ | 660 | 660 | 660 | 8000 | nm rad |
| Transverse vertical emittance | $\gamma \varepsilon_{y}$ | 20 | 20 | 20 | 40 | nm rad |
| Horizontal IP beam size before pinch | $\sigma_{\mathrm{x}}{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 40 |  | 142 | 640 | nm |
| Vertical IP beam size before pinch | $\sigma^{*}$ | 1 |  | 2 | 5.7 | nm |
| Beamstrahlung energy loss | $\delta_{\text {B }}$ | 29 | 11 | 7 | 2.4 | \% |

## CLIC Test Facility (CTF3)

- Demonstrate remaining CLIC feasibility issues, in particular:
- Drive Beam generation (fully loaded acceleration, bunch frequency multiplication)
- CLIC accelerating structures
- CLIC power production structures (PETS)



## Beam-Generated Halo and Tail

- Halo particles contribute very little to the luminosity but may instead be a major source of background and radiation.
- Even if most of the halo will be stopped by collimators, the secondary muon background may still be significant.
- Halo and tail considerations are needed for design studies to allow to estimate and minimise any potential performance limitations from this source.
- Provides analytical estimates + package with code and interface for detailed tracking with samples and application to CLIC (+ ILC within EuroTeV)

CLIC: HTGEN as standard component of PLACET

## Halo and Tail Sources

## Particle processes: <br> $\square$ Beam-gas scattering (elastic, inelastic) <br> $\square$ Synchrotron radiation (coherent/incoherent) <br> $\square$ Scattering off thermal photons <br> $\square$ Ion/electron cloud effects <br> I Intrabeam scattering <br> - Touschek scattering

Optics related: Halo modeling

- Mismatch
- Coupling
- Dispersion
- Non-linearities

Various (equipment related, collective)

- Noise and vibration
- Dark currents
- Space charge effects close to source
- Wake fields
- Beam loading
- Spoiler scattering


## Beam-Gas Scattering



## Beam Delivery System (BDS)

## Collimation System

. Reduce the background by removing particles at large betatron amplitudes (Halo) or energy Offsets.
$\square$ The choice of the collimator apertures should guarantee good cleaning efficiency of Halo.

- To avoid wakefields that might degrade the orbit stability.


## Final Focus System

- Need to provide a very strong focusing.
- Reduces the transverse sizes of the beam at the IP sufficiently to provide the required luminosity
- The correction of chromatic and geometric aberrations.


## Equation of Motion

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
x^{\prime \prime}(s)-k(s) x(s)=0 & \text { Hills equation } \\
x(s)=\sqrt{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\beta(s)} \cdot \cos (\psi(s)+\phi) & \text { General solution } \\
\text { (1) } x(s)=\sqrt{\varepsilon} * \sqrt{\beta(s)} * \cos (\psi(s)+\phi) & \\
\text { (2) } & x^{\prime}(s)=-\frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{B(s)}} *\{\alpha(s) * \cos (\psi(s)+\phi)+\sin (\psi(s)+\phi)\} \\
\varepsilon=\gamma(s)^{*} x^{2}(s)+2 \alpha(s) x(s) x^{\prime}(s)+\beta(s) x^{\prime}(s)^{2}
\end{array}
$$

## Dispersion Function

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \alpha(s)=\frac{-1}{2} \beta^{\prime}(s) \\
& \gamma(s)=\frac{1+\alpha(s)^{2}}{\beta(s)}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
x^{\prime \prime}+x\left(\frac{1}{\rho^{2}}-k\right)=\frac{\Delta p}{p} \cdot \frac{1}{\rho}
$$

$$
\text { Phase Advance: } \psi(s)=\int_{0}^{s} \frac{d s}{\beta(s)}
$$

general solution:

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
x(s)=x_{h}(s)+x_{i}(s) & \text { Tune: } Q_{y}=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \cdot \oint \frac{d s}{\beta(s)} \\
D(s)=\frac{x_{i}(s)}{\Delta p / p} & \text { Chromaticity: } \\
\xi=\frac{-1}{4 \pi} * \oint \boldsymbol{K}(s) \beta(s) d s
\end{array}
$$

## CLIC BDS Optics



## Simulation : Model of the Beam

If a lattice is linear then particle representation:

$$
\sum_{i} \equiv\left[\begin{array}{llll}
\sigma_{x, i} \sigma_{x, i} & \sigma_{x, i} \sigma_{\dot{x}, i} & \sigma_{x, i} \sigma_{y, i} & \sigma_{x, i} \sigma_{y, i} \\
\sigma_{x, i} \sigma_{x, i} & \sigma_{x, i} \sigma_{x, i} & \sigma_{x, i} \sigma_{y, i} & \sigma_{x, i}^{\prime} \sigma_{y, i} \\
\sigma_{y, i} \sigma_{x, i} & \sigma_{y, i} \sigma_{\dot{x}, i} & \sigma_{y, i} \sigma_{y, i} & \sigma_{y, i} \sigma_{\dot{y}, i} \\
\sigma_{y, i} \sigma_{x, i} & \sigma_{y, i} \sigma_{x, i} & \sigma_{y, i} \sigma_{y, i} & \sigma_{y, i} \sigma_{y, i}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Beam Matrix of pulse representation:

$$
\Sigma \equiv\left[\begin{array}{llll}
\sum_{x x} & \sum_{x x^{\prime}} & \sum_{x y} & \sum_{x y^{\prime}} \\
\sum_{x^{\prime} x} & \sum_{x^{\prime} x^{\prime}} & \sum_{x^{\prime} y} & \sum_{x^{\prime} y^{\prime}} \\
\sum_{y x} & \sum_{y x^{\prime}} & \sum_{y y} & \sum_{y y^{\prime}} \\
\sum_{y^{\prime} x} & \sum_{y^{\prime} x^{\prime}} & \sum_{y^{\prime} y} & \sum_{y^{\prime} y^{\prime}}
\end{array}\right]
$$

## Beam Tracking in BDS (1)

Beam-Entrance Profile in BDS


Beam Entrance in BDS *




## Beam Tracking in BDS (2)

Beam Profile at IP





## Beam Tracking in BDS (3)



## Beam Tracking in BDS (4)



## Halo Estimation using Collimation Depth

Only $17 \%$ of halo particles are outside the window in case of final quad is super conducting final magnet. $25 \sigma_{x}$ and $80 \sigma_{y}$

Only $4.5 \%$ particles are outside the selected window in case of final quad is permanent magnet. $400 \sigma_{\mathrm{z}}$ and $1000 \sigma_{\mathrm{y}}$



## Analytical Estimates and Simulations for CLIC BDS

Integrated over the Linac, the probability for Mott scattering is then $1.16 \times 10^{-3}$
$\square$ The total probability for the 2.75 km long BDS is $6.02 \times 10^{-5}$.
$\square$ For the sum of LINAC and BDS we get a scattering probability of $1.2 \times 10^{-3}$.
$\square$ The probability for inelastic scattering with a fractional energy loss $\mathrm{K}_{\min }>0.01$ is much smaller, about $2.1 \times 10^{-13} \mathrm{~m}$ both in the LINAC and BDS.

- Summing up over the full length, we get a probability for inelastic scattering for the combined LINAC and BDS system of $5 \times 10^{-9}$.
A fraction of about $2 \times 10^{-4}$ of all particles will have large amplitudes and hit the spoilers in the BDS.
$\square$ With $1.24 \times 10^{12}$ particles per train, this would translate into a flux of $2.4 \times 10^{8}$ particles per train impacting on the spoiler.
$\square$ At 1.5 TeV , we expect that a fraction of about $9 \times 10^{-4}$ of these particles produce secondary muons, resulting in a flux of about $2 \times 10^{-5}$ muons per train

| Parameter | Unit | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{y}, \text { initial }}$ | nm | 5.0 |
| $\beta \mathrm{y}$ | m | 100 |
| Residual gas (BDS) |  | CO |
| Residual gas (LINAC) |  | CO |
| Temperature (BDS) | K | 300 |
| Temperature (LINAC) | K | 300 |
| Pressure (BDS) | nTor | 10 |
| Pressure (LINAC) | nTor | 10 |
| Length of LINAC | Km | 15 |
| Length of BDS | Km | 2.5 |
| Kmin |  | 0.01 |


| Location | $\mathbf{E}$ <br> $\mathbf{G e V}$ | Gas | $\rho$ <br> $m^{\wedge}-3$ | $\sigma_{\text {el }}$ <br> Barn | $\mathbf{P}$ <br> $m^{\wedge}-1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LINAC | 9 | $C O$ | $3.2 \times 10^{14}$ | $1.1 \times 10^{8}$ | $3.6 \times 10^{-6}$ |
| BDS | 1500 | $C O$ | $3.2 \times 10^{14}$ | $3.6 \times 10^{5}$ | $2.2 \times 10^{-8}$ |

## Analytical Estimates and Simulations for ILC BDS

* The probability for elastic scattering at the beginning of the LINAC is about 50 times higher.
* The elastic scattering probability in whole LINAC is $9 \times 10^{-3}$.
* Only a fraction of these will hit spoilers or the beam pipe.
* The probability integrated over LINAC with angles exceeding 30 times the beam vertical divergence is $10^{-5}$.
* Integrated probability over BDS is $5 \times 10^{-7}$.
* The probability for inelastic scattering with a fractional energy loss kmin $>0.01$ is small, $1.8 \times 10^{-12} / \mathrm{m}$ in the LINAC and rather similar, $1.0 \times 10^{-12 / \mathrm{m}}$ in the BDS.
* Sum of LINAC and BDS inelastic scattering of $2.3 \times 10^{-8}$.
* The probability of thermal scattering is still much smaller, about $9 \times 10^{-11}$ for the BDS and completely negligible for the LINAC.
* The beam-gas scattering from the LINAC and BDS combined results in a fraction of $10^{-4}$ of the particles impacting on the spoilers. * For the nominal intensity of $2 \times 10^{10}$ particles per bunch and 2820 bunches, we expect that $6 \times 10^{9}$ particles hit the spoilers at each train crossing.

| Location | $\mathbf{E}$ <br> $\mathbf{G e V}$ | Gas | $\rho$ <br> $\mathbf{m}^{\wedge}-3$ | $\sigma_{\text {el }}$ <br> Barn | $\mathbf{P}$ <br> $\mathbf{m}^{\wedge-1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LINAC | 5 | He | $4.8 \times 10^{16}$ | $2.0 \times 10^{6}$ | $9.9 \times 10^{-6}$ |
| LINAC | 250 | He | $4.8 \times 10^{16}$ | $3.8 \times 10^{4}$ | $1.8 \times 10^{-7}$ |
| BDS | 250 | N 2 | $1.6 \times 10^{15}$ | $4.6 \times 10^{-5}$ | $1.5 \times 10^{-7}$ |

## Analytical Estimates and Simulations for ILC BDS






Horizontal (top) and vertical (bottom) beam positions as function of the longitudinal coordinate s in the BDS

## CLIC Drive Beam Tracking (1)

| Parameter | Unit | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drive beam sector length | $\mathbf{m}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 5 3}$ |
| numb. of part. per bunch | $\mathbf{1 0}^{\mathbf{9}}$ | 52.5 |
| numb. of bunches per train | - | $\mathbf{2 9 2 8}$ |
| mean initial beam energy | $\mathbf{G e V}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 4 0}$ |
| mean final beam energy | $\mathbf{G e V}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 0}$ |
| $\varepsilon_{\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{y}, \text { initial }}$ | $\mathbf{m m}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 0 . 0}$ |
| $\varepsilon_{\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{y}, \text { final }}$ | $\mathbf{m m}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 4}$ |
| Residual gas mixture |  | $\mathbf{4 0 \% \mathbf { H 2 O 4 0 \% H 2 } ,}$ |
| 20\% (CO, N2, CO2) |  |  |
| Temperature | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ |
| Pressure | $\mathbf{n T o r r}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |
| Beam divergence |  |  |
| $\mathrm{K}_{\text {min }}$ |  | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1}$ |


| Process | $\rho\left[\mathrm{m}^{-3}\right]$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\text {init }}\left[\mathbf{m}^{-1}\right]$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\text {final }}\left[\mathbf{m}^{-1}\right]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mott | 3.22*10 ${ }^{14}$ | 7.96*10 ${ }^{-12}$ | 4.21*10 ${ }^{-11}$ |
| Brems. | 3.22*10 ${ }^{14}$ | $1.11 * 10^{-13}$ | $1.11 * 10^{-13}$ |
| Comp. | $5.45 * 10^{14}$ | 3.63*10 ${ }^{-14}$ | 3.63*10 ${ }^{-14}$ |

## CLIC Drive Beam Tracking (2)

## Mott scattering

## electron : theta


electron : theta

photon : energy

## CLIC Drive Beam Tracking (3)

* Energy spread caused by Compton scattering stays below 0.25\%
* Total scattering probability integrated over the whole decelerator is $7.69 \times 10^{-9}$
* Effect of ionization of residual gas shows that the ionization level stays below 3\%. So no need of model extension.
* The total number of intra beam scattering events per unit time scales with $1 / \beta 4$ and increases with particle density which shows that intra beam as well as Touschek become more relevant with low energy beams and small beam size.
* Sliced beam -model and particle beam -model
* Particle is considered to be lost if amplitude exceeds the aperture of element.
* Small fraction of $10^{-7}$ particles is lost.



## Test Beam Line (CTF3)



## Test Beam Line (CTF3)

set n_bunches 200
set n_slices 51
set n_macros 1
set d_bunch 0.025
set sigma_bunch 1000
set gauss_cut 3
set charge 1.4575 e 10
set e0 0.150
set emitt_x 1500.0
set emitt_y 1500.0
\# Define the longitudinal mode
set beta_l 0.4529
set RQ 2294.7/2
set lambda_l 0.025
beam offset,
sigmax $=134.8$, sigmay $=329.8$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { Maximum beam energy }=0.150 \mathrm{GeV} \\
& \text { Lorentz factor }(\gamma) \quad=293.543 \\
& \text { Velocity }(\beta) \quad=0.999994 \\
& \text { Normalized emittance } \varepsilon_{\mathrm{N}}=\varepsilon_{\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{~N}}=150 \mathrm{mrad} \\
& \text { Geometric emittance } \varepsilon=\varepsilon_{\mathrm{N}} /(\beta \gamma)=0.511001 \mathrm{mrad} \\
& \text { Beta Functions } \beta_{\mathrm{x}}=0.827, \quad \beta_{\mathrm{y}}=4.72 \mathrm{~m} \\
& \qquad \theta_{\min }=\sqrt{\varepsilon / \beta} \\
& \qquad \theta_{x}=\sqrt{\left(\varepsilon_{x} / \beta_{x}\right)}=0.786 \mathrm{mrad} \\
& \left.\theta_{y}=\sqrt{\left(\varepsilon_{y} / \beta_{y}\right.}\right)=0.329 \mathrm{mrad}
\end{align*}
$$



## Drive Beam Halo: CTF3-TBL

| CTF3-TBL LENGTH $[\mathrm{m}]$ | $=21.99$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| CLIC Drive Beam Length [m] | $=738.349$ |
| Z mean $\left(\mathrm{N}_{2}\right)$ | $=7$ |
| PRESSURE [Pa]:1.33322e-06 | $=10 \mathrm{nTorr}$ |
| Temperature $[\mathrm{K}]$ |  |
| NPart | $=300$ |
| KMIN | $=4 \mathrm{e}+09$ |
| Particle density $\left(\mathrm{m}^{-3}\right)$ | $=6.437660 \mathrm{e}+14 / \mathrm{m} 3$ |

CLIC estimate. $\quad \mathbf{P}=$ probability $/ \mathrm{m}$ for scattering

| Location | E <br> $(\mathrm{GeV})$ | Gas | $\sigma_{\text {el }}$ <br> Barn | $\sigma_{\text {in }}$ <br> Barn | $\mathbf{P}_{\text {el }}$ <br> $\mathrm{m}^{-1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\text {in }}$ <br> $\mathrm{m}^{-1}$ | $\Theta_{\text {min }}$ <br> mrad |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CTF3- <br> TBL | 0.150 | $\mathrm{~N}_{2}$ | 5242 | 5.5117 | $3.37 \mathrm{e}-10$ | $1.77 \mathrm{e}-13$ | 329 |

## Beam-Gas Scattering: CTF3-TBL

## Mott scattering





## Drive Beam Halo: CTF3-TBL Tracking




HTGEN+PLACET application to low energy CLIC drive beam, started potential for benchmarking - CTF3

## Halo Flux Estimate: CTF3-TBL

* electrons/bunch $=1.4575 \times 10^{10}$
* Probability $=3.37 \times 10^{-10} / \mathrm{m}$
* Probability in CLIC TBL Drive beam $=7.41 \times 10^{-9}$
* Halo/bunch $=1.08 \times 10^{2}$


## Halo Acceleration in Linac (1)

- FullTracking
- Temperature 300 K
- Pressure 10 ntorr
- Scattering angle 10nrad
- Residual Gas



## LINAC Beamline

- Standard PLACET lattice
- Total no. of elements 54068
- No. of Quad. 1324
- No. of BPMs 1324
- No. of slices 31
- No. of macroparticles 100
- Linac injection energy 9.0 GeV
- Charge 4 nC
- Emitt. along x-axis 680 nrad
- Emitt. Along y-axis 10 nrad

Energy of the halo particles is increasing almost linearly during passing through the accelerating structures of the LINAC

## Halo Acceleration in Linac (2)





## CLIC Post Collision Line

Benchmarking study between DIMAD and PLACET codes with 20 mrad post collision line

## Overview (1)

- Comparison between two contemporary codes: DIMAD and PLACET.
- CLIC post collision line for benchmarking purpose.
- We consider current 20 mrad extraction line of CLIC
- Tracking performed using
- 4-particles tracking with different energy deviation.
- 1K particles
- Heavily disrupted post collision electrons beam


## Overview (2)

- Lattice conversion from DIMAD $\rightarrow$ MAD-X $\rightarrow$ PLACET format
- Rotation of beam axes from horizontal to vertical is performed by tilt option inside the sector bend at right angle.
- Few wrong units are corrected:
- Modification in extraction line lattice
-Aperture sizes are corrected
-Removal of aperture constraints from drifts
-Implementation of aperture constraints on four collimators as well.
- Disrupted beam as DIMAD input
- Tracking performed with PLACET from IP to dump.


## Layout of Post Collision Line

Transportation of spent beams and the beamsstrahlung photons from the interaction point to their dumps, with as small losses as possible.
4.0 m
highest point under the ceiling (present CE design, taken from ILC)

```
3.6m------
```



## Extraction Line Lattice

Table 1: First set of four magnets, starting 20 m from the interaction point.

|  | Magnet 1 | Magnet 2 | Magnet 3 | Magnet 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | 4.000 | 4.000 | 4.000 | 4.000 |
| Width $(\mathrm{m})$ | 0.414 | 0.682 | 0.946 | 1.208 |
| Height $(\mathrm{m})$ | 0.833 | 1.451 | 2.065 | 2.677 |
| Gap width $(\mathrm{m})$ | 0.167 | 0.230 | 0.288 | 0.344 |
| Gap height $(\mathrm{m})$ | 0.260 | 0.610 | 0.960 | 1.310 |

Table 2: Second set of four magnets, just after the intermediate dump.

|  | Magnet 5 | Magnet 6 | Magnet 7 | Magnet 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | 4.000 | 4.000 | 4.000 | 4.000 |
| Width $(\mathrm{m})$ | 1.870 | 1.870 | 1.870 | 1.870 |
| Height $(\mathrm{m})$ | 1.510 | 1.510 | 1.510 | 1.510 |
| Gap width $(\mathrm{m})$ | 0.450 | 0.450 | 0.450 | 0.450 |
| Gap height $(\mathrm{m})$ | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

- Coll. 1: $\mathrm{Y}=0.184 \mathrm{~m}$
- Coll. 2: $\mathrm{Y}=0.476 \mathrm{~m}$
- Coll. 3: $\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{Y}=0.809 \mathrm{~m}$

$$
\beta(s)=\beta^{*}+\frac{s^{2}}{\beta^{*}}
$$

In case when there is no quadrupole, only 2 sets of 4 bending magnets


## Single Off Momentum Particles Tracking

- Switched off SR
- No need of particle-matter interactions
- Single particle trajectory
- Four particles with transverse components ( $\mathrm{x}=0, \mathrm{xp}=0, \mathrm{y}=0, \mathrm{yp}=0$ ) at IP
- Energy deviation of each ( $\delta=0, \delta=-0.3333, \delta=-0.80000, \delta=0.93333$ )



## Ideal Beam with Off Momentum Particles




## Disrupted Beam: Transverse Distributions






## Disrupted Beam: Energy vs Offsets/Angles



## Disrupted Beam: Energy Histogram



## Beam-Beam Interactions: GuineaPig

ACCELERATOR:: CLIC-2500

$$
\begin{aligned}
\{\text { energy }=2500 . ; \\
\text { particles }=0.4 ; \\
\text { emitt_x }=0.58 ; \\
\text { emitt_y }=0.01 ; \\
\text { beta_x }=8.0 ; \\
\text { beta_y }=0.1 ; \\
\text { sigma_z }=30 . ; \\
\text { dist_z }=0 ; \\
\text { espread }=0.0 ; \\
\text { which_espread }=0 ; \\
\text { offset_x }=0 ; \\
\text { offset_y }=0 . ; \\
\text { waist_x }=0 ; \\
\text { waist_y }=0 ; \\
\text { angle_x }=0 ; \\
\text { angle_y }=0 ; \\
\text { angle_phi }=0 ; \\
\text { trav_focus }=0 ; \\
\}
\end{aligned}
$$

## PARAMETERS::

CLIC_standard_compton

$$
\begin{gathered}
\{ \\
\text { n_x }=64 ; \\
\text { n_y }=64 ; \\
\text { n_z }=36 ; \\
\text { n_t }=8 ;
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\text { cut_x=3.0*sigma_x. } 1 \text {; }
$$

cut_y=6.0*sigma_y.1 ;

$$
\text { cut_z=3.0*sigma_z. } 1 \text {; }
$$

n_m=40000 ;
force_symmetric=1;
integration_method=2 ;

$$
\text { do_eloss = } 1 \text {; }
$$

$$
\text { do_espread = } 1 \text {; }
$$

do_isr = 1;
store_beam=1 ;
electron_ratio=0.1 ;
do_photons=1 ;
photon_ratio=0.1 ;
store_photons=1;
do_pairs=0 ;

```
track_pairs=1; grids=7 ;
        pair_ratio = 1.0;
        pair_ecut \(=0.005\);
        beam_size=1;
        do_compt = 1;
        compt_x_min=0.01;
        compt_emax=800;
        do_hadrons=1;
        store_hadrons = 1 ;
    hadron_ratio=1000.;
        do_jets=1;
        store_jets=1 ;
        jet_ptmin=3.2 ;
        jet_ratio=10000.;
        jet_log=1;
        do_lumi=1;
    num_lumi=10000;
        lumi_p=0.0001 ;
        \}
```


## Jets Production at CLIC




## Conclusion

-Analytical estimation of scattering probability of beam-generated halo in:

- Beam delivery system and LINAC of CLIC
- Beam delivery system and LINAC of ILC
- CLIC drive beam
- CLIC Test Facility 3 drive beam
-Performed a detailed benchmarking study of two particle tracking codes, DIMAD and PLACET using 20mrad post collision line.
- Beam-Beam interaction (study going on......)


## Beam-Halo Collimation

Beam halo : damping ring, linac, final focus aberrations etc
$\square$ The beam halo can result in electromagnetic showers and SR reaching the detector (+ muon background).
$\square$ Halo removed by physically intercepting the particles using mechanical spoilers + thick absorbers to remove the debris.
$\square$ Thick absorbers then become a source of muons - should be within tolerable levels at the detector.
$\square$ IR layout and mainly final doublet dominate.


1 phase
2 phase

## Lattice with low Dispersion: BDS



## Transverse Phase Space: Exit of BDS




