

BEAM PHYSICS FRONTIER PROBLEMS*

Frank Zimmermann[†], CERN, Geneva, Switzerland

Abstract

The main challenges for far-future higher-energy particle colliders are discussed along with possible technological paths to overcome them.

COLLIDER LANDSCAPE

This workshop paper is mostly an abbreviated version of an article published in the “Frontiers in Physics” journal [1] (open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence). The topic of electric power generation using accelerators has been added.

High-energy physics calls for particle colliders with much higher energy and/or luminosity than any past or existing machine. Various types of future particle colliders are being proposed and under development.

Technically closest to construction are the International Linear Collider (ILC) in Japan, the Future Circular electron-positron Collider (FCC-ee) in Europe, and the Circular Electron Positron Collider (CEPC) in China. The ILC design is grounded in more than 30 years of dedicated and successful R&D efforts. Another type of linear collider, CLIC, is based on higher-gradient normalconducting RF cavities, and powered with a novel two-beam acceleration scheme. The two circular collider designs, FCC-ee and CEPC, build on 60 years of experience with operating colliding beam storage rings, and in particular, they include ingredients of the former LEP collider at CERN, and of the KEKB, PEP-II and SuperKEKB B factories. Combining successful concepts and introducing a few new ones allows for an enormous jump in performance. For example, FCC-ee, when running on the Z pole is expected to deliver more than 100,000 times the luminosity of the former LEP collider. The circular lepton colliders FCC-ee and CEPC would be succeeded by energy frontier hadron colliders, FCC-hh and SPPC, respectively, providing proton collisions at a centre-of-mass energy of about 100 TeV or higher.

Several colliders based on energy-recovery linacs (ERLs) also are under discussion. A Large Hadron electron Collider (LHeC), with an electron beam from a dedicated ERL, could extend the physics programme at the LHC [2, 3]. A similar collider option, called FCC-eh [4], is considered for the FCC-hh. Recently, high-energy, high-luminosity ERL-based versions of the FCC-ee [5] and of the ILC [6, 7] have been proposed.

The above proposals are complemented by still others, presumably in the farther future, such as photon colliders, muon colliders, or colliders based on plasma acceleration.

Technical feasibility, affordability, and sustainability are among the questions which the collider designers may need to address.

ACCELERATOR CHALLENGES

Five major challenges are driving the design and, ultimately, the feasibility of future high-energy colliders. These are: (1) synchrotron radiation, (2) the bending magnetic field, (3) the accelerating gradient, (4) the production of rare or unstable particles (positrons or muons), and (5) cost and sustainability.

A charged particle deflected transversely to its velocity vector emits electromagnetic radiation which, if emitted due to the influence of an external magnetic field, is called synchrotron radiation. Denoting the charge of the particle by e , its relativistic Lorentz factor by γ , and considering a particle that follows a circular orbit of bending radius ρ , the energy loss per turn is given by

$$U_0 = \frac{e^2}{3\epsilon_0} \frac{\gamma^4}{\rho} . \quad (1)$$

If there is not a single particle but a beam with current I_{beam} , the power of the emitted synchrotron radiation becomes

$$P_{\text{SR}} = \frac{I_{\text{beam}}}{e} U_0 . \quad (2)$$

To provide some examples, the maximum synchrotron radiation power at the former Large Electron Positron collider (LEP) was about 23 MW, while for the proposed future circular electron-positron collider FCC-ee a total constant value of 100 MW has been adopted as a design constraint.

For the same particle energy, the Lorentz factor of protons is much (about 2000 times) lower than for electrons. Consequently, until now, synchrotron radiation power for proton beams has been much less significant, even if not fully negligible. For the Large Hadron Collider (LHC), it amounts to about 10 kW. However, this value increases to a noticeable 5 MW for the proposed future circular hadron collider FCC-hh. Removal of this heat from inside the cold magnets of the collider arcs, requires more than 100 MW of electric cryoplant power. These numbers reveal that for both future electron-positron and hadron circular colliders, synchrotron radiation alone implies more than 100 MW of electric power needs.

Possible mitigation measures to limit or suppress the synchrotron radiation include:

- increasing the bending radius ρ , which translates into a large(r) circular collider, and is a key part of the FCC concept;
- the construction of a linear collider, which features only minor arcs, but still faces the issues of radiation in the

* Work supported by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme under grant agreement no. 101004730 (iFAST).

[†] frank.zimmermann@cern.ch

final quadrupole magnets (Oide effect) and in collision (beamstrahlung) — see below;

- the construction of a muon collider;
- miniaturizing the beam vacuum chamber of a large ring; and
- shaping the beam to suppress radiation.

We will now look at these five possibilities in greater detail.

Size of Circular Colliders

The construction cost of different collider elements increases or decreases with the size of the ring. The optimum size is a function of the maximum beam energy. In 1976, B. Richter performed a cost optimisation of circular electron-positron colliders [8]. For a maximum c.m. energy of about 365 GeV (top quark production), he found that a collider diameter of 100 km is close to the optimum. A similar circumference value of about 90 km is obtained when extrapolating from the size and energy of more recent machines (PETRA, TRISTAN and LEP) [9].

Serendipitously, a circumference of 90–100 km is exactly the size required for a 100 TeV hadron collider. Namely, the beam energy of a hadron collider is given by

$$E = ecB\rho, \quad (3)$$

where B is the dipole field, ρ the bending radius. Doubling the field compared with the LHC, and increasing the radius or circumference by a factor 3–4 yields a factor 6–8 increase in proton energy to about 100 TeV in the centre of mass.

In addition, the size of 90–100 km required for both FCC lepton and hadron colliders also matches the local topology of the Lake Geneva basin, where possible tunnel locations are bounded on two sides by the Jura and (Pre-)Alpes, respectively, and where, in addition, the collider should pass around the Salève mountain.

Linear Colliders

A linear collider still features moderate arcs in its beam delivery system, and also faces the issues of synchrotron radiation emitted in the final quadrupole magnets and in collision, which ultimately limit the achievable beam size and the maximum beam energy of such colliders.

Indeed, some bending magnets are an integral part of the beam delivery systems, e.g., for the collimation of off-energy particles, and for the chromatic correction of the final focus. Synchrotron radiation emitted in these bending magnets can increase the beam size at the interaction point (IP), either directly due to the resulting increase of the horizontal emittance, or due to incomplete chromatic correction for particle energy changes that occur within the system [10]. These effects call for reduced bending as the beam energy is increased. At the same time, at higher energy the incoming geometric beam emittance adiabatically decreases, allowing for stronger sextupole magnets. In consequence, the geometry and the length of the beam delivery system change with beam energy. As an example, the CLIC

beam-delivery footprint and length greatly changes when increasing the collision energy from 500 GeV to 3 TeV [11, 12]. The initial tunnel layout for a linear-collider beam-delivery system should be designed so as to accommodate, and provide space for, a higher-energy geometry. Even with the modified, optimised geometry, synchrotron radiation is by no means negligible. For example, synchrotron radiation in the bending magnets caused a factor of about 2 loss in luminosity in the 2003 CLIC BDS design at 3 TeV [11]; a similar situation was found for the SLC at a beam energy of only 45.6 GeV [13]. Such questions will also need to be addressed for a proposed 3 TeV energy upgrade of the International Linear Collider [14], or for upgrades of linear colliders to even higher energies, based on plasma acceleration.

A second limit set by synchrotron radiation in linear colliders arises in the final quadrupole magnets, where photon emission leads to an energy change, and thereby to a different focal length and increase in the vertical spot size (“Oide effect”) [15].

The third, and perhaps most important limitation due to synchrotron radiation at linear colliders relates to the one emitted during the collision in the electromagnetic field of the opposite beam, also called “beamstrahlung”. The strength of the beamstrahlung is characterized by the parameter Υ , defined as [16, 17] $\Upsilon \equiv \gamma B/B_c = (2/3)\hbar\omega_c/E_e$, with $B_c = m_e^2 c^2 / (e\hbar) \approx 4.4$ GT the Schwinger critical field, $\hbar\omega_c = (3/2)\hbar c\gamma^3/\rho$ the critical photon energy as introduced by Sands [18], E_e the electron (or positron) energy before radiation, B the local magnetic field, $\rho = e/(pB)$ the local bending radius, γ the relativistic Lorentz factor corresponding to E_e , $p \approx E_e/c$ the particle momentum, e the electron charge, and c the speed of light. The average Υ during the collision of three-dimensional Gaussian bunches is

$$\langle \Upsilon \rangle = \frac{5r_e^2}{6\alpha} \frac{N_b}{\sigma_z(\sigma_x^* + \sigma_y^*)}, \quad (4)$$

where α denotes the fine structure constant ($\alpha \approx 1/137$), $r_e \approx 2.8 \times 10^{-15}$ m the classical electron radius, N_b the bunch population, σ_z the rms bunch length, and $\sigma_{x(y)}^*$ the rms horizontal (vertical) spot size at the collision point.

In the classical regime $\Upsilon \ll 1$, and for flat Gaussian beams, the number of photons emitted per beam particle during the collision is [19]

$$n_\gamma \approx 2.12 \frac{\alpha N_b r_e}{\sigma_x^* + \sigma_y^*}. \quad (5)$$

The parameter n_γ is important, since it describes the degradation of the luminosity spectrum. Namely, the emission of beamstrahlung photons changes the energy of the emitting electron or positron, and, thereby, the energy of its later collision. The fraction of the total luminosity L_{tot} at the target centre-of-mass energy L_0 is determined by n_γ as [20]

$$\frac{L_0}{L_{\text{tot}}} = \frac{1}{n_\gamma^2} (1 - e^{-n_\gamma})^2, \quad (6)$$

To illustrate this degradation with an example, for CLIC at 380 GeV 60% of the total luminosity lies within 1% of the target energy, while at 3 TeV this fraction decreases to only 34%. In this way, at TeV energies, e^+e^- collisions in linear colliders lose their distinct energy precision.

Muon Colliders

The muon is about 200 times heavier than the electron, which, according to Eq. (1), implies close to 2×10^9 times less radiation at the same energy and bending radius. On the other hand, muon beams have two drawbacks: their production is not trivial, and the muons decay, with a rather short lifetime of only $2.2 \mu\text{s}$ at rest. In the later section on unstable or rare particles, we will present an innovative approach to the muon collider.

Shielding the Radiation

The radiation emission is suppressed at wavelengths larger than $\lambda_{\text{sh}} \approx 2\sqrt{d^3/\rho}$ with d signifying the pipe diameter [21]. Therefore, miniature accelerators with extremely small beam pipe, on the micron or nanometre scale, combined with a large bending radius ρ could suppress almost all radiation. An extreme case would be the use of bent-crystals, where d becomes comparable to the inter-atom distance in the crystal lattice.

Shaping the Beam

It is noteworthy that classically a uniform time-independent beam does not emit any synchrotron radiation [22, 23]. As an example, the CERN ISR operated with high-current stationary beams. In the case of such a coasting beam, residual radiation could arise from shot noise or from beam instabilities. The shot noise might be reduced by suitable manipulations — see e.g. [24] — or by stochastic cooling. The shot noise and, therefore, the associated synchrotron radiation can be markedly suppressed in case the cooling is so strong as to produce a crystalline beam [25]. The acceleration of a “DC” (or near-DC) beam may be accomplished by induction acceleration [26].

HIGH-FIELD MAGNETS

The energy reach of hadron colliders, and of hypothetical future muon colliders, is determined by their size and by the magnetic field — see Eq. (3).

All SC hadron storage rings built to date used magnets based on Nb-Ti conductor, for which the maximum reachable magnetic field is 8–9 T, as for the LHC dipole magnets. To go beyond this field level, the High Luminosity LHC (HL-LHC) upgrade foresees the installation of a few tens of higher-field magnets made from Nb₃Sn superconductor, with a design peak field of 11–12 T. The FCC-hh is designed with a few 1000s of Nb₃Sn magnets with a higher field of 16 or 17 T, which is close to the maximum field that can be reached with this type of conductor. To achieve even higher fields, high-temperature superconductors are under consideration. At CERN magnets based on REBCO are being developed.

In China iron-based superconductor, with a field of up to 24 T, is the material of choice for the SPPC.

The coils of the SC magnets for future hadron colliders must withstand extreme pressure and forces, without any quench and without any degradation in performance. In dipole accelerator magnets, the horizontal forces per quadrupole approach 10 MN/m for a field of 20 T [27].

ACCELERATING SYSTEMS

SC Radiofrequency Systems

As for the bending fields, also for the accelerating systems, superconducting materials have gained widespread use. Superconducting radiofrequency (RF) cavity systems underpin many modern facilities, the latest examples being the European XFEL at DESY Hamburg, the LCLS-II at SLAC, and FRIB in Michigan. Accelerating fields have been increased from a few MV/m to more than 30 MV/m for multicell cavities, and close to twice this value for single cells. Most SC cavities to date have been based on bulk Nb or in Nb-on-Cu cavities. New cavity treatments (nitrogen doping or nitrogen infusion [28]), innovative production methods (chemical vapor deposition [29], high impulse power magnetron sputtering [30]) and new materials, e.g. Nb₃Sn [31], as for the magnets, etc. promise further significant advances in performance, by factors of 2–10 in quality factor Q_0 and of 2–3 in maximum accelerating gradient. As an example, for Nb₃Sn, the theoretical ultimate “superheating” field [32] corresponds to a maximum accelerating gradient of ~ 100 MV/m, about twice the corresponding value for Nb, while the latter is not far from the currently achieved peak values of about 50 MV/m for Nb cavities [31].

Plasma Acceleration and Crystals

Other advanced accelerating concepts can reach much higher gradients. For example, plasma acceleration routinely achieves fields of 100 GV/m, which is 3000 times higher than the Nb cavities proposed for the International Linear Collider. The accelerating plasma waves can be driven either by a high-energy charged particle beam or by a laser. Comprehensive concepts have been developed for electron-positron colliders based on either beam-driven [33, 34] or laser-driven plasma acceleration [35, 36]. Beam quality, pulse-to-pulse stability, and energy efficiency of plasma accelerators [37] are critical issues addressed by ongoing R&D programs. High-energy colliders are arguably the most demanding application of plasma acceleration. Possible ultimate limits of plasma acceleration arise from the scattering of beam particles off plasma nuclei and plasma electrons, and from the emission of betatron radiation [38]. Both of these effects might be partially mitigated by accelerating in a hollow plasma channel. For realizing e^+e^- colliders, not only electrons but also positrons must be accelerated in the plasma, while preserving the beams’ transverse and longitudinal emittance. For this purpose, more complex plasma excitation schemes may need to be developed, e.g. [39, 40].

Thanks to their higher electron density, even larger gradients can be generated in crystals. The maximum field is given by [41]

$$E_0 \approx \frac{m_e c \omega_p}{e} \approx 100 \left[\frac{\text{GeV}}{\text{m}} \right] \sqrt{n_0 [10^{18} \text{ cm}^{-3}]}, \quad (7)$$

with ω_p the angular plasma frequency and n_0 the electron density. With $n_0 \approx 10^{22} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ to $5 \times 10^{24} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ in a crystal, peak gradients of 10–1000 TV/m would be within reach. Accelerating crystal waves could be excited by X-ray lasers [41].

UNSTABLE OR RARE PARTICLES

Several future colliders require unprecedented production rates of positrons (linear colliders) and muons (muon collider), while future circular colliders need positrons at a level already demonstrated.

The present world record positron production rate of about $5 \times 10^{12} \text{ e}^+$ per second was established at the SLC in the 1990s. Even achieving, or reproducing, this SLC rate is not trivial. The SLC target failed after 5 years of operation. For a dedicated failure analysis performed at LANL, the failed SLC positron target was cut into pieces and metallographic studies were carried out to examine the level of deterioration of material properties due to radiation exposure. The hardness of the target material in units of kg/mm^2 was found to be decreased by about a factor of 2, over the first 10 mm. However, whether this degradation had been due to radiation damage, work hardening, or temperature cycling could not be clearly resolved.

To push the production rate of e^+ and μ 's much beyond the state of the art, a candidate ultimate source of positrons and muons is the Gamma factory [42, 43], which we discuss in the following subsection.

Gamma Factory

The Gamma Factory [42] is based on resonant scattering of laser photons off partially stripped heavy-ion beam in the existing LHC or in the planned FCC-hh. Profiting from two Lorentz boosts, the Gamma Factory acts as a high-stability laser-light-frequency converter, with a maximum photon frequency equal to $\nu_{\gamma, \text{max}} = 4\gamma^2 \nu_{\text{laser}}$, where γ is the relativistic Lorentz factor of the partially stripped ion beam. This allows the production of intense bursts of gamma rays with photon energies of up to several 100 MeV. Importantly, the LHC-based Gamma Factory can also be used to drive a subcritical nuclear reactor, producing of order 300 MW electric power, while performing a transmutation of nuclear waste [44].

In particular, the Gamma Factory can serve as a powerful source of e^+ (yielding 10^{16} – $10^{17} \text{ e}^+/\text{s}$ — five orders of magnitude higher than the state of the art), μ (10^{11} – $10^{12}/\text{s}$), π , etc. [42, 43]. The positron rate available from the Gamma factory would be sufficient for a LEMMA type muon collider [45, 46]. The Gamma Factory would also allow for Doppler laser cooling of high-energy beams, and, thereby, provide an avenue to a High Luminosity LHC based on laser-cooled isocalar ion beams [47].

Induction Acceleration and Positron Annihilation in Plasma Target

The LEMMA scheme for a muon collider is based on the annihilation of positrons with electrons at rest [45]. The cross section for continuum muon pair production $\text{e}^+\text{e}^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ has a maximum value of about $1 \mu\text{b}$ at a centre-of-mass energy of $\sim 0.230 \text{ GeV}$, which corresponds to a positron beam energy of about 45 GeV, exactly as required for the FCC-ee operating as a TeraZ factory and provided by the FCC-ee full-energy booster [48].

Challenges with the LEMMA-type muon production scheme relate to the emittance preservation of muons and muon-generating positrons upon multiple traversals through a target, and the merging of many separate muon bunchlets, due to production by many separate positron bunches or positron bunch passages.

These challenges may potentially be overcome by [49]:

- Operating the FCC-ee booster with a barrier bucket and induction acceleration, so that all positrons of a cycle are merged into one single superbunch [50], instead of $\sim 10,000$ separate bunches.
- Sending the positron superbunch from the booster into a plasma target, where, during the passage of the positron superbunch, the electron density is enhanced 100–1000 fold without any significant density of nuclei, hence with bremsstrahlung and Coulomb scattering largely absent.

Since the positron bunch will be mismatched to the nonlinear plasma channel, filamentation and significant transverse emittance growth may result [49].

For a typical initial plasma electron density of $n_e = 10^{23} \text{ m}^{-3}$, and assuming a density enhancement by a factor of 1000, due to the electron pinch in the positive electric field of the positron beam, the positrons annihilate into muon pairs at a rate of 10^{-8} m^{-1} .

As described in the CDR [51], the FCC-ee booster can accelerate 3.5×10^{14} positrons every 50 s. Using the much more powerful Gamma Factory positron source, with a rate of 10^{16} – $10^{17} \text{ e}^+ \text{ s}^{-1}$ [42], and injecting into the booster during one or a few seconds, of order 10^{17} e^+ can be accumulated, at the booster injection energy of $\sim 20 \text{ GeV}$. The positrons can be captured into a single barrier RF bucket, with a final length of $\sim 5 \text{ m}$, at which the longitudinal density would be about 1000 times higher than the peak bunch density in the collider ring (without collision), possibly compromising the beam stability.

Accelerating the long positron superbunch containing 10^{17} e^+ by 25 GeV, from 20 to 45 GeV, requires a total energy of 0.4 GJ, or, if accelerated over 2 s, about 200 MW of RF power. This translates into an induction acceleration voltage of $\sim 2 \text{ MV}$ per turn, which is three orders of magnitude higher than the induction voltage of the KEK digital accelerator [52], but about 10 times lower than the induction RF voltage produced at the LANL DARHT-II [53], at much higher or lower repetition rate, respectively. On the ramp and at top energy, the full bunch length l_b can conceivably

Content from this work may be used under the terms of the CC-BY-4.0 licence (© 2022). Any distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s), title of the work, publisher, and DOI

be compressed to the assumed $l_b \approx 5$ m, by squeezing the gap of the barrier bucket (which requires substantially more voltage for the barrier RF system) – also see [26, 52]. Tentative parameters of the positron superbunch are compiled in Ref. [49]. We assume that the booster ring runs near the coupling resonance so that the emittance is shared between the two transverse planes.

When the accelerated and compressed positron bunch is sent into a plasma, the plasma electron distribution quickly acquires a nearly stationary shape, while any remaining plasma ions are slowly repelled away from the positron beam [54]. In the stationary phase, the electron distribution approaches a form that resembles the one of the positron beam, with a density

$$n_{e,\text{stat}} \approx \frac{N_b}{2\pi l_b \sigma_{\perp}^2}, \quad (8)$$

so as to neutralize the electric field. With an average rms size of $\sigma_{\perp} \approx 10 \mu\text{m}$, we obtain $n_{e,\text{stat}} \approx 10^{26} \text{ m}^{-3}$. Considering a 100 m long plasma channel yields $\sim 10^{11} \mu$ pairs, with an initial muon energy of ~ 22 GeV, and an initial lifetime of 0.5 ms at this energy.

In particular, once the electron distribution is nearly stationary, the longitudinal fields inside the plasma can be neglected. The resulting transverse emittance of the produced muons can be optimized by adjusting positron beam parameters and the optical functions at the entrance to the plasma [49]. In addition, a phase rotation (bunch compression) of the muons may be required, since the initial bunch length ~ 5 m, of the positrons or resulting muons, will still be too long for collider operation.

Overall, the described scheme would produce about 10^{12} muon pairs per cycle, with a cycle length of order 3 s. Even at an energy of 50 TeV, the muons would decay with a lifetime of only 1.1 s. This kind of cycle/lifetime ratio of about 3:1 might still be considered acceptable. On the other hand, for collision at a muon beam energy of 7 TeV in the existing LHC ring, the muon lifetime would be only 0.15 s, and the scheme would be considerably more challenging.

COST AND SUSTAINABILITY

Efficient RF Power Sources

Radiofrequency (RF) systems are used to keep a charged particle beam bunched, and to feed energy to the beam, be it for purposes of acceleration or to compensate for the energy lost due to synchrotron radiation. In superconducting continuous-wave RF cavities, almost no power is lost to the cavity wall and all RF power entering the cavity can be transferred to the beam highly efficiently. Then, in the overall power budget, the RF power source is the most inefficient element. For RF frequencies above about 400 MHz, and for high power applications, historically klystrons have been the RF power source of choice on particle accelerators.

It is most remarkable that about 80 years after the invention of the klystron by the Varian brothers, a revolution in klystron technology is underway. Using advanced bunching

techniques, it is expected that the klystron efficiency can be raised from the present 50–60% level to about 90%, which would translate into a significant energy saving [55]. Prototypes of such novel highly-efficient klystrons are being manufactured both by CERN, in collaboration with industry, for FCC, CLIC and ILC, and, in China, for the CEPC project.

In parallel, the efficiency of alternative RF power sources, such as inductive output tubes or solid-state amplifiers [56], is also being improved.

While at present the RF power sources are the dominant contributors to overall grid-to-beam power transmission inefficiency, a few percent additional losses each occur in the electrical network between utility high-voltage interconnect point and RF power source, and in the wave guides and couplers feeding the generated RF power into the accelerating cavities, respectively.

Efficient Magnets

For high fields, superconducting magnets are most efficient, as no energy is lost, and electric power is mostly required for the cryogenic system. Namely, significant heat from synchrotron radiation and (in the case of muons) particle decay needs to be removed from the cold magnet environment. Approximately 1000 W of electric power is required to remove 1 W of heat at 1.9 K. Increasing the operating temperature of the high-field superconducting magnets from presently 1.9 or 4.5 K to 10–20 K or higher, would greatly improve the cryogenic efficiency [57], and reduce overall power consumption. This temperature step may be achieved through advanced magnets based on high temperature superconductor [58].

For lower fields, up to of order 1 T, permanent magnets are most energy efficient. An example is the Fermilab Recycler Ring [59], which was built almost entirely from permanent magnets. Even adjustable permanent magnets have been designed and built for applications at light sources, colliders, and plasma accelerators [60]. Other ingenious solutions for energy saving can be found, depending on the respective application. For example, for the FCC-ee double-ring collider, twin dipole and quadrupole magnets at low field (of order 0.05 T, for the dipoles) have been designed [61], which promise a significant power reduction compared with the magnets of similar fields at earlier colliders.

Energy Recovery Linacs (ERLs)

Recovering the energy of the spent beam after one or several collisions is another effective measure to improve overall energy efficiency, if a significant fraction of the overall electric power is stored in the beam, as typically is the case for beams accelerated in superconducting linacs [62].

A comparison of ERL-based colliders proposed half a century ago with several recent concepts is presented in Table 1. The main differences between proposals from the 1970s and today are the collision of flat beams instead of round beams, and much smaller (vertical) beam sizes, combined with higher beam current, yielding, on paper, of order

Table 1: A comparison of ERL-based colliders proposed in the 1960s [62] and 1970s [63, 64], and in the recent period 2019–2021 [7, 65, 66].

Proposal	Tigner 1965	Amaldi 1976	Gerke & Steffen 1979	Litvinenko et al. 2019		Telnov 2021		Litvinenko et al. 2022	
c.m. energy [GeV]	1–6	300	200	240	600	250	500	240	3000
av. beam current [mA]	120	10	0.3	2.5	0.16	100	100	38	40
vert. rms IP beam size [nm]	40,000	2,000	900	6	5	6.1	7.4	2.7	4.1
	(round)	(round)	(round)						
luminosity [10 ³⁴ cm ⁻² s ⁻¹]	0.0003	0.01	0.004	73	8	90	64	343	94

~10,000 times higher luminosity than the proposals from half a century ago.

Beam Loss Control and Machine Protection

Also minimisation of beam loss can improve the energy efficiency of accelerators, such as ERLs. For proposed future higher-energy facilities, machine protection and beam collimation systems become ever more challenging due to their unprecedented beam power or stored energy. For example, the FCC-hh design features a stored beam energy of 8.3 GJ [67], which is more than a factor 20 higher than for the LHC.

NOVEL DIRECTIONS

Storage rings constructed as high energy physics colliders could also serve for other intriguing applications. In this section, we mention a few examples.

Ultimate Light Sources

Large circular storage rings like the FCC-ee, and even the FCC-hh, can serve as ultimate storage-ring light sources, with diffraction limited emittances down to photon wavelengths of

$$\lambda_{\min} \approx 4\pi\epsilon_x. \quad (9)$$

For FCC-ee the geometric emittance ϵ_x , of the collider or of the full-energy booster, scales as γ^2 , and the lowest value of $\epsilon_x \approx 50$ pm is reached at the injection energy of 20 GeV, resulting in $\lambda_{\min,ee} \approx 650$ pm. With a beam current of 1.5 A or higher, this could represent a formidable light source. Conversely, for FCC-hh the normalized proton beam emittance $\gamma\epsilon_x$ shrinks during proton beam storage at 50 TeV to ~ 0.2 μm [67], corresponding to a geometric emittance of 4 pm, and the associated minimum wavelength is $\lambda_{\min,ee} \approx 50$ pm, still more than an order of magnitude lower than for the FCC-ee. The FCC-hh design beam current is 0.5 A.

The FCC-ee ring emittance could be further reduced by factors of 10–100 through the addition of damping wigglers, pushing the accessible wavelength into the ten picometre regime.

A more detailed study of synchrotron light produced by such low-emittance FCC-ee beams passing through realistic undulator configurations has been performed recently [68]. The use of hadron storage rings as light sources was

discussed in the past, e.g., for the Superconducting Super Collider (SSC) [69].

In addition, also Free Electron Lasers (FELs) based on ERLs designed for high-energy physics colliders can offer outstanding performance in terms of average brightness, and in their wavelength reach down into the few picometre range [70], e.g., in the case of the LHeC-ERL based FEL, with a beam current of ~ 20 mA.

Detection of Gravitational Waves

Various approaches have been suggested for using beams in a storage ring for the detection of gravitational waves [71–74] including the construction of special optics with regions of extremely high beta functions that would serve as “gravitational wave antennae” [74, 75]. Exploration of such possibilities continues.

Storage Rings as Quantum Computers

With advanced cooling and manipulation schemes, storage rings might eventually be used as quantum computers [76, 77]. Indeed, combining the storage rings of charged particles with the linear ion traps used for quantum computing and mass spectrometry would enable a large leap in the number of ions serving as qubits for a quantum computer. Such an approach holds the promise of significant advances in general quantum calculations and, especially, in simulations of complex quantum systems.

Electric Power Generation

Future accelerators could generate significant rates of electric energy, and, thereby, contribute to ongoing efforts to slow down, or reverse, global warming.

One approach is power generation through inertial fusion with ion accelerators [78, 79]. This would be an alternative to nuclear fusion reactors like ITER.

Accelerators can also drive subcritical fission reactors and, thereby, generate energy more safely and in a better controlled way than classical nuclear power plants. Importantly, they can also offer an important solution to nuclear waste treatment.

As an example, the Multi-purpose hybrid Research Reactor for High-tech Applications (MYRRHA) in Belgium is being developed for demonstrating the large scale feasibility of nuclear waste transmutation using an Accelerator Driven System (ADS) [80]. The MYRRHA design is based on a

cw 600 MeV proton linac with a high average beam power of 2.4 MW. A major concern is the reliability and availability of this accelerator. Only 10 beam trips longer than 3 s are allowed per 3-month operation cycle, translating into an overall required Mean Time Between Failure of at least 250 hours [80].

Similarly, in Asia, the China initiative Accelerator Driven System (CiADS) equally aims at building the first ADS experimental facility to demonstrate nuclear waste transmutation. The CiADS driving linac can accelerate 5 mA proton beam to 500 MeV at a beam power of up to 2.5 MW with state-of-the-art accelerator technologies [81].

In Japan, at J-PARC, a Transmutation Experimental Facility (TEF) is being developed. In this facility, a beam of negative hydrogen ions, with a power of 250 kW, will be sent onto a Lead-Bismuth Eutectic target, placed in the ADS Target Test Facility (TEF-T). In addition, a laser charge exchange technique will be employed to deliver a low-intensity beam of 10 W to the Transmutation Physics Experimental Facility (TEF-P) [82].

Above, in the section on unstable or rare particles, we already indicated a novel approach to driving subcritical reactors, namely by using high-energy photons from a Gamma Factory, as proposed for CERN [42]. This Gamma Factory, based on laser collisions with a partially stripped LHC ion beam, would produce high-energy photons with tunable angle-dependent energies, which could be tailored to transform specific radioactive isotopes. Waste isotopes may be suitably arranged as a function of radial distance from the central photon axis. Such a subcritical nuclear reactor driven by photons from the Gamma Factory is predicted to produce an electric power of order 300 MW, while processing the nuclear waste [44].

BEYOND THE EARTH

To reach the Planck scale of 10^{28} eV, linear or circular colliders would need to have a size of order 10^{10} m, which is about a tenth of the distance between the earth and the sun, if operated close to the Schwinger critical field [83, 84].

Following the FCC a possible next or next-next step in this direction could be a circular collider on the moon (CCM) [85]. With a circumference of about 11 Mm, a centre-of-mass energy of about 14 PeV (1000 times the energy of the LHC), based on 6×10^5 dipoles with 20 T field, either ReBCO, requiring ~ 7 – 13 k tons of rare-earth elements, or iron-based superconductor (IBS), requiring of order a million tons of IBS [85]. Many of the raw materials needed to construct machine, injector complex, detectors, and facilities can potentially be sourced directly on the Moon. The 11000-km tunnel should be constructed a few 10 to 100 m under lunar surface to avoid lunar day-night temperature variations, cosmic radiation damage, and meteoroid strikes. A “Dyson band” or “Dyson belt” could be used to continuously collect sun power. Operating this collider would require the equivalent of 0.1% of the sun power incident on Moon surface [85].

SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

Particle colliders boast an impressive 70 year long history, with dramatic improvements in performance, and they will also be the cornerstone for a long and exciting future in high-energy physics. Future colliders should heed the lessons from the previous generations of colliders, like LEP, SLC, KEKB, PEP-II, LHC, and SuperKEKB.

Present collider-accelerator R&D trends include the development of more powerful positron sources; the widespread application of energy recovery; “nanobeam” handling — with stabilisation, positioning, and tuning; the polarization control at the 0.1% level; monochromatization; the use of machine learning and artificial intelligence, e.g. for automated design and for accelerator operation; and the introduction of novel uses, such as for generating electrical power, probing gravity or developing high-throughput quantum computing; plus, last not least, bringing advanced acceleration schemes to maturity.

Considering the desired higher intensity and energy for future machines, a major challenge will be to make the future colliders truly “green”, that is energy-efficient and sustainable. In this context, suppressing synchrotron radiation or mitigating its impact becomes a key objective for the long term. Concerning the near term, it is important to observe that the Future Circular lepton Collider, FCC-ee, is the most sustainable of all the proposed Higgs and electroweak factory proposals, in that it implies the lowest energy consumption for a given value of total integrated luminosity [86, 87], over the collision energy range from 90 to 365 GeV.

For the Future Circular Collider (FCC) effort, the next concrete steps encompass the local/regional implementation scenario to be worked out in collaboration with the CERN host states, machine design optimization, physics studies, and technology R&D, performed via a global collaboration and supported by the EC H2020 FCC Innovation Study, to prove the FCC feasibility by 2025/26.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank R. Abmann, J. Beacham, M. Benedikt, G. Franchetti, K. Oide, V. Shiltsev, and many other colleagues for helpful discussions.

This work was supported, in parts, by funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 101004730 (iFAST).

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Zimmermann, “Accelerator Technology and Beam Physics of Future Colliders,” *Frontiers in Physics*, vol. 10, 2022, doi: 10.3389/fphy.2022.888395
- [2] J. Abelleira Fernandez *et al.*, “A Large Hadron Electron Collider at CERN: Report on the Physics and Design Concepts for Machine and Detector,” *J. Phys. G*, vol. 39, p. 075 001, 2012, doi: 10.1088/0954-3899/39/7/075001
- [3] F. Zimmermann, O. Bruning, and M. Klein, “The LHeC as a Higgs Boson Factory,” 2013, <http://cds.cern.ch/record/1575158>

- [4] O. Brüning, A. Seryi, and S. Verdú-Andrés, “Electron-Hadron Colliders: EIC, LHeC and FCC-eh,” *Front. Phys.*, vol. 10, p. 886473, 2022, doi:10.3389/fphy.2022.886473
- [5] V. N. Litvinenko, T. Roser, and M. Chamizo-Llatas, “High-energy high-luminosity e^+e^- collider using energy-recovery linacs,” *Physics Letters B*, vol. 804, p. 135394, 2020, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2020.135394
- [6] V. I. Telnov, “A high-luminosity superconducting twin e^+e^- linear collider with energy recovery,” *arXiv*, 2021.
- [7] V. N. Litvinenko *et al.*, “The relic: Recycling linear e^+e^- collider,” 2022, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2203.06476
- [8] B. Richter, “Very High-Energy electron-Positron Colliding Beams for the Study of the Weak Interactions,” *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.*, vol. 136, pp. 47–60, 1976, doi:10.1016/0029-554X(76)90396-7
- [9] S. Myers, “FCC: Building on the shoulders of giants,” *Eur. Phys. J. Plus*, vol. 136, no. 10, p. 1076, 2021, doi:10.1140/epjp/s13360-021-02056-w
- [10] K. Oide, “A Final Focus System for Flat Beam Linear Colliders,” *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A*, vol. 276, pp. 427–432, 1989, doi:10.1016/0168-9002(89)90567-6
- [11] M. Aleksa *et al.*, “CLIC Beam Delivery System,” *CERN Report*, vol. CLIC-Note-551, 2003, http://cds.cern.ch/record/602202
- [12] G. Zamudio and R. Tomas, “Optimization of the CLIC 500 GeV Final Focus system and design of a new 3 TeV Final Focus system with $L^*=6.0$ M,” CERN, Tech. Rep., 2010, http://cds.cern.ch/record/1368480
- [13] F. Zimmermann, “Magnet alignment tolerances in the 1994 SLC final focus system,” *SLAC SLC Collider Note*, vol. SLAC-CN-398, 1994.
- [14] H. Padamsee, “ILC Upgrades to 3 TeV,” *arXiv*, vol. 2108.11904, 2021.
- [15] K. Oide, “Synchrotron Radiation Limit on the Focusing of Electron Beams,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 61, pp. 1713–1715, 1988, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.61.1713
- [16] K. Yokoya, “Quantum Correction to Beamstrahlung Due to the Finite Number of Photons,” *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.*, vol. A251, p. 1, 1986, doi:10.1016/0168-9002(86)91144-7
- [17] K. Yokoya and P. Chen, “Beam-beam phenomena in linear colliders,” *Lect. Notes Phys.*, vol. 400, pp. 415–445, 1992, doi:10.1007/3-540-55250-2_37
- [18] M. Sands, “The Physics of Electron Storage Rings: An Introduction,” *Conf. Proc. C*, vol. 6906161, pp. 257–411, 1969.
- [19] P. Chen, “Review of linear collider beam-beam interaction,” *AIP Conf. Proc.*, vol. 184, pp. 633–679, 1989, doi:10.1063/1.38047
- [20] P. Chen, “Differential luminosity under multiphoton beamstrahlung,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 46, pp. 1186–1191, 3 1992, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.46.1186
- [21] R. L. Warnock, “Shielded coherent synchrotron radiation and its effect on very short bunches,” in *4th Advanced ICFA Beam Dynamics Workshop: Collective Effects in Short Bunches*, 1990.
- [22] J. S. Schwinger, “On radiation by electrons in a betatron: Transcription of a paper by J. Schwinger, 1945,” pp. 307–331, 1945, doi:10.2172/1195620
- [23] L. Arzimovitch and I. Pomeranchuk, “The Radiation of Fast Electrons in the Magnetic Field,” *J. Phys. (USSR)*, vol. 9, 1945.
- [24] D. Ratner and G. Stupakov, “Observation of shot noise suppression at optical wavelengths in a relativistic electron beam,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 109, p. 034801, 3 2012, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.034801
- [25] H. Primack and R. Blümel, “Synchrotron radiation of crystallized beams,” *Phys. Rev. E*, vol. 60, pp. 957–967, 1 1999, doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.60.957
- [26] K. Takayama and R. J. Briggs, Eds., *Induction Accelerators*. Springer, 2011, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-13917-8
- [27] L. Bottura, “High Field Magnets,” *Future Collider Forum: 1st Workshop, DESY 6–8 October, 2021*, 2021.
- [28] P. Dhakal, “Nitrogen doping and infusion in SRF cavities: A review,” *Physics Open*, vol. 5, p. 100034, 2020, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physo.2020.100034
- [29] M. Ge *et al.*, “Cvd coated copper substrate srf cavity research at cornell university,” in *Proc. 19th Int. Conf. RF Superconductivity (SRF’19)*, Dresden, Germany, 2019, pp. 381–386, doi:10.18429/JACoW-SRF2019-TUFUB8
- [30] M. Sayeed, H. Elsayed-Ali, G. V. Ereemeev, M. J. Kelley, C. E. Reece, and U. Pudasaini, “Magnetron Sputtering of Nb3Sn for SRF Cavities,” in *Proc. 9th Int. Particle Accelerator Conf. (IPAC’18)*, Vancouver, Canada, 2018, pp. 3946–3949, doi:10.18429/JACoW-IPAC2018-THPAL129
- [31] S. Posen, M. Liepe, G. Ereemeev, U. Pudasaini, and C. E. Reece, “Nb3Sn Superconducting Radiofrequency Cavities: a Maturing Technology for Particle Accelerators and Detectors,” in *2022 Snowmass Summer Study*, 2022.
- [32] H. Padamsee, K. W. Shepard, and R. Sundelin, “Physics and accelerator applications of rf superconductivity,” *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 635–686, 1993, https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ns.43.120193.003223
- [33] E. Adli *et al.*, “A beam driven plasma-wakefield linear collider: From higgs factory to multi-tev,” *arXiv*, vol. 1308.1145, 2013.
- [34] J. B. B. Chen, D. Schulte, and E. Adli, “ e^+e^- Beam-Beam Parameter Study for a TeV-scale PWFA Linear Collider,” *arXiv*, vol. 2009.13672, 2021.
- [35] W. Leemans and E. Esarey, “Laser-driven plasma-wave electron accelerators,” *Phys. Today*, vol. 62N3, pp. 44–49, 2009, doi:10.1063/1.3099645
- [36] C. B. Schroeder, C. Benedetti, E. Esarey, and W. P. Leemans, “Laser-plasma-based linear collider using hollow plasma channels,” *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A*, vol. 829, pp. 113–116, 2016, doi:10.1016/j.nima.2016.03.001
- [37] V. Lebedev, A. Burov, and S. Nagaitsev, “Efficiency versus instability in plasma accelerators,” *Phys. Rev. Accel. Beams*, vol. 20, p. 121301, 12 2017, doi:10.1103/PhysRevAccelBeams.20.121301
- [38] F. Zimmermann, “Possible limits of plasma linear colliders,” *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.*, vol. 874, 012030. 8 p, 2017, doi:10.1088/1742-6596/874/1/012030
- [39] Z. Y. Xu *et al.*, “New injection and acceleration scheme of positrons in the laser-plasma bubble regime,” *Phys. Rev. Accel. Beams*, vol. 23, no. 9, p. 091301, 2020, doi:10.1103/PhysRevAccelBeams.23.091301
- [40] C. S. Hue *et al.*, “Efficiency and beam quality for positron acceleration in loaded plasma wakefields,” *Phys. Rev. Research*, vol. 3, p. 043063, 4 2021, doi:10.1103/PhysRevResearch.3.043063
- [41] V. D. Shiltsev, “High energy particle colliders: past 20 years,

Content from this work may be used under the terms of the CC-BY-4.0 licence (© 2022). Any distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s), title of the work, publisher, and DOI

- next 20 years and beyond,” *Phys. Usp.*, vol. 55, pp. 965–976, 2012, doi:10.3367/UFNe.0182.201210d.1033
- [42] M. W. Krasny, “The Gamma Factory proposal for CERN,” *arXiv*, vol. 1511.07794, 2015.
- [43] A. Apyan, M. W. Krasny, and W. Placzek, *Gamma Factory high-intensity muon and positron source – exploratory studies*, 2022, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2212.06311
- [44] M.W. Krasny, *Gamma Factory driven subcritical reactor*, <https://indico.cern.ch/event/1137276/contributions/4950792/>, 2022.
- [45] M. Antonelli, M. Boscolo, R. Di Nardo, and P. Raimondi, “Novel proposal for a low emittance muon beam using positron beam on target,” *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A*, vol. 807, pp. 101–107, 2016, doi:10.1016/j.nima.2015.10.097
- [46] F. Zimmermann, “LHC/FCC-based muon colliders,” *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, vol. 1067, p. 022017, 2018, doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1067/2/022017
- [47] M. W. Krasny, A. Petrenko, and W. Placzek, “The Gamma Factory path to high-luminosity LHC with isoscalar beams,” *PoS*, vol. ICHEP2020, p. 690, 2021, doi:10.22323/1.390.0690
- [48] M. Benedikt and F. Zimmermann, “Future Circular Collider: Integrated Programme and Feasibility Study,” *Submitted to Frontiers of Physics*, 2022.
- [49] F. Zimmermann, A. Latina, A. Blondel, M. Antonelli, and M. Boscolo, “Muon Collider based on Gamma factory, FCC-ee and Plasma Target,” *Submitted to IPAC’22*, 2022.
- [50] A. Blondel, *Private communication*, 2021.
- [51] The FCC Collaboration, “FCC-ee: The Lepton Collider,” *Eur. Phys. J. Spec. Top.*, vol. 228, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjst/e2019-900045-4>
- [52] K. Takayama *et al.*, “Induction acceleration of heavy ions in the KEK digital accelerator: Demonstration of a fast-cycling induction synchrotron,” *Phys. Rev. ST Accel. Beams*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 010101, 2014, doi:10.1103/PhysRevSTAB.17.010101
- [53] J. Barraza *et al.*, “Upgrades to the DAHRT Second Axis Induction Cells,” *Conf. Proc. C*, vol. 070625, p. 2385, 2007, doi:10.1109/PAC.2007.4441258
- [54] F. Zimmermann, A. Latina, J. Farmer, A. Blondel, M. Antonelli, and M. Boscolo, “Muon Collider Based on Gamma Factory, FCC-ee and Plasma Target,” no. 13, p. 1691, presented at *IPAC’22*, Bangkok, Thailand, Jun. 2022, paper WEPOST009.
- [55] A. Y. Baikov, C. Marrelli, and I. Syratchev, “Toward High-Power Klystrons With RF Power Conversion Efficiency on the Order of 90%,” *IEEE Trans. Electron. Dev.*, vol. 62, no. 10, pp. 3406–3412, 2015, doi:10.1109/TED.2015.2464096
- [56] N. Barov, X. Chang, D. J. Newsham, and D. Wu, “Development of the Energy-Efficient Solid State RF Power Source for the Jefferson Laboratory CEBAF Linac,” *Conf. Proc. C*, vol. 1205201, pp. 3455–3457, 2012.
- [57] M. Seidel, “Towards Efficient Particle Accelerators - A Review,” in *Proc. IPAC’22*, Bangkok, Thailand, 2022, pp. 3141–3146, doi:10.18429/JACoW-IPAC2022-FRPLYGD1
- [58] L. Bottura and F. Zimmermann, *HE-LHC Options*, invited article for a book on the LHC and its potentials edited by O. Brüning, M. Klein, L. Rossi, and P. Spagnolo, 2022.
- [59] J. T. Volk, “Experiences with permanent magnets at the fermilab recycler ring,” *Journal of Instrumentation*, vol. 6, no. 08, T08003–T08003, 2011, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/6/08/t08003
- [60] B. Shepherd, “Permanent Magnets for Accelerators,” *JACoW*, vol. IPAC2020, MOVIRO05, 2020, doi:10.18429/JACoW-IPAC2020-MOVIRO05
- [61] A. Milanese, “Efficient twin aperture magnets for the future circular e^+e^- collider,” *Phys. Rev. Accel. Beams*, vol. 19, p. 112401, 11 2016, doi:10.1103/PhysRevAccelBeams.19.112401
- [62] M. Tigner, “A possible apparatus for electron clashing-beam experiments,” *Nuovo Cim.*, vol. 37, pp. 1228–1231, 1965, doi:10.1007/BF02773204
- [63] U. Amaldi, “A Possible Scheme to Obtain e^-e^- and e^+e^- Collisions at Energies of Hundreds of GeV,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 61, pp. 313–315, 1976, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(76)90157-X
- [64] H. Gerke and K. Steffen, “Note on a 45-GeV - 100-GeV ‘Electron Swing’ Colliding Beam Accelerator,” *DESY Report*, vol. DESY-PET-79-04, 1979.
- [65] V. N. Litvinenko, T. Roser, and M. Chamizo-Llatas, “High-energy high-luminosity e^+e^- collider using energy-recovery linacs,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 804, p. 135394, 2020, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2020.135394
- [66] V. I. Telnov, “A high luminosity superconducting twin e^+e^- linear collider with energy recovery,” in *International Workshop on Future Linear Colliders*, 2021.
- [67] The FCC Collaboration, “FCC-hh: The Hadron Collider,” *Eur. Phys. J. Spec. Top.*, vol. 228, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjst/e2019-900087-0>
- [68] S. Casalbuoni, M. Benedikt, M. Doser, and F. Zimmermann, “First thoughts on the synergetic use of the FCC-ee collider and its injector complex for photon science and other applications,” *CERN/FCC Internal Note*, 2020.
- [69] S. K. Dutt, “Synchrotron radiation from protons,” in *Workshop on 4th Generation Light Sources*, 1992.
- [70] Z. Nergiz, N. S. Mirian, A. Aksoy, D. Zhou, F. Zimmermann, and H. Aksakal, “Bright ångstrom and picometer free electron laser based on the large hadron electron collider energy recovery linac,” *Phys. Rev. Accel. Beams*, vol. 24, p. 100701, 10 2021, doi:10.1103/PhysRevAccelBeams.24.100701
- [71] D. Zer-Zion, “On the detection of gravitational waves through their interaction with particles in storage rings,” 1998.
- [72] J. W. van Holten, “Cyclotron motion in a gravitational wave background,” 1999.
- [73] S. Rao, M. Brüggem, and J. Liske, “Detection of gravitational waves in circular particle accelerators,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 102, p. 122006, 12 2020, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.122006
- [74] A. Berlin *et al.*, “Storage Rings and Gravitational Waves: Summary and Outlook,” in *ARIES WP6 Workshop: Storage Rings and Gravitational Waves*, 2021.
- [75] K. Oide, “Response of a storage-ring beam to a gravitational wave - preliminary considerations,” *presented at ARIES SRGW2021 workshop*, 2021.
- [76] K. A. Brown and T. Roser, “Towards storage rings as quantum computers,” *Phys. Rev. Accel. Beams*, vol. 23, p. 054701, 5 2020, doi:10.1103/PhysRevAccelBeams.23.054701
- [77] T. Shaftan and B. B. Blinov, “Cold ion beam in a storage ring as a platform for large-scale quantum computers and simulators: Challenges and directions for research and development,” *Phys. Rev. Accel. Beams*, vol. 24, p. 094701, 9 2021, doi:10.1103/PhysRevAccelBeams.24.094701
- [78] I. Hofmann, “The Challenge of Inertial Fusion Driven by

- Heavy Ion Accelerators,” in *Proc. LINAC’98*, Chicago, IL, USA, Aug. 1998, <https://jacow.org/198/papers/FR2001.pdf>
- [79] S. A. Slutz *et al.*, “Scaling magnetized liner inertial fusion on z and future pulsed-power accelerators,” *Physics of Plasmas*, vol. 23, no. 2, p. 022 702, 2016, doi:10.1063/1.4941100
- [80] H. Podlech *et al.*, “The MYRRHA Project,” in *Proc. NAPAC’19*, Lansing, MI, USA, Sep. 2019, pp. 945–950, doi:10.18429/JACoW-NAPAC2019-THZBA2
- [81] Z. J. Wang *et al.*, “The Status of CiADS Superconducting LINAC,” in *Proc. IPAC’19*, Melbourne, Australia, May 2019, pp. 994–997, doi:10.18429/JACoW-IPAC2019-MOPTS059
- [82] S.-i. Meigo, H. Iwamoto, H. Matsuda, and H. Takei, “Target test facility for ads and cross-section experiment in j-parc,” *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, vol. 1021, no. 1, p. 012 072, 2018, doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1021/1/012072
- [83] P. Chen and R. J. Noble, “Crystal channel collider: Ultrahigh-energy and luminosity in the next century,” *AIP Conf. Proc.*, vol. 398, no. 1, pp. 273–285, 1997, doi:10.1063/1.53055
- [84] F. Zimmermann, “Future colliders for particle physics—big and small,” *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment*, vol. 909, pp. 33–37, 2018, 3rd European Advanced Accelerator Concepts workshop (EAAC2017), doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2018.01.034>
- [85] J. Beacham and F. Zimmermann, “A very high energy hadron collider on the moon,” *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 24, no. 2, p. 023 029, 2022, doi:10.1088/1367-2630/ac4921
- [86] M. Benedikt, A. Blondel, P. Janot, *et al.*, “Future Circular Colliders succeeding the LHC,” *Nature Physics*, vol. 16, p. 402, 2020, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41567-020-0856-2>
- [87] P. Janot, A. Blondel, “The carbon footprint of proposed e⁺e⁻-Higgs factories,” *Eur. Phys. J. Plus*, vol. 137, p. 1122, 2022, doi:10.1140/epjp/s13360-022-03319-w

Content from this work may be used under the terms of the CC-BY-4.0 licence (© 2022). Any distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s), title of the work, publisher, and DOI