

Berliner Elektronenspeicherring-Gesellschaft für Synchrotronstrahlung m.b.H.

Experiences with Start to End Simulations and Tolerance Studies for HGHG FEL Cascades Bettina Kuske, Michael Abo-Bakr, Atoosa Meseck ICFA-FLS-Workshop, Hamburg, May 16th, 2006





Outline of the talk

3 simulation examples:

- Bunches of S2E simulations
- Tolerance studies (errors in gun/linac)
 - Timing jitter (resulting from above)

Discussion:

- Performance reduction
 - Counter measures
- Influence on the layout of HGHG FEL cascades



Computational Effort

S2E simulations:

Gun Simulation: Astra

Linac Simulation: Elegant

FEL Simulation: Genesis

25000-100000 particles 3-10 hours of CPU (no. particles/length)

1-2*10⁵ particles 2-6 hours of CPU (no. particles/CSR)

few 10² particles/wavelength cascading: harmonics used*10² particles 3-4 min / 1000 slices / U-period many (!) hours of CPU

=> Full passage easily takes days

=> Tolerance studies multiply the effort by the number of runs studied





Modulator:

energy modulation of electrons resonant to seed wavelength short undulator (0.5-3m)

Dispersion: boost harmonic bunching 4 equal dipoles

Radiator:

harmonic radiation tuned to harmonics of seed length 3-20m (enough seed power / no e-spread in fresh bunch)



1. Example: Bunches from S2E simulations <=> constant bunch parameters





Parameter Profiles in s2e bunches and how to cope with them (BESSY Linac)



Energy Chirp:

- needed for bunch compression
- different γ in each HGHG stage ($\Delta \gamma = 0.2\%$)
- violation of resonance condition
- => use variable gap undulator (< 1% in K)

Current:

- profile created by cathode laser
- determines seeding power for next stage
- => dispersion tuning to adjust bunching

Emittance / Beam Size:

- depend on space charge effects in gun
- mismatch reduces coupling
- quadrupole doublets after each stage
- adjustment of the bunch part used in the next stage

Energy Spread:

- changes modulation depth
- dispersion tuning to adjust bunching



⇒S2E simulations necessary in HGHG cascades to predict local bunch parameters

 \Rightarrow big effect on the radiator output power

⇒tunable hardware necessary to adjust to varying bunch properties



2. Example: Tolerance Studies

BESSY LE-FEL:

- only first stage
- 1.0 GeV, 2 KA
- 24 s2e bunches
- gun and linac errors

Layout for s2e bunch, no errors:

- 18 period modulator
- 8% bunching @ 258 nm
- ~30% bunching @ 51.5 nm
- spectral power max/min = 10

Modified Layout:

- 28 period modulator
- 15% bunching @ 258 nm
- 30% bunching @ 51.5 nm
- spectral power max/min = 3





=> Tolerance studies directly influence hardware layout

=> Longer devices to make up for reduced coupling of imperfect bunches to radiation



3. Example: Timing jitter – 75 fs rms in BESSY FEL

Seeding radiation will interact with different bunch parts

Energy chirp:

earlier arrival ⇔ higher average energy ⇔ lower resonant wavelength

late arrival ⇔ lower average energy ⇔ higher resonant wavelength





Seeding power, output power and central wavelength of the final amplifier as a function of the arrival time

Final amplifier Bessy LE-FEL

- S2E bunch (no errors)
- ontime seed
- simulate different arrival time
- => asymetric behaviour

For earlier arrivals:

- seeding power decreases
- output power grows
- shorter central wavelength



Development of average slice parameters in the final amplifier

- identical slice position, +140 fs and 140 fs
- different electron properties
- seeding radiation emitted by bunch part ahead



late arrival ⇔ lower than resonant energy ⇔ energy absorbtion ⇔ lower output power

early arrival ⇔ higher than resonant energy ⇔ energy emission ⇔ higher output power



- \Rightarrow Power variation due to timing jitter can be reduced
- \Rightarrow FA: higher than nominal energy profitable
- \Rightarrow equivilant to reducing the K-value





