

HEAVY-ION SUPERCONDUCTING LINACS*

J. R. Delaven

Argonne National Laboratory
9700 S. Cass Avenue, EP/207
Argonne, IL 60439

Abstract

This paper reviews the status of the superconducting heavy-ion accelerators. Most of them are linacs used as boosters for tandem electrostatic accelerators, although the technology is being extended to very low velocity to eliminate the need for an injector. The characteristics and features of the various superconducting heavy-ion accelerators are discussed.

Introduction

This paper reviews the status of rf superconductivity as applied to heavy-ion accelerators. While a major amount of effort in rf superconductivity is directed towards high-energy accelerators, the issues associated with heavy-ion accelerators are quite different, and the options and choices available to the accelerator designer are more numerous and varied. Until recently, the rf superconducting technology for heavy-ion accelerators could be considered as being more mature than its counterpart for high-energy accelerators, since a larger number of machines have been operational for a longer time.

The main differences between the two applications come from the fact that heavy-ion accelerators must accelerate efficiently particles which travel at a velocity much smaller than that of light particles, whose velocity changes along accelerator, and also different particles which have different velocity profiles.

Heavy-ion superconducting accelerators operate at frequencies which are lower than high-energy superconducting accelerators. Since the rf losses associated with the superconducting state increase roughly quadratically with frequency, the rf superconducting technology did not need to be pushed as far to find useful applications for heavy-ion accelerators.

A thorough review of the history of superconducting linear accelerators and of the technical issues associated with them can be found in Ref. 1. A review of the start of the art of rf superconductivity in general, including high-energy accelerators, can be found in Ref. 2.

Basic Features of Superconducting Booster Linacs

Until very recently, all heavy-ion linacs were used as boosters for electrostatic accelerators. Since the electrostatic accelerators were, in most instances, part of existing facilities, the boosters had to be designed to fit in these facilities which explains the sometimes convoluted and less than optimal layout of the resulting tandem-linac systems.

While other accelerating systems exist which can produce high ion beam energies, such as cyclotrons, superconducting linacs offer a range of characteristics which make them attractive for nuclear physics research.

The first characteristic is the ability to preserve the excellent beam quality provided by the tandem accelerator. This is not a trivial matter, since the tandems produce dc beams while the booster requires bunched beams extending no more than a few degrees of rf phase. The currents produced by the tandems are also usually quite low and reduced even more by subsequent stripping, so the bunching process must be done efficiently. The bunching is usually done in two stages: a low frequency normal conducting buncher operating at several harmonics and located at the entrance of the tandem, and a higher frequency often superconducting buncher at the entrance of the linac. A chopper is also usually located between the tandem and the linac. Such bunching systems can compress more than 60 percent of the beam into bunches about 100 ps wide. The beam quality is preserved along the linac by operating it in the longitudinal focusing mode. A rebuncher/debuncher is located at the output of the linac, giving the capability of producing small time spread or small energy spread at the target.

Another important characteristic of superconducting heavy-ion linacs is the use of short, independently-phased accelerating structures. This modularity results in an increased complexity but offers many advantages:

- The velocity profile along the linac can be tailored at will to accommodate a wide range charge to mass ratio
- The capability of the linac is not limited by its "weakest link." A number of resonators can be turned off and still leave the accelerator fully operational although at a smaller output energy or mass range
- A facility can be put to use as soon as a few resonators are installed, well before final completion
- An accelerator can be easily upgraded or retrofitted. For example, its output energy can be increased by adding higher β resonators at the output, or its mass range can be extended toward heavier masses by adding lower β resonators at its input
- The output energy can be easily and rapidly changed by varying the phase of the last few resonators

*This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract W-31-109-ENG-38.

- Short structures are easier to manufacture than longer ones

Reliability and durability were major concerns in the early days of superconducting boosters. These concerns have now been put to rest. Superconducting structures, both Nb and Pb, have shown good sustained performance in typical accelerator environments, and superconducting boosters have operated reliably and have accumulated more than 50,000 hours of beam on target under minimal supervision.

Design Choices

Even a rapid survey of the field of superconducting heavy-ion linacs will reveal a wide range in the conceptual designs. This results from a variety of options for the basic design parameters. The choices are being made based upon science, technology, economics, convenience, and maybe even preconceived ideas. Some of these design choices, their consequences, and interrelations will be discussed now.

Structures

A large number of structures has been developed for superconducting linacs: Helix [3,4], Reentrant [5], Spiral [6], Split-ring [7,8], Quarter-wave [9-11], Interdigital [12,13], and Half-wave [14,15]. All but the first two use quarter-wavelength resonant lines terminated by drift tubes through which the particles travel. A resonator can contain a single resonant line (spiral, quarter-wave, interdigital) or two (split-ring, half-wave) and the lines can be straight (quarter-wave, interdigital, half-wave) or bent (spiral, split-ring).

Resonators using straight inductors have the advantage of greater mechanical stability and lower peak surface magnetic field at the expense of a larger transverse dimension. Resonators using a single drift tube have a wider velocity acceptance while resonators using multiple drift tubes provide a higher energy gain over a small velocity range (at constant frequency and β).

At extremely low β , where longitudinal dimensions are so small that several inductors cannot fit inside the structure, the resonant line can be terminated in a multiple drift tube to form an interdigital quarter-wave resonator.

Materials

From the beginning, the two materials of choice have been niobium and lead. The fundamental superconducting properties of Nb are superior to those of Pb; its transition temperature and critical field are higher, its surface resistance is lower. This translates into a lower power dissipation to achieve a given accelerating field thus reducing operating costs; Nb resonators, on the other hand, are more expensive to manufacture.

Both Pb and Nb resonators still operate below the theoretical limits and their performance is rarely limited by fundamental superconducting properties.

Pb resonators are obtained by electrodeposition of a few microns of Pb onto a high-thermal conductivity Cu structure [16,17]. The Cu base acts as a stabilization element against magnetic-thermal breakdown by carrying away the heat generated at local "hot" spots. Improved thermal stability of Nb resonators has been achieved by the use of high thermal conductivity Nb and explosive bonding of Nb onto Cu [18]. Attempts are being made at sputtering thin layers of Nb on Cu [19]; however, because of the complicated geometry of low-velocity structures, success has not yet been achieved.

Frequency

The accelerating structures used in superconducting heavy-ion linacs have lower resonant frequencies than those used in high-energy superconducting accelerators, typically between 50 and 200 MHz.

The advantages of lower frequencies are:

- The beam bunches occupy a smaller rf phase angle
- Fewer resonators are required to provide the same energy gain
- In principle, power dissipation in the cavities is smaller

The advantages of higher frequencies are:

- The resonators and cryostats are smaller
- Higher frequency resonators are easier to phase stabilize

Nb structures often have resonant frequencies which are lower than those of Pb structures. There is no fundamental reason why it should be so, but it is mainly due to historical reasons.

Phase Control

Phase control which once was thought to be a major drawback of heavy-ion superconducting accelerators is not an issue anymore with today's cavity designs, frequencies, and achievable gradients. On the other hand, if a way was found to dramatically increase the achievable gradients, then phase control could become an issue again, especially for the lower frequency structures.

Phase stabilization is usually accomplished in one of two ways. One way is by using an external voltage-controlled reactance which can be either electrically coupled or decoupled to the resonators [20]. By adjusting the duty cycle between the two states, the average phase of the rf field in the resonator can be backed to an external reference. This method is used in large, less stable structures. The other method of phase stabilization is by negative phase feedback where no attempt is being made at controlling the resonator frequency [21]. Instead, the resonator is operated in a self-excited loop, its loaded bandwidth is artificially broadened by overcoupling and the loop oscillation frequency is controlled. This method is simpler, in principle, than the previous one but limited to the smaller, more stable structures.

Focusing

Focusing in superconducting linacs is usually achieved either by room temperature quadrupoles located between the cryostats or by superconducting solenoids located inside the cryostats. The first solution results in a larger number of simpler cryostats while the second results in a smaller number of more complicated cryostats.

Status of Superconducting Booster Projects

Argonne National Laboratory [2,3,42]

The ANL superconducting linac was the first and is still the largest of the existing machines. First beam was delivered in 1978, the booster was dedicated in 1982 and ATLAS in 1985. The whole machine uses Nb split-ring resonators: 11 of $\beta=0.06$ at 97 MHz, 22 of $\beta=0.1$ at 97 MHz and 9 of $\beta=0.16$ at 145 MHz. Focusing is accomplished by superconducting solenoids located inside the cryostats after every pair of resonators. Phase stabilization is accomplished by voltage-controlled reactances. A positive ion injector consisting of an ECR source and a very low velocity linac is under construction as a replacement for the tandem.

SUNY Stony Brook [24,25]

The Stony Brook machine, which was dedicated in 1983 also uses split-ring resonators but made of Pb on Cu. It consists of 16, $\beta=0.55$, resonators in four cryostats and 24, $\beta=0.10$, resonators in eight cryostats. Focusing is done by room temperature quadrupoles located between the cryostats. Phase stabilization is accomplished by negative phase feedback.

The performance of this machine has been limited by two factors. The full refrigeration capability of the refrigerator was not delivered to the cryostats, but a fraction of it was lost in the distribution system. Most of the sources of additional loss have now been identified. The low β resonators could not be operated at design field because of excessive mechanical vibrations; these resonators are being replaced by quarter-wave resonators.

Weizmann Institute [26]

The Weizmann Institute booster project saw the first use of the quarter-wave resonators. It was a small machine consisting of a single cryostat of four Pb/Cu resonators ($\beta=0.95$, 160 MHz). There are no plans for extension.

University of Washington [27,28]

This machine, operational since September 1987, was the first to make large scale use of Pb/Cu quarter-wave resonators: 24 of $\beta=0.1$ in six cryostats and 12 of $\beta=0.2$ in six cryostats, all operating at 150 MHz. It is designed to produce $\beta=0.3$ protons, which is, at present, the highest velocity beam produced by a superconducting booster.

Florida State [29,30]

Dedicated in 1987, this machine uses ANL resonators (13 Nb split-ring cavities). The cryostats have been redesigned so the resonators are positioned upside down compared to their position in the ANL cryostats.

Saclay [31,32]

The Saclay booster is the first and only machine to use helices. All resonators have $\beta=0.085$, with 16 resonating at 81 MHz and 34 at 135 MHz. Half of the accelerator has been operational since December 1987, and the whole machine became operational in March 1989.

Phase stabilization is accomplished by multistep VCX located outside the cryostats. The cavities are immersed in liquid helium, and the helium is forced through the helix tubing. This machine is the only example of low-velocity structures immersed in liquid.

Kansas State [33]

The unique feature of this facility is that it is designed to be used as a decelerator. Ions are stripped to a high charge state either at the output of the tandem or after the first few resonators and then decelerated by the rest of the linac. It uses Argonne's Nb split-ring resonators (5 of $\beta=0.06$ and 5 of $\beta=0.1$).

Daresbury [34]

This machine started as an Oxford booster made from 10 Pb/Cu split-ring resonators, $\beta=0.10$, 150 MHz. The hardware was transferred from Oxford to Daresbury in 1988 and is under installation. The possibility of adding other resonators to increase the capability of the facility is under study.

Japanese Atomic Energy Research Institute [35]

This machine, which is in the early construction stage, will make the first use of the Nb quarter-wave resonators. Tests of prototypes have produced fields of 6 MV/m at a power dissipation of 4 W.

Present funding calls for four cryostats of four resonators each; future plans call for six additional cryostats.

Legnaro [36]

A large project with the goal of adding 36 MV equivalent to a 16-MV tandem. It will make use of 93 Pb/Cu quarter-wave resonators:

24 cavities of $\beta=0.55$ at 80 MHz
48 cavities of $\beta=0.09$ at 160 MHz
21 cavities of $\beta=0.15$ at 160 MHz

Bombay [37]

Still in the planning stage, this project calls for 11 cryostats of four 150-MHz Pb/Cu quarter-wave resonators injected from a 14 UD pelletron.

First phase calls for 14 Nb split-ring resonators of Argonne's design located in two cryostats, plus a buncher and a rebuncher.

ANU, Canberra [39]

This project originally called for 40 Pb/Cu quarter-wave resonators. All efforts, recently, have been directed toward sputtering of Nb onto Cu quarter-wave structures.

Munich [40,41]

This machine is unlike every one previously mentioned, since it is not a linac but a separated orbit cyclotron which includes six cavities operating at 170 MHz. The cavities are made of Cu and plated with a Pb-Sn alloy.

Recent Developments and Future Prospects

Following the pioneering successes of the Argonne and Stony Brook accelerators, the last few years have seen a large increase in the number of superconducting boosters which have come into operation or which are under construction. The technology, however, has not remained static, and advances are still being made.

Some of the limitations of existing tandem-linac systems, most notably the available ion mass range and beam currents, are due not to the superconducting booster but to the electrostatic injector. The major advances which have taken place recently have been in the area of replacement of existing negative-ion source--tandem combinations by ECR ion source--superconducting injector linac combinations. An ECR source located on a high voltage platform can produce ions with high charge states and sufficient velocity to be injected directly into a superconducting linac. This approach, which has been recently demonstrated at Argonne [42], has required the development of a new class of low-frequency (~50 MHz), low-velocity (~0.1 c) superconducting structures [12, 13, 43]. Another approach, which is being investigated at Stony Brook and still is in the early RF development stage, is an ECR source-superconducting RFQ combination [44].

A completely different application of superconducting heavy-ion linacs, which is also under investigation, is for the acceleration of high-current ion beams [45]. The issues which will have to be addressed are quite different from those related to boosters. For example, in the case of high-current beams, the ability to produce high, CW accelerating fields is more important than power efficiency. If such high-current superconducting ion accelerators come into existence, they will be quite different in their design philosophy from the superconducting boosters which are now in existence.

The superconducting rf technology for ion accelerators is now established, widespread, and well proven. At the same time that the number of construction projects is increasing, advances are being made into new areas of application of the technology.

References

1. L.M. Bollinger, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci., vol. 36, pp. 475-503 (1986).
2. ANL-PHY-88-1, Proceedings of the Third Workshop on rf Superconductivity, Argonne Natl. Lab., September 14-18, 1987, K.W. Shepard, ed.
3. A. Brandelik, A. Citron, P. Flecher, J.L. Fricke, R. Hietschold, G. Hochschild, G. Hornung, H. Klein, G. Krafft, W. Khün, M. Kuntze, B. Piosczyk, E. Sauter, A. Schempp, D. Schulze, L. Szecsi, J.E. Vetter, K.W. Zieher, Part. Accel., vol. 4, p. 111 (1972).
4. K.W. Zieher, A. Hornung, IEEE Trans. on Nucl. Sci., vol. NS-18, p. 3312 (1981).
5. P.H. Ceperley, I. Ben-Zvi, H.F. Glavish, S.S. Hanna, IEEE Trans. on Nucl. Sci., vol. NS-22, p. 1153 (1975).
6. G.J. Dick, K.W. Shepard, Appl. Phys. Lett., vol. 24, p. 40 (1974).
7. K.W. Shepard, G.P. Zinkann, IEEE Trans. on Nucl. Sci., vol. NS-30, p. 3339 (1983).
8. J.R. Delaysen, G.J. Dick, J.E. Mercereau, IEEE Trans. of Mag., vol. MAG-17, p. 939 (1981).
9. I. Ben-Zvi, J.M. Brennan, Nucl. Instrum. & Meth., vol. 212, p. 73 (1983).
10. D.W. Storm, J.M. Brennan, I. Ben-Zvi, IEEE Trans. on Nucl. Sci., vol. NS-32, p. 3607 (1985).
11. K.W. Shepard, S. Takeuchi, G.P. Zinkann, IEEE Trans. on Mag. vol. MAG-21, p. 146 (1985).
12. K.W. Shepard, Rev. Sci. Instrum., vol. 57, p. 770 (1986).
13. K.W. Shepard, Proc. of the 1987 Particle Accelerator Conference, IEEE 87CH2387-9, p. 1812.
14. J.R. Delaysen, J.E. Mercereau, IEEE Trans. on Nucl. Sci., vol. NS-32, p. 3590 (1985).
15. J.R. Delaysen, J.E. Mercereau, Nucl. Instrum. & Meth. in Phys. Res., vol. A257, p. 71 (1987).
16. G.J. Dick, J.R. Delaysen, H.C. Yen, IEEE Trans. on Nucl. Sci., vol. NS-24, p. 1130 (1977).
17. G.J. Dick, J.R. Delaysen, IEEE Trans. on Mag., vol. MAG-19, p. 1315 (1983).
18. K.W. Shepard, C.H. Scheibelhut, R. Benaroya, L.M. Bollinger, IEEE Trans. on Nucl. Sci., vol. NS-24, p. 1147 (1977).
19. M. Malev, D. Weissner, this conference, paper H5.
20. G.J. Dick, K.W. Shepard, Proc. 1972 Applied Superconductivity Conference, IEEE Ph. No. 72, CHO 682-S-TABSC, p. 649.
21. J.R. Delaysen, G.J. Dick, J.E. Mercereau, IEEE Trans. on Nucl. Sci., vol. NS-24, p. 1759 (1977).
22. J. Aron, R. Benaroya, J. Bogaty, L.M. Bollinger, B.E. Clifft, P. Den Hartog, K.W. Johnson, W. Kutschera, P. Markovich, J.M. Nixon, R.C. Pardo, K.W. Shepard, G. Zinkann, Rev. Sci. Instrum., vol. 57, p. 737 (1986).
23. P. Markovich, K.W. Shepard, G.P. Zinkann, ref. 2, p. 435.
24. J.W. Noe, Rev. Sci. Instrum., vol. 57, p. 757 (1986).
25. J. Sikora, I. Ben-Zvi, J.M. Brennan, M. Cole, J.W. Noe, ref. 2, p. 419.
26. I. Ben-Zvi, B.V. Elkonin, J.S. Sokolowski, I. Tserruya, Nucl. Instrum. and Meth. in Phys. Des., vol. A244, p. 306 (1986).

27. J.F. Amsbaugh, R.C. Connolly, D.T. Corcoran, J.G. Cramer, M.A. Howe, D.W. Storm, H.E. Swanson, T.A. Trainor, R. Vandenbosh, L.P. Van Houten, W.G. Weitkamp, D. Will, Rev. Sci. Instrum., vol. 57, p. 761 (1986).
28. D.W. Storm, D.T. Corcoran, M.A. Howe, Q.X. Lin, D.P. Rosenzweig, ref. 2, p. 367.
29. J.D. Fox, L. Wright, Rev. Sci. Instrum., vol. 57, p. 763 (1986).
30. E.G. Meyers, J.D. Fox, A.D. Frawley, P. Allen, J. Faragasso, D. Smith, L. Wright, ref. 2, p. 405.
31. B. Cauvin, M. Eret, J.P. Fouan, J. Girard, J.L. Girma, Ph. Leconte, Y. Lussignol, R. Moreau, J.P. Passerieux, G. Ramstein, L. Wartski, ref. 2, p. 379.
32. G. Ramstein, B. Cauvin, J.P. Fouan, J. Girard, this conference, paper H55.
33. T. Gray, Rev. Sci. Instrum., vol. 57, p. 783 (1986).
34. T.W. Aiken, G. Doucas, ref. 2, p. 413; and private communication.
35. S. Takeuchi, ref. 2, p. 429; and private communication.
36. G. Fortuna, R. Pengo, G. Bassato, A. Facco, P. Favaron, V. Palmieri, A.M. Porcellato, M. Rosa, B. Tiveron, ref. 2, p. 399; and private communication.
37. B. Kurup, private communication.
38. O. Sala, private communication.
39. D. Weisser, M. Malev, ref. 2, p. 425; and private communication.
40. U. Trinks, ref. 2, p. 389.
41. U. Trinks, W. Assmann, G. Hinderer, Nucl. Instrum. and Meth. in Phys. Res., vol. A244, p. 273 (1986).
42. L.M. Bollinger, P.K. Den Hartog, R.C. Pardo, K.W. Shepard, R. Benaroya, R.J. Billquist, B.E. Clifft, P. Markovich, F.H. Munson, J.M. Nixon, G.P. Zinkann, this conference, paper N8.
43. K.W. Shepard, P.M. Markovich, G.P. Zinkann, B. Clifft, R. Benaroya, this conference, paper M15.
44. I. Ben-Zvi, private communication.
45. J.R. Delayen, Application of rf Superconductors to Linacs for High-Brightness Proton Beams, to appear in Nucl. Instrum. and Meth. in Phys. Res. (April 1989).