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Continuing the Miracle of Creation

• Basic theme of high-energy physics:
  Understand nature via creation of new particles.
  ⇒ Pursue the energy frontier.

• But it takes big machines to reach high energies.
  Can/will our society bear the costs?

• Hadron collider (LHC, SSC): ≈ $100k/m [superconducting magnets].

• $e^+e^-$ collider (SLAC, NLC(?)): ≈ $200k/m [rf].
  Are there other options?

• Muon collider:
  Well-defined leptonic initial state.
  $m_\mu/m_e \approx 200$ ⇒ Little beam radiation.
    ⇒ Can use storage rings.
    ⇒ Smaller footprint.

Technology: closer to hadron colliders.
Ingredients of a Muon Collider?

An accelerator complex in which

- Muons (both $\mu^+$ and $\mu^-$) are collected from pion decay following a $pN$ interaction.
- The muon phase volume is reduced by ionization cooling.
- The cooled muons are accelerated and then stored in a ring.
- $\mu^+\mu^-$ collisions are observed over the useful muon life of $\approx 1000$ turns at any energy.

Muons decay: $\mu \rightarrow e\nu$  \Rightarrow

- Must cool muons quickly (stochastic cooling won’t do).
- Detector backgrounds at LHC level.
- Personnel background from $\nu$ interactions.
Muon collider:

- Significant base cost (≈ $1B) at any energy, plus ‘modest’ cost (≈ $100k/m) for storage rings.
- Up to 4 TeV on existing sites at cost below LHC.
- Technology path to ≈ 100 TeV before limited by radiation losses.
Physics Opportunities

- Full CoM energy available for particle production.

- Beam energy spread: $10^{-5}$ at 100 GeV, $10^{-3}$ at 3 TeV.

- “Natural” beam polarization $\approx 20\%$ from $\pi$-decay at 200 MeV/c.
Precision Beam Energy Measurement

Via decay asymmetry of polarized muons.

[Raja and Tollestrup, FERMILAB-Pub-97/402]

⇒ Can measure width (2 MeV) of light Higgs.
Physics Backgrounds

1. Electrons (+ photons) from $\mu$ decay:

O.K., if use pixel vertex detector.

### Radial Fluences at 2x2 TeV

particles/cm$^2$/crossing for two bunches of $10^{12} \mu$'s each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>radius (cm)</th>
<th>photons</th>
<th>neutrons</th>
<th>protons</th>
<th>pions</th>
<th>electrons</th>
<th>muons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threshold</td>
<td>25 keV</td>
<td>40 keV</td>
<td>10 MeV</td>
<td>10 MeV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. ‘Bethe-Heitler’ muons \([\mu \rightarrow e \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-]\):

Affects calorimeter performance at CoM energies above 1 TeV.

[Iuliu Stumer]
Dose from Neutrino Interactions

Much worse at straight sections: e.g. even 0.1 m str. section is ~ twice disk ave.

Hazard is charged particles from $\nu$ interactions in surroundings...

Predicted dose downstream from straight section:

$$\frac{\text{Radiation Dose}}{\text{U.S. Fed. Limit}} \approx 0.4 \times \left( \frac{\text{length of str. section}}{\text{collider depth}} \right) \times \left( \frac{\text{muon current}}{10^{20} \text{ $\mu^{-}$/year}} \right) \times \left( \frac{E_{\text{coM}}}{1 \text{ TeV}} \right)^3$$

(spherical Earth & non-tilted ring)
Neutrino Problem ‘Stabilizes’ above 10 Tev

- Neutrino cross section levels off at high energy:
  \[ \frac{\sigma(E_\nu = 100 \text{ TeV})}{\sigma(E_\nu = 1 \text{ TeV})} = 33, \]  
  (rather than 100).

- Previous formula overestimates dose once \( \nu \) spot is smaller than 1 m.

- Better cooling schemes will permit low emittance for smaller muon beam current.

- \( \Rightarrow \) May never need ring deeper than 500 m.
Neutrino Physics at a Muon Collider

- **HUGE** statistics: 50 g/cm² target $\Rightarrow$ 3 x 10⁹ events/year
- outstanding reconstruction of CC & NC event kinematics
- full particle ID $\Rightarrow$ ID of struck quark
# Muon Collider Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoM energy</td>
<td>3 TeV</td>
<td>0.4 TeV</td>
<td>0.1 TeV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p energy</td>
<td>16 GeV</td>
<td>16 GeV</td>
<td>16 GeV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p's/bunch</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{13}$</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{13}$</td>
<td>$5 \times 10^{13}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunches/fill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. rate</td>
<td>15 Hz</td>
<td>15 Hz</td>
<td>15 Hz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p power</td>
<td>4 MW</td>
<td>4 MW</td>
<td>4 MW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ/bunch</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{12}$</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{12}$</td>
<td>$4 \times 10^{12}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ power</td>
<td>28 MW</td>
<td>4 MW</td>
<td>1 MW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall power</td>
<td>204 MW</td>
<td>120 MW</td>
<td>81 MW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collider circumf.</td>
<td>6000 m</td>
<td>1000 m</td>
<td>300 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>500 m</td>
<td>100 m</td>
<td>10 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{\Delta p}{p}$ (rms)</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.003%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D $\epsilon_6$ (πmm)$^3$</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_n$ (rms)</td>
<td>50 π mm mrad</td>
<td>50 π mm mrad</td>
<td>85 π mm mrad</td>
<td>195 π mm mrad</td>
<td>280 π mm mrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta^*$</td>
<td>0.3 cm</td>
<td>2.3 cm</td>
<td>4 cm</td>
<td>9 cm</td>
<td>13 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_z$</td>
<td>0.3 cm</td>
<td>2.3 cm</td>
<td>4 cm</td>
<td>9 cm</td>
<td>13 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_r$</td>
<td>3.2 μm</td>
<td>24 μm</td>
<td>82 μm</td>
<td>187 μm</td>
<td>270 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tune shift</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luminosity</td>
<td>$5 \times 10^{34}$</td>
<td>$10^{33}$</td>
<td>$1.2 \times 10^{32}$</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{31}$</td>
<td>$10^{31}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoM $\frac{\Delta E}{E}$</td>
<td>$8 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>$8 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>$8 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>$7 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgs/year</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Challenges

• 16-GeV proton driver, 15 Hz, 4-MW beam power, 1-ns bunch length.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Linac</th>
<th>Pre-Booster</th>
<th>Booster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final energy</td>
<td>GeV</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protons/bunch</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5 \times 10^{13}$</td>
<td>$5 \times 10^{13}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of bunches</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. rate</td>
<td>Hz</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumference</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>180.6</td>
<td>474.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm. 95% emit. $\pi$ mm mrad</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp.-ch. tune shift</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final field</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Targetry and Capture

• Muon Cooling

[Storage rings have beautiful, highly corrected solutions due to heroic work of Al Garren, Carol Johnstone and Dan Trbojević.]
Overview of Targetry for a Muon Collider

• Get muons from pion decay: \( \pi^\pm \rightarrow \mu^\pm \nu. \)

• Pions from proton-nucleus interactions in a target.

• Goal: \( 1.2 \times 10^{14} \mu^\pm/s. \)

\( \Rightarrow \) High-\( Z \) target,

High-energy proton beam,

High magnetic field around target to capture soft pions.

\( \mu/p = 0.08 \) at 16 GeV \( \Rightarrow 1.5 \times 10^{15} p/s. \)

• 15-Hz proton source.

• 4 MW power in \( p \) beam.

• Compare: 0.1 MW in 900-GeV extracted \( p \) beam at FNAL;
  0.25 MW in 30-GeV extracted beam at BNL AGS.
Liquid metal target: Ga, Hg, or solder (Bi/In/Pb/Sn alloy)

20-T capture solenoid followed by 5-T phase-rotation channel.

20 T = 8-T, 8-MW water-cooled Cu magnet + 12-T superconducting magnet.

Cost of 12-T magnet ≈ 0.8 M$ (B[T] R[m])^{1.32}(L[m])^{0.66}$ ≈ $6M.
• Capture pions with $P_\perp < 220$ MeV/c.

• Adiabatic invariant: $\Phi = \pi r^2 B$ as $B$ drops from 20 to 5 T.

• $r = P_\perp/eB =$ radius of helix.

• $\Rightarrow P_{\perp,f} = P_{\perp,i} \sqrt{B_f/B_i} = 0.5$ (and $P_{\parallel,f} > P_{\parallel,i}$).

• Tilt target by $\approx 0.1$ rad to minimize absorption of spiralling pions (factor of 2 effect).

• Target should be short and narrow,
  $\Rightarrow$ high density; no cooling jacket.

• High power of beam + radiation damage would crack stationary target.
  - 10% of beam energy deposited in target $\Rightarrow 30$ kJ/pulse.
  - $M_{\text{target}} = \pi r^2 l \rho \approx 10$ kg $\Rightarrow \approx 0.1$ eV/atom/pulse.
  - 10% of TNT $\Rightarrow$ Shock damage.
  - 1% of atoms ionized each pulse $\Rightarrow$ embrittlement....

• $\Rightarrow$ Pulsed heavy-metal liquid jet as target.
Target Optimization via MARS Code

Yield vs. Beam Energy

Yield vs. Magnetic Field

Yield vs. Target Radius

Yield vs. Target Angle

High Radiation Dose Around Target

Isodose contours show radiation dose in rad/h for 1.5 x 10^{15} protons/s on target (from A.H. Sullivan) based on measurements in AA and ACOL target areas.

Neglecting the water cooling spaces in the heavy metal absorber, the mean power deposited in the region of the solenoids is shown approximately in W/kg of absorber.

Pion production target and capture solenoids.
Mercury Jet Studied at CERN

Colin Johnson has joined the muon collider targetry group.
Eddy Current Effects on Conducting Liquid Jets

- In frame of jet, changing magnetic field induces eddy currents.
- Lenz: Forces on eddy current oppose motion of jet.
- Longitudinal drag force $\Rightarrow$ won’t penetrate magnet unless jet has a minimum velocity: $\sigma = \sigma_{Cu}/60$, $\rho = 10 \text{ g/cm}^3$, $\Rightarrow$
  \[ v_{\text{min}} > 60 \text{ m/s} \left[ \frac{r}{1 \text{ cm}} \right] \left[ \frac{r}{D} \right] \left[ \frac{B_0}{20 \text{ T}} \right]^2. \]
  Ex: $B_0 = 20 \text{ T}$, $r = 1 \text{ cm}$, $D = 20 \text{ cm}$, $\Rightarrow v_{\text{min}} = 3 \text{ m/s}$.
- Drag force is larger at larger radius $\Rightarrow$ planes deform into cones:
  \[ \frac{\Delta z(r)}{r} \approx -3\alpha \left[ \frac{r}{1 \text{ cm}} \right] \left[ \frac{B_0}{20 \text{ T}} \right]^2 \left[ \frac{10 \text{ m/s}}{v} \right]. \]
  Ex: $\alpha = L/D = 2$, $r = 1 \text{ cm}$, $v = 10 \text{ m/s} \Rightarrow \Delta z = 6 \text{ cm}$.
- Radial pressure: compression as jet enters magnet, expansion as it leaves:
  \[ P \approx 50 \text{ atm.} \left[ \frac{r}{1 \text{ cm}} \right] \left[ \frac{r}{D} \right] \left[ \frac{B_0}{20 \text{ T}} \right]^2 \left[ \frac{v}{10 \text{ m/s}} \right]. \]
  Ex: $P = 2.5 \text{ atm}$ for previous parameters.
- Will the jet break up into droplets?
- Need both FEA analysis and lab tests.
Phase Rotation Channel

- Capture pions with large $\Delta E$ about $E \approx 150$ MeV.
- Squeeze energy in linac phased for zero gain at 150 MeV.
- RF cavities interspersed with 5-T magnets.

[+ ↔ positive polarization, − ↔ negative]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linac Length</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Gradient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>MHz</td>
<td>MeV/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ionization Cooling

- Need to reduce 6-D phase volume of muon beam by $10^5$-$10^6$.
- No time for stochastic cooling.
- Ionization: takes momentum away
- RF acceleration: puts momentum back along $z$ axis.
- $\Rightarrow$ Transverse cooling.

Multiple scattering ‘heats’ the beam.

If no heating, ‘stop’ the beam once, and reaccelerate.

In practice, ‘stop’ the beam $\approx 10$ times, $\Rightarrow$ 6-GeV acceleration.
Ionization Cooling Theory

Transverse cooling by ionization, heating by multiple scattering:

\[
\frac{d\epsilon_n}{ds} = -\frac{1}{\beta^2} \frac{dE_\mu}{ds} \frac{\epsilon_n}{E_\mu} + \frac{\beta_\perp (0.014)^2}{2\beta^3 E_\mu m_\mu L_R},
\]

\[
\epsilon_n = \sigma_x \sigma_{P_x} / m_\mu c,
\]

\[
\beta_\perp = \text{Betatron function at the absorber},
\]

\[
L_R = \text{Radiation length of absorber}.
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \text{Equilibrium} \quad \epsilon_n \propto \frac{\beta_\perp}{\beta L_R (dE_\mu / ds)}.
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \text{Low-Z absorber (liquid hydrogen is best)},
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \text{Put absorber at low-}\beta_\perp \text{ (beam-waist)},
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \text{Need strong focusing (15-T solenoids, Li lens...)},
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \text{Keep } \beta = v/c \text{ near 1}.
\]

[Economics favor } \beta < 1 \text{ since must restore the beam energy many times,]
But the energy spread rises:

\[
\frac{d(\Delta E_\mu)^2}{ds} = -2 \frac{d(E_\mu)}{dE_\mu} (\Delta E_\mu)^2 + \frac{d(\Delta E_\mu)^2_{\text{straggling}}}{ds}
\]

Both terms are positive if operate below minimum of \(dE_\mu/ds\) curve.

⇒ Must exchange longitudinal and transverse emittance frequently to avoid beam loss due to bunch spreading.

Can reduce energy spread by a wedge absorber at a momentum dispersion point:

[6-D emittance constant (at best) in this process.]
Emittance Exchange Via Wedges + Bent Solenoids

LONGITUDINAL COOLING
Ionization Cooling of $\nu$-Produced $\mu$’s

The muon toroids of the CCFR neutrino experiment form an ionization-cooling channel.

Simulation indicates $\epsilon_n \rightarrow \epsilon_n/4$.

Data analysis underway [Bruce King].
Cooling in a Channel of Alternating Solenoids

Must alternate direction of $B$ to avoid buildup of canonical angular momentum.
A cooling section contains 10 2-m-long cells as above:

- 64 cm of LH$_2$ around the low-$\beta_\perp$ point inside a 15-T solenoid,
- 4 lower-field solenoids to flip sign of magnetic field,
- 12 $\pi/2$ mode rf cavities, 800-MHz, 5-mil Be windows, 30 MV/m gradient.

Interleaved side coupled, standing-wave structure.

[Al Moretti]
Simulated Cooling Performance

Factor of 2 reduction in 6-d emittance in a 20-m stage.
Simulated Cooling Performance

Alternating-solenoid scheme becomes difficult after $\approx 25$ stages.

But more cooling is desirable.
Cooling in Lithium Lenses

LITHIUM CURRENT CARRYING COOLING ROD

1 - tubes of liquid lithium supply;
2 - oxidized titanium insulators;
3 - operating lithium volume;
4 - two-wall insulated titanium cylinder;
5 - current input.
Simulation of Cooling in Lithium Lenses

Even lower emittance ‘possible’ with optical stochastic cooling.
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R&D Priorities

• Theoretical Studies:
  – Cooling scenarios (now working ‘on paper’!)
  – 4-TeV Collider
  – ‘Demonstration’ Machines
    * ≈ 100-GeV Higgs Factory
    * 200- and 400-GeV Upgrades

• Experimental Programs:
  – Prototype Superconducting Accelerator Magnets and RF Cavities
  – Cooling Demonstration
  – Target and RF Capture Demonstration
  – Prototype Pulsed Ring Magnets
Cooling Demonstration Experiment

Test basic cooling components:

- Alternating solenoid lattice, RF cavities, LH$_2$ absorber
- Lithium lens (for final cooling)
- Dispersion + wedge absorbers to exchange longitudinal and transverse phase space

Phase I: Track individual muons; simulate a bunch in software

Phase II: Cool a muon bunch from prototype source
Cooling Demonstration Experiment

Possible site: Meson Lab at Fermilab:

Measure 6-D emittance before and after cooling:
Recommendation on R&D for a Muon Collider

The Subpanel recommends that an expanded program of R&D be carried out on a muon collider, involving both simulation and experiments. This R&D program should have central project management, involve both laboratory and university groups, and have the aim of resolving the question of whether this machine is feasible to build and operate for exploring the high-energy frontier. The scale and progress of this R&D program should be subject to additional review in about two years.
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Options for Future Colliders at CERN

J. Ellis, E. Keil, G. Rolandi
January 23, 1998

6 RECOMMENDATIONS

3. CERN should launch technical studies of $\mu^+\mu^-$ colliders, notably in the areas of the source and beam cooling, and should explore the possibility of locating such machines on or in the neighbourhood of the CERN site.

6. These studies should be carried out in collaborations with other laboratories, since most technical problems do not depend on the site. CERN's goal in these collaborations should be to contribute to the global pool of technologies for future collider options. It should confirm its reputation as a valuable and reliable partner in the international collaborations that will form to develop proposals for future collider projects.