

## PRINCIPLES AND APPLICATIONS OF MUON COOLING

DAVID NEUFFER<sup>1</sup>

*Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Ill. 60510 U.S.A.*

*(Received February 17, in final form May 24, 1983)*

The basic principles of the application of "ionization cooling" to obtain high phase-space density muon beams are described, and its limitations are outlined. Sample cooling scenarios are presented. Applications of cold muon beams for high-energy physics are described. High-luminosity  $\mu^+\mu^-$  and  $\mu$ - $p$  colliders at more than 1 TeV energy are possible.

### I. INTRODUCTION

Previous high-energy accelerators have used electrons and protons as their basic tools in the pursuit of high collision energies. Electrons (and positrons) have been useful tools in recent experiments because their "point-like" nature permits their use in studies of simple processes:  $e^+e^-$  annihilation to produce new particles ( $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma^* \rightarrow$  hadrons, etc.) and the exploration of proton structure in "deep inelastic" ep collisions. Their future use is severely limited by their participation in radiation processes. Synchrotron radiation in storage rings causes electrons to lose an amount of energy  $\Delta E$  per turn given by<sup>1</sup>

$$\Delta E(\text{MeV}) = \frac{4\pi e^2}{3R} \left( \frac{E}{mc^2} \right)^4 = \frac{0.0885 [E(\text{GeV})]^4}{R(\text{m})} \quad (1)$$

where  $R$  is the storage-ring radius and  $E$  the electron energy. Studies based on this equation and the constraint  $\Delta E/E \lesssim 1$  indicate that storage rings with  $E \gtrsim 100$  GeV are thoroughly impractical.

Single pass linear accelerators are proposed to circumvent this problem. Radiation processes still limit their usefulness, and they are quite expensive, and may not obtain adequate luminosity.

The fourth power of the mass in the radiation formula (1) might suggest that radiation difficulties can be circumvented by use of a heavier probe. Thus protons are used to obtain the highest-energy collisions. The liability of protons (and antiprotons) is that they are complex objects with correspondingly complicated interactions, which may obscure important effects. Lepton-lepton and lepton-hadron colliders are needed for a complete picture of high-energy processes.

In this paper, we suggest that muon ( $\mu^\pm$ ) beams may be used as primary probes in high-energy collisions, since they combine a "point-like" electron-like nature with a large mass which is sufficiently immune to radiation. Muons have, of course, been used in secondary beams as "deep-inelastic" probes of hadron structure. Here we note, as

<sup>1</sup> Now at Los Alamos National Laboratory, P.O. Box 1663, Los Alamos New Mexico, 87545 U.S.A.

Skrinsky<sup>2</sup> and others have noted, that their role can be extended to use in primary beams,  $\mu^+$  storage rings and  $\mu$  linacs at high energies.

The principal liabilities of muons are their short lifetime and the large phase-space area of the initial muon beam, which is produced from  $\pi$ -decay. The lifetime  $\tau$  is given by<sup>3</sup>

$$\tau = 2.197 \cdot 10^{-6} \frac{E_\mu}{m_\mu} \text{ sec}$$

This is an adequate lifetime for any linac, and, as we show below, is adequate for some storage-ring applications. The short lifetime does preclude long-term accumulation of  $\mu$ s at "low" energies ( $\lesssim 10$  TeV) which will limit  $\mu$ -beam intensity in any scenario.

The large phase space area of a muon beam can be damped using "ionization" cooling<sup>2</sup> to a small value using a muon cooling ring or linac, as will be described below. The damped beam will then be suitable for colliding-beam scenarios or acceptance in a high-gradient linac or rapid-cycling synchrotron.

Cold  $\mu$  beams may meet the acceptance requirements of novel high-gradient acceleration mechanisms (such as "laser" accelerators)<sup>4</sup> whose basic requirements are a low phase-space volume beam. They may be preferred over  $e^+$  or  $p$  injection, particularly in scenarios in which the beam passes through a material medium (i.e., "plasma-laser" or "inverse Cherenkov") where  $e$  and  $p$  usage is limited by electron bremsstrahlung and proton-nucleus collisions.

We note here that these same matter-particle interactions prevent useful application of the present technique of "ionization" cooling in cooling of electrons and protons (see below).

In the following sections, we will describe muon cooling, suggest cooling scenario designs, and describe cooling limitations. In Section VI we describe  $\mu^+$  colliding beam possibilities in various scenarios.

## II. MUON ENERGY COOLING

The basic mechanism of  $\mu$  cooling is displayed in Fig. 1. The muon beam is passed through a material medium in which it loses energy, principally through interactions with atomic electrons. Following this, it passes through an accelerating cavity where the average longitudinal energy loss is restored to each  $\mu$ . Energy cooling occurs following

$$\frac{d(\Delta E_\mu)}{dn} \cong \frac{\partial \Delta_\mu}{\partial E_\mu} \Delta E_\mu, \quad (2)$$

where  $n$  is the number of cooling cycles,  $\Delta E_\mu$  is the muon energy deviation from the average reference value,  $\Delta_\mu$  is the energy loss of a muon with energy  $E_\mu$  in the material absorber, and the derivative is taken at the central energy. Cooling occurs if  $\partial \Delta_\mu / \partial E_\mu < 0$ . The beam is recirculated through the absorber-accelerator cycle through many turns either by a return path (cooling ring) or repeated structure (linac). Transverse motion is damped as transverse energy is lost in the absorber but not recovered in the accelerator.

The process is basically similar to radiation damping in electron storage rings,<sup>1</sup> where energy lost in curved sections of the ring by radiation is recovered in the rf




FIGURE 1 Sketch of "ionization cooling" principle

cavities. Radiation damping is limited by quantum fluctuations; analogously muon cooling is limited by statistical fluctuations in muon-atom interactions in the absorber. The important difference is that muons decay, and therefore cooling must be completed before decay can occur. The muon lifetime is<sup>3</sup>

$$\tau_{\mu} = 2.197 \times 10^{-6} \frac{E_{\mu}}{m_{\mu}} \text{ sec,}$$

which can be translated to a path length of

$$L = 6.59 \times 10^2 \frac{\beta_{\mu} E_{\mu}}{m_{\mu}} \text{ meters,} \quad (3)$$

where  $\beta_{\mu}$  is the muon speed, which will always be near 1 in this paper. For a storage ring, this can be translated to a number of turns of beam storage

$$N = \frac{L}{2\pi R} = \frac{LB}{2\pi B\rho} = 297 \bar{B}(T) \text{ turns,} \quad (4)$$

which we note is independent of momentum and only dependent on the ring-averaged bending field.

The energy loss rate for muons passing through a material is, approximately,<sup>3</sup>

$$\frac{dE}{dz} \cong \frac{DZ\rho}{A\beta^2} \left\{ \log \left( \frac{2m_e \gamma^2 \beta^2 c^2}{I} \right) - \beta^2 \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where  $Z$  and  $A$  are the nuclear charge and atomic number of the absorbing medium,  $\rho$  is the density of the material (in gm/cm<sup>3</sup>),  $m_e$  is the electron mass,  $\gamma$  and  $\beta$  are the muon

kinematic factors,  $D$  and  $I$  are constants with

$$D = 0.3070 \text{ MeV-cm}^2/\text{gm}$$

$$I \cong 16(Z)^{0.9} \text{ eV}$$

and  $c$  is the velocity of light. The function  $dE/dz$  as a function of muon energy for various materials is displayed in Fig. 2.

This is a steeply decreasing function of energy for  $\gamma \lesssim 3$  but for  $\gamma > 5$  it is a slowly increasing function suitable for damping. This weak dependence can be enhanced by placing the absorber in a region where transverse position  $x$  depends on energy (a "non-zero dispersion" region) and varying the thickness with position as shown in Fig. 3.

The net change in particle energy with respect to the central value in one cycle of passage through an absorber of width  $\delta(x)$  plus acceleration is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\Delta E_\mu) &\cong -\frac{\partial}{\partial E_\mu} \left[ \frac{dE}{dz} \delta(x) \right] \Delta E_\mu \\ &= -\left[ \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial E_\mu \partial z} \delta(0) + \frac{dE}{dz} \delta' \frac{\eta}{E_0} \right] \Delta E_\mu = -\frac{\Delta E_\mu}{n_c} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$




FIGURE 2 Energy loss as a function of muon energy

PAR  
OF

wh  
is th  
equ

A  
neo

whi

The  
br  
Th  
abs  
Th  
sto  
(  
tio  
sto  
life  
un




FIGURE 1. Use of varying thickness absorber to minimize energy dependence of energy loss.

where  $\delta = d\delta/dx$ , and we have redefined the inverse of the coefficient of Eq. (6) as  $\eta$ .  $\eta$  is the value of the Courant-Snyder dispersion function at the absorber.<sup>5</sup> The damping equation is

$$\frac{d\Delta E_a}{dt} = \left[ \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial E_a^2} \delta_a + \frac{\eta}{E_a} \frac{dF}{dz} \delta \right] \Delta E_a \quad (7)$$

A limiting requirement of  $\mu$  cooling is the total acceleration of the central orbit necessary to obtain the desired cooling. The total acceleration to obtain 1% cooling is

$$E_{cool} = u \frac{dF}{dz} \delta(0),$$

which can be compared with  $E_a$ , the central energy

$$\frac{E_a}{E_{cool}} = \frac{E_a}{u} \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial E_a^2} \frac{d\delta}{dz} + \frac{\eta}{u} \frac{d\delta}{dx} \delta(0) \quad (8)$$

The first term has a maximum of  $\sim 0.2$  at  $E_a \approx 1$  GeV with little variation over the broad range  $0.5 \text{ GeV} < E_a < 10 \text{ GeV}$ , which is a reasonable range for  $\mu$  collection.<sup>6</sup> The second term is constrained by the transverse heating in non-zero dispersion absorption to  $\lesssim 1$  with an optimum at  $\sim 0.4$  with simultaneous transverse damping. These numbers can be compared with the corresponding factor of 2 for electron storage-ring radiation damping.

Choosing 0.6 as the sum, we note that  $4.6 \text{--} 0.6 E_a \approx 7.7 \text{ GeV}$  of acceleration is necessary to damp 1-GeV muon energy spreads by a factor of 100. Choosing a storage-ring system [see Eq. (4)] with  $\tilde{B} = 1$  T and requiring damping within 1 muon lifetime, we find an rf acceleration requirement of 26 MeV/turn, which is not unreasonably large.

### III. TRANSVERSE DAMPING

The mechanism for transverse damping is quite simple. Energy loss is parallel to the particle trajectory but energy gain (in rf) is longitudinal. On each passage through absorber and accelerator

$$x' = \frac{p_x}{p_z} \cong \frac{p_x c}{E_0}$$

is reduced:

$$x'_{\text{after}} = \left[ 1 - \frac{dE}{dz} \frac{\delta}{E_0} \right] x'_{\text{before}} \quad (9)$$

Averaging over particle phases and introducing the rms emittance

$$\langle \epsilon_x \rangle_{\text{rms}} = \left\langle \frac{x^2}{\beta} + \beta x'^2 \right\rangle \cong 2 \langle \beta x'^2 \rangle,$$

we obtain

$$\frac{d\epsilon_x}{dn} = - \frac{dE}{dz} \frac{\delta}{E_0} \epsilon_x, \quad (10)$$

where  $\beta$  here is the Courant-Snyder betatron function<sup>5</sup> and the variable  $n$  indicates the number of passages through an absorber/accelerator cycle. Total acceleration to cool by 1/e is simply  $E_0$  so  $E_0/E_{\text{cool}} = 1$  for transverse cooling.

The above cooling rate is correct for both  $x$  and  $y$  transverse cooling where energy loss occurs in zero-dispersion regions. But if a wedge absorber in a non-zero-dispersion region is used to enhance energy cooling, then a corresponding degree of transverse heating occurs in that  $\eta \neq 0$  dimension, which competes with the damping.

The heating mechanism is shown in Fig. 4. In passing through an absorber, particle position ( $x$ ) does not change (to first order) but energy does. The position is the sum of an energy dependent component [ $\eta(\Delta E)$ ] and a betatron component ( $x_\beta$ ) and a decrease in  $\eta \Delta E$  implies an increase in  $x_\beta$  since the sum

$$x = \frac{\eta(\Delta E)}{E_0} + x_\beta$$

remains constant while

$$\Delta E \rightarrow \Delta E|_{\text{before}} - \frac{dE}{dz} (\delta_0 + \delta'x)$$

and  $x_\beta$  is changed by

$$\Delta x_\beta \rightarrow + \frac{\eta}{E_0} \frac{dE}{dz} \left\{ \delta_0 + \delta' \left( \frac{\eta \Delta E}{E_0} + x_\beta \right) \right\}. \quad (11)$$

FIGURE  
 $\eta \neq 0$

(We have  
and be  
obtain


Average  
can be

The  
so change  
must be  
 $\eta \delta' \cong 1$   
We r

which

IV. H)

$\mu$  cooling  
passing  
the emittance  
dampi



$$x'_\beta = x_\beta + \eta \frac{\Delta E}{E_0} - \frac{\eta' \Delta E'}{E_0} \tag{9}$$

FIGURE 4 Change in Courant-Snyder betatron amplitude in passing through a 'wedge' absorber at  $\eta \neq 0$

(We have assumed  $d\eta/dz = 0$  at the absorber to simplify discussion.) Assuming energy and betatron amplitudes are uncorrelated and keeping only lowest-order terms, we obtain

$$\Delta \langle x_\beta^2 \rangle \cong 2 \langle x_\beta \Delta x_\beta \rangle = \frac{2\eta}{E_0} \frac{dE}{dz} \delta' \langle x_\beta^2 \rangle. \tag{10}$$

Averaging over betatron phases, we obtain an emittance antidamping term, which can be added to the previously derived cooling term [Eq. (10)]

$$\frac{d \langle \epsilon_x \rangle_{rms}}{d\eta} = \left[ -\frac{\delta_0}{E_0} \frac{dE}{dz} + \frac{\eta}{E_0} \frac{dE}{dz} \delta' \right] \langle \epsilon_x \rangle_{rms}. \tag{11}$$

The antidamping is precisely opposite to the corresponding energy-damping term, so enhanced energy damping implies decreased betatron damping.  $\mu$ -cooler design must balance these damping requirements. (The two damping rates are equal at  $\eta \delta' \cong 0.4 \delta_0$ .)

We note here that the sum of  $\epsilon_x$ ,  $\epsilon_y$ ,  $\Delta E$  damping rates is constant

$$\sum_{\epsilon_x, \Delta E} \frac{E_0}{E_{cool}} = 2 + \frac{E_0}{dE} \frac{\partial}{\partial E_u} \left( \frac{dE}{dz} \right) \cong 2.2, \tag{12}$$

which parallels a similar invariant for electron radiation damping.<sup>1</sup>

#### IV. HEATING BY STATISTICAL FLUCTUATIONS

$\mu$  cooling is obtained through a finite number of muon-atomic electron collisions in passing through an absorber. Statistical fluctuations in the number of collisions and the energy exchanged in a collision increase the muon energy spread, opposing the damping mechanism.

(11)

An estimate of this antidamping mechanism can be obtained by noting that the mean energy exchange is approximately the mean electron ionization energy of the absorber:<sup>7</sup>

$$I \cong 10 Z_{\text{abs}} \text{ eV},$$

where  $I$  is the mean ionization energy and  $Z_{\text{abs}}$  is the nuclear charge of the absorber. The number of collisions is approximately

$$N_{\text{coll}} = \frac{dE}{dz} \frac{\delta_0}{I}$$

per cooling cycle and the rms energy error is  $(N_{\text{coll}}^{1/2})I$

$$\Delta E_{\text{rms}} = \sqrt{\frac{dE}{dz} \delta_0 I}.$$

Combining cooling with rms heating, we obtain the cooling equation

$$\frac{d}{dn} \langle \Delta E^2 \rangle_{\text{rms}} = -2 \left[ \delta_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial E_\mu} \left( \frac{dE}{dz} \right) + \frac{\eta}{E_0} \frac{dE}{dz} \delta' \right] \langle \Delta E^2 \rangle_{\text{r.m.s.}} + I \frac{dE}{dz} \delta_0. \quad (15)$$

An equilibrium energy spread can be obtained where the above derivative is zero

$$\langle \Delta E^2 \rangle_{\text{rms}} = \frac{IE_{\text{cool}}}{2}. \quad (16)$$

With  $E_{\text{cool}} \cong 2 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $I \cong 10 \text{ eV}$ , we obtain  $\Delta E_{\text{r.m.s.}} \cong 10^5 \text{ eV}$ , suggesting an approximate limit for  $\mu$  cooling. With  $1 \text{ GeV } \mu$ 's,  $\Delta E/E \sim 10^{-4} \sqrt{Z}$ .

Transverse cooling is severely limited by multiple small-angle elastic scattering in the absorber, mostly elastic Coulomb scattering from the nuclei. The scattering angle passing through an absorber can be estimated using the Particle Data Group (PDG) formula<sup>3</sup>

$$\theta_{\text{rms}} \cong \frac{14(\text{MeV})}{E_\mu(\text{MeV})} \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{L_R}}, \quad (17)$$

where  $\delta$  is the absorber length,  $L_R$  is the PDG radiation length. The change in r.m.s. emittance is

$$\Delta \epsilon_{\text{rms}} \cong \frac{\beta \theta_{\text{rms}}^2}{2} = \frac{\beta}{2} \left( \frac{14}{E} \right)^2 \frac{\delta}{L_R}, \quad (18)$$

so the

The e

where  
upon 1  
~ 300  
The  
prod  
Fig. 5  
the al  
absor  
para  
of an  
furth  
As  
 $E_\mu =$   
mat  
So  
focus






FIGURE 5 Sketch of low-beta absorber section (FDOODE Design)

so the cooling equation for zero-dispersion transverse emittance (unnormalized) is

$$\frac{dc}{dn} \cong - \frac{dE}{dx} \frac{\delta}{E_u} c + \frac{\beta}{2} \left( \frac{(14)^2}{E} \right)^2 \frac{\delta}{L_R} \tag{15}$$

The equilibrium emittance is therefore

$$c_0 \cong \frac{\beta}{2} \frac{(14)^2}{E_u \left( \frac{dE}{dx} L_R \right)} \tag{16}$$

where  $\beta$  is the betatron function at the absorber. The product  $[(dE/dx)L_R]$  depends upon the absorber and is largest for **light** elements ( $\sim 100$  MeV for *Be* and *C* and  $\sim 300$  MeV for *H<sub>2</sub>* or *D<sub>2</sub>* but  $\sim 7$  MeV for *Pb* or *W*).

The appearance of  $\beta$  in Eq. (20) demands very strong focusing of the beam to produce a small radius at the absorber. Suitable optics for this purpose is displayed in Fig. 5. Note that  $\beta$  is constrained by the focusing geometry to be less than the length of the absorber, unless the absorber is an active focusing element (e.g., a Li lens). Shorter absorbers are possible with heavier elements, balancing the constraint of the previous paragraph. In Table I we list the critical quantities ( $L, \rho, dE/dz, L_R$ ) influential in choice of an optimum absorber for particular applications.  $\mu$  cooling design constraints will be further discussed in the next section.

As a relatively modest choice suitable for some cooling goals, we choose  $\beta = 1$  cm,  $E_u = 1$  GeV and a beryllium absorber and obtain  $c_0 \cong 10^{-5}$  m-rad at 1 GeV, which is matched to typical proton-beam emittances.

Somewhat lower emittances are possible, but eventually the conflict between focusing and absorber requirements will limit the cooling.

TABLE I  
Properties of Some Absorber Materials

Material	Density $\rho \frac{\text{gm}}{\text{cm}^3}$	Mean Ionization Energy $I(\text{eV})$	$\frac{dE}{dz}$ Minimum Energy Loss (MeV/cm)	$L_{\text{rad}}$ Radiation Length (cm)	$\frac{dE}{dz} \cdot L_{\text{rad}}$ (MeV)
H <sub>2</sub>	0.71	18	0.29	890	260
Li	0.53	40	0.84	155	130
Be	1.85	64	2.97	35.3	105
C	2.27	80	4.03	18.8	76
Cu	9.0	315	12.9	1.43	18.5
W	19.3	750	22.4	0.35	7.8
Pb	11.4	790	12.8	0.56	7.2

### V. $\mu$ COOLER DESIGN OUTLINES

The cooling principles can be used to develop muon-cooling scenarios and in this section we outline some possibilities.

We first consider a  $\mu$  storage-ring scenario. The major requirements are shown in Fig. 5: a high-intensity multi-GeV primary (proton) beam, a target for  $\pi/\mu$ -pair production, a  $\pi$ -decay channel (or "stochastic injection")<sup>6</sup> and large acceptance  $\mu$  storage ring. The general properties of muon collection have been discussed previously for a different application.<sup>6</sup> We only quote the approximate result that  $\approx 10^{-2} - 10^{-3}$  1-GeV  $\mu$  per primary proton can be stored within an acceptance of  $\pm 5\%$  momentum,  $100\pi$  mm-mr emittance. (Stronger focusing at the target and in the decay channel than that of reference 6 is desired to maintain low  $\mu$  phase space.) Our design goal is a reduction in  $\Delta p/p$  to  $\lesssim \pm 0.2\%$  and  $\epsilon_{\perp} \lesssim 10\pi$ . (This reduced momentum spread can be rotated into a reduced muon bunch length by a "compressor arc" similar to that used for compressing radiation-cooled  $e^{\pm}$  beams for linac colliders.<sup>8</sup>)

Table II and Fig. 6 show parameters of a system that meets these requirements: a 30-m storage ring requiring  $\sim 15$  MeV/turn rf with three low-beta insertions for Be absorbers. These insertions can have non-zero dispersion for enhanced  $\Delta p/p$  cooling.

The storage-ring design is most severely constrained by the focusing requirements of

TABLE II  
Storage Ring Parameters

$\mu$ storage Energy	1 GeV
Circumference	30 m
$\beta_{\text{min}}$ (minimum $\beta$ value)	$\sim 1$ cm
Absorber Sections	$3 \times 4$ m (FDOODF)
RF Requirements	18 MV/turn
Transverse Cooling	$100\pi \rightarrow 10\pi$
Longitudinal Cooling	$\pm 5\% \rightarrow \sim \pm 0.2\%$
Cooling Time	$\lesssim 200$ turns
Absorber	$3 \times 2$ cm Be
Decay Channel Length	60 m




FIGURE 6. Muon cooling ring.

the low-beta insertions. Low beta at the absorber implies large beta at the focusing magnets and therefore large apertures, which must be large enough to accommodate the hot injected beam:

$$a \geq \sqrt{\epsilon} B_{max} \epsilon_{injected} \quad (21)$$

This constrains the focusing strength of the lens. The lens gradient  $G$  is limited by

$$G \lesssim \frac{B_{max}}{d_{max}} \quad (22)$$

We require a magnet doublet of length  $\gtrsim 1.5$  m to obtain  $\beta_{min} \approx 1$  cm with conventional 2- $T$  magnets.

Stronger focusing (lower  $\beta$  or shorter lenses) can be obtained with complex lenses and higher fields ( $\gtrsim 4 T$  superconducting magnets), but the transverse cooling remains substantially constrained by this aperture requirement.

This constraint can be circumvented by use of a linear muon cooler. A sample design is outlined in Fig. 7 with parameters displayed in Table III. This design consists of alternating low-beta insertions with accelerator cavity sections. The insertion length  $L_{ins}$  is kept constant while the lens aperture decreases as the beam shrinks (from emittance cooling). This provides stronger focusing, decreasing  $\beta_{min}$ , while the absorber length  $L_{abs} = 2\beta_{min}$  also decreases. The focusing parameter

$$k_F = \frac{B_0 L_{ins}}{B_{p\lambda} \epsilon \beta_{min}} \quad (23)$$

is kept constant at  $k_F \approx 8$ . The mean acceleration per structure period decreases from 10 MeV to 0.7 MeV following  $L_{abs}$ . The cooling rate decreases correspondingly. In fact, cooling in this design follows the equation

$$\frac{d\epsilon}{ds} \approx -Ac^2 \quad (24)$$

where  $Ac \approx [1dE_0/ds/E_0]$  is the cooling rate.




FIGURE 7 Sketch of muon cooling linac

TABLE III  
Muon Cooler Linac Parameters.

Muon Energy	500 MeV
Total Linac Acceleration	1.5 GeV
Total Length	1 km
Transverse Cooling	$100\pi \rightarrow 7\pi$ mm-mr
Momentum Cooling	$\pm 6\% \rightarrow \pm 0.5\%$
Focusing Period	2 m
Magnet Aperture	0.2 m $\rightarrow$ 0.05 m
$\beta_{\min}$ (Absorber Length = $2\beta/\text{Focusing Period}$ )	0.01 $\rightarrow$ 0.0007
Absorber	Be

The limitation  $L_{\text{abs}} \lesssim 2\beta_{\min}$  can be circumvented in some parameter regions by use of an actively focusing absorber such as a lithium lens. Lithium lenses can obtain high fields<sup>9</sup> (equivalent to  $> 15 T$  quads) focusing in both  $x$  and  $y$  directions, which can maintain the beam at low beta provided

$$\frac{B_{\text{eq}}}{B_p a} \gtrsim \frac{1}{\beta_{\min}^2}, \quad (25)$$

where  $a$  is the lens radius,  $B_{\text{eq}}$  is the equivalent focusing field and  $B_p$  is the magnetic rigidity,  $3.3E_{\mu}(\text{GeV}) T\cdot\text{m}$ . We have not included Li lens absorbers in our sample designs, but we expect that optimum designs will incorporate them in some portion of the structure.

The major advantages of the linear cooler are

- (1) Transverse cooling is not limited by the large aperture required to accommodate injected uncooled beam.
- (2) Losses through decay are less because of the shorter particle path length.

The disadvantages are

- (1) The linac does not naturally contain non-zero dispersion for enhanced momentum cooling; however, dispersion can be introduced with bending magnets.
- (2) The single-pass linac structure is longer and therefore more expensive.

We  
storag  
schem  
Multi  
trons  
and  $\Delta$   
As  
existi  
measu

VI. P  
In this

A. Th  
Skins  
gradie  
proto  
proto  
target  
oppos  
We  
can b  
proto  
suitab

B. Ot  
Cold n  
high e  
Other  
phase-  
is left  
gradie  
those  
We

(1) T  
t  
c  
f  
u  
(2) M  
(3) T  
v

We note that a linac structure is more naturally suited for transverse cooling, while a storage ring more naturally obtains enhanced  $\Delta p/p$  cooling. An optimum cooling scheme may combine these with a linac "precooler" followed by a storage ring. Multiple storage rings or more complicated structures similar to "race-track microtrons" may also be possible. Optimum systems can reach  $\epsilon_{\perp} \lesssim 2\pi$  mm-mr at 1 GeV and  $\Delta p/p \lesssim 0.1\%$ , or perhaps substantially less.

As a closing comment in this section, we note that it may be desirable to modify existing 1-GeV storage rings with low-beta insertions and increased rf to obtain measurable  $\mu$  cooling and explore the practicality of this technique.

## VI. POSSIBLE USES FOR COOLED MUONS

In this section, we outline some suggested possible uses for suitably cooled muons.

### A. The Proton Klystron

Skrinsky<sup>2</sup> has suggested the acceleration of cold muons (as well as  $\pi$ , e, etc.) in a high-gradient linac structure that is loaded by injection of a high-intensity, high-energy proton beam ( $> 10^{11}$  p, 400–1000 GeV). A muon bunch following in the wake of the protons can be accelerated to high energy ( $\approx 500$  GeV, say) and then used in fixed target ( $\mu - p$ ) or colliding with other linac ( $\mu^+$ ,  $\mu^-$ , etc.) bunches traveling in the opposite direction.

We have shown that muon bunches with  $\approx 10^9$   $\mu$ ,  $\epsilon \lesssim 10^{-4}$   $\pi$  (normalized) m-rad can be produced in a  $\mu$  cooling ring using some proton bunches from the primary proton ring, and a compressor arc can rotate the beam to a length ( $\lesssim$  a few mm) suitable for the klystron linac.

### B. Other Linac Structures

Cold muon bunches can be injected into a linac structure for acceleration to suitably high energies. Acceleration in a SLAC-type linac is possible with 1-GeV cold muons. Other innovative structures (laser accelerators, ...) may have substantially lower phase-space requirements, which may or may not be achievable with muon cooling. It is left for future development to invent a practical innovative linac (with  $\gtrsim 1$  GeV/m gradient), determine its phase-space requirements, and design a  $\mu$  cooler matched to those requirements. The muons could be used in external beam or collider modes.

We list some possible advantages of muons (over  $e^{\pm}$ ) in such structures.

- (1) Their relative immunity to bremsstrahlung and synchrotron radiation may make them more suitable in schemes with a material medium (plasma-wave accelerator) or beam bending fields ("inverse free electron laser", "two-wave device")<sup>4</sup> or beam focusing fields (almost any scheme). For example, synchrotron radiation precludes use of the "surfatron"<sup>10</sup> for ultra-high (TeV) energy acceleration of  $e^{\pm}$ .
- (2) Muons are relatively immune to "bremsstrahlung" in  $\mu$ -X collisions.
- (3) The higher mass of muons may make matching of beam and accelerator phase velocities easier than with electrons.



gions by use  
obtain high  
, which can  
  
(25)  
  
ie magnetic  
our sample  
a portion of  
  
ommodate  
  
gth.  
  
anced mo-  
g magnets.  
2.

### C. Linac-Storage Ring Systems

A real advantage of  $\mu^\pm$  beams from a linac is that the high-energy beams can be circulated in a storage ring for hundreds of turns to magnify luminosity over a single-pass mode. In Fig. 8 we display a sample system of this type which uses an existing linac and mimics the SLC design.<sup>8</sup> In the system, SLAC  $e^\pm$  bunches at  $\sim 50$  GeV are used to produce muons which are collected and cooled. Separate  $\mu^+$  and  $\mu^-$  bunches are reinjected into the linac, accelerated to 50 GeV and injected into a superconducting 50-GeV storage ring with  $\bar{B} = 4T$  ( $R = 40$  m).

The luminosity  $L$  can be obtained from

$$L = \frac{fN^+N^-}{4\pi\epsilon_{rms}\beta^*}, \quad (26)$$

where  $f$  is the collision repetition rate,  $N^+$ ,  $N^-$  are the number of muons,  $\epsilon_{rms}$  is the emittance and  $\beta^*$  is the collision betatron function ( $\beta_x^* \cong \beta_y^*$ ). With parameters achievable in the above SLC-like scenario ( $f = 2 \times 10^3$ ,  $N^+ = N^- \cong 3 \times 10^8$  from  $\sim 10^{11} e^-$ ,  $\epsilon = 2 \times 10^{-8}$  m-rad at 50 GeV,  $\beta^* = 0.1$  cm) we obtain  $L = 10^{28}/\text{cm}^2\text{-sec}$  which is sufficient to observe the  $Z_0$ , but not quite competitive with SLC. A higher-intensity muon source and a higher-brightness final muon beam can provide  $\mu^\pm$  collider parameter competitive with single-pass  $e^\pm$  colliders, particularly at higher energies.

We note here that the short lifetime of muons is in some ways an advantage, in that the small collision tune shifts and large aperture ( $20\sigma$ ) needed for  $e^+e^-$  storage-ring colliders can be avoided.

### D. Rapid Cycling Muon Accelerator—Storage Rings

The short lifetimes of muons would seem to preclude conventional synchrotron acceleration of muons. Nevertheless, at high energies ( $\geq 100$  GeV) the requirements of a muon accelerator do not seem unreasonable, particularly when compared with the requirements of  $e^+e^-$  storage rings at  $E \geq 50$  GeV.

The basic requirements are a storage ring that can cycle from low to full energy within  $\sim 100$  turns with a rf system which can accelerate at  $\geq .01$  of full energy per turn. The rf requirement is met by only  $\sim 10$  GeV/turn of acceleration for a 1-TeV  $\mu^+\mu^-$




FIGURE 8 A sample linac-storage ring system

C  
F  
SVI  
(

PREC  
L

collid  
requ  
(60-f  
prefe  
Th  
rapid  
cool  
cycli  
little  
stor.  
 $10^{-9}$   
eters

E.  $\mu^-$   
A sig  
stor  
cont  
with  
the  
emit  
T  
velo  
ener




FIGURE 9 (1 TeV  $\mu$  rapid cycling synchrotron)

collider (100-GeV  $e^+$  storage rings need  $\sim 10$  GeV of rf) and the rapid-cycling requirement (for 1 TeV) is not as great as that in rapid-cycling proton synchrotrons (60-Hz, 16-GeV *K*-factories). Conventional rather than superconducting magnets are preferred for rapid cycling.

The components of a 1 TeV  $\mu^+ - \mu^-$  collider are outlined in Fig. 9. They are a rapid-cycling proton synchrotron (100 Hz) to produce high-intensity  $\mu$  beams, a  $\mu$  cooler at  $\sim 1$  GeV, a  $\sim 20$  GeV Linac for  $\mu$  injection, and a  $\sim 3$  km-radius rapid-cycling muon storage ring. Luminosities of  $\geq 10^{32} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ sec}^{-1}$  seem practical with little extrapolation from readily achievable parameters. With  $f \cong 100 \text{ Hz} \times 300$  turns storage,  $n_p N^+ N^- \cong 10^{22}$  (10 bunches of  $3 \times 10^{10} \mu^+, \mu^-$ ),  $\beta^* = 0.1 \text{ cm}$ ,  $\epsilon_{rms} = 10^{-9} \pi \text{ m-R}$  at 1 TeV, we obtain  $L \cong 3 \times 10^{33} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ sec}^{-1}$ . Some of these parameters may be mildly optimistic, but the  $\mu^+ \mu^-$  accelerator seems reasonably attractive.

*E.  $\mu$ -p Collider*

A significant advantage of muons over electrons is that they can be stored in the same storage ring as protons for lepton-proton collisions. In Fig. 8, the storage ring could contain protons before  $\mu$  injection at full energy, or in Fig. 9 protons could be injected with  $\mu^-$  for acceleration. Luminosities can be higher than in  $\mu^+ \mu^-$  scenarios because of the larger number of protons, and as discussed above it is easy to match  $\mu$  and  $p$  emittances.

The two revolution frequencies are naturally mismatched because of the different velocities at equal energies. They could be rematched by displacing the two beams in energy under the condition

$$\frac{\Delta p}{p} \left[ \frac{1}{\gamma_T^2} - \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \right] \cong \frac{1}{2\gamma_p^2} - \frac{1}{2\gamma_\mu^2}, \tag{27}$$

where  $\gamma_T$  is the transition energy,  $\gamma_\mu$  and  $\gamma_p$  are the muon and proton kinetic factors, and  $\Delta p/p$  is the momentum offset. This works in a highly relativistic system with  $\gamma_p \gg \gamma_T \gg 1$ .

## REFERENCES

1. M. Sands, SLAC-121, *Proc. Int. School of Physics*, B. Touschek, Ed., Varenna, 1969 (Academic Press, New York, 1971).
2. A. N. Skrinsky, *Proc. XXth Int. Conf on High Energy Physics, A.I.P. Conf. Proc.* **68**, 1056 (1980).
3. Particle Data Group, *Phys. Lett.* **111B** (1982).
4. Laser Acceleration of Particles, P. Channell, Ed., *A.I.P. Conf. Proc.* **91** (A.I.P., New York, 1982).
5. E. D. Courant and H.S. Snyder, *Ann. Phys.* **3**, 1 (1958).
6. D. Neuffer, *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* **NS-28**, 2034 (1981).
7. U. Fano, in *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sci.* **14**, 1 (1963).
8. SLAC Linear Collider Design Report, SLAC (1980).
9. J. MacLachlan, private communication, 1982.
10. T. Katsouleas and J. M. Dawson (to be published) in *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* **NS-30** (1983).

T

The F  
Lague  
rapid.  
approx  
that th  
dampi  
azimut  
equati  
little r

1. IN

Many  
Sach  
deriv  
a case  
dipole  
bunch  
imped  
a singl  
Lat  
differ  
micro  
beam  
Sac  
applic  
radial  
equat  
growt  
calcul  
stabil  
rate is  
used,  
damp