

The State of the ETEAPOT (Electric Thin Element Accelerator Program for Optics and Tracking) Code, and its Context/Environment

J. Talman

January 14, 2013

Abstract

An overview of ETEAPOT is presented. A brief introduction continues with explicit instructions and examples of repeatable output. This allows simple direct verification of benchmarked work (both transverse and longitudinal). While the betatron/transverse propagation is well in hand ([1], [2]), the longitudinal/synchrotron is less established. Allowing new physicists to exploit this functionality fairly easily; I regard this as the main result of this project (to date). Physics implications can be expected to follow. For example, the need for reduced dispersion has already been suggested. Significant constraints remain. For example "modest curvature" lattice elements ($-1 \leq m \leq 1$) have turned out to be nearly equivalent for our purposes. However, some recent work ([3]) indicates that what's needed is m values more than 100 times this big! This makes the "Bend, Kick, Bend" algorithm approach all the more essential. This report aims to flesh all this out.

1 Introduction

As seen at URL <http://code.google.com/p/ual/source/list?num=25&start=25> the "Initial directory structure" for UAL was created May 6, 2008. N. Malitsky was the primary repository contributor until Aug 30, 2009 (UAL::243) or so. This is a very powerful/robust software architecture accommodating arbitrary accelerator lattice descriptions (assuming they permit a closed orbit). I have been the primary repository contributor (though in the restricted domain of all electric accelerators) since. "Electric Dipole Moment latest" (UAL::272 - UAL::967 or so) is at URL <http://code.google.com/p/ual/source/list>. Roughly speaking (and this is all a little rough), Nikolay created/imported the original TEAPOT (mostly magnetic) functionality as UAL and I have been grafting on the electric lattice capability. The UAL architecture underpins all my work. Figure 1 is an iconic representation of its foundational nature.

Expanding slightly, the acronym Accelerator Propagator Description Format enables any and all (\forall) lattice element algorithms!

Expanding slightly again, the acronym Standard eXchange Format enables any and all (\forall) lattice elements!

Probably the most important modification to the above synopsis is the central role of R Talman. He was central to the progenitor TEAPOT code, the philosophy of which circumscribes the UAL repository. Of course, Richard has been central to the entire UAL (all 966 revisions) development. Of course my involvement is due to him.

Probably the second most important modification to the above synopsis is the role of A Lucio and SPINK. The proof of concept of "adding" spin to the UAL architecture interested some important people.

Fanglei Lins name should be mentioned as well.

Nikolay is likely winding down his UAL involvement, and I might be, as well.

Again, my role has been to augment the existing magnetic functionality with electric (bend) functionality. Possible scenarios/trajectories for this effort are

(T1) I drop out, and the only result is the improved ability of Richard to help create a satisfactory electric storage ring

(T2) I drop out, and the code continues to help Richard, and possibly other physicists

(T3) I continue developing the code, but the effort remains mostly confined to me and Richard

(T4) I continue developing the code, become part of the relevant community, and the code develops a foothold

With an eye on handing off this work, this report targets scenario (T2) in/on the off chance that some fairly independent physicist(s) attempt to use it.

Possibly it helps me achieve (T3) and/or (T4).

2 Graphical, somewhat whimsical, restatement

Figure 2 presents an iconic portrayal of (T1): UAL, at least the electric part, closes. Presently, Richard moves on.

Figure 3 presents an iconic portrayal of (T2): UAL/ETEAPOT is but a small part of a general tool set. Physics is open ended (ie the primary domain).

Thus, with an eye on adding UAL/ETEAPOT to some physicists tool boxes, I turn to more concrete specification.

3 Computer Syntax for Repeatable Results

The exact steps:

```
svn co http://ual.googlecode.com/svn/trunk/ ual1
cd ual1
tcsh
setenv UAL 'pwd'
source setup-linux-ual
```

```
make clean
make >&! make.log
```

```
cd examples/ETEAPOT
cat README
```

and the inexact step:

```
"follow the relevant instruction file"
```

are designed to lead to repeatable results.

For now, I will follow one of the three instruction files referred to in README,

runExampleFor_ETEAPOT_MltTurn

as it targets previously benchmarked longitudinal/synchrotron motion. It looks like:

```
cp Shell.cc $UAL/ext/UI/src/UAL/UI/Shell.cc
```

```
pushd $UAL/ext/UI
```

```
make clean
```

```
make
```

```
ll lib/linux          // e.g. 1154818 libUalUI.so
```

```
popd
```

```
cp $UAL/codes/ETEAPOT_MltTurn/src/ETEAPOT_MltTurn/Integrator/RFCavityTracker-mod.cc
```

```
    $UAL/codes/ETEAPOT_MltTurn/src/ETEAPOT_MltTurn/Integrator/RFCavityTracker.cc
```

```
pushd $UAL/codes/ETEAPOT_MltTurn
```

```
make clean
```

```
make
```

```
ll lib/linux          // e.g. 574307 libETEAPOT_MltTurn.so
```

```
popd
```

```
cp data/eteapot_MltTurn.apdf data/eteapot.apdf
```

```
make outputReady
```

```
make clean
```

```
make
```

```
// We recommend the lenovo ThinkPad line with ubuntu, or Scientific Linux
```

```
// On an ubuntu single processor vostro 200, 12/31/2012, this next command
```

```
// takes 10 minutes or so, and generates a 3G or so file
```

```
./ETEAPOT_MltTurn ./data/E_BM_M1.0.RF.sxf -1 40 1 500 >! OUT
```

```
// On an ubuntu single processor vostro 200, 12/31/2012, this next command
```

```
// takes 10 minutes or so, and generates a 3G or so file
```

```
// "look" at NikolayOut
```

```
perl SplitNikolayOut.pl NikolayOut >! IG
```

```
gnuplot
```

```
gnuplot> l 'forGnuplot_Figure2'
```

4 Results

When these instructions are adhered to religiously (easier said than done), gnuplot gives Figure 4. The reader can take my word that this is identical to Figure 2 in [13], or he can verify it for himself. This latter is my preferred option as it facilitates ETEAPOT becoming part of the tool kit.

The original description in [13] is

Longitudinal dynamics in lattice BM M1.0.RF (having $m=-1$) is shown in Figure 2. (For the outermost amplitude the initial conditions have been adjusted to eliminate the initial betatron amplitudes.) The three benchmark lattices are compared in the similar plots of Figure 3. For this comparison only the three innermost amplitudes are tracked. In these plots three particles start at the origin traveling in the forward direction, with fractional energy offsets $UAL = 0.000001, 0.000002, 0.000003$. The three plots are essentially identical. We interpret this to mean that the quadrupoles adjacent to the bend elements, having been adjusted to restore the vertical tune to its standard value $Q_y = 0.2$, effectively cancel the focusing effect coming from non-zero field index m . In other words, as far as longitudinal dynamics is concerned, the three benchmark lattices are equivalent.

A similar procedure (only difference being `l 'forGnuplot_Figure11'` in gnuplot) duplicates Figure 11.

The original description in [13] is

A possibly surprising aspect of the oscillation is illustrated by the bottom figure of Figure 11. The tracked particle executes longitudinal oscillations of amplitude 0.5 m. This graph can therefore be usefully compared with the outermost of the orbits shown in Figure 2. Both have a similarly large ct-ranges. The tracked particle starts side-by-side with the reference particle, but with too little speed ($UAL = 105$), as can be seen from Figure 2. Acting as if above resonance its shorter path length dominates its too-low speed, and it takes the tracked particle only 25 turns to get to the front of the bunch, as can be seen from Figure 11. But then it takes about 50 turns to get back level with the reference particle, and 50 turns more to get to the tail of the bunch. The time distortion in Figure 11 therefore corresponds to the up-down asymmetry in Figure 2

The preceding is only the (probably most important) tip of the iceberg.

Richard and I have generated a whole series of benchmark results ([9], [10], [11], [12], [13]).

These can, in principle, all be recreated by the methods outlined above.

The instruction file

runExampleFor_ETEAPOT_MltTurn

is only one of three mentioned in file `$UAL/examples/ETEAPOT/README`

Others are

determineTwissCleanRunPlotM1.0.sl4

runExampleFor_orbitsWithSpin

5 Gotchas

This is all a little error prone. I'm working on improving it! The consensus seems to be that UAL is difficult, if not "dang near impossible" [2], to use.

This whole approach is predicated on the work of Munoz and Pavic [4]. The time of flight calculation, in particular, should be looked at more closely. One could take a different point of view, that I have been evaluating their work. Richard and I feel that it is at least mostly correct. There's a Munoz Evaluation section that goes into more detail on this.

My sense is that Richard and I will normalize to the lenovo ThinkPad line.

Furthermore, we may impose an operating system, e.g. Scientific Linux, as well.

There seems to be some (non show stopping) inconsistencies among the various potential UAL platforms. These we've learned to live with. There seems to be some (show stopping) inconsistencies among more widely divergent platforms. These have to be filtered out.

6 Discussion

Again, I am here targeting my "scenario (T2)" which involves other people potentially using this code and related material.

I have gathered all the documents cited below electronically. How long this will be available is anybody's guess!

Of course the google codes repository is likely to be around for a while! I may just check in all these supporting documents.

Again Figure 4 is simply recreatable, and duplicates previously benchmarked work. [13] shows that this "m=-1" ("saddle") lattice is nearly indistinguishable from "parallel" (m=0) and "toroidal" (m=1) lattices. This is within the constraint of small ($Q_y \approx 0.2$) values (so that the vertically focussing quads in the various lattices are quite different) for the vertical tune. Obviously very important if true! A corollary might be that m values more than 10 times these values might be called for ([14]). This in turn, might obsolete my ETEAPOT code as it uses a linearized equation for handling deviations from m=1. The relevant theory is in section 5.2 of [8].

These results, while repeatable/verifiable (or hopefully at least something to have a dialog over) are possibly incorrect. The time of flight per probe, per bend, is critically important. Our current results are a little controversial ([1]). The next section, Munoz Evaluation, goes into a little more detail.

7 TBD

I'm hoping/planning to make this a stand alone document. I feel that it is close now, though oriented for this presentation..

I'd like to better document the betatron/transverse capability and cross checking.

Figure 6 quotes transverse as "verified", and longitudinal as "ongoing". While I view this as correct, I should expand!

8 Munoz Evaluation

TEAPOTs "Drift, Kick, Drift" approach for maintaining symplecticity and other reasons is well documented (see e.g. [6]). For ETEAPOT, this approach has been upgraded to "Bend, Kick, Bend". This upgrade is made necessary by the variation of particle speed in electric fields (unlike magnetic). The lattice element whose continuous evolution is to be modelled as a delta function impulse is assumed known exactly. Here we are trying a refinement where we know the spherical bend element and its kick exactly, and then kick correct that for elements whose propagation is not known exactly (e.g. Cylindrical bend elements). Taking $\mathbf{F} \equiv -k\hat{\mathbf{r}}/r^2$ as our "to be kick corrected

force", this gives

$$\mathbf{F} = -k \frac{\hat{\mathbf{r}}}{r^2} = \frac{k}{r^2} \frac{d\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{d\theta} \quad (1)$$

(using $d\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}/d\theta = -\hat{\mathbf{r}}$). This implies planar motion and conserved angular momentum L (per probe, per bend). Choosing polar coordinates (θ, ϕ) in this plane, $L = \gamma m_p r^2 \dot{\theta}$. Note that [8] calls γ, γ^I , to emphasize that it is inside a bend element. Since I am always inside a bend element here, I use the simpler notation. Defining $\mathbf{u} \equiv \gamma \mathbf{v}$ so that $\mathbf{p} = m_p \mathbf{u}$

$$\frac{d\mathbf{p}}{dt} = \frac{d\mathbf{p}}{d\theta} \frac{d\theta}{dt} = m_p \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{d\theta} \frac{d\theta}{dt} = \frac{L}{\gamma r^2} \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{d\theta} \quad (2)$$

The classical law of motion $\mathbf{F} = d\mathbf{p}/dt$ holds good including in the semi relativistic region we are working with ([7]). Thus

$$\frac{k}{r^2} \frac{d\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{d\theta} = \frac{L}{\gamma r^2} \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{d\theta} \quad (3)$$

so that

$$\frac{d\mathbf{u}}{d\theta} = \frac{k\gamma}{L} \frac{d\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{d\theta}. \quad (4)$$

Both the r dependence, and the t dependence have been hidden. Of course the exact time dependence is of critical importance in the phasing of particles relative to the RF Cavity source. This is the main concern, here.

Defining $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{u} - \frac{k\gamma}{L} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ gives

$$\frac{d\mathbf{h}}{d\theta} = -\frac{k}{L} \frac{d\gamma}{d\theta} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}. \quad (5)$$

This form motivates the choice of \mathbf{h} as it shows that it is conserved nonrelativistically ($\gamma = 1$, a constant). It turns out that it is conserved relativistically in circular orbits ([4], their Eq. 8). This makes it especially good for the near circular design orbits of the EDM experiment.

Then

$$h_\theta = u_\theta - \frac{k\gamma}{L} = \gamma v_\theta - \frac{k\gamma}{L} = \gamma r \dot{\theta} - \frac{k\gamma}{L} = \frac{L}{m_p r} - \frac{k\gamma}{L} \quad (6)$$

so that

$$\gamma = \frac{L^2}{k m_p r} - \frac{L h_\theta}{k} = \frac{L}{m_p r^2 \dot{\theta}} = \frac{dt}{d\theta} \frac{L}{m_p r^2} \quad (7)$$

and

$$\frac{dt}{d\theta} = \frac{Lr}{k} - \frac{m_p r^2}{k} h_\theta = \frac{r}{k} (L - m_p r h_\theta). \quad (8)$$

This equation is interesting in its own right, and seems to be characteristic of this (Munoz) approach. Calculated quantities often seem to be the difference of 2 terms, each of similar size. Numerical imprecision becomes a major worry. Richard and I have been wrestling with these for at least a couple of years. We feel that we've handled/overviewed them pretty well.

From tracking, we think we know all these quantities (r , L , h_θ). L is constant (per probe, per bend). We think we have exact analytical formulas for r and h_θ right through each bend.

Various equivalent massaged expressions exist ([8] equations 148, 149, and 150).

We have tried a fair cross section of them, and always get quite similar answers. Still the possibility that we are making a mistake somewhere remains. A probably over pedantic list of error sources is:

- Is the Munoz formalism correct for this application?
- Did we calculate this formula correctly?
- Did we enter it into Maple correctly?
- Did Maple give the right answer(s)?
- Did I transcribe the answer(s) correctly?
- Should we have a "kick" correction in time, analogous to the kick correction in momentum?
- Is/are there simple "back of the envelope" approximation(s) that increase confidence?

Investigating some of these may be a future direction for me.

9 References

References

- [1] Semertzidis, Y. Personal Communication
- [2] Talman, R. Personal Communication
- [3] Talman, R. Reduced Dispersion Proton EDM Storage Ring Lattices December 10, 2012
- [4] Munoz, G., Pavic, I. A Hamilton-like vector for the special-relativistic Coulomb problem European Journal of Physics 27(2006) 1007-1018
- [5] Boyer, T. Unfamiliar trajectories for a relativistic particle in a Kepler or Coulomb potential American Journal of Physics 72(2004) 992-997
- [6] TEAPOT: A Thin-Element Accelerator Program For Optics And Tracking Schachinger, L. and Talman, R. Particle Accelerators 1987, Vol. 22, pp. 35 - 56
- [7] Talman, R. Geometric Mechanics Page 360 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 2000
- [8] Malitsky, N., Talman, J., and Talman, R. Appendix UALcode: Development of the UAL/ETEAPOT Code for the Proton EDM Experiment Personal Communication December 15, 2012
- [9] Talman, R. All-Electric Proton EDM Lattices for Benchmarking Simulation Codes Mar. 12, 2012
- [10] Talman, J. and Talman, R. UAL/ETEAPOT Results for Proton EDM Benchmark Lattices April 27, 2012
- [11] Talman, J. and Talman, R. UAL/ETEAPOT Proton EDM Benchmark Comparisons II: Transfer Matrices and Twiss Functions August 30, 2012
- [12] Talman, J. and Talman, R. UAL/ETEAPOT Results (Augmented) for Proton EDM Benchmark Lattices October 29, 2012
- [13] Talman, J. and Talman, R. UAL/ETEAPOT Proton EDM Benchmark Comparisons III: Dispersion, Longitudinal Dynamics and Synchrotron Oscillations January 10, 2013
- [14] Talman, R. Reduced Dispersion Proton EDM Storage Ring Lattices December 10, 2012




Figure 1: The "UAL Project View" (highly iconic representation of the UAL Architecture, and some successful prior projects)




Figure 2: Johns ETEAPOT Project view of the UAL world. I've enabled/facilitated electric bend physics simulations for physicists, and I'm done! ;-)




Figure 3: Johns Toolbox view of the physics world. I'm trying to add UAL/ETEAPOT to the tool box!




Figure 4: Duplication of the Figure 2 from [13]




Figure 5: Duplication of the Figure 11 from [13]




Figure 6: Duplication of the Figure 11 from [13]




Figure 7: Duplication of the Figure 11 from [13]