## **Comparison of computational methods and results concerning the simulation of IH structures with the codes LORAS and DYNAC.**

P. Lapostolle\*, E. Tanke, S. Valero\*\*

## **Introduction**

The differences in results between the codes LORAS and DYNAC could be explained by differences in methods of computation, and by differences in the adjustment of energy and phase of the ''reference'' particle along the structure.

## **Adjustment of the structure**

The IH structure is generated using a set of "reference" particles, one per section of the structure. LORAS output gives the energy of the reference particle after each gap. Its phase is always given in the gap centre. DYNAC input data are made such as to have identical energy and phase evolution for the reference particle as in LORAS (i.e. same phase at the gap centre and same energy gain).

The energy and phase of the beam at the input of the IH structure does not coincide with the reference, and have their own evolution along the structure. Therefore a check was made on DYNAC over a section of <sup>13</sup> gaps, using a small beam with the same input energy and phase as the reference particle. As the beam evolves indepedently of the reference, but now having the same starting conditions, both beam and reference particle should behave the same way.

\* Consultant

\*\* LNS, CEN-Saclay



Table 1:DYNAC results

From the above one can see that the procedure used for the setting up of the machine is correct. Similar results are found with LORAS.

## **Beam simulation**

Now consider a complete accelerating structure (we used the GSI IH design), with normal input conditions (N.B. both in LORAS and in DYNAC simulations a total of 500 particles were used). Simplifying the simulation of this structure by having zero transverse coordinates gave us the following LORAS and DYNAC results :



Table 2:IH simulation with longitudinal motion only

Table 2 shows a good agreement between LORAS and DYNAC when simulating with longitudinal movement only, though there is some difference in the output beam energy. The next step is to include radial motion (i.e. beam has nominal transverse input emittances ):



Table 3:IH simulation with longitudinal and transverse motion

From table 3 it can be seen that including radial motion does not affect the longitudinal emittance growth when looking at LORAS results. DYNAC results (analytical as well as numerical), however, give an increase in longitudinal emittance. The emittance growth in. the transverse planes is of the order of  $10\%$  in LORAS. In DYNAC values of  $11\%$ (horizontal plane) and 21% (vertical plane) are found. Table 4 shows the beam characteristics in the transverse planes at the output of the structure.



Table 4: Transverse output emittances



**DYNAC, without radial movement LORAS, without radial movement**





 $\overline{\mathsf{O}}$ h **h** λ**m** *<sup>4</sup>* **<sup>4</sup> \*¾ ♦- V⅜ ʌ <sup>1</sup> ∙¾ «‰ <sup>4</sup> <sup>1</sup> \*\* r» ʌ**



Output emittances in the transverse planes

Increasing the transverse emittances by a factor two, LORAS gives a longitudinal emittance growth of 30 %, whereas DYNAC gives 300 % (both in analytical and numerical results). However, taking 85% of the DYNAC output beam, a longitudinal emittance growth of some 50% is found.



Longitudinal output emittances containing 85% and 100% of beam (DYNAC) and 100% of beam (LORAS) for doubled transeverse input emittances.