High-Energy LHC design
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Abstract. In the frame of the FCC study we are designing a 27 TeV hadron collider in the LHC tunnel, called the High Energy LHC (HE-LHC). The HE-LHC can be realized by replacing the LHC’s 8.33 T niobium-titanium dipole magnets with 16 T niobium-tin magnets developed for FCC-hh. A high-quality beam available from the upgraded LHC injector complex and significant radiation damping allow achieving the challenging target values for both peak and integrated luminosity required by particle physics. Tunnel integration determines the maximum outer size of the magnet cryostat. The HE-LHC arc optics maximizes the dipole filling factor and optimizes the dynamic aperture, while limiting the field strengths of quadrupoles and sextupoles. The low-beta optics for the experimental insertions features a shielded quadrupole triplet even longer than the HL-LHC’s, which can support an interaction-point beta function of 25 cm, and survive an integrated luminosity above 10\(\text{ab}^{-1}\). Other challenges include collimation and extraction. The choice of injection energy and injector is another important element, and so are various collective effects. We here report the HE-LHC design status.

1. Parameter choices

The HE-LHC shall provide proton-proton collisions at an energy of about 27 TeV in the centre of mass. Its integrated luminosity should exceed 10\(\text{ab}^{-1}\) over 20 years of operation. The HE-LHC will employ FCC dipole magnets with a field of 16 T [1, 2]. The expected photon flux and synchrotron radiation power are 5–20 times higher than for the LHC. The FCC-hh beam screen...
design [3] offers an adequate solution, with high pumping capacity, low impedance, and a good Carnot efficiency. The HE-LHC also incorporates novel elements from the HL-LHC [4, 5], such as crab cavities and low-impedance collimators.

The HE-LHC could accommodate two high-luminosity interaction-points (IPs) 1 and 5, at the locations of the present ATLAS and CMS experiments. IPs 2 and 8 might host secondary experiments (or a lepton-hadron collision point) combined with injection, as for the LHC.

Following the LHC injector upgrade (LIU) [6], in 2020, a brighter proton beam will be available. Injection into the HE-LHC could be accomplished from the present SPS at 450 GeV, from a new fast ramping single-layer coil superconducting (SC) synchrotron in the SPS tunnel at 900 GeV [7], or from a double-layer coil SC synchrotron at 1.3 TeV [7, 8].

The HE-LHC itself must fit into the existing LHC tunnel with a typical diameter of 3.8 m. Therefore, the outer diameter of its dipole magnets is restricted to 1.2 m, while half sector cooling reduces the size of the cryogenics lines. Overall, the HE-LHC will need up to eight new cryoplants, each with 1.5 times the capacity of one of the existing eight LHC plants, and additional plants at 1.8 K. Two new underground cubes (10 m sides) are required at IPs 3 and 7.

The HE-LHC baseline design parameters are summarized in table 1, which also presents a comparison with the corresponding values for LHC, HL-LHC and FCC-hh [9].

| Table 1. Key parameters of HE-LHC compared with FCC-hh, HL-LHC [12] and LHC [13], for operation with proton beams. All values, except for the injection energy, refer to collision energy. HE-LHC entries shown in parentheses refer to a larger crossing angle; LHC entries in parentheses to the HL-LHC. The bunch spacing is 25 ns for all colliders. |
| parameter | unit | FCC-hh | HE-LHC | (HL-)LHC |
|—— | —— | —— | —— | —— |
| centre-of-mass energy | TeV | 100 | 27 | 14 |
| injection energy | TeV | 3.3 | 0.45/0.9/1.3 | 0.45 |
| arc dipole field | T | 16 | 16 | 8.33 |
| circumference | km | 97.8 | 26.7 | 26.7 |
| beam current | A | 0.5 | 1.12 (1.12) | 0.58 |
| bunch population $N_b$ | $10^{11}$ | 1.0 | 2.2 (2.2) | 1.15 |
| longitudinal emittance ($\sim 4\pi\sigma_z\sigma_E$) | eVs | 5 | 4.2 | 2.5 |
| norm. transv. rms emittance $\gamma\varepsilon$ | $\mu m$ | 2.2 | 2.5 (2.5) | 3.75 |
| IP beta function $\beta^*_x,y$ | m | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.25 (0.15) 0.55 |
| peak luminosity per IP $10^{34}$ cm$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$ | 5 | 30 | 28 (5, leveled) | 1 |
| peak no. of events / crossing | — | 170 | 1000 | 800 (132) 27 |
| SR power / beam | kW | 2400 | 100 | (7.3) 3.6 |
| transv. emittance damping time $\tau$ | h | 1.1 | 3.6 | 25.8 |
| initial proton burn-off time $\tau_{bo}$ | h | 17 | 3.4 | 2.5 (15) 40 |
| luminosity per year (160 days) $fb^{-1}$ | $\geq 250$ | $\geq 1000$ | 730 | (250) 55 |

2. Luminosity performance

Radiation damping is significant. The longitudinal emittance needs to be kept constant during the physics store, through longitudinal noise excitation, in order to maintain longitudinal Landau damping [10]. At the same time, the transverse emittance shrinks due to radiation damping, while the proton intensity decreases as the result of the high luminosity. The initial proton
The burn-off time is
\[ \tau_{bo} = \frac{N_b n_b}{L_0 \sigma_{tot} n_{IP}}, \tag{1} \]
where \( N_b \) denotes the bunch population, \( L_0 \) the initial luminosity, \( \sigma_{tot} \) the total proton-proton cross section, \( n_b \) the number of bunches per beam, and \( n_{IP} (= 2) \) the number of high-luminosity interaction points (IPs). The HE-LHC proton burn-off time is comparable to the transverse emittance damping time \( \tau \), yielding a natural luminosity leveling, while the beam-beam tune shift decreases during the store.

Following [9, 11], the integrated luminosity per interaction point (IP) at time \( t \) during the fill is
\[ \int_0^t L(t) dt = \frac{f_{rev} N_{b,0}^2 n_b}{4 \pi \varepsilon_0 \beta_y} \frac{\tau}{B} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{1 - B + B \exp(t/\tau)} \right), \tag{2} \]
from which the optimum fill length can be determined, with
\[ B \equiv \frac{\sigma_{tot} n_{IP} f_{rev} N_{b,0} \tau}{4 \pi \beta_y^2 \varepsilon_0}, \tag{3} \]
where \( \varepsilon_0 \) denotes the initial rms emittance, \( N_{b,0} \) the initial bunch population, and \( f_{rev} \) the revolution frequency.

Figure 1 shows the time evolution of key parameters over 24 hours at 100% availability. The typical optimum fill length of HE-LHC is about 3 hours. The turnaround time determines the integrated luminosity, as illustrated in figure 2.

3. Optics
The choice of the HE-LHC arc optics will be a compromise between maximizing the energy reach (favouring fewer and longer cells) and allowing injection from the existing SPS (calling for a larger number of shorter cells). Exploring the parameter space, we are considering two alternative arc optics: The first one, denoted “18 × 90”, features 18 FODO cells per arc and 90 degree phase advance per cell. The second optics, referred to as “23 × 90”, consists of 23 cells per arc, similar to the present LHC optics. Both optics follow the footprints of LEP and LHC, to within a few centimetres. Table 2 compiles key parameters. At 450 GeV, for the 23 × 90 optics the minimum physical aperture in every regular arc cell is about 9.5 \( \sigma \), for the 18 × 90 optics only 7.2 \( \sigma \) [14], using the parameters of [15] and a mechanical tolerance of 1 mm. These numbers are smaller than the minimum aperture of 12.6 \( \sigma \) for the HL-LHC [15]. They might become acceptable with a stricter control of injection oscillations, adequate machine protection measures, and tighter primary collimator settings. For example, above the primary collimators set at 5 \( \sigma \) another 4.5 \( \sigma \) (23 × 90) or 2.2 \( \sigma \) (18 × 90) [present LHC: ∼9 \( \sigma \)] would be available for preserving the collimator hierarchy between primary, secondary, and dump-protection collimators, and the arc aperture.

The calculated multipole field errors for the Nb3Sn magnets of the HE-LHC are shown in table 3, which assumes a SC wire filament size of 20 \( \mu \)m. For the 18 × 90 optics, including \( b_3 \), \( b_4 \) and \( b_5 \) correctors, the simulated dynamic aperture (10^5 turns, 60 seeds, \( \Delta p/p = 0.075\% \)) is 4.8 \( \sigma \) at 1.3 TeV, and significantly less at lower energies. For the 23 × 90 optics, it is 2.8 \( \sigma \) at 450 GeV, 1.0 \( \sigma \) (!) at 900 GeV, and 11.9 \( \sigma \) at 1.3 TeV [14]. At present only this last case looks viable. However, adding artificial pinning centers (APC) and either magnetic iron shims [17] or HTS persistent-current shims [18] could further reduce the field errors [19]. Improved correction schemes may also help.

More details on the arc optics can be found in Ref. [20]. An integrated overall HE-LHC optics exists at injection and collision energies [14]. It includes the experimental insertions [21, 22], betatron collimation straight [23], injection and extraction straights [24], and rf straight [25].
Figure 1. Instantaneous luminosity, pile-up, bunch population, normalized transverse emittance, total beam-beam tune shift, and integrated luminosity as a function of time during 24 hours, for the HE-LHC at 100% machine availability.
Figure 2. Average annual luminosity versus average turnaround time (nominal value 3 hours) for the HE-LHC, assuming 160 calendar days scheduled for physics operation per year and 70% machine availability.

Table 2. Arc optics parameters for LHC (scaled to a beam energy of 13.5 TeV) and the two HE-LHC optics designs.

| parameter               | unit | 23 × 90 | 18 × 90 |
|-------------------------|------|---------|---------|
| cell length             | m    | 106.9   | 137.2   |
| quadrupole length       | m    | 3.5     | 2.8     |
| max., min. beta         | m    | 177, 32 | 230, 40 |
| max., min. dispersion   | m    | 2.2, 1.1| 3.6, 1.8|
| dipole field for 13.5 TeV | T    | 16.59   | 15.83   |
| c.m. energy for 16 T dip | TeV  | 26.01   | 27.28   |

Table 3. Systematic, uncertainty and random normal sextupole component $b_3$ in the main arc dipoles, in units of $10^{-4}$ at a reference radius of 16.7 mm, for three different injection energies, considering a wire with 20 $\mu$m filament size and $\pm 5\%$ critical current variation [16].

| energy | syst. uncertainty | random |
|--------|-------------------|--------|
| 450 GeV | $-35$              | 10     | 10     |
| 900 GeV | $-55$              | 4      | 4      |
| 1.3 TeV | $-40$              | 3      | 3      |

4. Collective effects
Beam-beam effects in HE-LHC are discussed in [26]. Extrapolating from LHC studies and HL-LHC simulations [27], a 180 $\mu$rad half crossing angle will ensure adequate dynamic aperture. The
crossing angle could also be reduced, e.g. to 130 $\mu$rad, by adding a beam-beam compensation scheme.

The beam screen and the collimators are the major sources of HE-LHC impedance [28, 29]. The beam-screen impedance is increased compared with the present LHC due to the smaller half aperture (12 versus $\sim$18 mm in the vertical plane) and higher beam-screen temperature (50 K for HE-LHC versus 5–20 K for LHC). The collimators are a major contributor to the transverse impedance since they are operated with small gaps. It is assumed that the physical gaps of the collimators become tighter as the beam energy increases, so that the collimation system becomes the main impedance source already at 1.3 TeV. The impedance for warm beam pipes and other components can be taken from the LHC [30]. The complete transverse impedance [31] is illustrated in figure 3 for two different injection energies. For comparison the HL-LHC impedance is also shown. At 450 GeV the HE-LHC impedance is about a factor 2–3 higher than the HL-LHC impedance, due to the changes in the beam screen. At 1.3 TeV the HE-LHC impedance is even larger because of the tighter collimator gaps.

![Figure 3. Real (solid curves) and imaginary part (dashed curves) of the HE-LHC transverse impedance at two different injection energies compared with the HL-LHC transverse impedance, as a function of frequency [31].](image)

Using the impedance model, the stability limits can be explored with a Vlasov solver, such as NHT [32] or DELPHI [33]; the results of the two codes are consistent for single bunches [34]. The coupled-bunch instability modes will be cured by the transverse feedback, while single-bunch instabilities can be suppressed by Landau damping provided either through octupole magnets [26] or electron lenses [35].

Electron cloud is important at the present LHC [36] and a concern for HL-LHC. For HE-LHC, build-up simulations were performed for two different beam-screen designs [37], namely the FCC-hh type beam screen, adapted as baseline, and a scaled LHC beam screen of larger aperture [38]. At top energy, up to maximum SEY values of 1.7, or higher, the simulated electron density stays below the instability threshold [39], for both chamber options. However, the FCC beam screen gives rise to a ten times lower density, reflecting the smaller amount of photoelectron seeding. Also the heat load produced by the electron cloud is lower for the FCC beam screen. If the maximum secondary emission yield is below 1.5 the heat load from electron cloud amounts to less than 10% of the synchrotron-radiation power [37].
5. Summary
An HE-LHC optics solution with 1.3 TeV injection and 13.5 TeV top energy is (nearly) at hand. This would require a new superconducting SPS as injector. We are also investigating an alternative optics for injection at 450 (or 900) GeV with 13 TeV top energy. Related magnet design improvements are under study (e.g., active pinning centres and shimming). Challenges for the lower injection energy include physical and dynamic aperture, machine protection and collimation. Collective effects appear under control.

The HE-LHC 16 T Nb$_3$Sn magnets (compact and curved), cryogenics system, and tunnel integration are not trivial.
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