Conceptual Design of a High Power Target for the Jefferson Lab Positron Source

Andriy Ushakov, Eric Voutier, Christine Le Galliard and Sami Habet IJCLab, Orsay, France

24 May 2022

Assemblée Générale du GDR QCD, Île d'Oléron









This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement No 824093

Andriy Ushakov (IJCLab, Orsay) Design of Target for JLab Positron Source

- Efficiency of polarization transfer from polarized electrons to positrons
- CEBAF polarized e⁺ source
- Optimized polarized positron production
- Energy deposited in target by beam
- Water cooled spinning target
- Temperature and thermal stress
- Radiation damage
- Summary

Using Polarized e⁻ for Production of Polarized e⁺

Polarized Electrons for Polarized Positrons (PEPPo) demonstrated a high polarization transfer from 8.19 MeV polarized electrons ($P_{e^-} = 85\%$) to positrons via bremsstrahlung radiation and pair production in the same high Z conversion target (tungsten with thickness of 1 mm).



e⁺ Polarization and Efficiency of Polarization Transfer

D. Abbott et al. (PEPPo Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 116, 214801 (2016)

Scheme and Parameters of JLab Positron Source

The Physics program is asking for e^+ beams with polarization of ${>}60\%$ and current of ${>}100~\text{nA}$



Scheme of Positron Source

J. Grames, J-Future Workshop, JLab/Messina, March 28-30, 2022

Energy of primary e⁻ beam: 120 MeV

e⁻ beam current: 1 mA cw

Selection of Optimal Positron Energy after the Target and Optimal Target Thickness

Yield vs Target Thickness Selection of Optimal e⁺ Energy for $\Delta p/p = 10$ % Positron longitudinal polarization (%) 80 Max YP e+/e-Low Y High P 10² 10 10 High Y Low P 10 05 E_{e+}/E J. Dumas, PhD Thesis, Université de Grenoble (2011) Optimal e^+ energy after the target is $\simeq 50\%$ of e^- beam enerav Optimal thickness of tungsten target for 120 MeV e⁻ is t (mm) 4 mm S. Habet, UPS/IJCLab/JLab (2020)

Andriy Ushakov (IJCLab, Orsay)

Design of Target for JLab Positron Source

Deposited Energy by Beam with 1.5 mm RMS Size



120 kW e⁻ beam (1 mA @ 120 MeV) deposits in average 17 kW (14%) in Tungsten with 4 mm thickness

 $PEDD = 0.34 \text{ GeV}/(e^{-} \text{cm}^{3})$

In case target rotated with 4 m/s: 0.34 GeV/(e^- cm³) \Rightarrow 17.6 J/g

Stationary Target Heated by 1 mA cw e⁻ Beam



1 mA @ 120 MeV cw electron beam with 1.5 mm rms size melts the stationary 4 mm thick tungsten target in 64 ms

- Target has to be moved/rotated to distribute heat over bigger volume
- Efficient target cooling is needed

Water Cooled Rotating 17 kW Tungsten Target



Cross-section of Target



 $T_{\rm max} = 61 \ ^{\circ}{\rm C}$

 e^- beam passes rotated target at R = 17.5 cm Cross-section of water channel is 10 mm x 20 mm Speed of turbulent water flow is 2 m/s Temperature of water at inlet is 22 °C

Average Temperature and Thermal Stress



Average Temperature of Tungsten

Equivalent von-Mises Stress



 $T_{\rm max} = 258 \ ^{\circ}{\rm C}$

Max $\sigma_{vM} = 282$ MPa

Thermal Cycling of a Spinning Target

RMS beam size = 1.5 mm. Target rot. speed = 4 m/s

Snapshot of T after 2.5 ms



 $\Delta T_{max} = 120 \ ^{\circ}\text{C}$

10/16

Thermal Stress at the "End of Pulse"

Temperature after 2.5 ms

10 mm beam path on target (4 m/s)



 $\Delta T_{max} = 120 \ ^{\circ}\text{C}$

Equivalent von-Mises Stress after 2.5 ms



Max $\sigma_{vM} = 155$ MPa

Yield and Fatigue Strength of Tungsten



 $\sigma_{0.2}$ (22°C) = 1500 MPa $\sigma_{0.2}$ (380°C) = 977 MPa

5000 h of source operation with 0.275 s cycles $\Rightarrow 6.5 \cdot 10^7$ cycles

Fatigue Strength (22°C; 6.5 · 10⁷ cycles): 774 MPa

Fatigue Strength (380 °C; $6.5 \cdot 10^7$ cycles) = **504 MPa**

Max von-Mises stress estimated for JLab rotated W target: 280 MPa ($T_{ave} \simeq 260^{\circ}$ C) + 155 MPa ($\Delta T = 120^{\circ}$ C) = 435 MPa

Test of tungsten targets at the Mainz Microtron is planned

Fatigue Strength vs Number of Cycles at Room Temperature



0.5 dpa means every second atom in the material has been displaced in average from its site within the lattice of the material.

$$\mathsf{DPA} = \frac{\mathsf{A}}{\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{A}}\,\rho}\,\mathsf{N}_{\mathsf{d}}$$

A is the mass number, N_A is the Avogadro number, ρ is the density, N_d is the number of defects (Frenkel pairs)

Simplest Kinchin-Pease model:

 T_d is the damage (kinetic) energy,

 E_d is the displacement damage threshold.

E_d for tungsten is 90 eV [R.E. MacFarlane and A.C. Kahler, Nuclear Data Sheets, 111(12), 2739 (2010)].



Radiation Damage

Stationary Target and Rotated Target with Diameter of 35 cm



Damage of Rotated Target vs z

Max Damage per $e^- = 5.7 \cdot 10^{-22} \text{ dpa/e}^-$

Max Damage per Year = 0.215 dpa/5000h

0.5 dpa is typical limit of radiation damage for different materials

Note: Higher rotation speed of target reduces dpa per turn and increases number revolutions per hour. Therefore, the annual value of dpa does not depend on target speed. dpa_{5000h} $\sim 1/r_{target}$

Deposited Power	kW 17				
Thickness of W	mm			4	
Beam Width	mm			4	
Target Radius	mm	150	175	200	250
Volume	mm^3	15080	17593	20106	25133
Power Density	W/mm^3	1.13	0.97	0.85	0.68
Average ${\rm T}_{\rm max}$ of W	°C	306.1	257.9	229.5	198.4
$\rm T_{\rm max}$ of Water	°C	70.8	61.2	56.7	52
Eq. Stress $_{max}$ in W	MPa	347.7	281.6	243.2	221.2
Max Rad. Damage	dpa/5000h	0.250	0.214	0.188	0.150

- Average power of 17 kW is deposited in 4 mm thick tungsten target by 1 mA @ 120 MeV electron beam
- Average, peak temperatures and thermal stress in target were calculated
- Radiation damage of tungsten has been estimated
- Conceptual design of rotated tungsten target cooled by water is developed
- For proposed 35 cm in diameter W target spinning with 4 m/s, cooled by water (2 m/s flow) and 1.5 mm rms beam spot size on target:
 - $\bullet\,$ Max. average T $\simeq 260\,$ °C and max. peak T $\simeq 380\,$ °C
 - $\bullet\,$ Max. von-Mises stress \lesssim 435 MPa
 - Max. radiation damage \simeq 0.215 dpa/5000h