U. Bizzarri and A. Vignati: THE 12 MeV MICROTRON USED AS INJECTOR OF THE FRASCATI ELECTRON-SYNCHROTRON. -

INTRODUCTION. -

The electron accelerator called "Microtron" was proposed in 1944 by V.I. Veksler(1); from that time through about 1963 the development of such a machine was kept to a very low rate, due to the low values of the electron currents obtainable from the original design. In fact in the first prototypes the injected electron current was obtained by field effect extraction from the walls of the resonant cavity. The rather low injected current produced in such a way has been demonstrated to have a peak value corresponding to a wrong phase in order to be accelerated by successive turns, giving rise to an output peak current not exceeding the range of 100 μA. A drastic increase of the peak output current of 3 order of magnitudes was obtained as soon as the way was found of injecting electron from an hot cathode source. Such improvement, occurred around 1963 together with minor improvements in the performance of the resonating cavities, allowed the Microtron to jump from the range of the laboratory curiosities into the realm of interesting electron accelerator machines.

In 1964 a program of studing and building a Microtron in the range of 10 MeV energy has been started at Frascati Laboratories in
cooperation with the Physics Department of Catania University. After a first model machine of 5.5 MeV energy, it has been possible the successful development of 12 MeV energy microtron, and two such machines have been built. The first one has been installed as injector into the Frascati 1.1 GeV Electron-Synchrotron in August 1968; the second one will be put into operation as a medical as well as a physical research facility in a Laboratory of Catania University.

The Microtron working from more than one year as injector into the Frascati Electronsynchrotron produces a very well collimated external beam of electrons, of 60 mA peak current, 2 ± 4 μs pulse duration, 20 pulses per second; 12 MeV energy. During that time this machine has shown a very high degree of stability and reliability, the only service required being the periodical change (every about 300 hours of running) of the cathode.

Because of the successful and smooth running of this accelerator, we are encouraged to give a rather extensive description of the Microtron in the present paper, with reference to the design details of the machine realized in Frascati Laboratories. In fact we believe that the development of the Microtron has reached a stage interesting both for people who need a simple, reliable, low cost electron accelerator of energy less than 20 MeV, as for peoples designing higher energy machines based on the same principles.

1. - BASIC THEORY OF THE MICROTRON. -

Electrons running into the microtron are bended in circular orbits of increasing radius by a static and omogeneous magnetic field B. In each turn they cross the gap of a microwave resonating cavity, where they are accelerated by an high electric field (see Fig. 2).

A bunch of electrons accelerated in the first crossing of the cavity, must run the first turn in such a way to find the field into the cavity at second crossing in the right phase to be accelerated again. This is the so called "synchronism condition" which imposes a relationship between the magnetic field B, the accelerating voltage through the cavity ΔV, and the microwave frequency ν_{RF}. Of course a similar condition must be satisfied for all the successive orbits.

Calling T_n the running time of the n-th orbit and eV_n the total (including rest) energy of the electrons in this orbit, we have the following relation:

\[ T_n = \frac{2nV_e}{Bc^2} \]
where: $B$ is the magnetic field (in gauss), and $c$ the light velocity (in cm/s).

\[ T_1 = a T_{RF}, \]

\[ T_{n+1} - T_n = b T_{RF}, \]

where: $T_{RF} = 1/\nu_{RF}$ is the microwave period and $n = 2, 3, 4, \ldots$. The arbitrary integers $a, b$ characterize the "mode" of working of the microtron.
According to our previous definition of the total energy on n-th orbit, we have:

\[(1.4) \quad V_n = \frac{E_0}{e} + V_1 + n \Delta V,\]

where: \(E_0/e\) is the electron rest energy (510 KeV), \(V_1\) the injector voltage, \(\Delta V\) the voltage gain at each crossing of the cavity. By the substitution of (1.4) in (1.1), and imposing conditions (1.2), (1.3), we obtain the following basic microtron's equations:

\[(1.5) \quad \Delta V = \left(\frac{E_0}{e} + V_1\right) \frac{b}{a-b},\]

\[(1.6) \quad B = \frac{2 \pi \nu RF}{c^2} \left(\frac{E_0}{e} + V_1\right) \frac{1}{a-b}.\]

From these equations it can be observed that:
- \(a > b;\)
- the maximum value for \(B\) - minimum diameter of the magnetic for a given final energy - is obtained with \(a-b=1;\)
- with the condition \(a-b=1,\) the "mode" \(a=2, b=1\) requires the minimum accelerating voltage \(\Delta V,\) at cavity gap.

The \(a=2, b=1\) is called the "fundamental mode", and is the one employed in our design. The basic equations in our case are:

\[(1.7) \quad \Delta V = \frac{E_0}{e} + V_1,\]

\[(1.8) \quad B = \frac{2 \pi \nu RF}{c^2} \left(\frac{E_0}{e} + V_1\right).\]

We have assumed an injection voltage:

\(V_1 = 70\) KV.

The voltage gain per turn resulting:

\(V = 510 + 70 = 580\) KeV,

which is a value rather easily obtainable with microwave tubes (magnetron
or klystron) of more than 500 KW power output.

As it will be shown later the choice of the frequency is imposed by a compromise between magnet dimensions and cathode dimensions. We assumed \( \nu_{RF} = 3.000 \text{ Mc/s} \), from (1.8) it results:

\[ B = 1.214 \text{ gauss.} \]

The diameter \( D \) of the final orbit is fixed from \( B \) and from the number \( n \) of orbits, according to the relationship:

\[ D = 2 \frac{E_0 + V_i + n \Delta V}{eBc^2}. \]

In our case with \( n = 21 \) orbits, we have:

\[ D = 70 \text{ cm;} \]

the final kinetic energy results to be of 12, 25 MeV.

A choice of a larger value of the frequency \( \nu_{RF} \) according to eq. (1.8), results in a larger value of \( B \), and smaller magnet diameter, keeping constant the final energy. Unfortunately the dimension of the electron gun, which must be placed between the cavity and the first electron orbit, imposes a minimum value to the diameter of this orbit, which is given in our case by:

\[ d_{1st} = 2 \frac{c}{\pi \nu_{RF}} \beta = 5.6 \text{ cm}, \]

\( \beta \) being the ratio \( v/c \) between the first orbit electron velocity and the light velocity. Smaller values of \( d_{1st} \) are, of course, possible, but in the design of our microtron we decided to keep the conservative way.

The hypothesis assumed in the preceding basic theory are the following:

1) - constant voltage gain \( \Delta V \) per turn;
2) - perfectly homogeneous and constant magnetic field;
3) - the transit phase constant;
4) - perfectly circular orbits, crossing tangentially the center of the cavity, and running in a medium plane.

No one of the preceding hypothesis is exactly fulfilled by a real machine, and in order to keep a high intensity beam running, we have
to develop a better understanding of the behaviour of accelerated electrons, allowing the optimization of the following parameters of the machine:

- design of the electron-gun and the cavity gap;
- shape of the magnetic field;
- cavity peak voltage;
- shape of the cavity holes for improving the beam focusing.

2. - VOLTAGE GAIN OF ELECTRONS CROSSING THE CAVITY. -

The radiofrequency voltage into the cavity is time dependent following a sinusoidal law. An electron crossing a cavity having a vanishing thin gap, gains a voltage given by:

\[ \Delta V = V_o \sin 2 \pi \nu_{RF} t_o \]

where \( V_o \) is the peak voltage, and \( t_o \) is the instant of the crossing.

In the case of a cavity having a gap of length \( h \), a relativistic electron spends a time \( \tau = h/c \) to cross the gap. The voltage gain in this case must be averaged over the time:

\[ \Delta V = \frac{V_o}{h} \int_{t_o - \frac{\tau}{2}}^{t_o + \frac{\tau}{2}} v \sin 2 \pi \nu_{RF} t \, dt ; \]

assuming the velocity of electrons \( v = c \), the result is:

\[ \Delta V = V_o \frac{\sin 2 \pi \nu_{RF}}{2 \pi \nu_{RF}} \frac{\tau}{2} \sin 2 \pi \nu_{RF} t_o . \]

From the hypothesis that \( v = c \), it follows that the voltage gain \( \Delta V \) is constant in each turn. The hypothesis is well verified for all the turns but the first, where in our case \( v \approx 0.8 \, c \). It is convenient to consider the electrons injected into the second orbit, with a kinetic energy equal to the sum of the injection energy \( eV_i \) and the energy gained in the first turn \( eV_1 \). In this case the 2nd orbit takes the place of the 1st one, and the microtron works in the mode \( a = 3, b = 1 \). It follows from (1.5) and (1.6) that:
\[ \Delta V = \left( \frac{E_0}{e} + V_i + V_1 \right) \frac{1}{2} \]

\[ B = \frac{2 \pi \nu_{RF}}{c^2} \Delta V \]

The total energy \( eV_n \) after \( n \) turns, will be given by:

\[ V_{\text{fin}} = (n-1) \Delta V + \frac{E_0}{e} + V_i + V_1 = \frac{n+1}{2} \left( \frac{E_0}{e} + V_i + V_1 \right) = (n+1) \frac{Bc^2}{2 \pi \nu_{RF}}. \]

From this equation it results that the final total energy of electrons depends linearly from the magnetic field \( B \). We have found in our machine that \( B \) must be changed of \( \pm 5\% \) for losing all the beam.

3. - STABLE PHASE THEORY. -

According to eq. (2.2) the voltage gain in each turn depends from the time \( t_o \) at which the electron crosses the center of the cavity. An electron is called "synchronous" when it crosses the cavity in successive turns in such a phase to keep constant the term:

\[ (3.1) \quad \sin 2 \pi \nu_{RF} t_o = \text{const} = \sin \psi_s \]

in eq. (2.2). The corresponding argument \( \psi_s \) is called "synchronous phase".

If the "synchronous electron" gains the correct voltage \( \Delta V \) in order to be accelerated till the last orbit, what happens to the "non synchronous electrons" having a phase \( \psi_k \neq \psi_s \) in the \( k \)-th orbit? In other words how large is the range of the phases accepted by the machine to keep electrons till the \( n \)-th orbit. How this range of phases depends from the machine parameter? Many authors\((4,5,6)\) have developed theories in the purpose to answer such questions. We shall not repeat here these theories, but just recall some of the results which have been useful for the design of our machine.

Let:

\[ \tau_k = t_k - \bar{t}_k, \]

be the time difference between the time \( t_k \) a particle running the \( k \)-th orbit actually crosses the cavity and the time \( \bar{t}_k \) the synchronous particle, running the same orbit, crosses it.
The first difference \( \Delta \mathbf{r}_k = \mathbf{r}_{k+1} - \mathbf{r}_k \) is easily shown to be:

\[
(3.2) \quad \Delta \mathbf{r}_k = \mathbf{T}_k - \mathbf{T}_k,
\]

where \( \mathbf{T}_k \) is the period of the considered particle and \( \mathbf{T}_k \) the period of the synchronous one running the \( k \)-th orbit.

According to eq. (1.1):

\[
\mathbf{T}_k = \frac{\frac{2 \pi}{eBc^2}}{E_k},
\]

\( E_k \) being the electrons total energy in \( k \)-th orbit. From the synchronism condition (3.1) and from the eq. (1.5) and (1.6) we have

\[
\frac{2 \pi}{eBc^2} = \frac{b}{eV \sin \varphi_s \cdot \nu_{RF}}.
\]

Combining the two last equations, and inserting in (3.2) we obtain:

\[
\Delta \mathbf{r}_k = \frac{b}{eV \sin \varphi_s \cdot \nu_{RF}} (E_k - \mathbf{E}_k)
\]

where \( \mathbf{E}_k \) is the total energy of the synchronous electron. By multiplying both members of last equation by \( 2 \pi \nu_{RF} \), we obtain the following relation between the phases in the two successive orbits \( k \) and \( k+1 \):

\[
(3.3) \quad \Delta \varphi_k \equiv \varphi_{k+1} - \varphi_k = \frac{2 \pi b}{eV \sin \varphi_s} (E_k - \mathbf{E}_k),
\]

The energy gain of electrons during the \((k+1)\)-th crossing of the cavity is given by

\[
(3.4) \quad \frac{E_{k+1} - E_k}{E_k} \equiv \Delta E_k = eV \sin \varphi_{k+1}
\]

By combining eq. (3.3) and eq. (3.4), we get a recurrent formula which allows us to calculate energy and phase of an electron, by assigning the initial values \( E_1 \) and \( \varphi_1 \) over the 1st orbit. In order to resolve the preceding equation we introduce a new variable, the "phase error", defined by:
\[ U_k = \psi_k - \psi_s; \]

it follows that:

\[ \Delta \psi_k = \psi_{k+1} - \psi_k = (\psi_{k+1} - \psi_s) - (\psi_k - \psi_s) = U_{k+1} - U_k = \Delta U_k. \]

Now we perform the first difference of eq. (3.3):

\[ \Delta (\Delta \psi_k) = \Delta^2 U_k = \frac{2 \pi b}{eV \sin \psi_s} (\Delta \tilde{E}_k - \Delta \tilde{E}_s); \]

introducing eq. (3.4) and remembering that:

\[ \Delta \tilde{E}_s = eV \sin \psi_s, \]

we obtain:

\[ \Delta^2 U_k = 2 \pi b \left( \frac{\sin \psi_{k+1}}{\sin \psi_s} - 1 \right). \]  

Assuming that \( U_{k+1} \ll \psi_s \), the \( \sin \psi_{k+1} \) could be approximated by:

\[ \sin \psi_{k+1} \approx \sin(\psi_s + U_{k+1}) \sin \frac{\psi_s + U_{k+1}}{\psi_s} \cos \psi_s, \]

By inserting (3.6) into (3.5), and writing explicitly the second difference \( \Delta^2 U_{k+1} \) we obtain the following approximate equation:

\[ U_{k+2} - 2U_{k+1} (1 + \pi b \cot \psi_s) + U_k = 0 \]

Solutions of this equation are finite and oscillatory when the characteristic equation has imaginary roots, for values:

\[ (1 + \pi b \cot \psi_s)^2 < 1. \]

We shall have phase stable solution (for assumed small phase oscillations) only where:

\[ -\frac{2}{\pi b} \leq \cot \psi_s \leq 0, \quad \text{or:} \]
90° ≤ ϕ_s ≤ 122° 26'  (supposing b = 1).

The optimal synchronous phase is supposed to be at the center of the above defined interval, that is to say:

\[ \cotg(\phi_s)_{\text{opt}} = -\frac{1}{\pi b} ; \quad (\phi_s)_{\text{opt}} = 107° 39' . \]

The corresponding optimum RF cavity peak voltage \( V_o \), is given by:

\[ V_o \sin \phi_s = \Delta V ; \quad (V_o)_{\text{opt}} = \frac{\Delta V}{\sin(\phi_s)_{\text{opt}}} \]

where \( \Delta V \) is the resonance voltage gain.

According to the previous calculation, the peak voltage \( V_o \) can range from the lower value corresponding to the required voltage gain \( \Delta V \), to the highest value allowed by the phase stability corresponding to:

\[ (3.8) \]

\[ \frac{\Delta V}{\sin(122°, 26')} \sim \Delta V (1 + 0, 18). \]

We have solved the phase equations (3.3) and (3.4) for small phase oscillations; allowing large phase oscillations these equations can be numerically solved by the help of a computer. The solutions plotted in a plane of coordinates: \( \phi \) and \( E \), where:

\( \phi = \) phase of the particle in the successive orbits,
\( E = E - E = \) actual energy - synchronous particle energy,

give rise to open or closed curves. Points inside a closed curve belong to closed curves contained into the first one; in other words curves are not intersecting. It follows that it exist a closed limiting curve, all the points inside the curve belonging to closed curves, all points outside belonging to open curves. The closed limiting curve encloses the so called "stable phase region", a region in the \( \phi, (E/V/\Delta V) \) plane all the points of which represent phase stable running electrons.

Each value of the peak cavity voltage \( V_o \) allowed by the limiting conditions (3.8) gives rise to a phase stable region which can be numerically calculated and plotted (see Fig. 3).

The plot of the phase stable region is a useful tool for evaluating the range of the useful injection phases. In fact an electron which
is injected in to the cavity from the cathode with a phase $\varphi$ gains a voltage which differs from the voltage gained by the synchronous electron, by a relative amount given by:

$$\frac{V_o \sin \varphi - V_o \sin \varphi_s}{V_o \sin \varphi_s} = \frac{\delta V}{\Delta V}$$

or simplifying:

$$\frac{\sin \varphi}{\sin \varphi_s} - 1 = \frac{\delta V}{\Delta V}$$

This relationship is represented in to the plane $\varphi$, $\delta V/\Delta V$ by a curve which intersects the phase stable region. The points of the curve laing into the phase stable region represent phase stable injected electrons, in other words all electrons accepted for further acceleration from the phase stability point of view. (In Fig. 2 is plotted only to curve corresponding to $V_o = 570$ KV).

4. - INJECTION. -

In the introduction of the present paper it has been mentioned the fact that injection has been one of the major problems in the development of the microtron. Cold extracted electrons from the walls of the cavity have been the source of the injected current in first microtrons. The intensity of the cold extracted electron current was thought to be large enough to give rise to an appreciable accelerated current. In recent years many authors have realized that cold electron current, field extracted from the walls of the cavity, is mostly injected with a wrong phase, just at the boundary of the above defined phase stable region. Such a difficulty has been overcome by hot cathode injection, following one of the two proposed methods:

1) electrons are injected by an hot cathode inside the cavity (Kapitza\textsuperscript{(7, 8)});
2) electrons are injected by an hot cathode outside the cavity (Wernholm\textsuperscript{(6)}).

By the method n, 2 a high capture efficiency could be reached (up to 6.5%) and final energy, emittance, geometrical position of the last
orbit result quite insensitive to the value of the peak cavity radio frequen-
cy voltage. By this method of injection an energy, geometry, and position
stable beam of electrons could be extracted from the last orbit of the
microtron and easily injected into a larger machine. These are the rea-
sons of our choice of the Wernholm injection method for the microtron
built as injector of the Frascati 1.1 GeV. electronsynchrotron.

Kapitza's n. 1 injection method allows continuous change of the
final energy of the beam extracted from the machine, through a range of
±20% of the nominal value. Due to the miscellaneous use, both for me-
dical and physical purposes, foreseen for the microtron to be installed
at Catania University, in this machine both injection methods shall be
allowed by minor changes into the injector and cavity geometry.

In the following we shall describe the injector of the Frascati
machine, according to the Wernholm method. As it is shown in Fig. 4, 5, 6.

FIG. 4

the electron gun is put outside the cavity into a furrow machined in the
wall of the cavity in order to keep clean the way for the first orbit. Elec-
trons emitted by the cathode are accelerated by a pulse of 70 kV applied
the cathode support, and move towards the grounded cylindrical envel-
lope of the cathode. In this region they follow an epicycloidal trajectory
due to the combined action of perpendicular electric and magnetic fields.
Baffled by an hole in the cylindrical envelope of the cathode structure,
a beam of electrons runs an half circle of 0.76 cm radius and enter into
the first window of the cavity. The fringing electric field from the cavi-
ty helps the capture of electrons into the cavity gap.

The almost coaxial structure of the electron gun (see Fig. 7)
is built by an external titanium cylinder containing a smaller tantalium
rod. This latter supports a pill of an high emission density material (LaB₆) which is heated to about 1800°C by an auxiliary electron beam of 50 W power produced by a conventional Wolframium cathode. The cathode structure is supported by an Araldite insulating vacuum tight rod and passes through a hole in the lower pole face of the microtron's magnet. The position of the cathode with respect to the cavity can by slightly remotely adjusted by movement of the supporting structure into the hole.

FIG. 7

5. - TECHNOLOGY OF THE LaB₆ EMITTER. -

One of the most delicate problems to be solved in order to built an efficient and long lived hot cathode injector for the microtron is the technology for preparing the LaB₆ pills. We have followed the steps described in the present paragraph.

The termojonic properties of the alkali earths have been studied by Lafferty. We refer here in Table I some of the properties of LaB₆.

TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melting point</td>
<td>2210°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistivity (1800°C)</td>
<td>ρ = 120 Ωcm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall coefficient</td>
<td>R = 7.7 x 10⁻¹² V cm/amp gauss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson's law parameters</td>
<td>A = 29 A/cm² K⁻²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaporating rate at 1953°K</td>
<td>θ = 2.66 Volt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature corresponding to</td>
<td>2.89 g/cm² s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a vapour tension of 10⁻⁵ torr.</td>
<td>T_p = 2090°K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table II some properties of materials employed as cathodes are listed.

**TABLE II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>$T_p$ (%)</th>
<th>$\Phi$ (Volt)</th>
<th>$T_p/\Phi$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ta</td>
<td>2680</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaO - SrO</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th over W</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaB$_6$</td>
<td>2090</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pills of LaB$_6$ can be obtained by sintering the pressed powder under vacuum at a temperature ranging from 1375°C to 1800°C(9).

Heating the LaB$_6$ in contact of refractory metals like W, Ta, Mo, etc gives rise to the diffusion of Boron into the metal, and to evaporation of Lantanum. Long living cathods must be supported by a inactive material. Renium or graphite supports have been used with some difficulties; we preferred an easy to machine Tantalum support, in which the place for the LaB$_6$ pill is prepared. A thin layer of MoSi$_2$ prevents the diffusion of LaB$_6$ into the Ta support. The layer of MoSi$_2$ is good conductor, does not react with both materials, has an high melting temperature of 2023°K and seems to be well suited to the pourpose.

The process for preparing this kind of cathodes goes through the following steps:

- a solution of MoSi$_2$ in trichloroethylene is dropped by means of a small brush into the hole drilled into the Tantalum support;
- quick evaporation of the trichloroethylene solvent leaves a layer of MoSi$_2$ powder which is heated under vacuum to a temperature of 2023°K by electron bombardment. The fused MoSi$_2$ covers the inside surface of the Ta hole with a strong thin film;
- powder of LaB$_6$ is pressed into the hole and is heated under vacuum at 1800°K for about 15 minutes.

Cathodes prepared in this way are ready for use; an emitting surface of about 5 mm$^2$ gives rise to currents of 5-10 A. The life of such cathodes is well above 1000 working hours.
6. - MAGNETIC FIELD. -

The microtron's magnetic field is supposed to be uniform over the region filled by the beam's orbits. An approximate calculation is described in the present paragraph in order to estimate the amount of disuniformity allowed. The last, and larger orbits are of course the more sensitive to field disuniformity\(^{(12,13)}\). We suppose the field \(B\) in the geometric median plane to be described by the function:

\[
B(\theta) = B_o + B_1 \sin \theta + B_2 \cos \theta
\]

where \(\theta\) is the azimuthal angle over the orbit, taking \(\theta = 0\) at the center of the resonating cavity gap. In this formula first armonic terms are the only one considered.

A further simplifying hypothesis is introduced by substituting the sinus and cosine functions by step functions of the same period, phase and amplitude. The \(B_1 \sin \theta\) function is approximated by:

\[+
B_1 \quad \text{for} \quad 0^\circ < \theta < 180^\circ
\]

\[-
B_1 \quad \text{for} \quad 180^\circ < \theta < 360^\circ
\]

The trajectory of electrons of momentum \(P\) consequently has the shape of two half cycles (see Fig. 8) having radii:

\[
R_1 = \frac{P}{e(B_0 - B_1)} \quad \text{end} \quad R_2 = \frac{P}{e(B_0 + B_2)}
\]

FIG. 8
Such a trajectory can cross again the cavity hole of radius \( r \), if:

\[
2(R_1 - R_2) \leq r.
\]

From this condition it follows, by simple algebra, that

\[
B_1 \leq \frac{e r B_0^2}{4 P} \sim \frac{r B_0}{4 \bar{R}},
\]

where:

\[
\bar{R} = \frac{P}{e B_o} = (n+1) \lambda ;
\]

or:

\[
\frac{B_1}{B_0} \leq \frac{r}{4(n+1) \lambda},
\]

where: \( n \) is the orbit number, \( \lambda \) the wavelength of the radiofrequency feeding the cavity.

In our case we have:

\[
r \approx 0.5 \text{ cm}, \quad \lambda = 10 \text{ cm}, \quad n = 20 \text{ (last orbit)},
\]

and it results:

\[
\frac{B_1}{B_0} = \frac{0.5}{4.21 \times 10} = 0.6 \times 10^{-3}.
\]

This figure gives an order of magnitude of the accuracy of magnetic field uniformity needed to keep the beam running the largest orbits, without missing the cavity hole.

A graphical study of the term \( B_2 \cos \theta \) in eq. (6.1) shows that a larger value of \( B_2 \) is allowed in order to let the beam crossing the cavity. In this case the value of \( B_2 \) changes the effective length of the orbits, and is mostly limited by the phase conditions.

Assuming again a step function approximation of \( \cos \theta \), we have:

\[
B_2 \cos \theta \approx \begin{cases} +B_2 & \text{for } 270^\circ \leq \theta \leq 90^\circ \\ -B_2 & \text{for } 90^\circ \leq \theta \leq 270 \end{cases}
\]
From Fig. 9 it is easy to verify that the length of the orbit results to be:

\[ 2\pi \left( \frac{R_1}{4} + \frac{R_2}{2} + \frac{R_1}{4} \right) + 2(R_2 - R_1) = \]

\[ 2\pi \left( \frac{R_1 + R_2}{2} \right) + 2(R_2 - R_1) \approx 2\pi R_o + (R_2 - R_1), \]

(6.3)

where: \( R_1 \) and \( R_2 \) are defined as in (6.2) changing of course \( B_1 \) by \( B_2 \).

In the last equation it is supposed:

\[ \frac{R_1 + R_2}{2} \approx R_o. \]

The term \( 2(R_2 - R_1) \) represents the change in the orbit's length due to the field asymmetry; it corresponds to a time lag of electrons circulating with velocity \( c \), given by

\[ \Delta T = \frac{2(R_2 - R_1)}{C} = \frac{2P}{eC} \left[ \frac{(B_o + B_2) - (B_o - B_2)}{B_0^2 - B_2^2} \right] \approx \frac{4P}{eC} \frac{B_2}{B_0^2}. \]

The phase shift \( \Delta \psi = \omega \Delta T \) is given by:

(6.4)

\[ \Delta \psi = -\frac{4P \omega B_2}{eCB_0^2} = -4(n+1) \frac{B_2}{B_0}. \]

Assuming to allow in the \( n=20 \) orbit a maximum phase shift of \( \Delta \psi = 0.5 \) rad, we have from (6.3):

\[ \frac{B_2}{B_0} \leq 0.6 \times 10^{-2}. \]
Finally we have to take into account that the average value of the actual magnetic field $\bar{B}(\theta)$ differs from the nominal value $B_0$. This error introduces a phase shift $\Delta \gamma'$ which easily shown to be, on the n-th orbit:

$$\Delta \gamma' = 2 \pi (n+1) \frac{\bar{B}(\theta) - B_0}{B_0}.$$

Assuming $n=20$, $\Delta \gamma' = 15^\circ$ we have:

$$\frac{\bar{B}(\theta) - B_0}{B_0} \leq 0,2 \times 10^{-2}.$$

Of course we have to consider that both phase shifts: $\Delta \gamma$ and $\Delta \gamma'$, are present at same time, so that it seems conservative to cut by a factor 2 the allowed values of magnetic field dishomogeneity:

$$\frac{B_2}{B_0} \leq 0,3\% \quad \frac{\bar{B}(\theta) - B_0}{B_0} \leq 0,1\%.$$

7. - BEAM EXTRACTION. -

The extraction of electron beam from the microtron seems to be a quite easy operation because of the large orbit separation. In fact the orbits, which are bunched together at cavity gap, are separated by $\lambda / \tau$ (3.18 cm in our case) at the diametrically opposite position. Unfortunately the introduction of an iron pipe tangentially to the last orbit, in order to extract electrons by screening the magnetic field, gives rise to a local perturbation of the field which disturbs the orbits in such a way to reduce by a large amount the intensity of the extracted beam.

A method for reducing the perturbation due to the extraction pipe has been proposed by Reich and Lons(14), and has been adopted by us. It has been shown by these authors that the value $B$ of the field in the median plane at a distance $x$ from the perturbing iron pipe depends from the ratio $x/a$, where $a$ is the magnet gap, according to the function:

$$(7.1) \quad B(\frac{x}{a}) = B_0 f(\frac{x}{d}, \frac{a}{d}),$$

where $d$ is the rod diameter and $B_0$ the unperturbed field. A family of curves of the function $f(x/d, a/d)$ is reported in Fig.10. An inspection of
these curves shows that for an assigned value of $x/d$, the value of the function $f$ approaches unity as $a/d$ is decreased. The gap height of the magnet cannot be actually decreased, but Reich and Lons observed that in formula (7.1) the gap height $a$ can be substituted by the distance between the rod and his magnetic image symmetrical with respect to an equipotential plane; a regular ladder of real and image parallel rods, having a distance $a'$, gives rise to the same perturbation of a single rod into a gap of height $a'$.

![Graph showing the relationship between $B/B_0$ and $x/d$ with curves labeled for different values of $a/d$.](image)

**FIG. 10**

In our extraction system we have introduced, above and below the extraction pipe, two rods of the same diameter $d = 16$ mm, at a distance of 33.3 mm; this corresponds to a value $a' = (1/3)a = (1/3)10$ cm. From Fig. 10 it can be calculated the value of the perturbed field expected at the last but one orbit, where we have $x/d = 2$:

$$\frac{B}{B_0} = 0.96 \quad \text{(Without correcting side rods, for } \frac{a}{d} = 6.25)$$

$$\frac{B}{B_0} = 0.995 \quad \text{(With two correcting side rods for } \frac{a'}{d} = 2.08)$$
the perturbation results greatly reduced.

The mechanical arrangement of the extracting pipe and correcting rods(6) is shown in Fig.11; the device can be remotely adjusted by movements in the medium plane in order to optimize its position with respect to the beam running the last orbit. By a good positioning of the extracting system an extraction efficiency very near 100% has been obtained.

**FIG. 11**

8. - MAGNET DETAILS AND VACUUM SYSTEM. -

The magnet design is shown in Fig. 2, 12. The two circular flat pole pieces are kept in position at a distance of 10 cm by the stainless steel vacuum chamber. At border of pole pieces a small "tip" corrects the magnetic field from fringing effects.

**FIG. 12**

The shape of the actual magnetic field in the medium plane, measured with a Diecke magnetometer along a diameter, is plotted in Fig. 13. It can be observed that the "tip" overcompensate the fringing
effects; because in the useful region the measured disuniformity of the field is less than 0.1% we have left the "tip" unchanged.

Magnet excitation is obtained by two 364 turns coils, wounded with copper of rectangular cross section of 5 x 3 mm$^2$. The resulting resistance of the coils is about 3Ω, and a current of 13 A is needed to reach the value $B_0=1,214$ g of the magnetic field.

The vacuum chamber is made by the two iron pole pieces and a stainless steel ring; two O-rings ensure the vacuum tightness between chamber's parts. The stainless steel ring structure is shown in Figure 2. In the ring 9 circular windows are opened for allowing: 3 vacuum pumping parts, 1 input of the wave guide feeding the power to the cavity, 5 input of power for auxiliary cathode, 4 beam output, 2 optical inspection of the beam, 6 remote control of the arm supporting the Faraday cup measuring beam current.

By 3 jonic titanium pumps, of 100 lit/s capacity a final vacuum of $5 \times 10^{-7}$ torr is reached into the chamber.

A mechanical pump followed by a diffusion pump and nitrogen trap is runned at the beginning of vacuum pumping operation to bring the pressure below the threshold of jonic pumps working. A vacuum better than $5 \times 10^{-6}$ torr is needed for beam running; such a vacuum is reached in about 2.5 hours by the above described vacuum system.

9. - CAVITY AND MICROWAVE SYSTEM. -

As it has been described in § 1 a peak voltage of $V_0 = 580$ kV must be maintained at the gap of resonating cavity in order to accelerate and keep in phase the electrons.

Using a cylindrical cavity of radius $r = 38,3$ mm and gap $h =$
= 15 mm we expect a $Q_0$ value of ref. (15):

$$Q_0 = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{r}{\delta}} = 8.800,$$

$\delta = 1.22 \times 10^{-4}$ mm being the copper skin depth at the frequency:

$$\nu_{RF} = 3.000 \text{ Mc/s}.$$

The measured $Q$ value results to be:

$$Q = 7500,$$

and the shunt resistance $(15)$

$$R_p = 188Q \frac{h}{r} = 550 \text{ K} \Omega.$$

The power required to maintain a peak voltage of $V_o = 580$ kV at the cavity gap (without the electron beam leading), is:

$$P_o = \frac{1}{2} \frac{V_o^2}{R_p} = 305 \text{ kW},$$

Because of economy reasons we have chosen a 2MW tunable magnetron (TV 1542) as microwave power supply. A modulator supplies to the magnetron power pulses of 45 kV, 90 A, 2 + 4 $\mu$s length.

Of course higher power and larger duty cycle could by obtained by a klystron microwave power tube, the cost of which is quite larger.

We can evaluate the maximum beam current which can be accelerated by our microwave system; let:

- $P_m$ the magnetron power
- $P_t$ the power absorbed by the beam
- $P_o$ the power fed to the cavity
- $\eta = 0.85$ a coefficient taking into account the power lost in the microwave feeding circuit;

we have:

$$\eta P_m = P_o + P_t$$

(9.1)
The power $P_t$ absorbed by the beam is the sum of two terms:

$$P_t = nP_f + P_e$$

where $P_f$ is the power absorbed by stable phase running electrons per turn and $P_e$ is the power absorbed by lost electrons.

We have:

$$K = \frac{P_e}{P_f} \simeq 20 \div 25,$$

because about 5% of injected current is accepted and accelerated by the microtron with the Wernholm injection system.

For $n$ orbits acceleration, it results:

(9.2) \hspace{1cm} P_t = nP_f + P_e = V_o i_f (K+n),

where $i_f$ is the beam final current. From (9.1) and (9.2), $i_f$ is given by:

(9.3) \hspace{1cm} i_f = \frac{1}{nV_o} \frac{\gamma(P_m - P_o)}{1 + \frac{K}{n}}.

Injecting into eq. (9.3) the values of parameters of our microtron:

- $\gamma = 0.8$
- $K = 20 \div 25$
- $n = 21$
- $nV_o = 12$ MV
- $P_o = 305$ kW
- $P_m = 2$ MW,

we expect a beam current:

$$i_f \simeq 60 \text{ mA},$$

a value very near to the measured one.

The microwave resonator is a cylindrical cavity of 38, 3 mm radius and 15 mm height obtained by machining a solid block of oxygen free high conductivity copper. The 3 pieces by which the resonator is built, shown as A B and C in Fig. 4, are assembled by screws. Into the bases of the cylinder two rectangular 8x16 mm windows are machined for allowing the beam to cross the cavity; as is shown in Fig. 4 the window down-
stream to the beam is shifted of 3 mm from the axial position with the purpose of following the first orbit.

The piece of the cavity indicated by A in Fig. 4 presents an hole to give place to the electron gun, and holes are drilled into the bulk material in such a way to form a pipe for circulatind the cooling water.

A rectangular hole couples the cavity to the waveguide feeding the microwave power. A ceramic window (RCA J 15152) separates the section of the microwave circuit working under vacuum (resonator and the last piece of wave guide) from the remaining section which works at a pressure of 2 Kg/cm² of N₂.

More details of the microwave circuit design are given in Appendix I, II, III.

In Table III we give the principal parameters of our machine, in Table IV the energy and current values are given of some of the largest microtrone built by various laboratories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>energy (MeV)</th>
<th>(mA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lund</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosca</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosca</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubna</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TABELLA III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum electron energy</td>
<td>12 MeV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of orbits n</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak current</td>
<td>60 mA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse length</td>
<td>$2 \pm 4 \mu s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pulses per second</td>
<td>20-400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam emittance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horizontal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vertical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momentum spread $\Delta p/p$</td>
<td>+0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltage gain per turn</td>
<td>580 kV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microwave frequency</td>
<td>3000 Mc/s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetron (TV 1542) peak power</td>
<td>2 MW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetron's power supply:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peak voltage</td>
<td>45 kV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peak current</td>
<td>90 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ripple</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microwave pulse rise time</td>
<td>0.2 \mu s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavity filling time</td>
<td>0.5 \mu s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic type RCA-J 15152</td>
<td>ceramic type RCA-J 15152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetic field</td>
<td>1214 gauss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole pieces diameter</td>
<td>1060 mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last orbit diameter</td>
<td>700 mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetic field uniformity inside a diameter of 890 mm</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap height</td>
<td>100 mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight of magnet + coils</td>
<td>2.5 tons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coils (copper 10 mm$^2$ rectangular cross section)</td>
<td>2 x 364 turns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance of coils</td>
<td>3 ohm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coils current</td>
<td>13 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current stability</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wernholm injector current</td>
<td>1.2 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injector voltage pulse</td>
<td>70 kV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean life of cathodes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auxiliary cathode</td>
<td>$\sim 300$ h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaB$_6$ cathode</td>
<td>$\sim 1000$ h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time needed to change a cathode</td>
<td>$\sim 3$ h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working vacuum</td>
<td>0.5 - 5 x $10^{-6}$ torr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum system 3 titanium pumps</td>
<td>100 lit/s each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 m$^3$/h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500 lit/s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam remote measuring devices and controls:</td>
<td>a) Faraday cup at successive orbits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Induction output electrode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Position of extracting device</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Position of cathode.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I - Microwave circuit.

The microwave circuit consists of the magnetron coupled to the resonator by a ferrite insulator and a microwave window (see Fig. 14).

1 Magnetron (TV 1542 or M 5015)
2 Ferrite insulator (2 x ISH 27)
3 Directional coupler (-60 db)
4 Microwave window
5 Cavity

FIG. 14

The ferrite insulator is used to limit the resonator power reflection due to unavoidable mismatching.

The magnetron used in our microtron (TV 1542) requires a standing wave ratio $S_0$ not larger than 1.2.

One can easily calculates $S_0$, obtaining:

$$S_0 = \frac{1 + \Gamma \sqrt{\alpha_1 \alpha_2}}{1 - \Gamma \sqrt{\alpha_1 \alpha_2}}$$

where $\Gamma$ is the voltage reflection coefficient of the resonator, and $\alpha_1$, $\alpha_2$ are the forward and backward power transmission coefficient of the ferrite insulator. Using two 3 MW Raytheon ISH 27 type insulators in series having $\alpha_1 = 0.95$, $\alpha_2 = 0.1$ one obtains $S_0 = 1.2$ in the case $\Gamma = 1$ (detuned cavity).

APPENDIX II - Coupling of the resonator to wave guide.

The coupling of the resonator must be realized in order to obtain:

a) The maximum power transfer in the accelerated beam.
b) The possibility of changing the current beam in large limits without increasing the $S_0$ value over (1.8), which is the limit value of insulator.

At this point it is convenient to introduce the coupling factor $\beta$ of the resonator (ref. 15 pag. 235):
\[ \beta = \frac{Q_o}{Q_e} = \frac{P_e}{P_o + P_t}, \]

where: \( P_e \), \( P_o \) and \( P_t \) are respectively the power dissipated in the input admittance, in the cavity walls and into the beam.

\[ Q_o = \frac{2\pi\nu \text{ energy stored in cavity}}{\text{power dissipated in cavity (walls + beam)}} = \frac{2\pi\nu \text{ En. Stor. Cav.}}{P_o + P_t}, \]

\[ Q_e = \frac{2\pi\nu \text{ energy stored in cavity}}{\text{power dissipated in input admittance}} = \frac{2\pi\nu \text{ En. Stor. Cav.}}{P_e}, \]

\( P_e \) depends from the hole shape between cavity and waveguide.

In the hypothesis that the hole is adjusted in order to have \( \beta = 1 \) (waveguide matched) with a fixed \( P_t \) (\( P_t \) is the power dissipated on \( I_t \) beam current, that maches the cavity), one has:

\[ P_e = P_o + P_t, \]

and

\[ \beta = \frac{P_o + P_t}{P_o + P_t}. \]

(1)

This formula is very usefull to calculate \( \beta \) for any value of \( P_t \) and in particular the value of \( \beta = \beta_{\infty} \) when \( P_t = 0 \). The \( \beta_{\infty} \) is the only parameter that can be measured by microwave test equipment:

\[ \beta_{\infty} = 1 + \frac{P_t}{P_o} = 1 + \frac{I_t}{I_o}. \]

(2)

The parameters that can realize the conditions a), b) are the power \( P_m \) required from the magnetron, the VSWR \( S \) which depend by the beam current and by \( \beta_{\infty} \) (we remember that \( \beta_{\infty} \) depends only from the coupling hole of the cavity).

The equation 1) can be transformed into:

\[ \beta = \frac{\beta_{\infty}}{1 + \frac{P_t}{P_o}} = \frac{\beta_{\infty}}{1 + \frac{I_t}{I_o}}, \]

(3)
\( I_0 \) is the equivalent current in the cavity walls. Because (ref. 15 page 235)

\[
S = \beta \quad \text{for} \quad \beta > 1 \\
S = 1/\beta \quad \text{for} \quad \beta < 1
\]

one has:

\[
S = \frac{\beta_{\infty}}{1 + \frac{I_t}{I_o}} \quad \text{for} \quad I < I^x
\]

\[
S = \frac{1}{\beta_{\infty}} \quad \text{for} \quad I > I^x
\]

(4)

The equation (3, 4) are plotted in Fig. 15.

The power required from the magnetron \( P_m \) is:

\[
P_m = \frac{(P_o + P_t + P_r)}{\gamma}
\]

(5)

where: \( P_r \) is the reflected power from the cavity and \( \gamma \) is a factor taking into account the power losses in the microwave circuit. Now we have:

\[
\Gamma^2 = \frac{P_r}{\gamma P_m} = \left( \frac{\beta_{\infty} - 1}{\beta_{\infty} + 1} \right)^2 = \left( \frac{1 - (I_t/I_o)}{\beta_{\infty} + 1} + \frac{I_t}{I_o} \right)^2
\]

(6)

Substituting (6) in (5) and taking into account of (2), (3) we have

\[
\beta_{\infty} \frac{P_m}{P_o} = \frac{1 + (\beta_{\infty} - 1) (I/I_o)}{1 - I_t/I_o} - \left( \frac{1+I_t/I_o}{(\beta_{\infty} + 1)/((\beta_{\infty} - 1) + I_t/I_o)} \right)^2
\]

(7)

The equation (7) is plotted in Fig. 16.

The Fig. 15 and 16 show that the value \( \beta_{\infty} = 3 \) realizes the possibility to change the beam current from 15 mA to 55 mA with \( S \leq 1.8 \) and a power transfer into the beam near the maximum obtainable with perfect matching at the maximum current (\( \beta = 5 \) I = 60 mA).
FIG. 15

FIG. 16
APPENDIX III - Vertical focusing\(^{(10, 11, 12)}\). -

The radio frequency field fringing from the hole of the resonator produces vertical focusing effects on the electron beam. This effect is dependent from the shape of the gap. In fact from the Maxwell equations:

\[
\text{div } E = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{curl } H = \mathcal{E}_0 \frac{\partial E}{\partial t},
\]

one obtains (ref. 2)

\[
E_z = -\alpha z \frac{\partial E_x}{\partial x} \quad \text{and} \quad B_y = -\frac{z}{c^2} \frac{\partial E_x}{\partial t},
\]

where \(xyz\) are orthogonal reference axes, with \(x\) directed along the cavity axis and \(z\) along the microtron magnetic field (see Fig. 4).

The parameter \(\alpha\) depends from the shape of the hole as it is shown in Table V.

| Circular shape of the gap | \(\alpha = 1/2\) |
| Rectangular shape of the gap parallel to \(y\) axis | \(\alpha = 1\) |
| Rectangular shape of the gap parallel to \(z\) axis | \(\alpha = 0\) |

From the motion equation one has:

\[
\Delta P_z = \Delta P = -\alpha e \int_{t'}^{t''} (\frac{\partial E_x}{\partial x} - \frac{\beta}{c} \frac{\partial E_x}{\partial t})z \, dt
\]

(8)

Where \(\Delta P_z\) is the change in momentum along \(z\) axis gained by a particle in crossing the fringing region of one hole. In the interesting case \(\alpha \approx 1\), equation (8) becomes (ref. 2), pag. 280

\[
\Delta P = \Delta (m_0 \gamma \frac{dz}{dt}) = -\alpha 1 \frac{dE_x}{dx} z \, dt
\]

(9)

Where:

\[\Delta t = t'' - t'\]
The equation (9) can be transformed into:

\[ \Delta P = - \frac{\alpha \varepsilon x \Delta E_x}{C_1} = - \frac{\alpha \varepsilon_o}{C_1} z \]

\[ \varepsilon_o = h \Delta E_x \]

where \( \varepsilon_o = h \Delta E_x \) is the energy gained per turn by a particle. Neglecting the length of the fringing field region with respect to the gap length, the effects of the gaps entrance hole on the electrons, and of the exit hole are respectively given by the matrices:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 1 & \frac{\varepsilon_e}{\gamma_n \varepsilon_o} & 1 & 0 \\
\frac{\alpha \varepsilon_o}{h C} & 1 & 0 & 1 & \frac{\alpha \varepsilon_o}{h C} & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\]

The product of the two matrices describes the behaviour of the electron in crossing the resonator. One obtains:

\[
(10) \quad \begin{pmatrix}
1 - \alpha / \gamma_n & hC / \gamma_n \varepsilon_o \\
-\alpha^2 \varepsilon_o / \gamma_n C_1 & 1 + \alpha / \gamma_n
\end{pmatrix}
\]

The remaining path of the electron, in the static magnetic field, is described by the matrix:

\[
(11) \quad \begin{pmatrix}
1 & \frac{C}{\varepsilon_o} \left(1 - \frac{h}{\gamma_n + 1}\right) \\
0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\]

The matrix corresponding to a whole turn is the product of the (10), (11) and is given by:

\[ A = \begin{pmatrix}
a_{11} & a_{12} \\
a_{21} & a_{22}
\end{pmatrix} \]

where:

\[ a_{11} = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{\gamma_n} - \frac{\alpha^2}{\gamma_n h} \]
\[ a_{21} = -\alpha^2 \frac{\mathcal{E}_o}{\gamma_n \text{Ch}} \]

\[ a_{22} = 1 + \frac{\alpha}{\gamma_n} \]

\( a_{12} \) may be derived by the equation:

\[ \det A = 1 \]

One can demonstrate that the coordinate \( z \) makes oscillations:

\[ z = Z_n \cos (\phi + n \mu) \]

where:

\[ \cos \mu = 1/2 \left( a_{11} + a_{12} \right) \approx \alpha \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{\gamma_n h}} \]

\[ n = \gamma_n + 1 \text{ if the number of revolutions,} \]

\[ Z_n = \left( \frac{a_{12}}{\text{sen} \mu} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{a_{12}}{\lambda} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{\gamma_n h}{\gamma_n} \right)^{1/4} \alpha^{1/2} \]

In the relativistic region \( a_{12} \) is nearly constant and:

\[ \sin \mu \approx \mu = \alpha \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{\gamma_n h}} \]

and one obtains:

\[ \frac{Z_m}{Z_n} = \left( \frac{\gamma_m}{\gamma_n} \right)^{1/4} = \left( \frac{m+1}{n+1} \right)^{1/4} \]

For \( m = 21 \) turns (that is the number of turns in our microtron) and \( n = 4 \) (electron nearly relativistic) one obtains:

\[ \frac{Z_{21}}{Z_4} = \left( \frac{2}{5} \right)^{1/4} \approx 1.4 \]

This result means that the minimum loss of beam from the 4\textsuperscript{th} to 21\textsuperscript{th} orbit is to be expected of 30\%, in the hypothesis that the beam is uniformly distributed in vertical.
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