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1. INTRODUCTION

Over the last two decades, heavy ion beams have become increasingly important tools for scientific investigations ranging from the synthesis of heavy "man-made" elements to the fields of nuclear physics and biology and medicine.

In the context of this paper, a heavy ion is the nucleus of any element with an atomic mass larger than 4 amu (atomic mass units), deliberately excluding hydrogen and helium. Heavy ion accelerators are employed to accelerate and form the particles into pure and intense beams of the desired energy. Unstable isotopes are occasionally used if their half-life is long compared to the acceleration process.

The invention and development of the cyclotron in the 1930s by E. O. Lawrence, S. Livingston, and other collaborators, started particle physics, nuclear physics, and nuclear chemistry on the road of expansion to the major scientific enterprise we know today. The development of beams of protons, deuterons, alphas, and lithium ions from 60-in. cyclotrons throughout the world served a highly productive area of nuclear physics and chemistry. The Berkeley 60-in. cyclotron ran very intense beams until 1961, when the LBL 88-in. isochronous cyclotron and the ORIC (Oak Ridge Isochronous Cyclotron) took its place with strong emphasis on nuclear physics. Livingston and Blewett (1) give a detailed history of accelerator development prior to 1962.

Nuclear Chemistry research with heavy ion linacs dates from 1957, when the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, together with Yale University, developed and built the first two productive heavy-ion linear accelerators delivering beams of 10 MeV/amu with masses up to 40 amu (2).
A similar development took place in Dubna, USSR in the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research (JINR).

Parallel developments with electrostatic accelerators, particularly the tandem Van de Graaffs (3), led to the attainment of higher and higher terminal voltages, up to the presently envisioned 20 and 30 MV. With the refinement of negative heavy ion sources (4), the tandem Van de Graaff accelerators entered the field of heavy ion nuclear physics, and now complement the linacs and cyclotrons. The excellent phase-space characteristics of these beams, including energy resolutions of up to $10^{-4}$, make them ideal tools for precision nuclear physics experiments. The Yale group, with its MP-tandem, led the way in the use of Van de Graaffs for heavy ion research.

Accelerator experiments with heavy relativistic ions were started in 1970, with the conversion of the proton synchrotrons at Princeton (5) (Princeton-Penn accelerator, which discontinued operations in 1975) and Berkeley (6) (Bevatron), to the acceleration of heavy ions. Initially, beams were limited in intensity and ion species by injectors, which had been designed for protons. At Berkeley, the limits were extended by injecting the beam of a high-intensity, low-energy heavy ion accelerator (SuperHILAC) into the Bevatron. This combination (the Bevalac) yields particle currents of about $10^9$/sec for ions up to neon, sufficient for counter and coincidence experiments with high energy and particle mass resolution, and beams of reduced intensity up to iron. Available energies range from 100 MeV to 2.4 GeV per nucleon.

The applications of heavy ion beams in basic and applied research are numerous. At energies below the Coulomb barrier, very precise
nuclear quantities (e.g., energy levels, matrix elements) can be extracted. With beams of $^{136}\text{Xe}$, rotational states with $I = 24$ have been excited in $^{238}\text{U}$, and heavier projectiles should excite even higher states. Above the Coulomb barrier, aspects of nuclear interactions, e.g., the ion-ion potential or the effects of deformations on scattering and reaction processes, are studied. The investigation of transfer reactions and compound nucleus formation, as well as deep inelastic processes, advances our understanding of reaction mechanisms. The search for superheavy elements ($Z = 114$ to 126) constitutes another branch of ongoing research at modest energies. In atomic physics, improved yields for the production of molecular orbit x-rays or the observation of the predicted autoionization of positrons are expected from collisions between very heavy ions.

Above 20 MeV/amu, a qualitatively new feature appears in that now the estimated velocity of sound in nuclear matter is exceeded, opening up the possibility of studying nuclear matter at varying densities.

In the realm of nuclear physics at high energies, researchers are eagerly searching out novel features of interactions where a high number of baryons is simultaneously involved (7). Nucleons at high kinetic energies may be excited to the baryonic resonances, produce pions and kaons, or reabsorb them. In the process of a central collision, the initial ground state configuration of nuclei will be immediately transformed into a very hot piece of nuclear matter, where the binding energy per nucleon is readily overcome.

High-energy (above several hundred MeV per amu), heavy ion fragmentation cross sections are of particular interest to astrophysicists. They rely on these data to formulate models describing
the propagation of cosmic rays in space and to approach an understanding of how the universe was created. Furthermore, very precise beams of heavy ions are required to calibrate the sensitive instruments flown in space studies.

One of the most exciting prospects is the generation of the predicted abnormal states of nuclear matter that can be tested when relativistic beams as heavy as Pb or U become available.

The application of heavy ions for radiation biology, radiation therapy, and diagnostic radiology has fostered an entire new field of heavy-ion work. The potential attractiveness of these beams for radiotherapy lies both in their radiobiological effects and the fact that a precise radiation dose can be delivered to a specific tumor volume with minimal damage to normal tissue, compared with conventional x-radiation therapy. At LBL's Bevalac facility, an active experimental program is investigating these fields (8). Also, the first steps in instituting an active patient treatment program are being taken.

Low charge-state heavy ions have been used in industry for some time. The major application is ion implantation—the doping of semiconductor materials by ion beams—to achieve far better uniformity and dose control, and in some cases to produce devices that were heretofore impossible to fabricate (9). Other uses of heavy ions now under active investigation are changing the optical properties of materials, changing magnetic properties of materials used for bubble memory, enhancing surface hardness and corrosion resistance, and altering properties of thin films (10). Ion implantation has also been used in the production of superconductors and to modify the
coefficients of friction. At ORNL (Oak Ridge National Laboratory) heavy-ion beams are used to simulate radiation damage from reactor neutrons in the absence of large enough neutron fluxes (11).

Among the many types of potential and operational heavy-ion accelerators, the choice of the proper machine depends upon the intended use. The precise beams of tandem electrostatic accelerators and cyclotrons are most suitable for experiments with high resolution spectrometers. Linacs, with their relatively high intensity and velocities independent of mass, are excellent tools for chemistry-type experiments, overlapping with cyclotrons and electrostatic machines. Synchrotrons can produce high-energy beams of excellent quality at moderate cost. A survey of other component considerations and basic accelerator types is the subject of this paper.

2. SOME FUNDAMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS OF PARTICLE ACCELERATORS FOR HEAVY IONS

The major characteristics of a particle beam are: particle species, charge state (Sect. 2.1 and 4.1), kinetic energy, energy spread, and time structure. Also of great importance are beam intensity, emittance, and the related concept of brightness (Sect. 2.2). The time structure can be both macroscopic (duty factor), which is the proportion of time the beam is on and microscopic, which is the intensity modulation due to the accelerating rf.

A simple accelerator is an evacuated tube with a different electrical potential at each end. If $V$ is the potential difference, an ion of charge $q_e$ will increase its energy by an amount $\Delta T = q_e V$ in traversing the tube.
For many applications the energy per nucleon \( T_n \) rather than total energy \( T \) is the decisive quantity; this is given by \( T_n = T/A \), where \( A \) is the mass number. Hence a particle falling through a potential \( V \) will gain \( \Delta T_n = (q/A)eV \).

Consequently, the charge to mass ratio of an ion is a most important quantity. The lower the value of \( q/A \), the greater the voltage \( V \) required to reach a given \( T_n \). Another consideration is that the deflection of particles by magnetic fields—important for bending and focusing—is proportional to the rigidity \( B\rho \), which is given by momentum divided by charge: 
\[
eB\rho = Mv/q = (A/q)\gamma m_p v.
\]
Here the particle mass 
\[
M = A m_p,
\]
where \( m_p \) is the proton mass, \( \gamma \) is the relativistic mass increase. Of two particles having the same energy per amu but different \( q/A \), the particle with the lower \( q/A \) will have a higher rigidity, requiring stronger magnetic fields for beam handling.

In principle, the acceleration process for heavy ions differs from protons only in that \( q/A \) is different. However, major differences occur in the ion sources, in the need for low velocity (low \( \beta \)) accelerator structures, and in the fact that heavy ions gain and lose electrons in charge exchange processes.

The charge state is initially determined by the degree of ionization attained in the ion source, a device that typically contains a plasma from which charged particles are extracted. The extraction process forms the original beam and sets certain properties of it such as emittance, brightness and maximum macroscopic time structure. A fuller discussion of the parameters of ion sources is given in Sect. 4.1.
Beyond this starting phase of beam formation, the charge state at various stages of acceleration requires careful consideration. It can be increased by stripping (Sect. 2.1), usually reducing the intensity. Charge exchange processes with the residual gas can cause a sudden change in Bp and in most situations means loss of the particle.

When q/A from the ion source is very low, as it often must be for very heavy ions, acceleration is relatively slow, causing problems with transverse beam containment. The inherent repulsion of charged particles with equal polarity gives rise to space-charge forces which in turn require compensation by focusing forces to contain them. At nonrelativistic energies the space charge forces per unit length are inversely proportional to $\beta^2$ (where $\beta = v/c$, the velocity of the particle $v$ relative to the velocity of light $c$). Special low $\beta$ accelerating structures must be built in order to cope with this situation.

2.1. Charge Exchange

An ion passing through matter exchanges electrons with atoms in the medium. Two processes operate in competition--stripping of electrons from the moving ion and capture of electrons by it. The cross section for each of these processes varies with the nuclear charge $z$ and the ion velocity $\beta$. At low velocities capture is dominant, while at high $\beta$ stripping is more important. This is illustrated by figure 1, which shows stripping and capture cross sections for iodine ions in nitrogen gas. At sufficiently high velocities the ion will be fully stripped; at lesser velocities an equilibrium is quickly reached, depending upon $z$, $\beta$, and the nature of the medium traversed.
Figure 1 Calculated charge exchange cross sections of iodine in air, as a function of velocity. Velocity is plotted as $\beta/\alpha$, where $\alpha$ is the fine structure constant, equal to $1/137$. The upper scale on the graph is $\bar{q}$, the mean charge state of the stripped ions [from (12)].
Because of the statistical nature of the process, at equilibrium there will be a distribution of charge states about some mean charge $\bar{q}$. Due to the complexity of the interactions involved, there is no theory that explains in satisfactory detail the observed stripping behavior; instead a number of semi-empirical formulae have been relied upon in designing and operating heavy ion accelerators. With these formulas, reviewed in a paper by Betz (13), it is possible to predict mean charge states to $\pm 1$, in the areas of $\beta$ and $z$ where measurements exist. Large extrapolations are risky. Some indication of the use of stripping for heavy ion accelerators can be obtained from an inspection of figure 2, in which the empirical formulas were used to plot equilibrium charge states as a function of $T_n$ (energy per nucleon) for dense stripping media. The stripping region lies below a given $z$ curve, the capture region above.

The acceleration of argon by the Bevalac serves as an illustration. Starting with $q = 3$ from the ion source, the first linac section accelerates to $T_n = 1.2$ for the first stripping, yielding $\bar{q} = 12.4$. The next linac section accelerates to $T_n = 8.5$ where, after a second stripping, $\bar{q} = 17.3$. Definite charge states must be used for each stage of acceleration. Here $q = 12$ is used after the first stripping, and $q = 18$ after the second stripping. After each stripping some beam intensity is sacrificed because several charge states are created and only one can be used. The loss is from 50-70% for argon at each stripping. For higher $z$ ions the losses are greater due to the wider charge state distribution.
Figure 2 Calculated equilibrium charge states for dense strippers as a function of energy, for $Z = 18, 36, \text{ and } 92$. The dotted lines indicate the processes of acceleration and stripping of argon ions in the Bevalac, which involves two stages of acceleration (a and c) and stripping twice (b and d). See Sect. 3.6.
2.2 Emittance and Brightness

The concepts of emittance and brightness are crucial because they determine beam size and particle-flux that can be transmitted through a given ion optical system. Knowledge of linear dimensions of a beam and of physical boundaries like the vacuum chamber alone are inadequate, since any beam has a certain divergence, and strength and spacing of focusing elements must be taken into consideration. The concept of emittance is also helpful in understanding the minimum possible beam size at any point (for example at a target), and the relative importance of disturbances, such as electric and magnetic inhomogenities, on beam quality.

Particles can be described by giving position relative to three orthogonal axes \(x, y, z\) and momenta \(p_x, p_y, p_z\) along these axes. Beam particles form an ensemble in the six-dimensional phase space of coordinates and momenta. A fundamental theorem of statistical mechanics, known as Liouville's theorem, states that if the ensemble is Hamiltonian (i.e., if the equations of motion can be written in Hamiltonian form), then in the neighborhood of a given particle the density of particles in phase space remains constant in time (14). Charged particles acted upon by external electric and magnetic fields are Hamiltonian. Processes such as stripping are non-Hamiltonian, since knowledge of the particles' initial coordinates and momenta and the external forces acting upon them is not sufficient to describe beam behavior.

In some instances the equations of motion are separable with respect to one or more coordinate axes. For example, motion in the
x plane might be independent of the other coordinates; in this case Liouville's theorem applies to the two-dimensional phase space $x, p_x$. This situation is often true in beam transport systems. Considering such a case of one-dimensional motion, we can examine the beam at time $t_0$ and see that a curve $E$ in phase space will enclose all of the particles (see figure 3). At a later time $t$ the particle distribution will be bounded by another curve $E$. It can be shown that, as a consequence of Liouville's theorem, the area enclosed by $E_0$ and $E$ is the same and a particle within $E_0$ at time $t_0$ must be within $E$ at time $t$. Taking $z$ as the beam axis, the area in the $x, p_x$ plane enclosed by $E$ is called the normalized emittance. If the average beam momentum is $p_0$, and we transform to variables $x, x'$, where $x' = p_x/p_0$, the area occupied by the beam is called the emittance.

Beam intensity is also an important parameter. However, if a beam can be made more intense only at the expense of emittance, the amount of useful intensity might be no greater. To facilitate such comparison, beam brightness is defined as

$$B = \frac{I}{E_x E_y},$$

where $I$ is the beam current and $E_x, E_y$ are emittances of the transverse phase spaces occupied by the beam.

One might expect that beam brightness would be conserved, provided the acceptance of an accelerator is adequate to transmit emittance. This is rarely so because loss of intensity can occur from charge exchange with residual gas, from stripping to increase charge state, in rf trapping, etc. Furthermore, emittance can be diluted in
Figure 3 Representations of beam emittance in transverse phase space.

\( x = \) transverse position, \( p_x = \) transverse momentum.
an accelerator or transport system even though in a strict sense, Liouville's theorem is not being violated. This is illustrated with a common case in figure 4. Beam emittance $E_0$ which is here taken to be elliptical in area, is shown in (a). After passing through a linear transport system, emittance is as in (b), an ellipse $E_1$ of different shape but the same area. However, if the transport system contains nonlinear fields, the result can be as shown in (c), where the emittance $E_0$ has been transformed into $E_2$, a distorted shape with the same area. Unless stringent measures are taken such as compensating nonlinearities, subsequent beam transport must accept the larger emittance figure enclosed by the dotted curve $E_3$. For further discussion of these questions see Banford (15).

3. TYPES OF HEAVY ION ACCELERATORS

Electrostatic machines are in principle the simplest heavy ion accelerators; operating dc, they also inherently possess the highest duty factor. They have beams of low emittance and excellent energy resolution. They are restricted in maximum energy of ions, and with the large tandem systems are somewhat restricted in ion species because of the necessity for a negative ion source.

Linear accelerators can be built to any final energy. They can also have high duty factor. However, the accelerator structure is used only once by the ions, so cost sets a limit on length of structure and hence energy. High duty factor is also limited because of the cost of rf power of which only a small fraction will be transmitted to the beam, in typical applications.
Figure 4 A beam of elliptical phase space area $E_0$ in (a), when
subjected to linear forces transforms to an ellipse of equal area $E_1$
in (b). However, when $E_0$ is subjected to nonlinear forces it translates
to a non-elliptical shape $E_2$ in (c), which can only be enclosed by a
larger ellipse $E_3$ for further linear transformations [after Banford (15)].
Collective acceleration is still experimental, but is of interest because potentially it could be the most economical. The duty factor, however, is inherently low.

Cyclotrons economize on rf power by accelerating the particles again and again through the same structure. Maximum energy is set by the magnet dimensions and therefore cost. The duty factor is inherently high. When high energies as well as variable ion species and energies are needed, changes in magnetic field shape due to relativistic mass increases lead to sophisticated field shaping techniques.

Synchrotrons economize on both rf power and magnet. With present technology, the synchrotron is the most economical machine to reach high energies. The duty factor is inherently low, but can be stretched to ~25-50% at the cost of average intensity. Vacuum requirements are severe because of the ion's long path length.

In principle, any acceleration scheme conceived and developed for protons can be adapted to the acceleration of heavy ions, and most of the necessary modification to variable energy cyclotrons, synchrotrons and electrostatic accelerators can be readily accomplished even after the machine is built. Changes in linear accelerators must be considered at the design stage.

However, the existence of the fundamental technology has made possible rapid development of heavy ion accelerators with rather well defined specifications, including accelerator designs uniquely suited for the relatively low q/A heavy ions. Some of the performance characteristics of the major heavy ion accelerator types are shown in figure 5, as intensity vs mass number, and figure 6, which shows
Figure 5  Approximate particle current vs mass number for heavy ion accelerator types. (a) 25 MV tandem electrostatic accelerator, (b) tandem + cyclotron or linac booster, (c) existing linacs, (d) proposed high intensity linac for heavy ion fusion, (e) existing $K = 140$ cyclotron, (f) proposed $K = 500$ superconducting cyclotron, (g) proposed tandem cyclotrons, each of $K = 400$, (h) proposed tandem superconducting cyclotrons, $K = 500$ and $K = 800$, (i) linac and synchrotron (Bevalac, after completion of current improvement program), (j) state-of-the-art linac + synchrotron (20 Hz rep rate synchrotron).
Figure 6  Energy per nucleon vs mass number for several accelerators. The descriptive symbols are explained in Sect. 5. (a) HHIRF tandem (T25), (b) HHIRF phase I (T25 + K90), (c) HHIRF phase II (T25 + K90 + K400), (d) Chalk River (T13 + K500), (e) Rochester (T13 + K500), (f) SuperHILAC (D8.5), (g) UNILAC (D4.5 + L23.8), (h) GANIL (K25 + K400 + K400), (i) MSU (K52 + K500 + K800), (j) Bevalac (D8.5 + S2.6). Only lower limit is shown -- upper is $T_n = 2.6$ GeV/amu for $A=20$, and maximum $T_n = 1.3$ GeV/amu for $A=238$, (k) Dubne JINR U200 + U300, (m) JINR U400(k725).
energy per nucleon vs mass number. The reasons for the wide disparity in performance of the various types will become clear as each type is discussed in detail.

3.1. Electrostatic Accelerators

Electrostatic accelerators utilize an insulated belt or chain to carry charge up to a terminal that is maintained at a high potential. Ions are accelerated through the potential difference between terminal and ground. Research and development on this type of accelerator was led by Van de Graaff for many years and the machine is frequently referred to using his name.

The Van de Graaff accelerator is the only type that has achieved voltages above 10 MV. Another high voltage generator is the Cockcroft-Walton (16), and shunt-fed form of it, the Dynamatron (17). Voltages up to 4 MV with relatively high currents of many milliamperes make the Cockcroft-Walton generator a desirable preinjector for linacs.

For electrostatic accelerators above about 1 MV, pressurized vessels are used to contain the high voltage components. This permits work with much higher electric fields and thus reduces the physical size of the apparatus, which is limited by breakdown and corona phenomena. Sulfur-hexafluoride alone or mixtures with nitrogen and carbon dioxide are used as insulating gas with pressures up to 250 psi.

The accelerating column, of course, must have a high vacuum to avoid unwanted charge exchange for heavy ions. With electric-field gradients in the accelerating tubes of 2–3 MV/m, a conditioning process is necessary for steady, reliable operation. Conditioning a large electrostatic accelerator, a sensitive task involving, it seems, both
folklore and technical skill, requires many hours to accomplish. The fundamental objective in conditioning is to eliminate by controlled discharges small (often microscopic) irregularities on the high voltage surfaces.

A modern development has been the "tandem," in which negatively charged ions are accelerated up to the high voltage terminal, where they are stripped, then accelerated to ground (18) (see figure 7). New charging techniques have been devised, which replace the traditional charging belt with metal charge carriers called pellet chains. With these chains there is reduced chance of spark damage and frictional loss to the gas is low, giving modest power input and eliminating cooling requirements (19).

An example of the latest tandem technology is a 25 MV machine by NEC (National Electrostatics Corporation) now under construction at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (figure 8). The tank is oriented vertically with the terminal at the top. A 180° bending magnet is placed in the terminal, and the same column is used both for the negative and positive ion beams. This folded arrangement saves substantially in both tank and building height. The ion source is located at the base of the accelerator for convenience and building economy (20).

Another large tandem facility is under construction at Daresbury in England. Initial operation at 20 MV, with later upgrading to 30 MV is planned. This machine is also placed in a vertical tower, but with the ion source at the top (21).

Electrons or ions released from surfaces in the accelerating tube are suppressed by installing diaphragms with reduced apertures at
Figure 7  Schematic of a tandem electrostatic accelerator [after Van de Graaff (18)].
Figure 8 View of HIRF 25 MV tandem built by NEC. A negatively charged beam from the ion source is bent 90° and accelerated upward to the terminal, where after stripping, it is bent 180° and accelerated downward through the same potential. A 90° magnet is arranged to rotate about a vertical axis in order to deliver the beam to any one of several radial transport lines.
intervals along the tube. Most ions or electrons originating between diaphragms are stopped at the next diaphragm. A few proceed to the second diaphragm where they are stopped. Thus, positive-negative ion exchange, which is responsible for "electron loading," is depressed in a simple and elegant fashion. Other means are the introduction of magnetic fields or inclined electric fields.

Quadrupole lenses are appropriately located for beam control; with beam profile monitors and steering elements, beam transmission from source to target is straightforward. A change in beam energy or in charge state is easily and quickly accomplished by a skilled operator.

Beams from an electrostatic accelerator can be injected into a cyclotron or a linear accelerator booster to extend energies to 8 MeV/amu or more. The 25 MV Oak Ridge tandem will inject into the cyclotron 'ORIC' to provide ions to energies above 9 MeV per nucleon for mass 100. Planning is also well advanced on an open sector cyclotron booster to provide energies above 10 MeV per nucleon for all ions (22) (see figure 9). A similar arrangement of lower energy is being constructed at the Hahn Meitner Institute in Berlin.

At Argonne National Laboratory plans are under way to utilize an existing tandem for injection into a superconducting linac (23). Similar arrangements are being pursued at other laboratories.

Two attractive features of electrostatic machines are dc operation and modest power requirements. To reach higher energies, the problem of ion exchange on the surface of the accelerating tube must be overcome. Experiments show that clean surfaces of titanium or stainless steel have much higher thresholds for discharge than these metals when coated
Figure 9 Plan of HHIRF facility. The radial transport lines from the tandem are at the left. The K = 90 cyclotron (ORIC) is at the top. The future K = 400 cyclotron is at the bottom. This cyclotron can receive a beam directly from the tandem, as well as from ORIC.
with condensed vapors. As tube length is increased, vapors migrate out more slowly and conditioning becomes more difficult. Another effect sets in. Condensed molecules dislodged by impinging ions temporarily form a gas, can be ionized and can increase discharge, which when fed by vapor from condensed layers can spread to disruptive proportions. An all metal and ceramic bakeable tube is very helpful for minimizing discharge problems, but recent difficulties have shown that vapors introduced inadvertently can persist over a long period.

3.2. Heavy Ion Linear Accelerators

Although static potentials of electrostatic accelerators now under construction at Oak Ridge and Daresbury are expected to operate in the 25-30 MV range, a limit is set by voltage breakdown between the two terminals.

A much higher effective potential can be obtained by arranging the accelerating tube so that a more modest accelerating potential is repeatedly applied to the ions in transit. Such an accelerator, or linac, will consist of many short accelerating stations arranged in sequence; in principle, there is no upper limit to the ion energy that can be achieved. Although a variety of linac structures have been employed to accelerate charged particles, the ones that so far have proved most practical as heavy ion accelerators fall into the category of drift-tube linacs.

A drift tube is a cylindrical metal (usually copper) shell, closed at each end except for an axial hole for passage of the ions. A number of drift tubes are arranged in sequence, with gaps between (figure 10), and an electric field is established in the gaps. The field originates
Figure 10: Schematic of a drift tube rf linac.
with a rf oscillator, so that it periodically changes direction. Ions are accelerated in the gaps during the period when the field has the proper polarity; during the part of the cycle when the field is reversed, the ions are shielded from fields by the drift tube.

The behavior of a beam of ions traversing a linac can best be seen by first visualizing what happens to a reference particle, usually called a synchronous particle, as it is accelerated. It will gain exactly the right amount of energy at each gap by remaining (usually) at a constant phase angle relative to peak rf voltage. As the ion gains energy its velocity will increase, so if rf phase is to remain constant the separation of gaps must increase. This leads to drift tube spacings that are determined by synchronous velocity. Once the linac is built, the spacings are fixed and the synchronous velocity at a given point cannot be changed. The situation is different if the gaps are electrically independent of one another, allowing rf phase at each gap to be varied at will. In such a single-gap linac the synchronous velocity profile can be varied in an arbitrary manner, so long as it remains a continuous function, by proper programming of the rf gap phase.

A beam will be successfully accelerated if the particles remain near to the synchronous particle in both longitudinal and transverse phase space. The conditions for longitudinal phase stability in a linac require the electric field to be rising at the time the synchronous particle crosses the gap, because particles arriving at a gap earlier than the synchronous particle will then receive less energy, and consequently arrive later at the next gap. Particles
arriving later than the synchronous particle gain more energy, hence arrive at the next gap earlier. Electric gap fields also impart transverse radial forces on the particles; if the rf phase is correct for longitudinal stability, these radial forces will be directed away from the axis, that is, defocusing. Therefore, additional positive restoring forces must act on the particle to keep the bunch together during linac transit. The usual means for accomplishing this is to add focusing elements such as magnetic quadrupoles, either inside the drift tubes, or in gaps between drift tube structures. Radial defocusing forces are inversely proportional to $\beta^2$, and because of the difficulties in offsetting them, these forces limit the use of linac structures to accelerate very low velocity ions. The lower $\beta$ limit varies with the type of structure. With presently operating machines it is about $\beta = 0.005$ for the Widerøe structure and $\beta = 0.015$ for the Alvarez structure.

The structure diagrammed in figure 10 is an Alvarez linac. In this machine, a cylindrical tank is made to resonate to the desired frequency in the $T_{010}$ mode, giving an axial electric field with a maximum along the center. The drift tubes are supported by hangers attached to the tank wall. The cell length, or gap-to-gap distance advanced by the ions each n rf cycles is just $\beta \lambda$, where $\lambda$ is the rf wavelength. The rf phase advance in one cell is $2\pi n$. In principle, n can be any integer, but in practice the accelerating field becomes inefficient when n is greater than 1. A typical Alvarez heavy ion linac is the SuperHILAC (24), with rf of 70 MHz, $\lambda = 43$ m. The tank diameter, set by the requirement for resonance, is 3.0 m, about $3\lambda/4$. 
For $\beta \ll 0.015$ the cell length $\beta \lambda$ becomes too short for adequate quadrupole focusing unless $\lambda$ is made larger, which requires a resonant tank of larger diameter and hence greater cost. The difficulty can be avoided by using a Wideröe structure (sometimes called a Sloan-Lawrence structure), which does not rely upon a resonant cavity, but instead delivers rf power to the drift tubes by means of two conductors connected alternately to the drift tubes. Thus adjacent drift tubes have opposite polarity, and particles advance odd multiples of $\pi$ in rf phase between one gap and the next, with the distance traveled being $n\beta \lambda/2$, where $n$ is an integer. Figure 11 is a drawing of a Wideröe linac similar to the UNILAC design. The drift tubes are arranged in a $\pi - 3\pi$ sequence to allow room for quadrupoles in every other drift tube. The short drift tubes are connected to and supported by a metal pipe, which in turn is connected to three rf tuning stubs. The long drift tubes are suspended from the tank wall, which serves as the other conductor.

Recalling that the energy gained by an ion in a linear accelerator depends upon the charge number $q$ in addition to the effective accelerating potential difference, we see that to reach high energies it is important to have $q$ as high as possible. Ion sources show a strong intensity decrease with increasing $q$, so that in a practical linear accelerator one faces a compromise between energy and intensity. This compromise is partially offset by the fact that once a moderate velocity has been reached, stripping can produce a higher $q$ than could be achieved ordinarily in an ion source. Consequently, a typical heavy ion linear
Figure 11 Drawing of a Widerøe drift tube linac.
accelerator design will usually have an ion source providing ions of moderate q injected in a dc accelerator that reaches \( \beta = 0.005 \) to \( \beta = 0.015 \), then a linac that accelerates to a modest energy, after which the ions are stripped to a q that is two to four times the injected q. This is followed by another linac stage to reach the final energy. Stripping does exact a penalty in loss of two-thirds or more of original beam intensity, due to creation of many charge states, only one of which can be usefully accelerated in most cases.

The state of the art in heavy ion linacs is typified by the UNILAC, built and operated by GSI at Darmstadt, Germany (25) (figure 12). Two dc injectors of 320 kV, each containing two ion sources, are used to assure continuous operation. A Wideröe linac operating at 27 MHz provides the first stage of acceleration, from \( \beta = 0.005 \) to \( \beta = 0.055 \) (\( T_n = 0.012 \) to 1.4 MeV/amu). A view of the drift tube structure of the Wideröe is shown in figure 13.

After being accelerated to 1.4 MeV/amu in the Wideröe linac, the beam is stripped before being injected into the next section, an Alvarez linac. Note that the 1.4 MeV/amu beam is taken through a siding before being further accelerated (figure 12). The purpose of this siding is to analyze charge states resulting from the stripping process, permitting only one charge state to enter the poststripper. A small experimental area has been installed to utilize rejected charge states. After being accelerated to 4.5 MeV/amu in the Alvarez section, the ions enter a chain of 20 resonant single gap cavities, each one cell long. This permits each cavity to be driven independently of its neighbor, allowing arbitrary phase differences. The synchronous
Figure 12  Plan of the UNILAC accelerator at Darmstadt.
Figure 13 Photograph looking inside a Widerøe tank at the UNILAC.
particle profile may then be chosen at will. Variable energy operation is easily accomplished, including the possibility of deceleration. At the end of the machine, neon energies from 2 to 15.4 MeV/amu and uranium energies from 2 to 8.5 MeV/amu can be achieved. A plan of the experimental area is shown in figure 14. Figure 15 is a view from above of a portion of this area.

Improved linac structures for heavy ions are being developed in a number of laboratories. Figure 16 shows the Argonne split ring superconducting cavity, a unit of the tandem postaccelerator (23). At Heidelberg helix resonators (26), and at Munich, an interdigital drift tube structure (27), have been built as tandem postaccelerators. At Stanford University, substantial experience with superconducting niobium cavities has been gained in the design of an electron accelerator. Efforts are underway to make this technology available to heavy ion acceleration (28).

3.3. Collective Acceleration

In an early paper Veksler (29) suggested forming a bunch of electrons with some ions imbedded in it, then finding some way to accelerate the entire system. Electrons, being much lighter than ions, and hence having a very large q/A, can be accelerated more readily. The ions will be trapped by coulomb forces and will be carried along with the electron bunch. This idea is known today as collective acceleration. Successful acceleration of protons and other ions has been achieved experimentally by a number of collective methods.

The electron bunch can be produced in the form of a ring (electron ring accelerator--ERA) (30) or an intense burst (intense relativistic
Figure 14 Plan of experimental area of UNILAC. Accelerator is at left; beam from the accelerator is switched into one of the three beam lines, and each of these serves several experiments.
Figure 15 View from above of a portion of the UNILAC experimental area. Just visible in the upper right hand corner are the three beam lines of figure 14; the circular structure at left center is the scattering chamber labeled X2 in figure 14.
Figure 16  Superconducting split ring accelerator cavity. This is one unit of the Argonne postaccelerator.
electron beam—IREB) (31). Both methods are capable of short bursts of ion beams after the carrier electrons are separated from the embedded ions. The IREB may well emerge as a useful heavy ion source. Typical IREBs have an energy from 100 keV to 10 MeV and currents of 10 kA to 1 MA with pulse length from 10 nsec to 100 nsec. The electron density achieved in IREBs is \(10^{11} - 10^{13} \text{ cm}^{-3}\). IREB development is being conducted at a number of laboratories. However, in most cases heavy ion production is not the main goal of such work, but an incidental byproduct. Groups are actively pursuing various ERA collective techniques at the University of Maryland (U.S.), the Max Planck Institut in Garching (West Germany), the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research at Dubna, and the Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics at Moscow (U.S.S.R.).

Keefe has reviewed progress in the field of collective acceleration in a recent review article (32).

3.4. Isochronous Cyclotrons

In a cyclotron, ions are made to describe quasicircular orbits in a magnetic field. This magnetic field is usually established between the poles of a large circular electromagnet, with the particle orbits constrained to the midplane. An ion of charge \(q\) and mass \(M\) will have an orbital frequency given by

\[
 f_p = \frac{q\Phi_e}{2\pi M}
\]

where \(\Phi\) is the average value of the magnetic field. Acceleration is accomplished by inserting D-shaped electrode plates, called dees, above and below the orbital plane, and attaching them to a rf resonator so that voltage of the appropriate frequency is seen by the particles. In a heavy ion machine the range of \(q/M\) values that must be accommodated can be large,
requiring a variable frequency rf system. In addition, it is often necessary to further extend the range by employing harmonic acceleration, in which the rf frequency \( f_{HF} \) is given by \( f_{HF} = hf_p \), where \( h \) is a positive integer. The values of \( h \) that can be used in a given cyclotron will depend upon dee geometry (single dee or multiple symmetric dees) and the manner in which they are phased relative to one another. The necessary condition to satisfy, regardless of the number of dees or the harmonic number, is that the rf voltage be attractive as the ion enters the dee, and repulsive as it leaves the dee, so that the ion is accelerated both upon entering and leaving. Figure 17 shows a section through the midplane of the LBL 88-inch machine. The dee is 180° in extent, filling the upper half plane in the drawing.

A useful cyclotron must provide some means for axial focusing of the ions. Early cyclotrons relied upon the weak focusing principle in which the magnetic field decreased with radius. In such a cyclotron, however, the energy ions can attain is limited by their relativistic mass increase. The ion mass can be written as \( M = m_0 \gamma A \), where \( m_0 = \) nucleon mass, \( A = \) mass number, \( \gamma = \) total energy divided by rest energy. Since \( m_0 \) and \( A \) are constants, we see that in equation 2 all values are constants except \( B \) and \( \gamma \). If \( B \) decreases, as it must in a weak-focusing machine, the revolution frequency will decrease and the ion will slip in phase relative to the rf. As the ion gains energy \( \gamma \) will increase, causing further slipping.

In an isochronous machine \( B \) is made to increase with radius such that \( B/\gamma \) remains constant, hence the revolution frequency remains constant. Axial focusing with these machines is obtained by azimuthal variation of the magnetic field (the term AVF cyclotron for Azimuthally
Figure 17 Plan of an isochronous cyclotron (the 88 inch, at LBL).
Varying Field cyclotron is often used). The magnetic field is divided into several (usually three or four) sectors, each consisting of a narrow iron gap followed by a wider gap, so that the ion sees a field that fluctuates in amplitude. This produces a scalloped orbit, with nonnormal crossing of field boundaries, resulting in an axial focusing component at each crossing. Additional axial focusing is obtained if the field boundaries, instead of being radially straight, are made to curve at a constantly increasing angle away from the radial. The machine shown in figure 17 has three sectors, with moderate spiral boundaries. For orbital stability at least three sectors are required, because isochronism requires that the radial betatron frequency \( \nu_r \) (i.e., the number of radial oscillations about the equilibrium orbit per revolution) be approximately equal to \( \gamma \), so that \( \nu_r = 1 \) at the center of the machine, and greater than 1 as the ions gain energy.

If the number of sectors \( N = 2 \), there will be a betatron-oscillation phase advance of \( \pi \) per sector, a condition for which the focusing forces are unstable (known as the \( \pi \) stopband). With \( N = 3,4 \ldots \) this is avoided. As ions gain energy, another stopband will be reached when \( \gamma = N/2 \); this energy for \( N = 3 \) is 469 MeV/amu. For further details on isochronous cyclotron design, see Ref. (33).

In an isochronous cyclotron, since particles of different energy have the same revolution frequency, there is no longitudinal phase stability such as exists for a linac or synchrotron. If the field shape is exactly isochronous, particles that are injected into the center at a particular rf phase remain at this phase until maximum energy is reached. Any departure from the isochronous field, however,
will cause particles to slip in rf phase, and with slippage beyond \( \pm \pi \), the particles will be lost to further acceleration. This condition limits the allowable magnetic field departure from isochronism. Typically, field tolerances must be held to one part in \( 10^{-5} \) or better.

It can be shown that there is no field contour that will satisfy equation 2 for all radii as \( q/A \) is allowed to vary. This means that for a variable-ion machine, some means must be incorporated for appropriately shaping the field for the ion being accelerated. Usually, trim coils are employed, although movable shims also have been used. An accurate field mapping is necessary for various field levels and effects of trim coils or shims, so that field level and profile can be set to the required accuracy for a particular ion.

A number of methods are used for injecting ions into the innermost orbit. The simplest is to insert an ion source into the cyclotron. The diameter of the source is kept small, and the dee voltage is made large enough so that the first orbit clears the back of the ion source. Another method is to locate the ion source outside the magnet, with an axial transport system, terminating in a 90° inflector to inject into the first orbit. This can be combined with stripping (see figure 19). Still another means is employed with large separated sector cyclotrons. By preaccelerating the ions in another cyclotron or tandem-Van de Graaff, they have substantial energy at injection, yielding a larger first orbit.

Extraction is usually accomplished by exciting a betatron-oscillation resonance and thus increasing the radial position of the particle orbit in one revolution at a specified azimuth sufficient to insert a septum of an electrostatic or magnetic channel. This channel in turn will
counteract the guide field and let the particle escape in controlled fashion.

The maximum energy that can be attained in a cyclotron depends upon \( q/A \) and is given by \( T_n \approx kq^2/A^2 \), where \( K \) is a constant for a particular accelerator. This expression is exact in the non-relativistic limit. Since present heavy ion cyclotrons seldom exceed \( \gamma = 1.02 \), the factor \( K \) is useful for comparing the capabilities of cyclotrons. Figure 18 shows a plan of the GANIL project, now under construction in France, which will incorporate four cyclotrons, two (labeled \( \text{CO}_1 \) and \( \text{CO}_2 \)) of \( K = 25 \) and two (labeled \( \text{CSS}_1 \) and \( \text{CSS}_2 \)) of \( K = 400 \) (34).

3.5. Superconducting Cyclotrons

A new type of cyclotron, the so-called superconducting cyclotron, is a focus of major development effort. It combines high field superconducting magnet techniques with the basic isochronous cyclotron technology. Using superconducting main coils, the cyclotron's magnetic field can be raised by a factor of approximately three, to the 50 kG level. This high magnetic field leads to a major reduction in size and cost, even when the added expenses of cryogenic equipment and special conductor are included. (A superconducting cyclotron as estimated by H. Blosser is roughly one half the cost of a conventional isochronous cyclotron of the same energy and one third the cost of a separated sector isochronous cyclotron.)

The anticipated properties of such a cyclotron make it a very attractive component for a number of heavy ion accelerator systems. Figure 6(d), (e), and (i) compares estimated performance curves of superconducting
Figure 18 Plan of the GANIL facility. The two large cyclotrons are connected in tandem, with a stripper between them.
cyclotrons with other heavy ion accelerators. The expected high operating energies (above the constraints of the Coulomb repulsion, surface interactions and normal density); will permit qualitatively new aspects of nuclei (such as high density, supersonic and coherent mesic phenomena) to become the subject of sensitive investigation.

The superconducting cyclotron was first explored by a group at Michigan State University (35) in the early 1960s, but the idea was laid aside because of then underdeveloped conductor technology. A group at Chalk River (under J. Fraser) reconsidered the idea (36) in 1973, concluding that superconducting coil technology had reached a level of development that not only established feasibility, but also offered a major economic breakthrough, lowering costs for both construction and operation. Today three laboratories are actively exploring superconducting cyclotron technology: the Atomic Energy of Canada Laboratory at Chalk River, Ontario, the University of Milan Cyclotron Laboratory at Milan, Italy, and the Michigan State University Cyclotron Laboratory at East Lansing, Michigan. The long-range goals of all three involve the pairing of two accelerators. At Chalk River and Milan, the first stage accelerator is envisaged as a large tandem electrostatic accelerator with the second stage a superconducting cyclotron of \( K = 500 \). In contrast, the MSU plan involves two superconducting cyclotrons—a \( K = 500 \) machine that injects into a \( K = 800 \) machine.

All three groups are presently involved in constructing prototype superconducting magnets; the prototypes at Chalk River (37) and MSU (38) are full scale, and the one at Milan (39) is 1/6th scale. Also, all
expect to have their prototype magnets in operation in 1977. Successful operation of these magnets will substantially advance the overall feasibility of superconducting cyclotrons, since all other major components operate at room temperature and involve established technologies. Major design constraints are set by the large attractive force (approximately 1000 tons) between the upper and lower halves of the coil, the need for good thermal insulation of the main coil, and the need for a sharp magnetic field edge to facilitate extraction. All three projects plan a solenoidal-like main superconducting coil with a small median plane gap for injected and extracted beams and control hardware. The winding is further divided into two major sections so that shifting of ampere turns from one coil section to the other will approximately match the variation in field shape required by particles of different mass. Major features of the structure planned at Chalk River are shown as an example in figure 19.

The main coil superconductor is a NbTi and Cu composite. In the MSU design, this coil is tightly packed onto a large stainless steel spool, with a picket fence lattice between radial layers to allow helium cooling. All three projects use a massive magnet yoke, more or less completely encasing the coil. The major access to internal components will be from top and bottom by raising or lowering the appropriate elements of the yoke with a system of precision jacks.

Ion source design also differs among the three projects. The Chalk River design omits entirely the use of a central ion source since the cyclotron is always intended to be a second-stage accelerator. For testing purposes Milan provides a central ion source in its second-
Figure 19 The superconducting cyclotron under construction at Chalk River, Canada. The insert drawing shows the method of external injection. A stripping foil placed near the center lowers the rigidity of the beam so that it is trapped in the first orbit.
stage superconducting cyclotron and will then shift to use of the electrostatic first-stage accelerator. The MSU prototype magnet includes an interchangeable central geometry to allow the 500 MeV magnet to be set up as a conventional cyclotron with a central ion source, or alternatively used to study central region design of a second-stage booster accelerator.

Beam quality for the superconducting cyclotrons is expected to be generally similar to that of present heavy ion isochronous cyclotrons, with some improvement in intensity as a result of the much better vacuum systems provided in the design. The new machines are expected to produce beams of moderate emittance and energy spread in the microampere range and low emittance and energy spread at reduced intensity, characteristics that are well matched to contemplated experimental programs in heavy ion physics.

3.6. Heavy Ion Synchrotrons

To attain energies above 100 MeV/amu the synchrotron becomes economically attractive as a heavy ion accelerator. The synchrotron consists of a ring of guide field magnets whose apertures need only accommodate a single orbiting beam. The particles complete $10^4 - 10^6$ revolutions with a modest energy gain each revolution. This is in contrast to a linac, in which particles traverse the accelerating rf system only once, and to the cyclotron with its guide field magnet large enough to enclose a platter comprising orbits all the way from injection to extraction energies. In addition to guide field magnets, the synchrotron has straight sections for injection, extraction, rf cavities, vacuum pumping stations, and auxiliary magnets of various kinds.
The magnetic field is programmed to rise in a predetermined manner, usually either linearly or sinusoidally. As the field rises, the rf must change to be in step with the particles, and the energy gained by the particles must be just sufficient to keep them within the magnetic guide field. Particles will oscillate about a synchronous phase angle, as in the linac, causing the beam to be bunched. If the rf is the same as the orbital frequency, there is only one bunch, but if, for practical reasons, the rf is chosen as a multiple of the orbital frequency, then the number of bunches depends upon the harmonic number. Beam control is usually accomplished by feedback systems in which the beam bunches themselves are used to generate radius and phase information and to control the position of the beam.

Such positive feedback systems depend on sufficient beam intensity for favorable signal-to-noise ratio. Heavy ion beams don't always possess sufficient intensity, or very low intensity may be desired, so in these cases the rf must be preprogrammed. But establishing the correct rf settings may require an accuracy on the order of one part in $10^6$, a severe test of component reproducibility. One way to solve this problem is to run a light tracer ion with adequate intensity and a $q/A$ as close as possible to the desired heavy ion beam to find the correct rf settings, which are then recorded in a computer. For a discussion of the theory of synchrotrons, see Refs. (40,41).

Because of the relatively large cross section for charge exchange processes with the residual gas, and a long path during acceleration, a good vacuum is needed in heavy ion synchrotrons. Any change of
charge state will cause immediate loss, because the magnetic rigidity is inversely proportional to ionic charge.

Depending on length of acceleration, ion species, charge state and tolerable losses, a vacuum of $10^{-9}$ to $10^{-10}$ Torr may be required. The vacuum requirement is less severe for fully stripped ions because their energy at injection is high enough to render the capture cross sections much smaller than the stripping cross sections (see Sect. 2.1). Inversely, if fully stripped ions are desired, then the minimum injection energy is determined. Contrary to the proton synchrotrons, space charge effects for heavy ions to date are small. Hence, the magnetic field at injection must only be high enough to avoid problems with remnant fields. This establishes a minimum of $B_0$ at injection and, therefore, the injection energy for a given $q/A$. The maximum energy attainable will then depend upon the ratio of maximum to minimum magnetic field. This ratio will usually fall in the interval 20 to 40.

To obtain intense beams of proper emittance, energy spread and charge state, an air insulated Cockcroft-Walton dc accelerator and an rf linac with short pulses are the favored components of an injection system.

Following the shutdown of the Princeton-Pennsylvania Accelerator, there remains only one operating heavy ion synchrotron, the Bevalac facility located at Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, figure 20 (42). Since the Bevatron itself was originally built to accelerate protons, its parameters had to be adapted for heavy ion acceleration; it can now achieve maximum particle rigidities of 229 kG-m (2.6 GeV/amu for fully stripped particle with $q/A = 1/2$). Its injector system consists
Figure 20  Plan of the Bevalac facility at LBL. The synchrotron is in the lower left hand corner. The SuperHILAC injector is at the upper right.
of a 2.5 MV pressurized and a 750 kV air insulated Cockroft-Walton dc accelerator, either of which can inject into the SuperHILAC, an Alvarez-type linac of 8.5 MeV/amu (43). The high-intensity beam from this machine is then transported via a 250 m-long transfer line for injection into the Bevatron synchrotron. With an operating vacuum of 2.10^{-7} Torr in the Bevatron, only fully stripped beams can be accelerated. The heaviest particle accelerated to date is $^{56}$Fe, which at 8.5 MeV/amu from the linac yields about 5% of 26+ (fully stripped) with a 400 µg/cm² carbon stripping foil.

In accelerating the iron beam, the intensity was too low for operation of the feedback loops, so $^{15}$N^+ (q/A = 0.4667) was used as a tracer particle for $^{56}$Fe^{+26} (q/A = 0.4643). An improvement program is planned that will permit acceleration of very heavy (A~200) and partially stripped ions.

4. IMPORTANT ACCELERATOR COMPONENTS

In this section we attempt to round out the sketch that has been given of each accelerator type with a discussion of some vital components common to all, with emphasis on those features that are of most importance for the heavy ion machines.

4.1. Ion Sources for Heavy Ion Accelerators

The ideal ion source for a modern heavy ion accelerator should provide beams of all atomic species at high intensity, good emittance and long lifetime. The source should be easily accessible for maintenance. For accelerators that require positive ions from the source, high charge states are desirable. Cyclotron energy is
proportional to charge squared, and linac length can be reduced by using ions with highest charge states. For tandem electrostatic accelerators the charge state is -1 (only a few low intensity ion species have been produced with -2 charge).

High charge state ion beams for positive ion accelerators can be produced by electron bombardment of atoms and ions in a plasma or by stripping of fast ions. For electron bombardment sources, the product of flux density and ion confinement time must be sufficient to produce the desired charge state. Electron energies should be 10s of eV up to hundreds or several thousand eV, depending upon the degree of ionization to be achieved.

For a more complete discussion of heavy ion sources, see Ref. (44).

The traditional heavy ion source for cyclotrons and linacs is the PIG (45,46) (see figure 21). Gas is introduced into the vertical tube where the arc is struck between the two cathodes. The arc follows the direction of the magnetic field. Electrons for the arc are supplied by the cathodes. Ions are extracted through an aperture in the side or one end of the discharge tube (side-extracted or axially extracted PIG). Solid materials can be fed into the source by placing them in a cathode or tangent to the bore in the anode, or by use of an oven.

Another type of source that has been used for heavy ion production is the duoplasmatron, which also establishes a plasma in a magnetic field, with the ions extracted axially (47). It has undergone many years of development for high-intensity (hundreds of mA), high-quality pulsed beams of protons at high-energy synchrotron laboratories, and
Figure 21 The PIG ion source as installed in a cyclotron.
has recently been used for heavy ions at the UNILAC heavy ion linac.

The duoplasmatron has higher intensity than the PIG, better emittance and lifetime, but lower average charge states. For heavy ion linac requirements (e.g., UNILAC) of \( q/A \geq 0.38 \) the duoplasmatron is preferred over the PIG for ions lighter than xenon.

Several other types of sources are under development for high charge states. One is the electron cyclotron resonance, or ECR source. Here the high energy electrons used to strip ions are produced from the magnetically confined plasma by feeding in microwave energy at the cyclotron resonance frequency of the electrons in the applied magnetic field (48).

Another is the electron beam ion source (49). In EBIS, a usually superconducting solenoid of 1 m length confines an electron beam from a gun placed at one end. The magnetic field keeps the beam limited to a radius of a few millimeters as it drifts down the solenoid axis to the collector at the other end. A pulse of gas injected at the gun end is ionized and confined radially by the potential well of the electron beam. A raised field at either end confines the ions longitudinally for typically 10 – 100 msec, until the desired charge state is reached. Then the barrier is lowered at the solenoid exit, providing beam extraction. The output current averaged over long times is orders of magnitude less than for the other sources, but the unique high charge states would make possible significantly higher energies from cyclotrons than with the other sources. Also, the pulsed nature of the source, and the delivery of fully stripped ions (presently up to neon), make it a good match to synchrotron requirements.
Other sources that have great potential for high currents of low charge state ions are the multi-aperture sources developed for ion propulsion (50) and for injection of multi-ampere beams of hydrogen into thermonuclear fusion reactors (51).

Tandem electrostatic accelerators must rely upon negative ion sources. The recently developed cesium sputter ion source (52) is able to deliver much improved yields compared with earlier sources, and can be used with a much greater range of ion masses.

In summary, a large amount of work is being done at many different laboratories on new types of ion sources to achieve greater intensity and higher charge states. The reason for this intense effort is that the design of accelerator systems depends critically on ion sources. A doubling of the charge state, for example, will cut in half the electric field required for acceleration, and also reduce the magnetic rigidity by one-half. At the present time, however, the PIG and duoplasmatron sources are almost exclusively relied upon for heavy ion accelerators.

4.2. Control Systems

An adequate control system will have some means for adjusting accelerator parameters to achieve optimum output. All heavy ion accelerators described in this paper are sufficiently complicated to require many adjustable parameters in order to change ions, energy, etc. Some means should also exist for recording parameters for future use. Analog control systems have been used in the past, but great progress has been made recently in implementing computer control systems for accelerators (53). They will perform the duties mentioned
above admirably, and have other useful features.

One of the great advantages of a computer control system is its potential for retaining a great amount of data, which can be presented to the operator on a selective basis. This permits the use of sophisticated instrumentation where necessary, while at the same time reducing the number of meters, displays, recorders, etc., competing for the operator's attention. In figure 22 is shown schematically the computer control system installed at the SuperHILAC. A central processor is used to transmit and receive information from operator consoles, and is also linked to standard peripheral devices. Two auxiliary computers are used for real-time control of accelerator hardware, while a third is used for graphic displays of beam data. This system employs four minicomputers for accelerator control because the complexity of operation at the SuperHILAC requires it; at other accelerator installations a single minicomputer could perform all functions adequately.

The diagram in figure 22 shows two operator control consoles employed to run the accelerator in the "timeshare" mode in which two different ions--argon and xenon, for example--are transmitted through the machine on successive pulses, and delivered to separate experimental areas (43). Each console is devoted to one of the ions and an operator at that console tunes his ion beam independently of the other beam. This type of operation illustrates how accelerator capabilities may be extended with the imaginative use of control computers.
Figure 22 Schematic of SuperHILAC computer control system.
4.3. Beam Instrumentation

For a heavy ion accelerator to operate properly, it is necessary to measure beam intensity, energy, charge state, mass number, emittance, etc. In spite of the great importance of such instrumentation, space does not permit a discussion in this paper. The interested reader is referred to instrumentation journals, accelerator conference reports, and internal laboratory memoranda.

4.4. Beam Transport Systems

Few accelerators could be utilized effectively without a beam transport system of some kind, either to carry a beam from the source to the accelerator, or from the accelerator to a target area. Design of beam transport systems has been described by several authors (15,54). Here only some basic considerations will be touched upon.

1) With heavy ion beams, good vacuum is necessary, particularly at low β, to prevent beam loss due to charge exchange.

2) In transporting heavy ion beams, charge state analysis, and sometimes isotopic analysis, can be very helpful. For example, for elements with several naturally occurring isotopes, only one of which is desired for acceleration, the mass separation can best be done in the injection line.

3) Clearly, a transport system should be able to transmit source or accelerator emittance without loss. However, as a safety factor the transport system should be designed to transmit a somewhat larger emittance, say by a factor of 2, to minimize time and beam loss in correcting small errors in parameters that inevitably occur.
5. TABLE OF HEAVY ION ACCELERATOR FACILITIES

Table 1 lists existing and proposed heavy ion facilities. The second column indicates the accelerator type by a prefix followed by a number from which the maximum energy can be determined. A plus sign indicates accelerators linked in series. Facilities in boldface type are operating or are under construction; others are proposed.

Meaning of symbols:

- \( Dn \) = Drift tube linac, max. energy \( n \text{ MeV/amu} \)
- \( Fn \) = Simple electrostatic accelerator, max. operating voltage \( n \text{ MV} \).
- \( Kn \) = Isochronous cyclotron, max. energy \( n \frac{q^2}{A^2} \text{ MeV/amu} \)
- \( Ln \) = Linear accelerator with independently phased resonators with max. total accelerating voltage \( n \text{ MV} \), max. energy \( n \frac{q}{A} \text{ MeV/amu} \).
- \( Sn \) = Synchrotron with maximum energy \( n \text{ GeV/amu} \) for ion of \( q/A = 0.5 \).
- \( Tn \) = Tandem electrostatic accelerator, max. operating voltage \( n \text{ MV} \).

6. FUTURE PROSPECTS FOR HEAVY ION ACCELERATORS

The many plans for expansion of existing heavy ion accelerator facilities and for construction of new facilities (see Sect. 5) are an indication of the keen interest in these machines as tools for nuclear physics. Many of these projects are for isochronous cyclotrons; the next largest number involve electrostatic accelerators. There is a trend to higher energies, as evidenced by the number of projects using two accelerators, some with a tandem injecting into a cyclotron, some with two cyclotrons in series. One (the GANIL project) plans to use three cyclotrons in series.

Linear accelerators have not been used as often as tandems.
Table 1. Existing and proposed heavy ion facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type and energy</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
<td>T20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Louvain</td>
<td>K70+K110</td>
<td>CYCLONE</td>
<td>(56), p.80,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Sao Paulo</td>
<td>E4+T8</td>
<td>NEC 4U,8UD</td>
<td>(55), p.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalk River</td>
<td>T13+K520</td>
<td>Superconducting Cyclotron</td>
<td>(37,57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>K28+K500</td>
<td>Superconducting Cyclotron</td>
<td>(56), p.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Aarhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>T7</td>
<td>EN Tandem</td>
<td>(58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caen</td>
<td>K25+K400+K400</td>
<td>GANIL</td>
<td>(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenoble</td>
<td>K90</td>
<td>Constr. by CGR-MeV</td>
<td>(56), p.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orleans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orsay</td>
<td>K11+K75</td>
<td>ALICE</td>
<td>(59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orsay</td>
<td>T12</td>
<td>MP tandem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
<td>T12</td>
<td>MP tandem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saclay</td>
<td>D5+S1.2</td>
<td>EBIS Source development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>E6+K120</td>
<td>VICKSI</td>
<td>(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darmstadt</td>
<td>D1.5+L22.8+D1.0</td>
<td>UNILAC</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td>T13+L3+L.9</td>
<td>Helix resonator postaccel.</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>T13+L3+L.5</td>
<td>Interdigital H-type postaccel.</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>K140</td>
<td></td>
<td>(56), p84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weizmann Inst.</td>
<td>T14</td>
<td>NEC 14UD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catania, Sicily</td>
<td>T13</td>
<td></td>
<td>(58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>T16+K540</td>
<td>XTU, SSC Dev. at U. of Milan</td>
<td>(61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type and energy</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osaka U. (RCNP)</td>
<td>K20</td>
<td></td>
<td>(56), p.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyushu U.</td>
<td>E5+T10</td>
<td></td>
<td>(62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saitama (IPCR)</td>
<td>L16</td>
<td>RILAC</td>
<td>(63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saitama (IPCR)</td>
<td>K77</td>
<td>WFC</td>
<td>(82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohoku U.</td>
<td>K50</td>
<td>CGR-MeV, Sumitomo Collab.</td>
<td>(56), p.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokai (JAERI)</td>
<td>T20</td>
<td>NEC 20 UR</td>
<td>(58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo U. (INS)</td>
<td>K68</td>
<td></td>
<td>(56), p.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo U.</td>
<td>D10+S1.4</td>
<td>Numatron (INS Study)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsukuba U.</td>
<td>T12</td>
<td>NEC 12UD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Groningen</td>
<td>K160</td>
<td></td>
<td>(83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw U.</td>
<td>K178</td>
<td>Modified U-200</td>
<td>(56), p.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>K200</td>
<td></td>
<td>(56), p.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Uppsala</td>
<td>K200</td>
<td>Exist. synchrocyclotron conv.</td>
<td>(56), p.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villagen</td>
<td>K135</td>
<td>SIN Injector</td>
<td>(64), p.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daresbury</td>
<td>T20 (T30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwell</td>
<td>K86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>E8+T2</td>
<td>VEC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argonne</td>
<td>T10+L15</td>
<td>SSRR postaccel.</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>K40</td>
<td>88 Inch</td>
<td>(76), p.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>D8.5+S2.6</td>
<td>SuperHILAC, Bevalac</td>
<td>(24,42,43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>L8+U2</td>
<td>MP Tandems</td>
<td>(66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.C. Davis</td>
<td>K90</td>
<td>HIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana U.</td>
<td>K16+K220</td>
<td>HIP</td>
<td>(67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Maryland</td>
<td>K180</td>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>(68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Minnesota</td>
<td>T12</td>
<td></td>
<td>(69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State U.</td>
<td>K50+K500+K800</td>
<td>K500&amp;K800 are superconducting</td>
<td>(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos</td>
<td>E8+T2</td>
<td>FN Tandem</td>
<td>(70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ridge</td>
<td>T7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ridge</td>
<td>T25+K90+K400</td>
<td>HHIF, K90 is called ORIC</td>
<td>(20,22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Rochester</td>
<td>T11+K500</td>
<td></td>
<td>(71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonybrook</td>
<td>T2+L12</td>
<td>SSR postaccel.</td>
<td>(72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M U.</td>
<td>K147</td>
<td></td>
<td>(73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Washington</td>
<td>T7+T9+L</td>
<td>FN Tandems</td>
<td>(74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale U.</td>
<td>T13</td>
<td></td>
<td>(75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Cont'd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type and energy</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubna (JINR)</td>
<td>K156+K250</td>
<td>U-200, U-300 (WFC)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubna (JINR)</td>
<td>D4+4A.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>K725</td>
<td>U-400</td>
<td>(77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>K140</td>
<td>U-240</td>
<td>(56), p.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leningrad</td>
<td>K140</td>
<td>U-240</td>
<td>(56), p.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow, Kurchatov I.</td>
<td>K60</td>
<td></td>
<td>(56), p.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow, Radiotech. I.</td>
<td>L102</td>
<td></td>
<td>(79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>T20</td>
<td>EGP-20</td>
<td>(80)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABBREVIATIONS

EBIS - Electron Beam Ion Source
HHIRF - Holifield Heavy Ion Research Facility
INS - Institute for Nuclear Study
IPCR - Institute of Physical and Chemical Research (RIKEN)
JAERI - Joint Atomic Energy Research Institute
JINR - Joint Institute for Nuclear Research
NEC - National Electrostatics Corporation
NHIP - No Heavy Ions Planned
ORIC - Oak Ridge Isochronous Cyclotron
RCNP - Research Center for Nuclear Physics
SIN - Swiss Institute for Nuclear Research
SSC - Superconducting Cyclotron
SSRR - Superconducting Split Ring Resonators
WFC - Weak Focusing Cyclotron
or cyclotrons for nuclear science because of their greater cost. Interest in linacs remains high, however, because they potentially have fewer limitations in intensity, particle species and in maximum energy. They are also superior as a synchrotron injector. Work in several laboratories is devoted to the development of more efficient linacs.

The prospect for heavy ion synchrotrons for nuclear science in the near future is promising. Present activity indicates that at least two, and perhaps as many as four will be started in the next five years.

There is growing interest from radiotherapists in using dedicated heavy ion machines for the treatment of cancer. The ion mass used would be in the range $A=12$ to 40, with energy around 500 MeV/amu. Duty factor could be low, intensity modest ($\sim 10^9$ pps). A synchrotron is the likely choice to fit the requirements.

The use of heavy ions as projectiles to trigger a thermonuclear reaction for fusion power generation has recently emerged as an attractive possibility. The requirement is for beams with $A=200$, $T_n \sim 200$ MeV/amu, with $\sim 10^{15}$ W of peak power in a $10^{-8}$ sec burst. There is no existing accelerator with these capabilities, but they seem to be within a reasonable extrapolation of existing accelerator technology. Studies are under way at several national laboratories to establish feasibility.
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