SRC 10020

Fermilab

p Note #449

AC

ANTE IN ASE A Sur C

Antiproton Yield Calculations

G. Dugan 1/20/86



Antiproton <u>Yield Calculations</u> <u>G. Dugan</u> <u>Jan. 20, 1986</u>

1

In the past, pbar yield calculations have been done using Monte Carlo hadronic cascade programs (based on been done measured cross sections) which have the advantage of including effects such as secondary production and multiple Coulomb scattering. However, because of their complexity, it is sometimes difficult to understand the dependences of the yield on various parameters of the system, and the development of an intuitive feel for the calculations is . thereby inhibited. It is therefore useful to supplement these Monte Carlo calculations with less complex but stil relatively realistic estimates of the yield, based on analytical calculations. As will be shown below, the only significant feature of the Monte Carlo calculations omitted in the analytical development is the secondary production in the target.

The analytical development follows closely the technique discussed in ref 2 Basically, a transport equation for the poar distribution function in phase space is written down in addition to poar production. It includes proton and poar absorption in the target, but neglects sultiple Coulomb scattering and energy loss. Since the poar production is derived from the primary proton team only, secondary production is neglected. Multiple Coulomb scattering of some the protons and obsers in the target is also neglected. However, this effect can be shown to te negligible for our case (see Appendix --2). All other significant features of the paar production and collection system are included in the talculation.

Based on the parameterization of ref 1, the pbar production cross section's angular dependence is plotted in fig. 1. (See Appendix A-1 for details). This angular dependence is fit very well by a gaussian, $\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1})$, with $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}$ with $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1}$, by the constant of the proton son tongsten, and 8.9 GeV/c pbars). This angular dependence is used throughout the calculations. The proton beam spatial distribution is also modelled as a Gaussian of rms size $\sigma_{\chi}^{-1} = \sigma_{\chi}^{-1} = \sigma_{\chi}^{-1}/\sigma_{\chi}^{-1}$.

To obtain the yield of pbars into a given system (e.g., beamline, Debuncher, etc.) the pbar distribution function at the target (the solution to the transport equation) must be integrated over the acceptance of the system, projected back to the target. The determination of the acceptance of a complex system like a beam line is best done using a numerical (ray-tracing) approach; however, for the first and

most important element in the line (the lithium lens), the acceptance can be idealized as an ellipse in phase space, and the sensitivity of the yield to the parameters of the lens (and target) can be studied

The details of the integration of the pbar distribution function over the acceptance ellipse are expounded in Appendix A-3. The analytical development leads to a number of integrals which must be evaluated numerically on the computer. As explained in the appendix, under some simplifying (but unrealistic) assumptions, the integrals can be evaluated analytically. For example, the integral over all transverse phase space produces a simple equation for the yield Y, which is defined as

Y= Np Ap

(1)

Here N_{p} = number of antiprotons in the momentum interval $\Delta \rho$, and N_{p} = the number of protons. The dependence of the poer production cross section on momentum is taken to be rise. The total yield is (see Accendic A-3, p. 4):

$$Y_{tot}(z) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_a} \frac{d\sigma}{d\rho} \right) z e^{-\frac{z}{\lambda}/\lambda}$$
(2)

Here zetanget lerger, $\frac{d\sigma}{d\rho}$ = can contain those section for 3.9 GeV/c poars by 120 Secondary on tungsten, $\lambda =$ proton abcortion length in thister and $\sigma_{\rm e}$ = proton contain cross section in regime. The an absorption length in tungsten (λ) is taken the qual of λ in this station situation for the situations); the situation λ = 35 cm and λ = 1.1 m. $\gamma_{\rm tot}$ maximizes at λ

$$Y_{max} = Y_{tor}(\lambda) = \pm \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{d\sigma}{d\rho} \right)$$
(3)

An analytical result for the yield into a finite acceptance area $\pi \epsilon$ (= $\pi \epsilon_x = \pi \epsilon_y$, an te obtained as detailed in Appendix A-3, p = 10-11 in the limit $\sigma_{-} \rightarrow 0$ and $\epsilon \chi << \theta_{-}^{2}$. With $\chi' = '/_{1}\theta_{\epsilon}$ for the upright acceptance ellipse at the center of the target, the result is

$$Y(z) = \frac{e^{-z/\lambda}}{\pi} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_a} \frac{d\sigma}{a\rho} \right) \frac{1}{\lambda \theta_o^2} 8z + am^{-1} \left(\frac{z}{2} \right)$$
(4)

Since $+\omega_{\Delta} \stackrel{i}{\xrightarrow{}} \frac{\delta}{2}$ grows more slowly than z, it is clear that Y(z) optimizes at $z < \lambda$, showing that targets shorter than 9 cm are best for small emittance collection. However, in our case, neither of the conditions $\sigma_n \rightarrow o$ and $\epsilon_N^2 < \delta_0^2$ is satisfied, as mentioned above, so this result is only of academic interest. The full expression presented in Appendix A-3 must be integrated numerically over the lens acceptance ellipse.

The acceptance ellipse of the lens is determined by the lens optics. The development of the relation between the acceptance ellipse parameters at the target and the lens parameters (length, radius, gradient) is presented in Appendix A-4. A plot of the variation of the lattice functions β and \propto from the target to the lens image plane is given in fig. 2.

In the approximation of an elliptical acceptance ellipse, the yield of pbars is entirely determined by the aspect ratio of the upright acceptance ellipse at the target center (β_{ℓ}) and the area of the ellipse ($\Omega \epsilon$, the emittance of the transmitted poer beam). The basic relation between β_{ℓ} (β at the image point, which is approximately equal to β at the lens exit(see fig. 2)) and β_{ℓ} (β at the target) is

$$B_{\ell} = \frac{1}{B_{\ell}} \frac{1}{k^2 \sin^2 \phi}$$
(5)

where k^2 in the $2^3 = 0.3 G/p$. We are gradient (in in probability in GeV) of kL, and length of the land. This relation between \mathcal{B}_L and ensignadient G is plotted in fig. 3 for variable β_L up to 1 cm (which covers the optimum for the obar yield is discused below). The celation between the maximum β_L allowed and the physical lens radius \mathcal{R}_L is

where $\Re \mathfrak{L}$ =pbar beam emittance (see Appendix A-4). Thus, for a given \mathcal{R}_0 , $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is limited above by this: these limits are shown (for \mathcal{R}_0 =10 mm) on fig. 3. From this graph can be obtained the minimum grady int required for a particular emittance. For a given value of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{L}}$. The actual value of \mathcal{B} at the image point; once chosen, must of course be able to be matched by AP-2 to the Debuncher. This could be a problem for small values of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{P}}$.

The required values of β_{\pm} are shown in fig. 4, which illustrates the variation of the $\overline{\rho}$ yield vs. β_{\pm} for different emittances. This result comes from the integration over the pbar distribution function discussed above, which is presented in gory detail in Appendix A-3. This calculation includes absorption of pbars in the lithium, using $\lambda_{\pm} = 136$ cm. Note that there is a broad range of acceptable β_{\pm} , over which the yield variation is rather flat: this is especially true at small values of Σ . The falloff at large β_{\pm} is due to the fact that the ellipse is too squat: this corresponds to too little lens focusing action. As β_{\pm} decreases, the acceptance ellipse gets tall and skinny: the falloff at small β_{\pm} (large lens gradients) comes from loosing particles at large x, and is a result of the finite size of the proton beam. For a point beam, there could be no falloff at small β_{\pm} : this can be seen from eq. 4, where the yield increases monotonically as χ increases.

All the information on the yield dependence on the lens parameters is, in principle, contained in figs. 3 and 4. However, it is useful to display the yield as a function of the lens and targeting parameters more splicitly, to allow the development of some insight. Also, the dependence of the yield on target length, proton spot is and lens length is useful to illustrate. In figs. 5 to 7, the yield is plotted as a function of:

(A), phan been emittance, for various lens gradients (A), 5). The circles with bots of this graph are the points from ref. 1. calculates with the same parameters. The fact that these points lie some the write for $\mathcal{E} > 20$ presumably reflects the president of secondaries, although the secondaries are estimated of 20 in ref. 1 and the differences shown in fig. 2 wie constants probly less than this.

(b), proton seam sizes for various emittances and 2 lens gradients (Fig. 6).

 (c). lens length, for various emitrances and 2 lens gradients (fig 7).

 (d), target langth, for various emittances and 2 lens gradients (fig B)

(e), lens gradient, for larious emittances (fig. 9).

In each case, the value of β_{ℓ} used for the yield calculation is that which corresponds to the maximum β_{ℓ} allowable for that gradient, taking $R_{o} = 1$ cm. (i.e., the dotted lines in fig. 3)

In fig. 10, we show the variation in yield with lens radius, for various emittances: for each radius, the gradient is scaled like NR_o as the radius is changed (which corresponds to scaling the current like R_o) and the value of β_{\pm} used again corresponds to the maximum β_{\pm} allowed for the scaled gradient and the corresponding radius.

Examination of the figures reveals the following facts:

(a). From fig. 5, at \mathcal{E} =20 there is very little difference between 800 and 1000 T/m. This is seen even more clearly in fig. 9. Lens operation at 800 T/m is considerably easier than at 1000 T/m; thus, it would be very useful to be able to empirically optimize the lens gradient over the range 800 to 1000 T/m. This requires the ability to change the focal length over the range 14.5 to 19.5 cm. This ability is not present in the existing target assembly and should be added. As seen from fig. 9, for emittances larger than 20 pi, higher gradients (i.e., near the design of 1000 T/m) are clearly preferred. Also, for smaller proton spot sizes, larger gradients ar required, as discussed below.

(b) From fig to the constantial band it afforded in principle by smaller upot sizes is clearly seen. Smaller proton spot sizes produce more gain for larger gradients: this is because the smaller β_{\pm} associated with larger gradients is required to make optimum use of the higher partenation are near the limit set by mechanical destruction of the target for the design $\sigma_{\rm L}$ = 0.054 cm, substantial reduction in $\sigma_{\rm L}$ will require internation of a beam sweeping system. Moreover, there a limits on the effective proton beam size due to multiple subtraining in the lens and lens abernations (see Addenum C) which must also be overcome to push to very small spot sizes (i.e., $\sigma_{\rm L}$ under about 0.02 cm).

(c). From figs 7 and 8, it is clear that $l_{lens} = 15$ cm and $l_{targ} = 5$ cm are clear the optima in each use, for either 800 or 1000 T/m gradients. Larger emittanc is than 20 pi would require longer lenses (for fixed gradient) and longer targets.

(d). Figure 10 shows the interesting feature that, for a current which varies as the radius of the lens and 2420, the yield is simple independent of the lens radius $R_{\rm e}^{-1}$.

This is due to the following: as the radius is decreased, β_{ℓ} at the lens must decrease (see eq. 6) which means that, to keep β_{ℓ} (and hence the yield) fixed, the gradient must increase (see fig. 3). But with current varying like R_{o} , gradient varies like $1/R_{o}$; this increase in gradient is close to what is required to keep β_{ℓ} constant. The variation of Y with β_{ℓ} is slow anyway (see fig. 4), so the result is a very slow change in Y with R_{o} .

This observation leads one to consider the possibility of smaller radius collection lenses, which have the advantage that they can pulse more rapidly (see ref. 3). As explained in ref. 3, the temperature rise per pulse in the lens

where T is the pulse duration and T_o is the peak lens current. To acheive the same current penetration ratio, (S[R_o) should be kept constant, where S a \sqrt{T} is the skin depth. For constant (S[R_o)² a T/R_o², T must = crease as R_o², so

Thus, to keep ΔT_p constant, T_o must vary like R_o , as in fig. 10.

The cyclic thermal stress in the lens (in the cooling jacket) is (see ref 3)

$$D \sigma \propto \frac{D T_{p} R_{o}}{\pm (1 + 2 \gamma R_{o} | E \pm)}$$

where t is the thickness of the cooling acket, $\gamma =$ the compressibility of inthium and E= the elastic modulus of the cooling jacket. If ΔT_p is constant, $\Delta \sigma^-$ can be kept constant if (R_o/t) is maintained constant as R_o decreases. This implies a thinner cooling jacket. For constant $\Delta \sigma^-$, the minimum lens cycle time γ_{cyc} is proportional to the thermal time constant for heat transfer across the jacket, γ_o :

For constant (R_0 /t), t $\propto R_0$, so $\gamma_R \propto R_0^2$, for example, to reduce γ_{cyc} from 2 sec (Tev I design) to 1 sec requires reducing R_0 by $\sqrt{2} \approx 7R_0 \approx ...707$ cm. As seen in fig. 10, the same yield would be produced if I_0 scaled like R_0 to 350 kA. (Actually, 280 kA would be just as good, as fig. 10 shows). Other practical considerations resulting from smaller lens radius must also be considered, of course. For example, as R_o decreases and β_ℓ decreases as R_o^2 , AP-2 must still be able to match the lens to the Debuncher. Also, as G increases the focal length decreases, which could present practical problems. For example, for $R_o = .7$ cm and $T_o = 350$ kA, f=8.4 cm and $\beta_\ell = 1.72$ m. Nevertheless, the feasibility of smaller radius lenses is clearly useful to investigate.

References

1. C. Hojvat, A. van Ginneken, "Calculations fo Antiproton Yields for the Fermilab Antiproton Source", NIM 206,67(1983).

 T. Vsevolozskaya, "The Optimization and Efficiency of Antiproton Production within a Fixed Acceptance", NIM 190,479(1981).

3. G. Dugan, "Limits to the Pulse Repetition Rate of a Lithium Lens", in Proceedings of the 1984 Summer Study on Design and Utilization of the SSC, p. 321 (1984).

4. T. Vsevolozskaya et. al., "Optical properties of cylindrical lenses", Sov. Phys. Tech. Phys., vol. 20, num. 12, 1556(1977).

5. A. Lennox, "The Design parameters for a lithium lens as an Antiproton collector", IEEE Trans. on Nucl. Sci., NS-30, 3663 (1983).





08/0 97

KOLLER REPERT OF LASES CO MIN WARY S

















Addenum A: the pbar distribution fucntion

An effort to understand AP-2 by Monte Carlo ray tracing of pbars from the target obviously needs an expression for the density distribution in phase space at the target center. This expression is derived in Appendix A-5, basically by guessing at a Green's function, using it to derive an answer, and then verifying that it satifies the transport equation.

Fig. A-1 is a projection of the differential yield at the target center

$$\frac{dY}{dx dy d\theta_k d\theta_y} = \frac{\overline{P(x, y, \theta_k, \theta_y)}}{N_p \Delta p}$$

on the x-axis (for $y = \theta_{y_1} = 0$, z=5 cm) for various θ_X . The broadening of the distribution as θ_X increases is the depth-of-field effect (due to the finite target length). Figs. A-2 and A-3 illustrate a 3-dimensional view of the surface $\overline{P}(x,\theta_X,\eta=0,\theta_Y=0,\xi=5cm)$ from two angles; figure A-4 is a projection or the 3-dimensional surface onto the (x, θ_X) plane. The shape gives rise to the term "buttefly" to describe the density distribution in phase space from a finite-length target.

The distribution Accention at any point (i) along the beam line can then be computed fromt the expression given in Appendix A-5, once the optical transformation M which connects $\vec{X_t}$ is the target) with $\vec{X_t}$ is known. For example, at the carget image (close to the left exit)

and

Ox=-Xeksmu Oyi=-yeksmu

X = Oxt / ksmu gi = Oyt / ksmu

So, at the target image the poar density distribution is $\overline{P}(-\Theta_x | k sunM, x k sunM, -\Theta_y | k sunM, y k sunM, \pm)$

where x, y, θ_x , and θ_y are the phase space variables at the target image. The Jacobian is unity since the determinant of M is one. Figure A-5 illustrates the projection of the differential yield onto the x-axis, for various θ_x values (and $y = \theta_y = 0$). The arrows indicate the lens aperture limits averaged over y). Figs. A-6 and A-7 illustrate 3-dimensional views of the surface for $y = \theta_y = 0$, from two angles. The sharp edges correspond to the lens aperture limits.

A simpler but less complete description of the density distribution function can be specified by computing the change in yield into a fixed emittance vs the emittance (ℓ_X or ℓ_Y). Although the result is a differential in only one quantity (transverse emittance in one plane), the result obviously depends on the aspect ratio of the acceptance ellipse at the target center (i.e., β_L), and so has less information in it than the full differential yield expression. Nevertheless, since, as seen from fig. 4, the yield vs β_E is rather flat near the optimum, this dependence is probably not very strong. Since the emittance in the Debuncher is presumably the same as at the target, except for the effects of aperture limitations.

Fig. A-9 shows $dY/de_{\chi}vs \ \epsilon_{\chi}$, where the integration over the (y, θ_{χ}) variables is to ϵ_{γ} =30, and the other parameters are the TeV I design values. Also shown is the exponential $dY/d\epsilon_{\chi} = 10e^{\epsilon/\epsilon_{o}}$, with ϵ_{o} =23, for comparison.











Discale and tieve i ppm/balle law 1 rods







Addendum B: optics of longer lenses

Plasma lenses are an alternative to lithium lenses as cylindrically symmetric focusing devices. The advantage of the plasma lens is its negligible density, which allows the length to be increased beyond that of the lithium lens. The length of the lithium lens is limited by absorption in the lithium (see fig. 7 above). To evaluate the parameters of would have plasma lens which the same a optical characteristics as the Tev I design lithium lens, we display the quantities I(lens current), l(lens length), and f(focal length) vs. ϕ =phase advance across the lens, in fig B-1. The calculations for these curves are presented on the next two pages: we have required a constant emittance ellipse at the target ($\xi = 20$, $\beta_{\pm} = 1.29$ cm) and a plasma radius of 1 As can be seen from the figure, the required current cm. =90 ° decreases substantially as ϕ and 1 increase. ϕ corresponds to the minimum current; here, f=0, which issomewhat impractical (although combined target-plasma lens assemblies could be considered). A more practical solution is \$ =70°, which requires f=7.7 cm, 1=25.8 cm and I=330 This peak lens current is substarrially less than the kA. roughly 600 kA needed for the lith um lens; the 13% absorption in the lithium is also eliminated. These are the principal advantages of the plasma lens

Given R (1), B₂ (target B)
$$z$$
 (emathematic)
Since R (1), B₂ (target B) z (emathematic)
Since B (B₂ = $\pi/\mu R^2/\epsilon$
 $k = \sqrt{\frac{0.3}{P}}$ G in T(m \rightarrow km m⁻¹
pro Go(\rightarrow km m⁻¹
G: B₁(R $B_{0}(2\pi R) = M_{0}T$, $B_{0} : \frac{M_{0}T}{2\pi R^{2}}$ G: $\frac{M_{0}T}{2\pi R^{2}} = 200T(kA) T$
 $G: B_{1}(R + b(2\pi R)) = M_{0}T$, $B_{0} : \frac{M_{0}T}{2\pi R^{2}}$ G: $\frac{M_{0}T}{2\pi R^{2}} = 200T(kA) T$
 $G: \frac{M_{0}T}{2\pi R^{2}} = k^{2} \cdot 0.3M_{0}T$ $M_{0} = 4\pi rxto^{7}$
Hun $k^{2} = \frac{1}{R^{2}} \left(\frac{S}{B_{0}}\right) \frac{1}{2\pi R}$ $M_{0} = 4\pi rxto^{7}$
Hun $k^{2} = \frac{1}{R^{2}} \left(\frac{S}{B_{0}}\right) \frac{1}{2\pi R}$ $\left(\frac{S}{R^{2}/B_{0}}\right) \frac{T}{2\pi R}$
 $B_{0}T = \frac{1}{B_{2}k^{2}sm^{2}k} = \frac{0.3M_{0}}{\pi R}$
 $S_{0} = \frac{S}{B_{0}} R^{2} = \frac{\pi}{R} R^{2}$
 $S_{0} = \frac{S}{B_{0}} R^{2} = \frac{\pi}{R} R^{2}$
 $S_{0} = \frac{S}{B_{0}} R^{2} = \frac{\pi}{R} R^{2}$
 $T|T_{m} = \frac{|k^{2}| S|R_{0}}{2\pi R} = \frac{\pi}{R} R^{2}$
 $f = \frac{1}{R^{2}sm^{2}k} = \frac{1}{R^{2}g_{0}sm^{2}k}$ $G = \frac{M_{0}T}{2\pi R} = Tm \frac{H}{R} sm^{2}k$
 $f = \frac{1}{R^{2}smd} = k^{2} = \frac{1}{R^{2}g_{0}sm^{2}k}$
 $f = \frac{1}{R^{2}smd} = k^{2} = \frac{1}{R^{2}g_{0}sm^{2}k}$
 $f = \frac{1}{R^{2}smd} = k^{2} = \frac{1}{R^{2}g_{0}sm^{2}k}$



$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{p \in A} \sum_{k=1}^{p$$

 $\theta_{t}(o) = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{APANC} = \frac{1}{2E_{\text{max}}} \left[(2 \text{ GAS}) (1-x_{\text{m}})^{2} \exp(-3\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) (1.59) \exp(1.32\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1.79x_{\text{m}}) \right] \\ = 1.0985 (1-x_{\text{m}})^{2} \exp(-1.62\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1.79x_{\text{m}}) \\ = 1.0985 (1-x_{\text{m}})^{2} \exp(-1.79x_{\text{m}}) \exp(-1.79x_{\text{m}}) \\ = 91^{2} \exp(-1.62\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1.79x_{\text{m}}) \exp(-1.62\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \\ = 91^{2} \exp(-1.62\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1.62\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \\ = 91^{2} \exp(-1.62\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1.62\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \\ = 91^{2} \exp(-1.62\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1.62\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \\ = 1 \exp(-1.62\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) (1-x_{\text{m}})^{2} \exp(-1.79x_{\text{m}}) \exp(-1.62\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \\ = 1 \exp(-1.62\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) (1-x_{\text{m}})^{2} \exp(-1.79x_{\text{m}}) \exp(-1.62\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \\ = 1 \exp(-1.62\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) (1-2\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) (1-2\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) (1-2\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \\ = 1 \exp(-1-2\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) (1-\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) (1-\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \\ = 1 \exp(-1-2\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) (1-\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \\ = 1 \exp(-1-2\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \\ = 1 \exp(-1-2\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) (1-\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \\ = 1 \exp(-1-2\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \\ = 1 \exp(-1-2\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \\ = 1 \exp(-1-2\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1\rho_{\text{m}}^{2}) \exp(-1\rho_$$



1

1.1

Million for the formal in the target

$$\frac{1}{p_{p}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{k_{R}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{4} \frac{k_{Q}}{k_{Q}} - \frac{1}{k_{R}} \right) \\
\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{p_{p}} \frac{1}{k_{R}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{4} \frac{k_{Q}}{k_{Q}} - \frac{1}{k_{R}} \right) \\
\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{p_{p}} \frac{1}{k_{R}} = \left(\frac{1}{1} (\frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{4})^{2} - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{9} - \frac{1}{2} \\
\frac{1}{2} \frac{$$

100

¥

Protection Mer
$$L_R = .35 \text{ cm}$$

 $R^2 = \left(\frac{148}{-3416}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{.55}\left(1 + \frac{1}{4}\log_{10}2/1.35\right)$
 $= 7.171 \times 10^{-1} \pm \left(1 + \frac{1}{4}\log_{10}2/1.35\right)$
 $= 7.171 \times 10^{-1} \pm \left(1 + \frac{1}{4}\log_{10}2/1.35\right)$
 $\pm = 5 \text{ cm}$ $g_{2}^{-1} = 4.045 \times 10^{-5}$ $g_{0} = 6.36 \text{ mrad}$
 $\text{sugadiative with 746 - 7 mgligitke}$
 $M_{10} = L_R = 155 \text{ cm}$
 $\theta_{0}^{-2} = 1.62 \times 10^{-3} \pm \left(1 + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{$

50 A 12

.

THE MAN W



 $\frac{d\overline{n}}{dxdyd\theta_x} = \frac{d\overline{n}}{dxdyd\theta_x} \frac{d\overline{n}}{dxdyd\theta_x} = \frac{d\overline{n}}{dxdyd\theta_x} \frac{d\overline{n}}{dxdyd\theta_x} = \frac{d\overline{n}}{dx}$ (abridy des de the = for the appression Sty dog do to P (x-00, 0, y, a) - 0 is and and is non us to the ungeged venicher; some for By the P-10 you some for ild of $\int dxdydQ_xdQ_yno P(xy,z) \frac{d^2\sigma}{dxdy} = \frac{d\sigma}{dp} n_0 N_0 e^{-\frac{1}{2}/\lambda}$ Jokedy Box day P(xyz) = dN ap $dM_{2}\left(\frac{dN}{dp}\right) = -\overline{\sigma}_{a} n_{o} dN / dp + n_{o} N_{o} e^{-2/2} d\sigma / dp$

The ise defined a quarter of the form

$$df_{M} = f(x)$$

$$df_{M} = f(x)$$

$$df_{M} = f(x)$$

$$df_{M} = f(x)$$

$$df_{M} = e^{x/\lambda} y|_{\lambda} + e^{x/\lambda} dy|_{dX} = e^{x/\lambda} (3/\lambda + dy|_{dX}) = e^{x/\lambda} f(x)$$

$$e^{x/\lambda} y|_{\lambda} = \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx$$

$$e^{x/\lambda} y|_{\lambda} = \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx + f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{e^{x/\lambda}} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx + f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{e^{x/\lambda}} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx + f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{e^{x/\lambda}} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx + f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{e^{x/\lambda}} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx + f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{e^{x/\lambda}} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx + f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{e^{x/\lambda}} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx + f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{e^{x/\lambda}} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx + f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{e^{x/\lambda}} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx + f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{e^{x/\lambda}} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx + f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{e^{x/\lambda}} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx + f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{e^{x/\lambda}} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx + f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{e^{x/\lambda}} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx + f(x) dx + f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{e^{x/\lambda}} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx + f(x) dx + f(x) dx + f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{e^{x/\lambda}} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{x/\lambda} f(x) dx + f(x$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} \left(e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \right) = N_{0} \frac{d_{T}}{d\rho} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \right)$$

$$= N_{0} \frac{d_{T}}{d\rho} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} = N_{0} \frac{d_{T}}{d\rho} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} = N_{0} \frac{d_{T}}{d\rho} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} = 0$$

$$= e^{\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} - \frac{1}{\partial \rho} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} = 0$$

$$= e^{\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} - \frac{1}{\partial \rho} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} = 0$$

$$= e^{\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} - \frac{1}{\partial \rho} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} = 0$$

$$= e^{\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} - \frac{1}{\partial \rho} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} = 0$$

$$= \frac{1}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} d_{T} e^{-\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \rho}$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{F$$

.55

The distributes of the space are
$$\varepsilon$$
:

$$d(z) = \int_{a(z)}^{b(z)} d(z) = \int_{a(z)}^{b(z)} d(z) + f(b(z)) \frac{dz}{dz} - f(q, z) \frac{da}{dz}$$

$$= \int_{a(z)}^{b(z)} d(z) \frac{d\overline{\rho}}{dz} = d(dz) \int_{a(z)}^{c(z)} d(z) \frac{d\rho}{dz} d(z) + \overline{\rho} = \overline{\rho}(c(z)) \frac{d\rho}{dz}) \frac{de(z)}{dz}$$

$$= \int_{a(z)}^{a(z)} \frac{d\rho}{dz} = d(dz) \int_{a(z)}^{c(z)} d(z) \frac{d\rho}{dz} d(z) + \overline{\rho} = \overline{\rho}(c(z)) \frac{d\rho}{dz}) \frac{de(z)}{dz}$$

$$= \int_{a(z)}^{a(z)} \frac{d\rho}{dz} + \int_{a(z)}^{a(z)} \frac{d\rho}{dz} \int_{a(z)}^{c(z)} d(z) \frac{d\rho}{dz} d(z) + \overline{\rho}(z) \frac{d\rho}{dz} d(z) - \overline{\rho}(z) \frac{d\rho}{dz} d(z) -$$

(get) Q(get) dE = dit jaxdy do, doy P - [Jaxdy Joby P(x y, 0, 0, 22)) - [dedy [dag P(x,y, Dy, 0x=0,(x,2)) + [dx dx [d0x P(x,y, 0, 0]= 02(x,2))] - [dx dy [dox P(x, Y, ox, 03=0(y, 2))] Each of the integerds a to essentially the live integral of the destudience finction ever esther the typ a tottom of the acceptance ellipse. Because of symmetry the line whey al over the typh of concells that are the lattom half =7 all extra trus are year

$$E = \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{3}{2} \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{3}{2} \frac{3}{2}$$

.

Sharif 1

.

$$P_{2}(\delta) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |A_{n} - A_{n} - A_{n}||_{2} = \sum_{n=0}^{2(l-b_{n})} + \frac{1}{2} |a| ||_{1} - ||_{1}||_{2} = \int_{n=0}^{\infty} |A_{n}||_{2} = \int_{n=0}^{\infty} |A$$

65



$$\begin{split} \mathbf{N} & = \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} & \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} & \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} & \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} & \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} & \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} & \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \\ -\frac{1}{2$$

. .

$$\begin{aligned} f_{2}(\eta) & f_{2}(\eta) \quad f_{2}(\eta) \quad f_{2}(\eta) = \frac{M_{0}}{\pi c_{1}} \cdot \frac{\omega_{p}(-n^{2}/c_{1}^{2})}{\pi c_{2}} \cdot \frac{\omega_{p}(1+\tau)}{2} \\ f_{2}(\eta) & f_{2}(\eta) = c^{-\tau/(\lambda_{p}-\omega_{0})}(\eta_{2}^{-1}/\lambda_{\lambda}) \frac{\omega_{p}(\eta_{p})}{\pi c_{2}} e^{2(\lambda_{p}-\omega_{0})} e^{\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_{p}-\eta_{\lambda})} dz \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha} dx \int_{0}^{\alpha} d\theta_{x} \\ \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha} d\eta \int_{0}^{\theta} f^{(x,y)} \frac{d^{1}r}{d\tau} e^{\frac{1}{2}\omega_{0}(1/\lambda_{1}^{-1}/\lambda_{0})} \int_{-2}^{2(\lambda_{p}-\omega_{0})} d\tau (1/\eta_{1}^{-1}/\lambda_{0}) dz \\ \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha} d\eta \int_{0}^{\alpha} d\eta \int_{0}^{\alpha} d\theta_{x} d\theta_{y} \quad f^{(x,y)} \int_{-2}^{\beta} d\theta_{x} d\theta_{y} \\ & h_{2}(\lambda) = n_{0} \frac{h_{2}}{2\lambda} \frac{d\sigma}{d\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{d\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{d\rho} e^{\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_{1}^{-1}/\lambda_{0})} \int_{-2}^{2(\lambda_{p}-\omega_{0})} d\tau (1/\eta_{1}^{-1}/\lambda_{0}) dz \\ & \int_{0}^{\alpha} d\eta \int_{0}^{\alpha} d\eta \int_{0}^{\beta} d\theta_{x} d\theta_{y} \quad g^{(x)}(\theta) = \Re h_{2}^{x} - \frac{\theta}{2} \int_{0}^{\alpha} d\eta \int_{0}^{\beta} d\eta \int_{-2}^{\alpha} d\eta \int_{0}^{\beta} d\eta \int_{0}^{\beta} d\eta \int_{0}^{\beta} d\theta_{x} d\theta_{y} \quad g^{(x)}(\theta) = \Re h_{2}^{x} - \frac{\theta}{2} \int_{0}^{\beta} d\eta \int_{0}^{\beta} d\eta \int_{0}^{\beta} d\eta \int_{0}^{\beta} d\theta_{x} d\theta_{y} \quad g^{(x)}(\theta) = \Re h_{2}^{x} - \frac{\theta}{2} \int_{0}^{\beta} d\eta \int_{0}^{\beta} d\eta \int_{0}^{\beta} d\theta_{x} d\theta_{y} \quad g^{(x)}(\theta) = \Re h_{2}^{x} - \frac{\theta}{2} \int_{0}^{\beta} d\eta \int_{0}^{\beta} d\eta \int_{0}^{\beta} d\eta \int_{0}^{\beta} d\eta \int_{0}^{\beta} d\theta_{x} d\theta_{y} \quad g^{(x)}(\eta) \int_{0}^{2(\lambda-\omega)} d\eta \int_{0}^{\beta} d\eta \int$$

Approxime

$$\frac{2}{N_{0}} = \frac{e^{-L/\lambda}}{2\lambda} \times \int_{-R}^{R} f_{1}(z)dz$$
Since $f_{1}(z)$ is even in $z = \int_{-R}^{R} f_{1}(z)dz = 2\int_{0}^{R} f_{1}(z)dz$

$$\frac{N_{0}(\lambda)}{N_{0}\Delta\rho} = \frac{e^{-L/\lambda}}{\lambda} \times \int_{0}^{R} f_{1}(z)dz = 2\int_{0}^{R} f_{1}(z)dz$$

$$\frac{N_{0}(\lambda)}{N_{0}\Delta\rho} = \frac{e^{-L/\lambda}}{\lambda} \times \int_{0}^{R} f_{1}(z)dz$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\infty} f_{1}(z)dz = \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\infty} f_{1}(z)dz$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\infty} f_{1}(z)dz = \int_{0}^{0} f_{1}(z)dz$$

$$f_{1}(z) = \int_{0}^{\infty} dn f_{2}(h_{1}^{2}z) = \int_{0}^{0} dn f_{2}(h_{1}^{2}z)\frac{dh}{d\pi n} = \frac{1}{d\pi} f_{2}(h_{2}^{2}z)$$

$$f_{2}(0,z) = \int_{0}^{2\pi} dd f_{4}(h_{1}^{0},h_{2}^{2}z) = d\pi f_{4}(h_{1}^{0},h_{2}^{2}z)$$

$$f_{4}(0,h_{1}^{2}z) = \left[\int_{0}^{\pi} f_{3}(h_{1}^{0})d\theta\right]^{2} \qquad \theta_{2} = \frac{\sqrt{eY(1+d^{2}/2)}}{1+\sqrt{e^{2}(2)}}$$

$$\theta_{1} = -\theta_{2}$$

$$f_{4}(0,h_{1}^{2}z) = \left[dX\int_{0}^{\theta_{2}} d\theta \exp(t\theta)g_{0}^{2}z\right]^{2} = \left(\pi \theta_{0} e_{0}t(\theta_{1}(\theta_{0}))^{2}\right]$$

$$\frac{N_{0}(L)}{N_{0}(\rho)} = \frac{e^{-L/\lambda}}{\lambda} \times \int_{0}^{R} dz \pi \theta_{0}^{2} \left[e_{0}f(\theta_{2}(\theta_{0}))^{2}\right]$$

ŝ

क्र छ त

2

.

• •

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} = \frac{\sqrt{2}\mathcal{L}}{\sqrt{2}\mathcal{L}} \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{L}}{\mathcal{L}} + \frac{\sqrt{2}\mathcal{L}}{\mathcal{L}} \right\} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} = \frac{\sqrt{2}\mathcal{L}}{\sqrt{2}\mathcal{L}} \left(\frac{\mathcal{L}}{\mathcal{L}} + \frac{\sqrt{2}\mathcal{L}}{\mathcal{L}} \right) \right\} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} \right\} \right\} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} \right\} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} \right\} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} \right\} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial$$



-

We require that:
$$n_{o} = \frac{a}{k \operatorname{Small}} = \operatorname{Nodelies} of the lews$$

then $a = n_{o} k \operatorname{Small}$
and $\varepsilon = ab = 0$ $b = \varepsilon/a = \frac{\varepsilon}{n_{o} k \operatorname{Small}}$
So $B_{\varepsilon} = b/a$ ε
 $B_{\varepsilon} = \frac{\varepsilon}{(n_{o} k \operatorname{Small})^{2}}$
 $\delta_{\varepsilon} = \frac{\delta_{\varepsilon}}{|B_{\varepsilon}|}$
 $B_{\varepsilon} = \frac{\delta_{\varepsilon}}{k^{2} \operatorname{Sm}^{2} u} = \frac{n_{\varepsilon}^{2} k^{2} \operatorname{Sm}^{2} u}{\varepsilon k^{2} \operatorname{Sm}^{2} u} = \frac{n_{\varepsilon}^{2}}{|\varepsilon|} \varepsilon$
 $k = \sqrt{\frac{0.36}{p}} m^{-1}$, GmTIm , $p \operatorname{mGeV}/c$ $G = B_{\varepsilon}/n_{o}$
 $\mu = k L = 2\sqrt{\frac{0.36}{p}}$

Seen next soge for a modeteration of the relation between the and has due to the cylindrical -symmetry of the leves.

Addendum C: Lens Abberations

The discussions in the previous sections assumed a perfectly linear field in the lens, and neglected multiple Coulomb scattering in the lens and chromatic effects. Of these three principal sources of aberrations, the most significant in the Tev I design is the first one. This arises from the pulsed nature of the lens current, which takes some time to diffuse from the periphery of the lens into the center. This diffusion, and the constraints that it sets on the lens operating parameters, has been described in detail elsewhere (see ref. 4 and 5). As discussed in these references, the deviation from linearity of the lens field is a function of the time t after the beginning of the lens pulse:

 $\Delta^{2}(\omega t) = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} dn n \left(\frac{B(n, \omega t) - G(\omega t)n}{(B(n, \omega t))^{2}}\right)^{2}}{(B(n, \omega t))^{2}} / \int_{0}^{\infty} n dn$

Here Δ^{-1} is the mean square relative deviation of the field $B(r, \omega t)$ from linearity at the tile t; $T = \pi/\omega$ is the duration of the half-sine wave current pulse. $G(\omega t)$ is the effective gradient, defined by minimizing the function $\Delta^{-1}(\omega t)$; i.e.,

$$d|dG(\Delta^2(\omega t))=0$$

is the equation for $G(\omega t)$. $\sqrt{\Delta^2}$ vs. $\phi = \omega t$ is shown in fig. C-1 for the Tev I design lens parameters; it minimizes at about 2.1% for $\phi = 1.93$ radians. As shown in Appendix A-5, the angular variation from linear focusing produced by Δ^2 in the lens is roughly equivalent to a position spread at the target of

For the Tev I design lens (see Appendix A-6), $\delta h_{\ell} \sim .21$ mm. This appendix also shows that the effect of the multiple Coulomb scattering in the lens is equivalent to a position spread of about .15 mm, and chromatic effects for $\delta \rho / \rho = \pm 2.4\%$ are equivalent to a position spread of 0.07 mm at the target.

The total effect of the aberrations (taken in quadrature) is roughly equivalent to a spread in r of about .26 mm at the target. When taken in quadrature with the design $\sigma_{\rm TL}$ = .54 mm, this is a 10% increase in beam size, or a 10% decrease in pbar yield according to fig. 6. However, if plans are made to reduce the spot size possible on the target utilizing beam sweeping techniques, it must be

realized that there will be a limit to the effective beam size at about .26 mm, unless β^2 is reduced by increasing the pulse width of the current pulse applied to the lens (see ref. 4, 5). This results in greater energy depostion in the lens and has implications for the peak current at which the lens can be operated.

AT A TANK OF A T



				21 0 = 20xco	-L = 1. 54xt	5-1		_
		8402A	Tw = (154×	(10-3) + 21(x 0,3+4	8,9 Txco-7 =	230kA		
	R=	= 10 =	we be:	To 102/20	m = <u>3,</u>	13 m	Be B = 3	63 W x 29 X 10 ⁻² W
			J.B.	BE = , 225 m°	= 22,5 a	M		
	S	0]	E = 293/Sm	y ka				
		4	F= 22.5 God	Сщ				
		-	l= 22.5 \$ 80	R=10 mm	5	-Shin		
é	I	kA)G	(The l(an)	f(cm)	ICA	Dela	TAR	4. 1
0	80		0	22.5	To	Titas	14	2
20	2505	5010	2.69	21.14	4.39	10.8	7 20/07	40
70	101	1918	10.0	17.29	50	80	557	2
60	340	130	20,11	2 91	1 02	Tist	2 540	•
90	293	586	35.34	0	1767	00	Z. KA	7
		R	- Smith	3 nargem	TER	Unise	R.	
10	9716	•	.68	22.1				
30	1172		5.89	19.5				
50	500		15.0	14.5				
70	331		25,8	7.7				1.1.4
*								
								1

Sec.

$$\frac{\Delta Re}{\theta_{0}^{2}} = 1.62 \times 10^{-7} \times 10^{-7$$

ž

$$\int dx = \int dx =$$

FIGHNORS ALL
Lens Absorbains
Angular and intermed to the tanget looking, in dense of positivity spread

$$i = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{1$$

 $\overline{P}(n,q;z) = e^{-2t/\lambda} \left(\frac{4}{\lambda}\right) \Delta P \frac{e^{-\Theta^2(0,z)}}{\pi \sigma_{\lambda}^2} I$

 $\begin{array}{l}
\omega_n \mid_{\Theta} \rightarrow & \omega \mid_{\Theta} (n + L \Theta_2) = \omega_n \mid_{\Theta} + \omega_{L/2} \\
\Theta_2 - n = & \Theta_L - (n + L \Theta_2) = & \Theta_{L/2} - n \\
n \rightarrow & \Theta_2 \ L \Theta_2
\end{array}$

tota + Lo/2.

 $\overline{P}(n, \Theta, z) = e^{-2t/2} \left(\frac{x}{2} \right) DP = \frac{-\Theta^2}{2\pi} \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\Theta \sigma_n} \exp(a_1) \left(erf(a_2) - erf(a_2) \right)$

$$a_{1} = \frac{\omega^{2} \sigma_{n}^{2}}{4 \theta^{2}} - \frac{\omega n}{\theta} - \frac{\omega L}{2}$$

$$a_{2} = \frac{\sigma_{n} \omega}{2 \theta} + \frac{L}{\sigma_{n}} \left(\frac{\theta L}{2 - n} \right)$$

$$a_{3} = \frac{\sigma_{n} \omega_{b}}{\theta} - \frac{L}{\sigma_{n}} \left(\frac{n + \theta L}{2} \right)$$

P(TB) IN [n.e-2/2 Dpe2/2 [dandy " Doddp" POR) dis s(n'- n+==) s(0-0') P(n) = 1 e-12/522 no and p= (x()) = 0400 $\overline{P} = e^{-2l} \left(\frac{X}{2} \right) OP \frac{e^{-\theta^2} \theta_0^2}{\pi \sigma^2} \int_{0}^{2} -\frac{2^{l} l_0^2}{e^{-2l} l_0^2} e^{-(l_0 - \theta_0)^2 l_0^2} d\theta_0^2$ w= 112-12 $i = -\omega z^{8} - \frac{1}{\sigma_{n^{2}}} \left(n^{2} - 2n \Theta z^{8} + z^{2} \Theta^{2} \right)$ $= -2^{2}\theta^{2}/\sigma_{n}^{2} - 2\left(\omega - 2n\theta/\sigma_{n}^{2}\right) - n^{2}/\sigma_{n}^{2}$ = $-\theta^2/\sigma_{\Lambda}^2\left(\frac{z^2}{z^2}+\frac{\sigma_{\Lambda}^2}{\theta^2}\left(\omega-\frac{2\Lambda\theta}{\sigma_{\star}^2}\right)\right)-\frac{n^2}{\sigma_{\Lambda}^2}$ Complete the square - 02/022 (22+02/022 (w/2-10/02) + (52/02)2(w-10/02)2) - nº (02 + 0º (02 02 02) (w/2 - NO(02)) = $-\theta^{2}|_{\sigma_{n}^{2}}(2 + \sigma_{n}^{2}|_{\theta^{2}}(w|_{2} - n\theta|_{\sigma_{n}^{2}}))^{2}$ $-n^{2}/\sigma_{n}^{2} + \sigma_{n}^{2}/\partial^{2}\left(\frac{\omega^{2}}{4} + n^{2}\partial^{2}/\sigma_{n}^{4} - \frac{\omega n \Theta}{\sigma_{n}^{2}}\right)$ Lost termo are - n2/52 + W2 52 + N2/52 - WA = W2 52 - WA $e_{PP}\left(\frac{\omega^{2}\sigma_{h}^{2}-\omega_{h}}{4\theta^{2}-\frac{\omega_{h}}{\theta}}\right)\int_{0}^{2}e_{PP}\left(-\frac{\Theta^{2}}{\sigma_{h}^{2}}\left(2+\sigma_{h}^{2}|_{\theta^{2}}\left(\frac{\omega}{2}-n\Theta/\sigma_{h}^{2}\right)\right)^{2}\right)$ some integral is $\int dt u = \frac{\Theta}{\sigma_n} \left(z + \sigma_n^2 \left(\Theta^2 \left(\frac{\omega_{2}}{2} - n\Theta_{\sigma_n}^2 \right) \right) = \frac{\Theta^2}{\sigma_n} + \frac{\sigma_n}{\Theta} \left(\frac{\omega_{2}}{2} - \frac{n\Theta_{\sigma_n}^2}{\sigma_n} \right)$ = 02/0, + 0, w/20 - 1/0, du = de de = on lo de = 1/00 (02-12) + 00 m/20 $\sum_{n=1}^{N_2} e^{-u^2} du = \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2} \left(ert(x_2) - est(x_1) \right)$ 102=0 u= "10 (w/2-n0/02) = 000 - n/02

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A_{1}^{k}, \mathbf{x}_{1}^{k}, \mathbf{x}_{1}^{$$

1.5

+ 19

$$\begin{aligned} = \frac{1(\frac{1}{2}x - \frac{1}{2}y_{2}) \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}x - \frac{1}{2}y_{2}) \frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$$

•

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f_{in}}{\partial x} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{d_{in}}{\partial x} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{d_{in}}}{\partial x} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{d_{in}}{\partial x}$$

CT:CR

$$\begin{split} \begin{split} \tilde{s}_{0} t_{0} & = t_{0} \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma_{1}^{2} t_{0}^{2}}{\sigma_{1}^{2} t_{0}^{2}} = \frac{\omega(\theta_{1} v_{1} \theta_{1} y_{0} \theta_{1} y_{0} \theta_{1}^{2})}{\theta_{1}^{2} t_{0} \theta_{1}^{2}} \right] f_{ne} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sigma_{1}^{2}} \frac{1}{\theta_{1}^{2} \theta_{0}^{2}} = \frac{\theta_{1} v_{0}}{\theta_{1}^{2} \theta_{0}^{2}} = \frac{\theta_{1} v_{0}}{\theta_{1}^{2} \theta_{0}^{2}} \right] \\ \int_{0}^{t_{0}} c_{ne} \left[-\frac{(\theta_{1}) (\theta_{1}^{2} y_{0}^{2})}{\sigma_{1}^{2}} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sigma_{1}^{2} t_{0}}{\sigma_{1}^{2} \theta_{0}^{2}} = \frac{\theta_{0} v_{0}}{\theta_{1}^{2} \theta_{0}^{2}} = \frac{\theta_{0} v_{0}}{\theta_{1}^{2} \theta_{0}^{2}} \right] \int_{0}^{t_{0}} dv \\ & J_{n} = \frac{(\theta_{1}^{2} t_{0} \theta_{1}^{2})}{\sigma_{n}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sigma_{1}^{2} t_{0}}{\theta_{1}^{2} \theta_{0}^{2}} = \frac{\theta_{0} v_{0}}{\theta_{1}^{2} \theta_{0}^{2}} = \frac{\theta_{0} v_{0}}{\theta_{1}^{2} \theta_{0}^{2}} \right] \\ & du = \frac{(\theta_{1}^{2} t_{0} \theta_{1}^{2})}{\sigma_{n}} d^{2} = \frac{\theta_{0} v_{0}}{\theta_{1}^{2} \theta_{0}^{2}} = \frac{\theta_{1} v_{0}}{\theta_{1}^{2} \theta_{0}^{2}} \\ & du = \frac{(\theta_{1}^{2} t_{0} \theta_{1}^{2})}{\sigma_{n}} d^{2} d^{$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} + \partial \mathbf{x}} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} + \partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} + \partial \mathbf{x}} \right\} \\ + \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} + \partial \mathbf{x}} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} + \partial \mathbf{x}} \right\} \\ + \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} + \partial \mathbf{x}} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} + \partial \mathbf{x}} \right\} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} + \partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}} \\ - \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \right\} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} + \partial \mathbf{x}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} + \partial \mathbf{x}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \right\} \\ - \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \partial \mathbf{x}^{2})}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{2}} \\ + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{$$

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \frac{dE}{dt} = \frac{dE$$



 $\approx j \in \mathbb{R}$