Abstract

We are in the process of re-assembling the Injection-Locked Relativistic Klystron Oscillator to increase the duration of the high power microwave pulse. This HPM source is designed to use a 500 kV, 10 kA annular electron beam and generate ~1.5 GW microwave pulse. Previously we published that the microwave pulse length was experimentally observed to be limited to a finite change in the beam current. These initial experiments focus on controlling the total variation of the emitted beam current. That is, our goal is to have the vacuum diode behave as a resistive load at the desired voltage. We will be presenting results of experiments on the materials used to fabricate the cathode and its emission surface, results from X-ray and optical diagnostics of the unmodulated electron beam position and thickness, and finally results from X-ray and optical diagnostics of the modulated electron beam position and thickness. These results will be compared with different time dependent and steady state computational tools.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Air Force Research Laboratory’s (AFRL) Injection-Locked Relativistic Klystron Oscillator (RKO) [1] is a High Power Microwave (HPM) source. During previous experiments the HPM pulse duration was found to be limited by the time required to increase from a start current to a maximum critical total electron beam current. The observation was that microwave pulse would only be generated while the electron beam current was greater than 7 kA and less than or equal to 10 kA. At this time we do not completely understand the cause of the current increase when a constant voltage (less than 5% variation) is applied to the anode-cathode (A-K) gap. During previous experiments we found the material used for the cathode had an impact on the magnitude of the current increase.

In order to understand the limitations to the HPM pulse being generated we need to understand why the electron beam current is not constant for any constant applied voltage. Toward that end we have put together an experimental and theoretical study on the generation of the annular electron beam. We are using previously validated codes: 1) TRAK Steady State Gun Code[2] and 2) ICEPIC[3] Particle-in-Cell Code. These tools are coupled with an experiment to look at the generation and propagation of an annular electron beam through the RKO structure and magnetic field coils.

II. RKO DIODE EXPERIMENT

The experimental arrangement is shown in Figure 1. The center-line of the system is indicated by the symmetry axis of the drawing. A long shaft to the pulsed power system supports the cathode. The electron beam is generated in a converging magnetic field (maximum axial field ~8 kG) and accelerated toward the hollow beam line. The annular electron beam is to be 5 mm in thickness and be confined by the magnetic field 5 mm from the wall. The microwave modulating cavities are part of the brazed structure forming the beam line. However, they are not used in this set of experiments. These cavities are blocked to preclude modulation of the electron beam.

Figure 1 Drawing of the RKO diode experiment.
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III. DIAGNOSTICS

A voltage derivative probe (V-dot or penny probe) and Rogowskii coil (I-dot probe) are located on the upstream (left-hand) end of the experiment. We have placed PIN diode detector on the downstream end of the center-line to monitor the generated X-ray pulse due to the collection of the electron beam pulse with a POCO graphite witness plate.

The electron beam diagnostics are used as a self-consistency check with traditional pulsed power diagnostics. For instance, IMP pulsed power system (10 stage, 1 MV maximum, 30 kJ stored) has a resistive voltage divider to monitor the charge of a 600 nsec, 5 Ω pulse forming line (PFL). The PFL is switched to the vacuum diode by a self-breaking, gas insulated, closing switch. By monitoring the switch out point in the charge of the PFL we may estimate how the flatness of the voltage waveform. For example, the time required for the PFL to reach maximum charge is \(~3.5\) µsec. We typically pressurize the output switch to close \(~3.2\) to \(~3.4\) µsec. Operation in this mode ensures the voltage waveform should be moderately constant at 50% of the IMP erected Marx voltage.

IV. SIMULATIONS

To gain insight into the vacuum diode behavior and electron beam propagation we make use of an assortment of computational tools. These include electric and magnetic field solvers[2] in addition to the gun and particle codes mentioned earlier. These codes will indicate regions of high electric field stress or non-uniformity in the applied magnetic field. Following the steady state fields calculations, then we begin to look at how the electron beam is generated and propagated through the structure. These simulation results are shown in Figure 2. The results are from Trak and ICEPIC, respectively. You will notice from the plots the same qualitative transport of the electron beam. We also make quantitative comparisons between the codes.

V. PRESENT EXPERIMENT

Data from the present experiment are shown in Figure 3. The data show the observed constant voltage pulse, and the normalized overlay of the emitted electron beam current with the X-ray PIN diode signal. The PIN diode indicates the X-ray dose rate during the pulse. Given the relation [4] between the dose rate, voltage and current we expect the PIN signal to track the electron beam current pulse as shown. We do have data showing a disagreement between the PIN diode signal and the electron beam current, however those data we for a non-constant voltage pulse or a fault in the Rogowskii coil.

![Figure 2 Sample simulation results, TRAK and ICEPIC respectively.](image1)

![Figure 3 Data from the diode experiments.](image2)
To aid in interpretation of the data when the PIN signal doesn’t track the beam current profile, we are setting up a streak camera to view the Cherenkov light generated by the beam impacting an acrylic plate. We are able to save the streak camera image and obtain a time history of the light intensity. We are still working on focusing the input optics to the streak camera so the acrylic plate is properly imaged on the streak camera input slit. We also are working on setting the various gains of the streak camera so the time history of the light intensity may be compared with the PIN signal and the electron beam current time history.

VI. SUMMARY

At this time we have begun comparison of experimental data with the various code predictions. An example is shown in Figure 4 of a prediction of the axial A-K gap that yields a 10 kA electron beam current for an applied 500 kV voltage pulse.

![Figure 4 Comparison of simulation and experimental results.](image)

We are also beginning to diagnose the beam spatial and temporal variations with the streak camera. This data will also be compared with other diagnostics and the various simulation tools.
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