Dear editor and referees,

First, we would like to thank you for processing and reviewing our manuscript. The encouragements, comments, and suggestions from two referees were very useful, insightful, and greatly appreciated as well. The following is our point-to-point response (in blue font), with explanations corresponding to our modifications, based on your comments and suggestions.

PROBLEMS WITH MANUSCRIPT:

In reviewing the figures of your paper, we note that the following changes would be needed in order for your figures to conform to the style of the Physical Review.  Please check all figures for the following problems and make appropriate changes in the text of the paper itself wherever needed for consistency.

Figure(s) [9,16,18,19,24]

Please modify quantities so that superscripts and subscripts are set as they would appear in text. Subscripts should be printed below the line. Also, we do not print computer notation. For example, set powers as superscript numbers; do not use ^2, \*\*2, etc., for squares of quantities. Please adjust the text of the paper accordingly.

Response: The problems in those figures have been fixed.

----------------------------------------------------------------------

Report of Referee A -- ZH10169/Li

----------------------------------------------------------------------

REFEREE A - ZH10169

The paper presents a novel approach for designing achromatic lattices with large dynamic aperture and large attainable tune spread. This problem is of large interest nowadays as the fourth-generation light sources aiming to reach the diffraction limit are being designed and built worldwide. The authors propose a solution based on minimization of variation of betatron actions, arguing that the present of near-integral of motion improves the robustness of the lattice in the presence of resonances. The argument is supported by an extensive numerical analysis involving an actual lattice of an existing light source – NSLS-II.

The numerical study used standard tools and approaches, widely accepted in the community, such as the ELEGANT tracking code, NAFF, and frequency map analysis. The simulation procedure is described in sufficient detail and the results are presented clearly. The number of figures is perhaps excessive, but otherwise the presentation of results is clear.

Response: Thanks for acknowledging our work. Some redundant figures have been removed, and more detailed explanation will be given in the following point-to-point response.

What seems to be missing from the paper is a direct one-to-one comparison of the lattice obtained through the described technique with the nominal NSLS-II lattice. Also, while some measurements performed at NSLS-II are briefly mentioned in the text, the information seems insufficient to judge whether the improvement of single particle dynamics observed in the simulation is also observed in the real machine. I would recommend a publication of the manuscript only after this issue is addressed.

Response: Thank for pointing out the weakness. Some one-to-one direct comparisons for the DBA lattice w/o QI have been added in the revised version. More detailed explanation will be given in the response to the first major comment below.

Major comments:


1) As mentioned above, what seems to be missing from the paper is a direct one-to-one comparison of the lattice obtained through the described technique with the nominal NSLS-II lattice. For example, while Figures 5, 6, 10 present the DA, betatron actions, and the tune

footprint of the optimized lattice, no such data is provided for the nominal lattice. Hence it is hard to judge how good the presented results are.

Response: The DBA lattice optimized having QI and presented in this paper has a higher chromaticity (=7) than the nominal operation lattice (=2). Therefore, stronger chromatic sextupoles are used in this example, and the DA optimization becomes a little bit challenging as well. Nevertheless, a direct simulated DA comparison for these two lattices has been added in Fig. 5 (although it is slightly unfair to the high chromaticity lattice). A comparison of actions from the same initial conditions (x, px, y, py) is illustrated in newly added Fig. 10. The measured DAs comparison has been added in Fig. 11. Some detailed discussion in Sect. V has been added to address this comparison. The main advantage of the QI lattice is its increased instability thresholds and reduced BBFB gain have been emphasized in the revised version. The single-bunch instability threshold measurements for two lattices are compared by adding a short paragraph. The needed BBFB gain was significantly reduced under the operation condition (i.e., 400 mA, 1200 bunches). Another advantage for QI lattice is that its less fluctuating trajectory is better when a small physical aperture exists, “When a small physical aperture exists in a ring, such as an undulator's gap, a smeared trajectory might be blocked. Then its realistic DA will be smaller than the physical aperture. In this case, a less fluctuating trajectory will be preferable.”

For example, page 4 reads “Even while crossing the low order resonance lines such as 1/3, the stop-band widths are observed quite narrow”. An obvious question would be narrow with respect to what?

Response: The nominal operation lattice was designed to avoid crossing 1/3 resonance, because its DA will reduce there. This QI lattice has a large tune-shift-with-amplitude and can cross this resonance easily. By comparing with the stop-band calculation as shown in Fig. 16.8 (attached below) in a textbook “particle accelerator physics” by H. Wiedemann and Schoch’s paper “Theory of non-linear perturbations of betatron oscillation”, we concluded the QI lattice’s stop-band widths are narrow. To address your comment, we added this book and paper as the references.



Later it the text some measurements of the DA are mentioned. It is said that “the measured DA is worse than the simulation prediction” but no data is provided anywhere.

Response: In the horizontal plane, the measured DA is about 10+/-1 mm, which is smaller than the simulated one due to realistic errors, but is still sufficient for the off-axis injection. The reason (error sources) is unclear for us, and still under investigation. We updated this statement by providing the measured DA data and adding a new figure 11.

In order to make the argument more convincing I would suggest, first, supplement the already shown numerical simulation results with similar results for the nominal lattice, highlighting the improvements.

Response: This suggestion has been adopted by adding new figure(s) and a corresponding paragraph as mentioned in previous response.

Second, present also the measured DA scans that are briefly mentioned text, again as a direct comparison of nominal lattice vs the optimized one. Then one could see how the improvement observed in simulation relates to the performance of the light source, making a very solid argument.

Response: This suggestion has been adopted. As explained already, the measured DA comparison between the two lattices has been added in the revised version, although their corrected chromaticities are different.

2) There seems to be a discrepancy between the tracking results presented in Figures 19 and 20. While Fig. 19 shows only a slight decay of betatron oscillations after 600 and 1500 turns, in Fig. 20 the centroid motion decreases by 50% after 600 revolutions and nearly vanishes after 1500 turns. What is the reason for this disagreement?

Response: There is no disagreement between these two figures, but our origin interpretation might not be clear enough. Two figures are using a same dataset. The original Fig. 19 shows the 2-dimensional distributions (x-px) of 4,000 particles. Each particle motion is always conservative. However, even within a small but finite beam size, particles could have tiny tune spread due to its amplitude dependent detuning. This tiny tune spread can cause the bunched beam to gradually smear in the phase space. In Fig. 19, particles distribute in a thin but unclosed ellipse after 600 turns, and the line density is different, so the center-of-mass (centroid) is about 50% reduced. After 1500 turns, particles distribute almost uniformly on a little bit thick ellipse, thus the center-of-mass is almost zero. Since the original Fig. 19 and 21 have been removed as you suggested. The detailed explanation seems unnecessary in the revised version.

Minor comments:

3) In Section II, a part of the introduction re-deriving the formulas for the normalized phase space coordinates seems unnecessary as those formulas are well known in the accelerator physics community. In my opinion the derivation can be significantly shortened without loss clarity.

Response: The revised version has removed this equation based on this input.

4) The description of the optimization procedure seems a bit opaque. In particular it is not clear if “Instead of directly calculating \phi\_x, the turn-to-turn evolution of … was analyzed in the frequency domain” applies to the procedure itself or to the particular implementation on a given accelerator lattice. Please consider clarifying this point.

Response: Thank you for pointing out this weakness. It is a very good comment. The revised version has been updated to clarify it. This procedure itself is independent of lattice. Rather than compute the phase advances for each turn using Eq. (5), and check its fluctuation, we carried out a NAFF analysis on turn-by-turn data to get two leading peaks amplitudes. In principle, the summation of all non-fundamental peaks should be compared against the fundamental frequency, but the computation cost will become higher. Since the NAFF outputs the peaks in descending order, we only use two leading peaks to get a quick but rough approximation. If only the real turn-by-turn coordinates (x) are used, we can’t determine if the tune is above or below ½. Therefore, the normalized complex coordinates (x +/- i px) are used. One of coauthors (K. Hwang) proposed to use the ratio of spectral integrals to get more accurate tune diffusion, and this method is still under development and not covered in this paper.

5) I could not find the description of actual quantities depicted in color coding in Figs. 5, 10, 13, 17. While it is clear that what is plotted should be the tune diffusion rate, in log scale I assume, it would add a bit of clarity to say somewhere explicitly what quantity is being plotted.

Response: The color represents the tune diffusion of from turn-by-turn data, and its definition and reference have been added in the revised version.

6) Labels in Figs. 19, 22 are a bit too small to read.

Response: A large font has been used in Fig. 19. The squeezed subplots in Fig. 22 have been rearranged into two rows, so that their labels are visible.

7) Figure 18 gives a nice illustration of how the phase space evolves along the cell. But inserts obstruct the view of lattice functions. Maybe consider putting the phase space portraits below.

Response: Thanks for this suggestion. This figure has been replotted in two rows as your suggested.

8) In general, the number of figures seems to be a bit excessive. For example, Figs. 7 and 8 covey similar information but in a different form, Figs. 19-21 could probably be replaced just by Fig. 20 that illustrates a good agreement between the theory and the simulation, Figs. 3, 7, 25 are very similar with the difference being that the first one is a general schematic and the other two: specific cases, same goes for Figs. 2, 6, 14.

Response: Thank for pointing out this weakness. Some redundant figures have been removed. The following adjustments has been made (the figures indices below are for the original version):

* Figs. 7 and 25 have been removed.
* Figs. 19 and 21 have been removed.
* Fig. 14 and 15 have been removed, only Fig. 6 is kept giving readers a visual impression on real action fluctuations (Fig.2 is just a schematic diagram.)

The corresponding sentences have been adjusted to fit the contexts.

We also did some minor re-wordings through the manuscript for a better interpretation.

----------------------------------------------------------------------

Report of Referee B -- ZH10169/Li

----------------------------------------------------------------------

REFEREE B - ZH10169

The paper sheds new light on multi-bend achromat lattices. This subject is of great importance for the next generation of high power and high brilliance light sources. The paper follows a very clear framework of action-angle variables to introduce appropriate Hamiltonian invariants of motion.

The paper is written in a transparent and compact fashion; presented analytic procedure, for minimizing turn-by-turn fluctuations of the Courant-Snyder actions is lucid and concise.

The bibliography seems adequate and complete.

Specific lattice examples provided in this paper offer a great inside into large amplitude-dependent betatron tune-spread, which can increase instability and space charge thresholds. The paper also demonstrated that a conventional DBA or MBA lattice can be re-tuned to

possess two approximate invariants by optimizing the settings of only the sextupoles and octupoles.

In summary, I strongly recommend this paper for publication as a PRAB article, based on its importance for future generation of ultra-low emittance lattices with large dynamic aperture.

Response: Thank you for acknowledging this work.

Again, we would like to express our appreciation to two reviewers for their suggestions, and comments on the shortcomings of our manuscript. Those detailed comments and suggestions are extremely helpful for us to better interpret this method and greatly improve the quality of this manuscript.

Yours truly,

-Yongjun Li and Chad Mitchell on behalf of all coauthors

Oct. 2021