

# Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

## Recent Work

**Title**

OPTIMIZING SUBROUTINE

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4d84p5gq>

**Author**

Meuser, R.

**Publication Date**

1981-08-01



# Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Engineering & Technical  
Services Division

RECEIVED  
LAWRENCE  
BERKELEY LABORATORY

OCT 26 1981

LIBRARY AND  
DOCUMENTS SECTION

**For Reference**

Not to be taken from this room



LBID-436  
21

## **DISCLAIMER**

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

# ENGINEERING NOTE

CODE  
MD1111

SERIAL  
M5773

PAGE  
1 of 8

AUTHOR  
R. MEUSER

DEPARTMENT  
MECH.ENG.

LOCATION  
BERK

DATE  
Aug 28, 1981

PROGRAM - PROJECT - JOB  
HIGH-FIELD MAGNET DEVELOPMENT  
ANALYSIS

TITLE  
OPTIMIZING SUBROUTINE

Traditionally, we have designed the cross-sections of multipole magnets to make certain higher-order field aberrations exactly zero. For example, for a dipole with three free variables - block angles, say - we can make  $C_3$ (sextupole),  $C_5$ (decapole), and  $C_7$ (14-pole) exactly zero.

This does not necessarily result in a magnet producing the best field. (What we mean by "best field" is not often well defined, which makes getting it, or knowing we've got it when we have, a bit difficult. Nevertheless...). We could, in the above example, reduce  $C_9$  and  $C_{11}$ , in principle, by letting  $C_3$ ,  $C_5$ , and  $C_7$  be slightly non-zero, and we might end up with a better magnet.

One systematic way of doing this is to minimize the sum of the weighted squares of a specified number of higher order multipoles. A scheme for doing that is developed in this report. A basic subroutine (Mincoef) has been built into several minicomputer programs. It is more complex, and therefore slower, than the simple Newton's method previously used, but even on the disgustingly slow HP9845, convergence takes perhaps 20 sec. for even a rather complex design.

(Just before Christmas of '80 it came to my attention that Palmer at BNL was doing this sort of thing, using an optimizing program called MINUITL, and so I gave it a whack. I later found that MINUITL is an obsolete, but still available, LBL program, and it was added to an LBL magnet design program. MINUITL is a rather complex affair - the write-up is a quarter inch thick. So far, experience with it has not been very successful.)

## Scheme For Making the Sum of the Weighted Squares of Errors a Minimum

We let  $y_i$ ,  $i=1$  to  $p$  represent the set of dependent variables to be optimized — the certain higher-order field aberration coefficients in the case at hand.

We let  $x_j$ ,  $j=1$  to  $q$  represent the set of independent variables which we adjust to optimize the  $y$ 's — certain mechanical-dimension parameters, if the currents are fixed, or the currents if the dimensions are fixed.

For the scheme to work,  $p \geq q$ .

Then

$$y_i = y_i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j, \dots, x_q) \quad (1)$$

and

$$dy_i = \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial x_1} dx_1 + \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial x_2} dx_2 + \dots \quad (2)$$

We represent  $\partial y_i / \partial x_j$  by  $a_{ij}$

and so for a linear relationship

$$y_i = \sum_{j=1}^q a_{ij} x_j \quad (3a)$$

$$\Delta y_i = \sum_{j=1}^q a_{ij} \Delta x_j \quad (3b)$$

$$\text{Let } y'_i = y_i + \Delta y_i$$

The error in  $y_i$ , which we call  $\epsilon_i$ , is

$$\epsilon_i = y'_i - Y_i = y_i + \Delta y_i - Y_i \quad (4)$$

where  $Y_i$  is the set of desired values of  $y_i$ ; usually, but not necessarily, zero.

We wish to minimize  $S$ , where

$$S \equiv \sum_{i=1}^p K_i \epsilon_i^2 \quad (5)$$

where  $K_i$  is a set of weighting factors,

by finding a new set of  $x_i$  values, namely

$x'_i$ , where

$$x'_i = x_i + \Delta x_i$$

To minimize  $S$ , we let  $\partial S / \partial x_j = 0$ ,  $j=1$  to  $q$ .  
Partial differentiation of the equation for  $S$ , then, gives

$$\sum_{i=1}^p K_i \epsilon_i \frac{\partial \epsilon_i}{\partial x_j} = 0, \quad j=1 \text{ to } q \quad (6)$$

For illustration, we expand (6) for the case

$$p=3, \quad q=2$$

$$K_1 \epsilon_1 a_{11} + K_2 \epsilon_2 a_{21} + K_3 \epsilon_3 a_{31} = 0$$

$$K_1 \epsilon_1 a_{12} + K_2 \epsilon_2 a_{22} + K_3 \epsilon_3 a_{32} = 0$$

or

$$K_1 (y_1 - Y_1 + a_{11} \Delta x_1 + a_{12} \Delta x_2) a_{11} + K_2 (y_2 - Y_2 + a_{21} \Delta x_1 + a_{22} \Delta x_2) a_{21} + K_3 (y_3 - Y_3 + a_{31} \Delta x_1 + a_{32} \Delta x_2) a_{31} = 0$$

$$K_1 ( \quad \downarrow \quad ) a_{12} + K_2 ( \quad \downarrow \quad ) a_{22} + K_3 ( \quad \downarrow \quad ) a_{32} = 0$$

We collect coefficients of  $\Delta x_j$ , put everything else on the right, and express in matrix form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} K_1 a_{11} a_{11} + K_2 a_{21} a_{21} + K_3 a_{31} a_{31} & K_1 a_{12} a_{11} + K_2 a_{22} a_{21} + K_3 a_{32} a_{31} \\ K_1 a_{11} a_{12} + K_2 a_{21} a_{22} + K_3 a_{31} a_{32} & K_1 a_{12} a_{12} + K_2 a_{22} a_{22} + K_3 a_{32} a_{32} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta x_1 \\ \Delta x_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ = \begin{pmatrix} K_1 (Y_1 - y_1) a_{11} + K_2 (Y_2 - y_2) a_{21} + K_3 (Y_3 - y_3) a_{31} \\ K_1 (Y_1 - y_1) a_{12} + K_2 (Y_2 - y_2) a_{22} + K_3 (Y_3 - y_3) a_{32} \end{pmatrix} \quad (8')$$

We represent this by

$$B \Delta X = C$$

The terms of the B and C matrixes are evidently

$$b_{jk} = \sum_{i=1}^p K_i a_{ik} a_{ij}, \quad c_j = \sum_{i=1}^p K_i (Y_i - y_i) a_{ij}, \quad i=1 \text{ to } p, j=1 \text{ to } q, k=1 \text{ to } q$$

We invert the B matrix, calculate  $\Delta X = B^{-1}C$ , and get new values of x,

$$x'_j = x_j + \Delta x_j, \quad j=1 \text{ to } q$$

If (1) is really linear, then S will be the desired minimum. If (1) is not linear we will obtain the first approximation.



## Scheme For Making Higher-Order Multipoles Exactly Zero

The development through eq. 5 is as before, except that  $p = a$ .

We set the errors  $\epsilon_i$  to zero, so

$$\Delta y_i = Y_i - y_i$$

For  $a = 3$ , for example, equations 3b become, in matrix form

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta x_1 \\ \Delta x_2 \\ \Delta x_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 - y_1 \\ Y_2 - y_2 \\ Y_3 - y_3 \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

or  $A \Delta X = D$

We invert the A matrix, calculate  $\Delta X = A^{-1}D$ , and get new values of  $x$ ,  $x'_i = x_i + \Delta x_i$

It can be shown that equation 8' of the previous discussion is equivalent to the above for the case  $p = a$ .

Equation 9 can be derived in a more direct fashion, as follows

$$\text{For } y_i = f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j, \dots, x_a) \quad i = 1 \text{ to } a$$

$$dy_i = \sum_{j=1}^a \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial x_j} dx_j$$

It is evident that  $\partial y_i / \partial x_j \equiv a_{ij}$ . We replace  $dy_i$  by  $\Delta y_i$ ,  $dx_j$  by  $\Delta x_j$ , and make the error zero by setting  $\Delta y_i = Y_i - y_i$ , which yields Eq. 9.

```
3740 SUB Mincoef(A(*),Wf(*),Y(*),Bigy(*),P,Q,Delx(*),B(*),C(*),D(*),Flag)
3750 MAT B=ZER
3760 MAT C=ZER
3770 FOR I=1 TO P
3780 FOR J=1 TO Q
3790 C(J)=C(J)+Wf(I)*A(I,J)*(Bigy(I)-Y(I))
3800 FOR K=1 TO Q
3810 B(J,K)=B(J,K)+Wf(I)*A(I,K)*A(I,J)
3820 NEXT K
3830 NEXT J
3840 NEXT I
3850 IF Q=1 THEN 3880
3860 CALL Simeq(B(*),C(*),D(*),Delx(*),Q,Flag)
3870 SUBEXIT
3880 Delx(1)=C(1)/B(1,1)
3890 SUBEND
```

```
3920 SUB Simeq(A(*),C(*),D(*),X(*),Order,Flag)
3930 OPTION BASE 1
3940 REDIM A(Order,Order),C(Order),D(Order,Order),X(Order)
3950 Flag=0
3960 IF DET(A)=0 THEN Flag=1
3970 IF DET(A)=0 THEN SUBEXIT
3980 MAT D=INV(A)
3990 MAT X=D*C
4000 SUBEND
```

MEUSER  
Variables in argument list

M5773

8 of 8

In program

In analysis

A(I, J)  
wf(I)  
Y(I)  
Bigy(I)  
P  
Q  
Delx(J)  
B(J, K)  
C(J)  
D(J, K)  
Flag

$a_{i,j}$   
 $K_i$   
 $y_i$   
 $Y_i$   
p  
q  
 $\Delta x_j$   
 $b_{jk}$   
 $c_j$

Used in simultaneous equation sub.  
= 0 normally; = 1 if determinant of A is 0.

I = 1 TO P  
J = 1 TO Q  
K = 1 TO Q

No variables are in common, none  
are dimensioned in subroutines.

This report was done with support from the Department of Energy. Any conclusions or opinions expressed in this report represent solely those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of The Regents of the University of California, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory or the Department of Energy.

Reference to a company or product name does not imply approval or recommendation of the product by the University of California or the U.S. Department of Energy to the exclusion of others that may be suitable.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION DEPARTMENT  
LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720