

## Near-threshold electron injection in the laser–plasma wakefield accelerator leading to femtosecond bunches

This content has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text.

2015 New J. Phys. 17 093033

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/1367-2630/17/9/093033>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

### Download details:

IP Address: 130.209.6.43

This content was downloaded on 24/08/2016 at 15:33

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

You may also be interested in:

[Characterization of laser-driven single and double electron bunches with a permanent magnet quadrupole triplet and pepper-pot mask](#)

G G Manahan, E Brunetti, C Aniculaesei et al.

[On electron betatron motion and electron injection in laser wakefield accelerators](#)

T Matsuoka, C McGuffey, P G Cummings et al.

[High quality electron beams from a laser wakefield accelerator](#)

S M Wiggins, R C Issac, G H Welsh et al.

[A controllable electron injector based on ponderomotive acceleration of electrons inside the wakefield](#)

Wentao Li, Jiansheng Liu, Qiang Chen et al.

[Magnetically assisted self-injection and radiation generation for plasma-based acceleration](#)

J Vieira, J L Martins, V B Pathak et al.

[Influence of realistic parameters on state-of-the-art laser wakefield accelerator experiments](#)

J Vieira, S F Martins, F Fiúza et al.



## PAPER

## Near-threshold electron injection in the laser–plasma wakefield accelerator leading to femtosecond bunches

## OPEN ACCESS

RECEIVED  
10 April 2015REVISED  
29 July 2015ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION  
24 August 2015PUBLISHED  
17 September 2015

Content from this work  
may be used under the  
terms of the [Creative  
Commons Attribution 3.0  
licence](#).

Any further distribution of  
this work must maintain  
attribution to the  
author(s) and the title of  
the work, journal citation  
and DOI.


M R Islam<sup>1</sup>, E Brunetti<sup>1</sup>, R P Shanks<sup>1</sup>, B Ersfeld<sup>1</sup>, R C Issac<sup>1</sup>, S Cipiccia<sup>1</sup>, M P Anania<sup>1</sup>, G H Welsh<sup>1</sup>,  
S M Wiggins<sup>1</sup>, A Noble<sup>1</sup>, R A Cairns<sup>2</sup>, G Raj<sup>1</sup> and D A Jaroszynski<sup>1</sup><sup>1</sup> Scottish Universities Physics Alliance, Department of Physics, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow G4 0NG, UK<sup>2</sup> School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of St. Andrews, Fife KY16 9SS, UKE-mail: [d.a.jaroszynski@strath.ac.uk](mailto:d.a.jaroszynski@strath.ac.uk)**Keywords:** laser–plasma wakefield accelerators, ultra-short bunch, injection mechanisms**Abstract**

The laser–plasma wakefield accelerator is a compact source of high brightness, ultra-short duration electron bunches. Self-injection occurs when electrons from the background plasma gain sufficient momentum at the back of the bubble-shaped accelerating structure to experience sustained acceleration. The shortest duration and highest brightness electron bunches result from self-injection close to the threshold for injection. Here we show that in this case injection is due to the localized charge density build-up in the sheath crossing region at the rear of the bubble, which has the effect of increasing the accelerating potential to above a critical value. Bunch duration is determined by the dwell time above this critical value, which explains why single or multiple ultra-short electron bunches with little dark current are formed in the first bubble. We confirm experimentally, using coherent optical transition radiation measurements, that single or multiple bunches with femtosecond duration and peak currents of several kiloAmpere, and femtosecond intervals between bunches, emerge from the accelerator.

**1. Introduction**

The laser–plasma wakefield accelerator (LWFA) [1] produces high quality relativistic electron beams with energies currently ranging from 100's of MeV to several GeV by exploiting the large electric field gradients generated by intense laser pulses interacting with plasma [2–7]. Potential applications of LWFA include drivers of compact synchrotron sources [8, 9], which have been demonstrated first in the visible [10] and then in the vacuum-ultraviolet [11] and at gamma ray energies [12]. The accelerating structure of the LWFA operating in the nonlinear blowout regime, consists of a string of ion ‘bubbles’ of evacuated regions of plasma created by the combination of the ponderomotive force of an intense, ultra-short, laser pulse and the electrostatic restoring force of background ions acting on plasma electrons. Electrons can be injected into the LWFA structure, if their velocity exceeds that of the bubble, from either an external injector, from the background plasma, or from further ionized gas. High brightness beams with narrow energy spreads  $< 1\%$  [13], geometric transverse emittance of  $0.2\text{--}1.5 \pi \text{ mm mrad}$  [14–16] and ultra-short duration  $\approx 1.5 \text{ fs}$  [17] have recently been demonstrated. The highest quality beams with bunch charges of  $1\text{--}20 \text{ pC}$  are produced close to threshold for injection [13, 18]. These attractive parameters make the LWFA a suitable candidate for driving a compact free-electron laser (FEL) [8, 9]. FELs require beams of low emittance, narrow energy spread and high peak current electron bunches [19], which are possible when the bunch duration is short.

The injection process is crucial in determining the electron bunch properties. Several models have been proposed to describe injection, but most are not valid for current experimentally relevant parameters, as we show below, or do not accurately predict bunch properties, such as bunch duration and structure, or the threshold for self-injection, which has been studied experimentally [20] (in a restricted density range) and using numerical simulations [21] (but without investigating the bunch structure in either case). In these models, injection is invoked by wavebreaking [22], variations in the bubble length (Hamiltonian  $H < 0$ ) [23, 24] or




**Figure 1.** Model for the wakefield bubble. (a) Geometry and charge distributions; (b) and (c) potentials for  $\eta = 0$  (without build-up) and  $\eta = 0.1$  (with build-up), respectively.

phase velocity [25, 26], or electron capture when the potential due to the ion background inside the bubble exceeds the kinetic energy of electrons in the sheath [25, 26]. Another condition for self-injection inferred from numerical simulations requires the bubble radius to be larger than four times the plasma skin depth [27].

Here we show that just above the threshold for injection it is necessary to take into account the build-up of charge in the sheath-crossing region, as schematically shown in figure 1. We show that near-threshold injection is always below the thresholds predicted by the existing models for injection, unless they take charge build-up into account. Whilst [24] describes a relaxation of the injection threshold due to charge build-up, they consider expansion of the bubble as the main mechanism for injection (and as ‘crucial’ for acceleration driven by petawatt lasers). Charge build-up in this region should also be accounted for in colliding beam injection and density ramp injection, but for the purpose of this paper we restrict ourselves to a LWFA driven by a single laser pulse in plasma with uniform density. We show theoretically, and confirm with simulations and experiments, that femtosecond duration bunches with high peak current are created by self-injection when the potential in the sheath crossing region is enhanced by this charge build-up, which is governed by the sheath current. Its time dependence leads to a bunch structure consisting of either single ultra-short duration bunches, with low (local) dark current, or more complicated trains of very closely spaced bunches that are injected into the same bubble. The formation of such bunch structure due to near-threshold injection cannot be explained by other injection mechanisms and to our knowledge has not been described before. Ultra-short duration bunches with femtosecond micro-structure have been experimentally confirmed on the ALPHA-X beamline [8, 9, 13, 18] from measurements of the bunch structure that are derived from the spectra of coherent transition radiation (CTR) emitted as the bunches traverse a pair of thin metal foils. We also show that the bunch structure can be controlled by varying the plasma density.

## 2. Near-threshold self-injection

When the normalized vector potential,  $a_0 (= |e|A/m_e c^2)$ , of an intense ultra-short laser pulse is greater than unity, its ponderomotive force drives a large amplitude plasma density wake to form a string of bubble-shaped cavities, where  $A$  is the vector potential,  $c$  the speed of light, and  $e$  and  $m_e$  the electron charge and mass, respectively. The resulting charge separation produces an electric field of the order of  $\sqrt{n_0} (\text{cm}^{-3}) \text{ V cm}^{-1}$ , with  $n_0$  the plasma density. For typical densities, this is more than three orders of magnitude larger than in conventional accelerators. The (normalized) bubble velocity,  $\beta_b = v_b/c \simeq (1 - 3\omega_p^2/2\omega_0^2)$  and associated Lorentz factor  $\gamma_b = (1 - \beta_b^2)^{-1/2}$ , are determined by the plasma dielectric properties and the ‘etching’ of the front of the laser pulse, where  $\omega_0$  and  $\omega_p (= \sqrt{4\pi e^2 n_0/m_e})$  are the laser and plasma frequencies, respectively; the



bubble radius, for  $a_0 > 1$ , is  $R \approx 2\sqrt{a_0}/k_p \approx 2(P/P_c)^{1/4}/k_p$  when the laser spot size matches the bubble size [27].  $P_c = 17\omega_0^2/\omega_p^2$  (GW) is the critical power for relativistic self-focussing [28] and  $k_p = \omega_p/c$ .

For self-injection from the background plasma to occur, the initially stationary electrons must gain sufficient longitudinal momenta in the accelerating potential of the bubble to be captured and accelerated. The details of injection have a profound impact on the final beam properties, such as charge, peak current, brightness, bunch duration etc. Various semi-empirical models have been proposed to explain electron injection [23, 25, 26, 29]. According to [25, 26] injection of an electron occurs when its kinetic energy is less than the potential energy, i.e., for  $\gamma_b \leq \sqrt{2a_0}$ , which is only valid for high  $a_0$  and/or high densities where large energy spread beams are observed in experiments.

The motion of an electron in the bubble is governed by the Hamiltonian  $H = \gamma - v_b \phi_z - \phi$  [30, 31], where  $\gamma = \sqrt{1 + \vec{p}^2}$  is the Lorentz factor,  $\vec{\phi}$  and  $\vec{p} = \vec{\phi} + \vec{A}$  are the kinetic and canonical momentum, respectively,  $\phi$  is the scalar potential, and  $\vec{r} = (r_t, \xi)$ , with  $\xi = z - v_b t$  and  $r_t = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$ . Dimensionless units are used from here onwards unless otherwise stated: time is normalized to  $\omega_p^{-1}$ , length to  $c/\omega_p$ , velocity to  $c$ , momentum to  $m_e c$ , the potential to  $m_e c^2/|e|$ , the electromagnetic fields to  $m_e c \omega_p/|e|$ , energy to  $m_e c^2$ , mass to  $m_e$ , charge to  $|e|$ , and the electron number density,  $n$ , to  $n_0$ . The Hamiltonian varies slowly in time due to plasma bubble shape and velocity evolution resulting from beam loading, laser pulse shape and spectrum changes, and plasma density variations. Bubble expansion can be modelled as  $R(t) = R_0(1 + \epsilon t)$ , where  $\epsilon (\ll 1)$  is the expansion rate and  $R_0$  the initial bubble radius [26].

The potential for an idealized spherically symmetric bubble, in the gauge where  $A_z = -\phi$ , is  $\phi = -[r^2 - R^2(t)]/8$ , which can be used to predict the parameter range for electron trapping solely due to stretching of the bubble. The condition according to [23] for electron trapping in this case,  $H < 0$ , is shown graphically in figure 2. The equations of motion (3), below, have been solved with this potential for different values of the bubble radius and expansion rates to determine the trajectories as the bubble expands for up to four plasma cycles. As an example, no injection occurs for  $Rk_p < 5$  and  $\epsilon \sim 0.007\omega_p$ . Parameters of several current experiments (cases A–D) and of a simulation taken from [23] (case E) are marked in figure 2. Since bubble expansion rates are not known for these experiments, we estimated upper limits from the parameters of [23]. Even for these expansion rates, which exceed those typically seen in simulations, all of them are in a region that would not allow injection solely due to bubble expansion.

In the following we focus on the region  $H > 0$  and develop a model for near-threshold injection, which includes the build-up of charge at the back of the bubble. We show that injection can only occur when the potential due to electron density build-up in the sheath crossing region [27] at the rear of the bubble exceeds a threshold value  $\phi_c$  for which the incoming electrons are captured by the moving bubble. This is compared with experimental observations and numerical simulations using a 3D particle-in-cell (PIC) code.

From Maxwell's equations in the Lorentz gauge together with the quasi-static approximation,  $A_z = -\phi$ , the pseudopotential  $\Psi (\equiv \phi - A_z)$  is obtained from  $\nabla_{\perp}^2 \Psi = -(\rho - J_z)$  [32]. The source term,  $\rho - J_z = \rho_0 + \rho_e - J_{ze}$ , comprises the ion charge density,  $\rho_0$ , and the electron charge and current densities,  $\rho_e$  and  $J_{ze}$ , respectively. For a completely evacuated bubble the interior contains only stationary ions,  $\rho_e = J_{ze} = 0$ , and is surrounded by a thin dense electron current sheath as schematically shown in figure 1.

We model (see figure 1a) the sheath as a spherical shell of inner radius  $R$  and thickness  $\Delta$ , thus outer radius  $r_m = R + \Delta$ :  $R^2 \leq r_t^2 + \xi^2 \leq r_m^2$ . We assume that all electrons encountered by the front half of the bubble,  $\xi > 0$ , join the sheath, while in the rear half,  $\xi < 0$ , a fraction  $\eta$  of electrons stay in the sheath, while the remaining fraction,  $1 - \eta$ , leave it at a radial position corresponding to where they joined. Furthermore, we assume neutrality in every transverse plane through the bubble. The fraction of electrons remaining in the rear part of the sheath causes an asymmetry between front and rear of the bubble potential. We call this the remnant charge parameter and infer its value from simulations as, approximately,  $\eta = n_s V_s / (n_0 V_b)$ , where  $n_s$  and  $V_s$  are the density in, and volume of, the sheath crossing region, respectively and  $V_b$  is the volume of the bubble. This is observed to be typically below 20%. For  $\eta = 0$  the potential  $\Psi$  converges to zero in the sheath crossing region (see figure 1b), which precludes electron injection when solving the equations of motion for typical values. These assumptions result in

$$\rho - J_z = \begin{cases} \rho_0 & \text{for } r_t < r_b = (R^2 - \xi^2)^{1/2}, \\ \rho_1 & \text{for } r_b \leq r_t < r_s = (r_m^2 - \xi^2)^{1/2}, \\ \rho_2 & \text{for } r_s \leq r_t < r_m, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where, for  $0 < \xi < R$ ,  $\rho_1 = -\rho_0(R^2 - \xi^2)/(r_m^2 - R^2)$  and  $\rho_2 = 0$ , while for  $-R < \xi < 0$ ,  $\rho_1 = -\rho_0[R^2 - (1 - \eta)\xi^2]/(r_m^2 - R^2)$  and  $\rho_2 = \rho_0\eta$ ; for  $\xi > R$ ,  $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = 0$ . If the sheath is closed at the rear and  $\eta \neq 0$ , the neutrality condition cannot be satisfied for  $\xi \leq -r_m$ . This calls for an extension of the model in the region  $\xi < -R$ , which we will not discuss further as it does not affect the potentials for  $\xi > -R$ .

Assuming that the electric field is dominated by the transverse components, the pseudopotential for the charge distribution (1) is

$$\Psi = \begin{cases} -\rho_0 r_t^2 / 4 - D_0 & \text{for } r_t < r_b \\ -\rho_1 r_t^2 / 4 - 2C_1 \ln(r_s / r_t) - D_1 & \text{for } r_b \leq r_t < r_s \\ -\rho_2 r_t^2 / 4 - 2C_2 \ln(r_m / r_t) + C_2 & \text{for } r_s \leq r_t < r_m \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

with  $C_1 = (\rho_1 - \rho_0)r_b^2/4$ ,  $C_2 = \rho_2 r_m^2/4$ ,  $D_0 = 2C_1 \ln(r_s/r_b) + 2C_2 \ln(r_m/r_s)$ , and  $D_1 = 2C_2 \ln(r_m/r_s) - C_1$ .

More sophisticated models, which allow the calculation of a realistic bubble shape and field distribution for an assumed sheath profile, have been developed by Lu *et al* [32] and Yi *et al* [33]. While these models are more realistic than ours, they also require more effort to solve the equation for the bubble shape before the fields and electron trajectories can be determined. Our model captures the essential feature of these models, the broken symmetry between front and back of the bubble, by incorporating the observation from PIC codes, also seen in the models of [32, 33], that more electrons remain in the rear half of the sheath than in the front, and quantifies it in terms of a single parameter,  $\eta$ . Reference [33] shows a reduction of the expansion rate required for injection into a wakefield bubble moving at ultra-relativistic speed,  $v_b = c$  (which precludes injection without expansion). It is plausible that an extension to  $v_b < c$  would show injection without expansion, as in our simplified model.


Assuming  $v_b \approx 1$  (thus  $A_z = -\Psi/2$ ) and  $A_{x,y} = 0$  [23] we obtain the Hamiltonian equations:

$$\frac{dx, y}{dt} = \frac{p_{x,y}}{\gamma}, \quad \frac{d\xi}{dt} = \frac{p_z}{\gamma} - v_b, \quad (3a)$$

$$\frac{dp_{x,y}}{dt} = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x, y} - \frac{p_z}{\gamma} \frac{\partial A_z}{\partial x, y} = \left(1 + \frac{p_z}{\gamma}\right) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x, y}, \quad (3b)$$

$$\frac{dp_z}{dt} = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \xi} - \frac{\partial A_z}{\partial \xi} + \frac{p_x}{\gamma} \frac{\partial A_z}{\partial x} + \frac{p_y}{\gamma} \frac{\partial A_z}{\partial y}. \quad (3c)$$

Energy conservation, with  $H = 1$  for initially unperturbed electrons far away from the bubble, implies that to capture electrons there must be a repulsive potential at the back of the bubble that exceeds a threshold value, or critical potential,




$$\phi_c = -1/2 + \delta\phi_c, \quad (4)$$

where  $\delta\phi_c = \sqrt{1 + p_\perp^2}/(2\gamma_b)$  is a potential offset. Similar considerations, albeit with different initial conditions, were used by Pak *et al* [29] to determine the threshold for injection induced by ionization inside the bubble. The transverse momentum acquired by the electrons while slowing down at the back of the bubble is  $p_\perp^2(\xi = -R, 0) \approx (r_t^0)^2/2$ , where the impact parameter  $r_t$  is the initial distance from the axis. This gives the offset  $\delta\phi_c = \sqrt{1 + (r_t^0)^2/2}/(2\gamma_b)$ . If  $\delta\phi_c = 1/2$ , or equivalently  $\sqrt{\gamma_b^2 - 1} = r_t^0/\sqrt{2}$ , then  $\phi_c = 0$ , which is a sufficient condition for electron injection, as suggested by [25]. However, most current experiments are not in this regime. If the offset is less than 1/2 then injection requires a repulsive (negative) potential. Note that in the case of an evolving bubble,  $\gamma_b$  corresponds to its rear. The enhanced repulsive potential in the sheath crossing region is due to increased electron density, i.e.  $\eta > 0$ . The bow wave [34] and similar streams from the bubble and the laser pulse in plasma reduce the electron density in the sheath crossing region. The equations of motion (3) have been solved numerically, taking into account variations of the bubble radius where applicable. Figure 3 shows three cases of electron trajectories with their corresponding Hamiltonian and kinetic energy for the case with only build-up ( $\eta = 0.1$ ), with only expansion ( $\epsilon = 0.003/\omega_p$ ) and with both expansion and build-up. The inclusion of both these processes results in a negative Hamiltonian after six plasma periods,  $t = 12\pi/\omega_p$ . However, in this case injection occurs long before the Hamiltonian becomes negative, which would be the point at which injection is predicted to occur using the injection model of [23].

### 3. Numerical simulations

To compare with our experimental measurements on the ALPHA-X beamline [8, 13, 14, 18] we have performed a series of 3D simulations using the PIC code OSIRIS [35], (simulations 1 and 2) for a linearly polarized laser pulse with parameters comparable with ALPHA-X beamline: vacuum laser energy 0.9 J in a spot of  $25 \mu\text{m}$  ( $1/e^2$  radius), pulse length 35 fs and wavelength  $\lambda_0 = 0.8 \mu\text{m}$ . In simulation 1 the background plasma density is kept constant at  $10^{19} \text{cm}^{-3}$  over a length of  $100c/\omega_p$ , with linear ramps of  $550 c/\omega_p$  at either end, which is equivalent to 2 mm gas jet, and  $a_0 = 0.82$ . In simulation 2 the background plasma density is kept constant at  $10^{19} \text{cm}^{-3}$  over a length of  $300c/\omega_p$ , with linear ramps of  $450 c/\omega_p$  at either end, and  $a_0 = 0.8$ . The vacuum focus is placed




at the start of the constant plasma profile. The simulation box of dimensions  $20 \times 100 \times 100(c/\omega_p)^3$  moves at the speed of light, and is divided into  $800 \times 500 \times 500$  cells with  $3 \times 2 \times 2$  particles per cell.

The results from simulation 1 are shown in figure 4, which includes a series of snapshots of bubble formation and the evolution of the charge density showing injection, and the corresponding potential with isocontours indicating the critical potential  $\phi_c$  necessary for injection at the back of the bubble. There is clear evidence of two distinct electron bunches with a clear spatial gap between them and fine structure in each bunch. The contour  $\phi \geq \phi_c$  at the rear of the bubble is evident when electron injection occurs.

Figure 5(a) shows more clearly the evolution of the critical potential  $\phi_c$ , calculated from equation (4), and the potential  $\phi(\xi = -R_z)$ ; the regions where  $\phi(\xi = -R_z) \geq \phi_c$  are highlighted. For simplicity, the impact parameter for  $\phi_c$  is approximated by the (dynamically updated) bubble radius.

Figure 5(b) shows the initial positions of 10,000 randomly selected captured electrons, which should be compared with the highlighted regions 1 and 2 for simulation 1. Simulation 2 shows a single bunch, which also graphically illustrates the condition required for self-injection and the dependence on the peak vector potential  $a_0$ , the Lorentz factor  $\gamma_b$  of the back of the bubble, and  $\eta$ .




In figures 5(c) and (d) we show the evolution of the bubble length and expansion rate  $\epsilon/\omega_p$ , respectively, to emphasize the weakness or lack of correlation of injection with  $\epsilon$ . The phase-space distribution of the injected electron beam indicates a low energy spread and femtosecond bunch structure, which we compare with measurements below. The peak energy range is between 260 MeV (simulation 1) and 100 MeV (simulation 2) depending on the plasma profile and the value of  $a_0$ . Figure 5(e) shows the evolution of  $a_0$ ; the increase in vector potential to  $a_0 > 3.5$  is due to nonlinear self-focusing in the underdense plasma ([36]). Figures 5(f) and (g) show the evolution of  $\gamma_b$  and  $\eta$ , respectively.


The bunch length in simulation 1 is given by the Lorentz contracted persistence or dwell length  $l_{\phi_c}$  of the highlighted regions in figure 5(a), which is approximately  $l_{\phi_c}/(2\gamma_b^2) \approx 0.6/k_p$  ([37]) corresponding to an rms value of  $0.27 \mu\text{m}$  ( $\sim 1$  fs). These self-injected electrons form a high quality beam with rms transverse geometric emittances of  $0.3 \pi$  mm mrad. The rms energy spread of the injected electron beam is 4.8 %, and the slice energy spread is  $\approx 1\%$ – $2\%$ . In simulation 2 the rms is  $0.35 \mu\text{m}$  ( $\sim 1.2$  fs), the transverse geometric emittances is  $0.55 \pi$  mm mrad and the rms energy spread is 16%.

Simulation 1 (figure 5) highlights the origin of multiple electron bunches, with femtosecond temporal gaps, in a single bubble, which reflects the periodic injection and termination arising from the fluctuating potential and threshold. To corroborate our OSIRIS simulations we have also performed simulations using the WAKE





**Figure 7.** Simulated CTR spectra produced by a transversely and longitudinally Gaussian electron beam with 100 MeV energy and 10 pC charge. Both the total radiation from the two-foil system (1 + 2) and the contribution from each foil (1, 2) are shown. (a) A bunch with 3% energy spread, 2 mrad divergence and duration at the source of 1 fs (lines) and 3 fs (lines and points). (b) A bunch with 3% energy spread, 1 fs duration and divergence of 2 mrad (lines) and 1.5 mrad (lines and points). (c) A bunch with 2 mrad divergence, 1 fs duration and energy spread of 3% (lines) and 1% (lines and points).



**Figure 8.** Measured and simulated CTR spectra. (a) CTR spectra calculated for simulations 1 and 2 (see figure 5). The insets show the corresponding bunch shapes. Simulation 1 shows a strong peak around  $4.5 \mu\text{m}$  which is a signature of multiple electron bunches with a temporal separation of 2 fs in the accelerator. Simulation 2 shows a CTR spectrum with little structure around  $4.5 \mu\text{m}$ , indicating the presence of a single bunch. The same features have been observed in experimental spectra (b) and (c), which are best reproduced by electron bunches with parameters chosen to match the measured energy and energy spread. However, the most important parameter is the temporal separation between the electron bunches. (b) A spectrum compatible with an electron bunch containing at least two short bunches separated by  $11.5 \pm 1$  fs after 1 m propagation from the accelerator. Three matching theoretical spectra are shown: (2) corresponds to two 100 MeV bunches separated by  $11.5 \pm 0.5$  fs and with energy spread of 1%, charge of 8 and 3 pC and bunch length at the accelerator exit of 0.9 fs; (3) contains an additional 90 MeV bunch separated by  $22 \pm 2$  fs from the first structure, 6% energy spread, 1.8 fs pulse duration and 0.5 pC charge; (4) contains a fourth bunch separated by  $45 \pm 1$  fs from the first bunch, 3% energy spread, 1.8 fs pulse duration and 0.5 pC charge. (c) A spectrum compatible with a single electron bunch. Three matching theoretical spectra are shown: (1) corresponds to a 90 MeV, 12 pC electron beam with 1.5 fs bunch duration at the accelerator exit and 6% energy spread; (2) contains an additional 90 MeV, 0.9 fs, 0.5 pC bunch with energy spread of 3% and separation of 55 fs; (3) contains a third 90 MeV, 0.9 fs, 0.5 pC bunch in-between the first two with a delay of 10 fs. All bunches have 2 mrad rms divergence. Insets show the corresponding electron bunch shapes.

mostly contain low energy electrons, which are defocused and filtered away by the permanent quadrupoles used for transport (pedestals are not important for FELs).

Two CTR spectra have been measured in different runs for different vertical distance between gas jet and laser beam, which introduced slight changes to plasma density and laser amplitude. The spectrum in figure 8(b), obtained for electron energies of  $90 \pm 15$  MeV, is characterized by a peak around  $4 \mu\text{m}$ , a dip around  $7 \mu\text{m}$  and a continuous rise to longer wavelengths. CTR spectra of smooth bunch shapes, e.g. Gaussian, are similar to figure 7 and show little or no structure for the electron energies. On the other hand, a train of two or more bunches can accurately reproduce the observed features. The dip around  $7 \mu\text{m}$  indicates the presence of two bunches separated by  $11.5 \pm 1$  fs after 1 m propagation from the accelerator. The peak at  $4 \mu\text{m}$  requires at least one bunch to have energy spread of 1%–2% or smaller and bunch duration at the accelerator exit of  $1 \pm 0.5$  fs for 2 mrad rms divergence. The second bunch should have similar duration and energy spread. The ratio of the

amplitudes of the two peaks and the depth of the dip is reproduced when one bunch contains about 70% of the charge, for a total of about  $10 \pm 5$  pC, depending on energy, energy spread and divergence. Variations of central energy within the measured  $90 \pm 15$  MeV range have a small effect at long wavelengths, whereas the short wavelength peak shifts from  $4.5 \mu\text{m}$  at 90 MeV to  $3.5 \mu\text{m}$  at 110 MeV, decreasing quickly in amplitude for energies lower than 90 MeV. This behaviour suggests that the short wavelength part of the spectrum has been generated by the most energetic electron beams and therefore theoretical curves in figure 8(b) have been obtained by setting the central energy of two bunches to 100 MeV. The measured spectrum is compatible with the presence of additional ultra-short bunches with short inter-bunch delays and with charge of  $\sim 0.5$  pC or smaller. Examples are shown for a train of three bunches all separated by  $11.5 \pm 0.5$  fs (curve 3) and with an additional fourth bunch with a delay of  $45 \pm 0.5$  fs from the first (curve 4), as shown in the insets to the figures.

Figure 8(c) shows a second measured spectrum produced by  $89 \pm 7$  MeV electron beams accelerated with the laser 1 mm further away from the gas jet, decreasing the plasma density by approximately 10%. It shows no prominent structure, has a much more uniform increase at long wavelengths and possibly small modulations at short wavelengths. This different shape can be reproduced by a single bunch with  $12 \pm 4$  pC charge,  $1.5 \pm 1$  fs bunch duration at the accelerator exit and  $6 \pm 1\%$  energy spread. It is also compatible with the presence of additional short bunches with charge less than  $\sim 0.5$  pC and variable delay.

Figure 8(a) shows the calculated CTR spectrum from simulation 1 indicating a strong peak around  $4.5 \mu\text{m}$  due to multiple electron bunches with temporal separation of 2 fs, and from simulation 2 where there is no peak, which indicates the presence of a single bunch. The electron beam energy measured in the experiment is lower than that of simulation 1 (figure 5(h), left) for the experimental parameters, but comparable to simulation 2 (figure 5(h) right). The peak energy in the simulations is between 260 (simulation 1) to 100 MeV (simulation 2) due to variation in plasma profile and a slight change in  $a_0$ . The energy of the electron beam strongly depends on where injection occurs in the gas jet and also the distance over which acceleration occurs, i.e., whether dephasing is reached or not. Injection close to threshold depends strongly on the plasma (density, length, ramps etc), and laser parameters (pulse length, focal spot size and position, chirp etc). Slight variations in these parameters can alter the point of injection and thus the final energy of injected electron beam.

CTR measurements have been performed at a distance of approximately 1 m from the accelerator, therefore the sub-structure delays obtained experimentally depend both on the initial separation at the accelerator exit (the gas jet) and on the electron bunch energy. After propagation over a distance  $D$ , two bunches initially displaced longitudinally by  $\delta_{\text{acc}}$  and with slightly different mean energy  $E_0$  and  $E_0 + \delta_e$  (with  $\delta_e = m_e c^2 \delta_\gamma$ ) will become separated by  $\delta_{\text{foil}} = \delta_{\text{acc}} + (D/\gamma_0^2) \delta_\gamma/\gamma_0$ . A positive (negative)  $\delta_\gamma/\gamma_0$  corresponds to the higher (lower) energy bunch initially in front. For  $E_0 = 100$  MeV and  $D = 1$  m,  $(\delta_{\text{foil}} - \delta_{\text{acc}})(\mu\text{m}) = 0.26\delta_e$  (MeV) or  $(\tau_{\text{foil}} - \tau_{\text{acc}})$ (fs) =  $0.87\delta_e$  (MeV). The  $\sim 10$  fs delay obtained experimentally for the spectrum of figure 8(b) indicates a separation at the accelerator exit of  $\delta_{\text{acc}}(\mu\text{m}) = 3 - 0.26\delta_e$  (MeV). For an energy difference up to 10 MeV, which is compatible with the measured energy spectra, the separation at the accelerator exit is in the range of  $0.5\text{--}3 \mu\text{m}$  (1.5–9 fs) if high energy electrons are travelling in front or  $3\text{--}5.5 \mu\text{m}$  if high energy electrons are at the back. A  $0.5\text{--}3 \mu\text{m}$  (1.5–9 fs) separation is compatible with the observation of multiple bunches within the same bubble, which is also observed in simulation 1, where high energy electrons are at the front and the spacing is about  $0.6 \mu\text{m}$  (2 fs). Additional bunches with longer delays are consistent with electrons accelerated both in the first and second bubble. However, this case of injection of significant charge into subsequent bubbles is incompatible with the measured spectra.

## 5. Conclusions

In conclusion, we report CTR electron bunch length measurements from a LWFA driven by a single laser beam for two different experimental conditions, observing 1–2 fs structure containing  $\sim 10$  pC of charge, resulting in 1–10 kA peak currents. In one case a train of at least two bunches separated by less than  $3 \mu\text{m}$  at the accelerator exit is observed. This is compatible with our theoretical model for near-threshold injection discussed above, supported by 3D PIC simulations of electron self-injection resulting in electron bunches with femtosecond scale micro-structure. The self-injection mechanism requires a threshold repulsive potential, which is facilitated through electron density build-up in the sheath crossing region at the rear of the bubble. If the condition for the threshold potential is no longer met then injection terminates. Periodic occurrences of injection followed by termination leads to a train of ultra-short bunches. The bunch length of the injected electrons is determined by the persistence (dwell) length over which the repulsive potential in the sheath crossing region remains at or above the critical potential. Our study highlights the importance of density variation in the sheath crossing region for determining the bunch structure, dark current, emittance, energy spread etc.

Our theoretical model enables an understanding of the near-threshold injection mechanism in the LWFA for typical experimental parameters that lead to high quality femtosecond duration electron bunches being

produced. More complicated ionization injection [29] and two-beam injection schemes using multiple laser beams [44] have been demonstrated, the latter leading to multiple injection in subsequent bubbles [17, 45]. However, in the cases where injection occurs very close to threshold, it is necessary to include the effect of density build-up at the back of the bubble to properly understand the electron bunch structure. Injection close to threshold is very sensitive to laser and plasma parameters: very small changes can lead to a transition from a single to multiple bunches. Therefore, to investigate control of electron beam properties from shot to shot requires very stable lasers.

## Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge the support of the UK EPSRC (grant no. EP/J018171/1), the EU FP7 programmes: the Extreme Light Infrastructure (ELI) project, the Laserlab-Europe (no. 284464), and the EUCARD-2 project (no. 312453). The authors would also like to thank the OSIRIS consortium (UCLA/IST) for the use of OSIRIS, and TM Antonsen, P Mora and SY Kalmykov for the WAKE code. The authors are grateful to the Faculty of Engineering at the University of Strathclyde, for access to the High Performance Computer cluster. The data associated with this research is available at doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15129/b5697435-7651-4333-b00e-2ed2e072eb6a>.

## References

- [1] Tajima T and Dawson JM 1979 Laser electron accelerator *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43** 267–70
- [2] Mangles S P D et al 2004 Monoenergetic beams of relativistic electrons from intense laser–plasma interactions *Nature* **431** 535–8
- [3] Geddes C G R et al 2004 High-quality electron beams from a laser wakefield accelerator using plasma-channel guiding *Nature* **431** 538–41
- [4] Faure J et al 2004 A laser–plasma accelerator producing monoenergetic electron beams *Nature* **431** 541–4
- [5] Leemans W P et al 2006 GeV electron beams from a centimetre-scale accelerator *Nat. Phys.* **2** 696–9
- [6] Clayton C E et al 2010 Self-guided laser wakefield acceleration beyond 1 GeV using ionization-induced injection *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** 105003
- [7] Pukhov A and Meyer-ter-Vehn J 2002 Laser wake field acceleration: the highly non-linear broken-wave regime *Appl. Phys. B* **74** 355–61
- [8] Jaroszynski D A and Vieux G 2002 *Coherent Radiation Sources Based on Laser–Plasma Accelerators. Advanced Accelerator Concepts: Tenth Workshop AIP Conf. Proc.* **647** 902–14
- [9] Jaroszynski D A et al 2006 Radiation sources based on laser–plasma interactions *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* **364** 689–710
- [10] Schlenvoigt H-P et al 2008 A compact synchrotron radiation source driven by a laser–plasma wakefield accelerator *Nat. Phys.* **4** 130–3
- [11] Fuchs M et al 2009 Laser-driven soft-x-ray undulator source *Nat. Phys.* **5** 826–9
- [12] Cipiccia S et al 2011 Gamma-rays from harmonically resonant betatron oscillations in a plasma wake *Nat. Phys.* **7** 867–71
- [13] Wiggins S M et al 2010 High quality electron beams from a laser wakefield accelerator *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **52** 124032
- [14] Brunetti E et al 2010 Low emittance, high brilliance relativistic electron beams from a laser–plasma accelerator *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** 215007
- [15] Sears C M S et al 2010 Emittance and divergence of laser wakefield accelerated electrons *Phys. Rev. Spec. Top.—Accel. Beams* **13** 092803
- [16] Weingartner R et al 2012 Ultralow emittance electron beams from a laser-wakefield accelerator *Phys. Rev. Spec. Top.—Accel. Beams* **15** 111302
- [17] Lundh O et al 2011 Few femtosecond, few kiloampere electron bunch produced by a laser–plasma accelerator *Nat. Phys.* **7** 219–22
- [18] Welsh G H et al 2012 High resolution electron beam measurements on the ALPHA-X laser–plasma wakefield accelerator *J. Plasma Phys.* **78** 393–9
- [19] Bonifacio R and Pellegrini C 1984 Collective instabilities and high-gain regime in a free electron laser *Opt. Commun.* **50** 373–8
- [20] Mangles S P D et al 2012 Self-injection threshold in self-guided laser wakefield accelerators *Phys. Rev. Spec. Top.—Accel. Beams* **15** 011302
- [21] Benedetti C et al 2013 Numerical investigation of electron self-injection in the nonlinear bubble regime *Phys. Plasmas* **20** 103108
- [22] Bulanov S V, Pegoraro F, Pukhov A M and Sakharov A S 1997 Transverse-wake wave breaking *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78** 4205–8
- [23] Kalmykov S, Yi S A, Khudik V and Shvets G 2009 Electron self-injection and trapping into an evolving plasma bubble *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103** 135004
- [24] Yi S A, Khudik V, Kalmykov S Y and Shvets G 2011 Hamiltonian analysis of electron self-injection and acceleration into an evolving plasma bubble *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **53** 014012
- [25] Kostyukov I, Nerush E, Pukhov A and Seredov V 2009 Electron self-injection in multidimensional relativistic-plasma wake fields *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103** 175003
- [26] Kostyukov I, Pukhov A and Kiselev S 2004 Phenomenological theory of laser–plasma interaction in bubble regime *Phys. Plasmas* **11** 5256
- [27] Lu W et al 2007 Generating multi-GeV electron bunches using single stage laser wakefield acceleration in a 3D nonlinear regime *Phys. Rev. Spec. Top.—Accel. Beams* **10** 061301
- [28] Froula D H et al 2009 Measurements of the critical power for self-injection of electrons in a laser wakefield accelerator *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103** 215006
- [29] Pak A et al 2010 Injection and trapping of tunnel-ionized electrons into laser-produced wakes *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104** 025003
- [30] Esirkepov T, Bulanov S V, Yamagiwa M and Tajima T 2006 Electron, positron, and photon wakefield acceleration: trapping, wake overtaking, and ponderomotive acceleration *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96** 014803
- [31] Bulanov S V et al 2006 Electron bunch acceleration in the wake wave breaking regime *Plasma Phys. Rep.* **32** 263–81
- [32] Lu W et al 2006 Nonlinear theory for relativistic plasma wakefields in the blowout regime *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96** 165002
- [33] Yi S A, Khudik V, Siemon C and Shvets G 2013 Analytic model of electromagnetic fields around a plasma bubble in the blow-out regime *Phys. Plasmas* **20** 013108

- [34] Esirkepov T Zh, Kato Y and Bulanov S V 2008 Bow wave from ultraintense electromagnetic pulses in plasmas *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101** 265001
- [35] Fonseca R A *et al* 2002 OSIRIS: a three-dimensional, fully relativistic particle in cell code for modeling plasma based accelerators *Lecture Notes Comput. Sci.* **2331** 342–51
- [36] Sprangle P *et al* 1987 Relativistic self-focusing of short-pulse radiation beams in plasmas *IEEE Trans. Plasma Sci.* **15** 145
- [37] Khachatryan A G *et al* 2004 Extremely short relativistic-electron-bunch generation in the laser wakefield via novel bunch injection scheme *Phys. Rev. Spec. Top.—Accel. Beams* **7** 121301
- [38] Mora P and Antonsen T M Jr 1997 Kinetic modeling of intense, short laser pulses propagating in tenuous plasma *Phys. Plasmas* **4** 217–29
- [39] Ginzburg V L and Tsytovich V N 1990 *Transition Radiation and Transition Scattering* (London: Taylor and Francis)
- [40] Agostinelli A *et al* 2003 Geant4—a simulation toolkit *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A* **506** 250–303
- [41] Happek U, Blum E B and Sievers A J 1991 Observation of coherent transition radiation *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67** 2962
- [42] Shibata Y *et al* 1994 Coherent transition radiation in the far-infrared region *Phys. Rev. A* **49** 785–93
- [43] Casalbuoni S, Schmidt B and Schmäser P 2005 Far-infrared transition and diffraction radiation *Technical Report TESLA-Report-2005-15*
- [44] Faure J *et al* 2006 Controlled injection and acceleration of electrons in plasma wakefields by colliding laser pulses *Nature* **444** 737–9
- [45] Lundh O *et al* 2013 Experimental measurements of electron-bunch trains in a laser–plasma accelerator *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** 065005