A concise demonstrative summary of the Symmetric Hybrid ring design for the storage ring proton electric dipole moment experiment is presented. Critical issues such as lattice design, background electrical fields, geometrical phase, general relativity, spin coherence time and polarimeter systematics are presented. Overall, we find that with the currently proposed design iteration, systematic error sources are reduced by orders of magnitude and that the ring alignment requirements are within the currently available technology.

I. INTRODUCTION

The latest muon \((g-2)\) results \([1,2]\) signify the dawn of high precision physics in storage rings. Spin and beam dynamics needed to be understood and controlled with uncertainties below \(10 \text{ ppb}\), similar to the level required for a storage ring electric dipole moment (EDM) experiment. This article describes a high precision storage ring EDM experiment for the proton as the next generation of high precision and high impact physics in storage rings.

The EDM of an elementary particle is proportional to its spin \(\vec{S}\), which is odd under time reversal \(T\). Hence, in the presence of an electric field \(\vec{E}\), which is invariant under \(T\), the interaction Hamiltonian of the particle \(H_{\text{int}} \propto -\vec{E} \cdot \vec{S}\) violates \(T\) symmetry. This would also imply combined charge conjugation parity (CP) symmetry violation, given CPT conservation, which is encoded in the quantum field theory formulation of the Standard Model (SM).

The weak interactions in the SM mediate well-established CP violating phenomena and can, through quantum processes, generate non-zero EDMs for constituents of atoms, \textit{i.e.} electrons and nucleons. However, the electron and nucleon EDMs in the SM are induced at high loop orders and are quite suppressed: \(d_\text{e}^{\text{SM}} \lesssim 10^{-38} \text{ e} \cdot \text{cm}\) and \(d_\text{n}^{\text{SM}} \lesssim 10^{-32} \text{ e} \cdot \text{cm}\), respectively; \(N=p,n\) \([3-5]\). The EDMs generated by the SM interactions are not observable at current or near-future experiments, making any positive measurement an unambiguous signal of new physics.

It is interesting to note that the SM, in principle, could have generated a large nucleon EDM, through a \(P\)-odd and \(T\)-odd renormalizable interaction \(\propto \theta G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}\), where \(\theta\) is a fundamental parameter of quantum chromodynamics (QCD); \(G_{\mu\nu}\) and \(\tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}\) denote the field strength tensor and dual tensor of the gluon, respectively. Due to the axial anomaly of QCD, the value of \(\theta\) gets shifted when quarks are transformed by chiral rotations that diagonalize the quark mass matrix \(M_q\). Thus, the physically observable quantity is given by

\[
\bar{\theta} \equiv \theta + \arg[\det(M_q)].
\] (1)

The contribution of \(\bar{\theta}\) – assuming dominance of the long-range pion loop processes – to nucleon EDMs is estimated to be \([3,6-8]\) \((g = e > 0)\) is the charge of the proton),

\[
d_n(\bar{\theta}) \approx d_p(\bar{\theta}) \approx 10^{-16}\bar{\theta} e \cdot \text{cm}. \tag{2}
\]

However, the above relation does not in general hold, since there are short range contributions to \(d_n(\bar{\theta})\) and \(d_p(\bar{\theta})\) that can in principle have similar magnitudes as that in Eq. \((2)\). There is no reason to expect that the long- and short-range contributions should cancel, and hence one can take the above estimate as a good lower bound \([7,8]\), though a non-perturbative treatment is required for a more definitive result; see for example Refs. \([8,10]\). Given the current bound on the neutron EDM \(d_n < 3.0 \times 10^{-26} \text{ e} \cdot \text{cm} (90\% \text{ C.L.})\) \([11]\), one then obtains \(\bar{\theta} \lesssim 10^{-10}\).

Note that \(\bar{\theta}\) could be rotated away if one of the quarks is massless, rendering \(\arg[\det(M_q)]\) ill-defined. That possibility is disfavored by low energy hadron phenomenology and lattice computations \([12,13]\). The smallness of \(\bar{\theta}\)
is therefore a conceptual SM puzzle, since there is no obvious reason why the sum of the contributions in Eq. (1) should cancel so precisely. A well-known resolution of this “strong CP problem” is furnished by the Peccei-Quinn (PQ) mechanism\cite{15}\cite{16} which provides a dynamical relaxation of $\theta$ to zero and gives rise to a light pseudo-scalar, the “axion”\cite{17}\cite{18}. Nonetheless, contributions from new physics beyond the SM (BSM) can perturb the PQ mechanism and induce a non-zero $\theta$\cite{19}.

There are good reasons for assuming BSM phenomena (setting aside gravity which is well-described by General Relativity). A multitude of observations\cite{19} have established that $\sim 25\%$ of the cosmic energy budget is made up of an unknown substance – namely dark matter (DM) – which requires BSM physics ($e.g.$, the PQ axion which can be a good DM candidate). The visible Universe, which accounts for $\sim 5\%$ of the cosmic total, has a dominance of ordinary matter over anti-matter, whose origin is an open fundamental question. In addition, the well-established flavor oscillation of neutrinos calls for non-zero neutrino masses which, again, cannot be accommodated in the minimal SM. Taken together, one reaches the unavoidable conclusion that BSM physics is required for a more complete description of Nature.

Quite generically, BSM theories introduce new interactions with complex couplings and, hence, additional sources of CP violation. In fact, an amount of CP violation well above the level that the SM provides is a requirement for a successful mechanism to explain the cosmic dominance of matter, or equivalently, the baryon asymmetry of the Universe\cite{20}. Therefore, new CP violating physics and additional contributions to particle EDMs are motivated from a number of key and empirically well-established facts about Nature, apart from any conceptual or theoretical arguments.

The SM prediction for a nucleon EDM, while a challenging experimental target, is only about three orders of magnitude below the projected reach of a proton storage ring facility, $\sim 10^{-29} e \cdot cm$. Thus, such an experiment has excellent prospects either to find evidence for new physics, or else severely constrain it; we will elaborate on this point in the following.

Numerous BSM proposals have been put forth over the last few decades to address the shortcomings of the SM. Many of these ideas have aimed to address the “hierarchy” between the weak scale $\sim 100$ GeV and much larger mass scales, such as Planck mass $M_{pl} \sim 10^{19}$ GeV associated with possible quantum gravity effects. Models based on supersymmetry, weak scale compositeness, and extra dimensions are some well known examples. Theories that attempt to explain the hierarchy generally predict the emergence of new physics at energy scales $\lesssim$ TeV, providing promising targets for discoveries at the LHC. However, so far the experiments at the LHC have not yielded any conclusive evidence for BSM physics at $O$(TeV) energies.

The above state of affairs has in part prompted discussions about future accelerators that can probe well beyond the TeV scale. The enormous cost of such facilities makes it imperative to provide strong physics motivation for their discovery prospects. For example, a $pp$ collider at center of mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 100$ TeV, based on current analyses\cite{21}, could potentially access new states up to masses $M_{\text{new}} \sim 30$ TeV. While one could speculate about various BSM scenarios that may be discovered at that facility, the detection of a clear proton EDM signal could provide extremely compelling motivation for its construction, as we will briefly discuss below.

Using quark models of hadrons, nucleon EDMs are estimated to be similar in size to quark EDMs and color EDMs which involve gluons instead of photons. An order-of-magnitude estimate for the 1-loop quark EDM is

$$d_q \sim \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} e m_q \sin \phi \frac{\sin \phi}{M_{\text{new}}^2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $g$ is a typical coupling of new physics to a quark with mass $m_q \sim 5$ MeV and $\phi$ is a BSM CP violating phase. A dipole operator couples left- and right-handed fermions and requires a chiral flip, accounted for by the $m_q$ dependence of the above expression. Let us assume a loop-factor $g^2/(16\pi^2) \sim 0.01$, as a typical expectation. We then find

$$d_q \sim 10^{-29} \left(\frac{30 \text{ TeV}}{M_{\text{new}}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{\sin \phi}{0.01}\right) e \cdot \text{cm}. \hspace{1cm} (4)$$

Thus, under reasonable assumptions, an EDM signal at a proton storage ring experiment can provide a strong physics case for the significant investments required to access scales of $O$(10 TeV) at a future collider. We also point out that $\sin \phi \sim 0.01$ can be considered fairly conservative, given that for the CP violating phase $\delta$ in the SM quark sector $\sin \delta \sim 1$\cite{22}. If we take $\sin \phi \sim 1$ in the BSM sector also, scales up to $\sim 300$ TeV can possibly be probed through the proton EDM measurement, well beyond the reach of any collider envisioned for the foreseeable future.

The recent years have seen a surge of interest in new ideas for BSM particles at or below the GeV scale that have suppressed coupling to the SM; see, for example, Refs.\cite{23}\cite{24}. Such physics may originate from a “dark sector” that includes DM and only indirectly interacts with the visible world. Also, given the apparent absence of BSM states near the TeV scale, it is worth considering that new physics could have a low energy scale, but require intense sources to access, due to its feeble interactions with the SM. Adopting this point of view, one may consider $M_{\text{new}} \sim 1$ GeV in Eq. (3), which yields a proton storage ring sensitivity to $g \lesssim 3 \times 10^{-5}$. This greatly exceeds current and projected sensitivity for the coupling of new light states to quarks, under various assumptions for BSM physics; see for example Refs.\cite{25}\cite{26}.

Finally, we note that the first results of the experiment E898 at Fermilab that were released recently\cite{27} confirm the long-standing muon $g - 2$ measurements at
Brookhaven National Laboratory \[28\]. The combined results point to a 4.2\(\sigma\) deviation from the SM theory prediction of Ref. \[29\] (however, see also Ref. \[30\]). If this deviation persists with more data and further scrutiny of the SM theory, it would be a harbinger of new physics. That physics could potentially also manifest itself via a proton EDM measurement. In that case, the complementary precision signals from the lepton and hadron sectors could provide valuable insights about the nature of the underlying BSM phenomena and help chart a course for a new era of discovery.

The storage ring proton EDM method targets \(d_p = 10^{-29} \text{e-cm}\) which is more than 3 orders of magnitude better than the current best neutron EDM limits \[11\]. We also claim that this sensitivity is achievable with existing technology thanks to the significantly relaxed alignment requirements with the Symmetric-Hybrid ring design.

The most prominent systematic error source in the storage ring designs based on the all-electric ring \[31\] is the background radial magnetic field — \(B_{rad}^{\text{external}}\). The stray magnetic field is the most challenging requirement \[32\].

To overcome such a shielding requirement, the next iteration after the all-electric ring, the Hybrid ring design \[33\] was developed. It has been a major accomplishment as for any \(B_{rad}^{\text{external}}\) is naturally shielded by the magnetic focusing system. Hybrid ring design features strong alternating magnetic focusing with electric bending that still allows simultaneous Clockwise (CW) and Counter-Clockwise (CCW) beam storage. Counter-rotating (CR) beams are crucial to avoid the first order systematic error source — vertical dipole \(E\) field.

In rings where the main vertical focusing is magnetic, the main systematic error source becomes the out-of-plane (vertical) electric field. However, this systematic error cancels exactly for vertical dipole electric fields with CR beams. It is the only lattice that accomplishes this cancellation and as such it represents a major breakthrough in the storage ring EDM field. The next level systematic error source is the fact that the average vertical velocity integrated over electric field sections might not be zero. This is a strict requirement for the case of radial polarization which has been relaxed by several orders of magnitude by making the lattice highly symmetric.

This work, the newest design iteration, the Symmetric-Hybrid ring relaxes requirements established by the Hybrid ring by several orders of magnitude, provides comprehensive systematic error analysis, standardizes experimental techniques. Highlighted novelties of this work include:

- Symmetric-Hybrid lattice design (Sections \[II\text{A}\] and \[III\text{C}\])
- Spin-based alignment (Section \[III\text{C}\])
- Hybrid sextupole configuration for simultaneous Spin Coherence Time (SCT) improvement for CR beams. (Section \[III\text{F}\]).

By providing solutions to the most significant systematic error sources and designing a storage ring with realistic specifications, this work aims to be the foundational basis for the commissioning of the proton EDM experiment.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows, Section \[II\] provides an introduction to the experimental technique and the tools used in this work, Section \[III\] discusses the major systematic error sources, Section \[IV\] concludes the work by providing the relevant discussions.

II. METHODS

A. Experimental Technique

Spin \(\vec{S}\) precession rate for a particle at rest in the presence of magnetic \(\vec{B}\) and electric \(\vec{E}\) fields is given as,

\[
\frac{d\vec{S}}{dt} = \vec{\mu} \times \vec{B} + \vec{d} \times \vec{E}
\]

where magnetic and electric dipole moments are defined as \(\vec{\mu} = (gq/2m)\vec{S}\) and \(\vec{d} = (gq/2mc)\vec{S}\) respectively.

Spin motion relative to the momentum for a particle with \(\vec{\beta} = \vec{v}/c\) in a cylindrical coordinate system is given as \[34\–36\], \[37\–39\],

\[
\bar{\omega}_a = -\frac{q}{m} \left( G\vec{B} - \frac{G\gamma}{\gamma + 1} \vec{\beta} \cdot \vec{B} - \left( G - \frac{1}{\gamma^2 - 1} \right) \vec{\beta} \times \vec{E} \right) \frac{c}{\gamma - 1}
\]

\[
\bar{\omega}_n = -\frac{\eta q}{2m} \left( \vec{E} - \frac{\gamma}{\gamma + 1} \vec{\beta} \cdot \vec{E} + \vec{\beta} \times \vec{B} \right)
\]

where \(\omega_a\) and \(\omega_n\) stand for precession due to magnetic and electric dipole moments respectively, \(G\) stands for the proton magnetic anomaly. For, \(\vec{\beta} \cdot \vec{E} = 0\, \vec{\beta} \cdot \vec{B} = 0\) the motion of the spin vector simplifies more,

\[
\bar{\omega}_a = -\frac{q}{m} \left( G\vec{B} - \left( G - \frac{1}{\gamma^2 - 1} \right) \vec{\beta} \times \vec{E} \right) \frac{c}{\gamma - 1}
\]

\[
\bar{\omega}_n = -\frac{\eta q}{2m} \left( \vec{E} + \vec{\beta} \times \vec{B} \right)
\]

\[
\bar{\Omega} = \bar{\omega}_a + \bar{\omega}_n
\]

\[
\frac{d\vec{S}}{dt} = \bar{\Omega} \times \vec{S},
\]
with \( \parallel \) indicating horizontal (in-plane) projection of a vector.

We set \( \vec{B} = 0 \) and choose “magic momentum” such that \( \gamma = \sqrt{1 + 1/G} \). For protons, the “magic” parameters are given on Table I. By choosing such proton momentum, Equation (5) leads to

\[
\bar{\omega}_y = \frac{q}{m\gamma c^2} \left( \beta \times \vec{E} \right) \parallel.
\]

(7)

Notably, a vertical electric field would create a non-zero radial component for \( \bar{\omega}_y \), which would look like the EDM signal with one beam direction. With horizontal \( \vec{E} \) fields and \( \beta \) (\( \vec{E} = \vec{E}_y \), \( \beta = \beta_y \)), the equation simplifies further into \( \bar{\omega}_y = 0 \) which is also known as the frozen spin condition. In this arrangement, the spin precesses into the vertical direction only due to the EDM contribution,

\[ \Omega \propto \eta E \]

linearly in the time scale of the injection \( \Omega \propto dS_y / dt \). \( dS_y / dt \propto E \eta \) is the fundamental principle of measuring the proton EDM. That is, measurement of the out-of-plane spin precession rate \( (dS_y / dt) \) inside a storage ring probes the intrinsic EDM of the particles. The coupling of the electromagnetic fields to a particle’s magnetic dipole moment (MDM) is orders of magnitude larger than the EDM coupling. Hence, a strict requirement of electromagnetic fields is necessary. Further details about the storage ring EDM experiment could be found in Refs. [37, 38].

The Symmetric–Hybrid ring design used in this study consists of 24 FODO sections making up 800 m in longitudinal length. Each FODO section comprises a pair of electric bending sections (more about electric fields and electrode design is in Appendix A) and a pair of magnetic quadrupoles. An illustration of a single FODO is given in Figure 2. A schematic of the ring is given in Figure 3. Dispersion and beta functions are given in Figure 4. As the estimations have shown, the slip factor needs to be negative in order for the Intra-Beam Scattering (IBS) not to cause beam lifetime issues.

With beam storage times of \( \approx 10^3 \text{sec} = 17 \text{min} \) in mind, IBS becomes the primary mechanism of the emittance growth and consequently of particle loss. For the current ring design, the beam lifetime is estimated to be 22 min due to IBS and Residual Gas scattering assuming the vacuum level \( 10^{-10} \) Torr of atomic hydrogen equivalent. The beam will be lost primarily on the polarimeter target due to IBS–induced exchange of horizontal and vertical emittance. The betatron tunes are optimized to avoid resonances up to 8th order inclusively, with the consideration of Space Charge and Beam-Beam tune shifts. The selected tunes were confirmed to be free of beam and spin resonances with simulation. Additionally, the lattice is compatible with Stochastic Cooling, which might be required to prolong the Spin Coherence Time (Section III F) and the beam lifetime even more.

More specifications and details are given on Table II.

### Table I. “Magic” parameters for protons, values obtained from Ref. [10].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( G )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( \gamma )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>( KE )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.793</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>0.7 GeV/c</td>
<td>233 MeV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE II. Ring and beam parameters for Symmetric Hybrid ring design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bending Radius ( R_0 )</td>
<td>95.49 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of periods</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrode spacing</td>
<td>4 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrode height</td>
<td>20 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deflector shape</td>
<td>cylindrical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radial bending E-field</td>
<td>4.4 MV/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight section length</td>
<td>4.16 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrupole length</td>
<td>0.4 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrupole strength</td>
<td>±0.21 T/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bending section length</td>
<td>12.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bending section circumference</td>
<td>600 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total circumference</td>
<td>800 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclotron frequency</td>
<td>224 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolution time</td>
<td>4.46 µs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersion, ( D_p^{max} )</td>
<td>64.54 m, 77.39 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunes, ( Q_x ), ( Q_y )</td>
<td>2.699, 2.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip factor, ( \frac{\eta p}{T} )</td>
<td>-0.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momentum acceptance, ( (d p / p) )</td>
<td>5.2 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal acceptance [mm mrad]</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS emittance [mm mrad], ( \epsilon_x ), ( \epsilon_y )</td>
<td>0.214, 0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS momentum spread</td>
<td>1.177 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles per bunch</td>
<td>1.17 \times 10^8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF voltage</td>
<td>1.89 kV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic number, ( h )</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synchrotron tune, ( Q_s )</td>
<td>3.81 \times 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucket height, ( \Delta p / p_{\text{buckete}} )</td>
<td>3.77 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucket length</td>
<td>10 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS bunch length, ( \sigma_{x} )</td>
<td>0.994 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. High precision tracking**

Runge-Kutta family integrator (5th order, adaptive step size [39]) was used in order to perform simulations throughout this work. Both beam and spin dynamics are fully tracked numerically. Particle beam dynamics are treated with perturbative expansion of the Lorentz equation around the reference orbit in Frenet-Serret coordinate system, with the spin tracked via T-BMT equation. More details are given in Appendix C.

### III. SYSTEMATIC ERROR SOURCES

The primary quantity of interest is the vertical spin precession rate \( dS_y / dt \) that lets us estimate the intrinsic dipole moment of the proton \( d_p \). The target sensitivity

FIG. 2. Schematic top view of the symmetric ring. Both CR beams have longitudinally, radially, and vertically polarized bunches with different helicities (arrows in dark color). Blue and red correspond to focusing and defocusing quads. Naturally, CR beams see opposite focusing effect from magnetic quads. The actual number of FODO sections is 24.

FIG. 3. Superperiod structure, beta functions and dispersion ($\beta$ letter within text of the paper always refers to velocity).

FIG. 4. The slip factor is obtained from evaluating $\frac{d\theta}{dp}$ per turn via numerical tracking. Negative slip factor corresponds to below transition operation, which is essential with the Intra Beam Scattering considerations.

of $d_p = 10^{-29} e \cdot cm$ corresponds to the vertical spin precession rate of $dS_y/dt = 1 \text{nrad/s}$ (this number will be useful throughout the work). Thus, any non-EDM originating vertical spin precession rate larger than $1 \text{nrad/s}$ is considered a potential systematic error source.

Ideally, the EDM search is accomplished with positive helicity CR 100% longitudinally polarized beams. Realistically, as little as $\approx 10^{-3}$ rad average radial spin component would be uncontrollable due to statistical limitations alone (see Section III C). Hence, any vertical spin growth inducer in radial polarization will also translate into longitudinal polarization direction due to this mixing. The mixing ratio between maximally longitudinal and maximally radial polarization directions could be controlled, which makes it a powerful tool to clearly differentiate the systematic error sources into longitudinal and radial polarization originating types.

In the following subsections, relevant to the EDM search potential systematic error sources will be discussed. With the mentioned mixing of polarizations in mind, the systematics pertaining to the radial polarization direction have its effect reduced for the EDM search (longitudinal polarization) by a factor of $10^3$.

A. Vertical Velocity

Vertical velocity systematic originates from the term proportional to

$$\left( \vec{S} \times (\vec{\beta} \times \vec{E}) \right)_y = S_z \cdot \beta_y \cdot E_x$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)
in the spin dynamics equation — Equations (6) and (7). Non-zero radial spin component $S_x$ (pointing inward/outward of the ring) combined with vertical velocity $\beta_y$ may create vertical spin precession that would be indistinguishable from EDM even with CR beam injection.

Despite $\langle \beta_y \rangle \equiv 0$, the velocity would be non-zero if averaged over the bending sections only ($E_x$ field regions). Formally, we can only expect,

$$\langle \beta_y \rangle_{\text{straight}} + \langle \beta_y \rangle_{\text{bending}} = 0,$$

but each of the $\langle \beta_y \rangle_{\text{straight}}$ and $\langle \beta_y \rangle_{\text{bending}}$ might not be zero individually. This leads to a possibility of

$$\langle \beta_y \cdot E_x \rangle \neq 0,$$

and,

$$\frac{dS_y}{dt} \propto \langle S_x \cdot \beta_y \cdot E_x \rangle \neq 0,$$

which is the essence of the effect.

This systematic is also known as vertical orbit corrugation or the “roller—coaster effect”. It is most prominent in the radial polarization case; thus its effect is at least a few orders of magnitude less in longitudinal (EDM search) polarization. In order to isolate and understand this effect better, we put the beam in radial polarization and create vertical orbit corrugation by vertically misaligning one magnetic quadrupole at a time. A single vertically misaligned quad induces vertical imbalance that creates non-zero average vertical velocity.

Vertical velocity systematic is especially prominent in ring designs where the quadrupoles are not equivalent in misalignments with respect to each other. For example, the 4-fold symmetric hybrid ring design [33], (Figure 5), where misaligned quads are not equivalent (symmetric), shows clear islands of tolerance to vertical quad misalignments, Figure 6 (a). Only the quads at locations where the ring looks the same in both directions longitudinally, the 4-fold symmetric ring is insensitive to the corresponding misalignments.

By making the ring symmetric for all the quads longitudinally (Figure 2), all the quadrupoles are made equivalent and tolerant to vertical misalignments — Figure 6 (b). A vast improvement in the background vertical precession rate is achieved with a symmetric ring design, therefore reducing the systematic error source by a few orders of magnitude.

### B. Dipole E-field

The dipole $E$-field systematic originates from the

\[
(S \times (\beta \times E))_y = S_s \cdot \beta_s \cdot E_y
\]

FIG. 5. 4-fold symmetric ring design, presence of the long straight sections reduce the number of symmetric points (adapted from [31])

term in Equations (6) and (7). Non-zero $E_y$ could arise due to some tilt ($x - y$ plane rotation) in the deflector plates. Each bending section, being randomly tilted, contributes to the average non-zero dipole $E$-field initially present in the storage ring. $E_y$ creates an EDM-like signal for one of the counter rotating beams. However, the true EDM-signal causes the vertical spin precession in opposite directions for CR beams. The difference of precession rates for CR beams gives us the true EDM signal, as the dipole $E$-field creates a discernible from EDM signal with CR beam storage — Figure 7 (N=0). Formally,

\[
\left( \frac{dS_y}{dt} \right)_{\text{EDM}} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{dS_y}{dt} \right)_{\text{CW}} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{dS_y}{dt} \right)_{\text{CCW}}.
\]

More about spin data combination is given in Appendix B.

In practice, compensation for non-EDM arising vertical spin precession is performed by applying opposite to the average trim dipole field until no visible precession is seen in both beam directions, which effectively sets $E_{\text{dipole}}^\text{dipole} = 0$.

### C. Quadrupole E-field and Spin-based alignment

In the absence of vertical electric fields $E_y^\text{external} = 0$, any non-zero $B_x^\text{external}$ would be compensated by a magnetic force coming from quadrupoles; therefore, it would on average result in $\langle B_y \rangle = 0$, within practical values of magnetic fields (more in Section IV B). Magnetic fields are balanced by magnetic fields; hence, there is no apparent vertical spin precession due to $B_x^\text{external}$ for all the...
Combination of E capole etc., cannot induce EDM-like precession, too.

In the context of storage ring EDM experiments, unwanted spin precession obtained due to non-commutativity of the successive rotations is referred to as Geometrical Phase. The spin precession is proportional to the product of successive rotation amplitudes. Hence, the points only show statistical upper limit of the possible vertical precession rate, actual rates could be lower.

\[ N = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, 24 \text{ harmonics — Figure 8} \]

\[ E_y = q(E_y - c\beta_s B_x) = 0. \quad (9) \]

Equation (9) needs to be true throughout the ring, not just on average. All the multipoles and harmonics of the \( E_y \) need to be addressed. The most dominant multipole, dipole \( E_y \) and all its harmonics do not create EDM-like signal due to the simultaneous CR beam storage (Figure 7). It is apparent that symmetric with CW–CCW injection scheme multipoles, i.e. dipole, sextupole, decapole etc., cannot induce EDM-like precession, too.

Next, quadrupole (and higher-order multiples of 4) \( E_y \) need to be addressed separately. If the CR beams do not overlap azimuthally everywhere around the ring, they will be subjected to different average vertical electric fields. Any non-zero \( E_{\text{quad}} \) is compensated by its magnetic counterpart to keep Equation (9) correct.

The presence of \( E_{\text{quad}} \) can be monitored by controlling local \( B_y \) (more about measuring \( B_x \) in Section IV B). Combination of \( E_{\text{quad}} \) and \( B_x \) produces non-zero vertical spin precession rate \((dS_y/dt)\). \( B_x \) is purposely produced (for example a magnetic chicane — Figure 9) so that it couples to the initially unknown \( E_{\text{quad}} \). This will create vertical spin precession rate \((dS_y/dt)\) proportional to \( E_{\text{quad}} \). Knowing \((dS_y/dt)\) and the local value of \( B_x \) will hence make it possible to infer the value of the corresponding \( E_{\text{quad}} \) which will be compensated externally afterwards

\[ \beta_s \text{ can safely be assumed constant as its variation is negligibly little} \]

\[ x, y \text{ subscripts are dropped for clarity} \]
FIG. 7. Longitudinal polarization case. Vertical spin precession rate vs \( E_y = 10 \text{ V/m field} \) \( N \) harmonic around the ring azimuth. For \( N = 0 \), the precession rate for CW (or CCW) beam is around 5 rad/s. The difference of the precession rates for CR beams (orange) is below the target sensitivity for all \( N \). The points only show statistical upper limit of the possible vertical precession rate, actual rates could be lower.

The product dependence is verified by linearly increasing the amplitude of successive rotations in the \( x, y \) plane. This is accomplished by misaligning all magnetic quadrupoles by \( \sigma \) (both \( x, y \) directions). By increasing \( \sigma \) while observing the growth of the unwanted vertical precession rate, the square dependence is clearly observed — Figure [10]. Significant cancellation is achieved by incorporating both CR beams [48] with reversed magnetic quadrupole polarities.

Geometrical Phase could be produced due to misaligned magnetic quadrupoles, tilted misaligned electric deflectors, or any other ring corrugation sources (More details in Appendix [D]). Numerical tracking shows that the EDM-like vertical spin precession caused due to Geometrical Phase is insignificant in case when the orbit planarity is \( \pm 50 \mu \text{m} \) with CR beam separation of \( \pm 5 \mu \text{m} \). Such orbit planarity requirements have already been achieved [49, 50] by mechanical means using water levels. The beam separation will be measured by the BPMs (see Section [IV B]).

E. General Relativity

General relativistic (GR) effects caused by the gravity and rotation of the Earth can be observed in high-precision experiments. The spin dynamics in the considered pEDM experiment could be affected. In connection with the Equivalence Principle, one can always introduce a local Lorentz (anholonomic) coordinate system based on a tetrad of appropriate orthogonal coordinate vectors. Dynamics of the momentum and spin in this coordinate system is defined by equations of motion formally coinciding with usual equations given by electrodynamics in the Minkowski spacetime [51–53]. The general rel-

FIG. 8. Longitudinal polarization case, CW beam only. Vertical spin precession rate vs \( B_R = 1 \text{nT field} \) \( N \) harmonic around the ring azimuth. The points only show statistical upper limit of the possible vertical precession rate, actual rates could be lower.

FIG. 9. Illustration of a magnetic chicane that is used to greatly amplify the effect of the quadrupole \( E \) field inside a deflector and make it possible to infer its value and compensate for it externally. A magnetic chicane would separate CW (blue) and CCW (orange) beams to mm level. Plate dimensions are not to scale.

FIG. 10. Longitudinal polarization case, CW beam only. Vertical spin precession rate vs \( \sigma \) quadrupole misalignments. \( \sigma = 1 \mu \text{m} \) alignment is required with a single CW beam. Additional cancellation is achieved by incorporating polarity switches with CR beams, which vastly relaxes this requirement.

\[ dS/dt = ky^2 \text{ Fit} \]
ativistic effects in storage ring EDM experiments have been analyzed in previous studies \[^{53, 57}\] and the corresponding systematic corrections have been calculated. It has been explicitly shown in Refs. \[^{58, 59}\] that the final results obtained in these studies perfectly agree with each other. The net effect due to GR creates a little or a distinguishable-from-the-EDM signal with CR beam storage. Hence, GR related effects are not significant for the current proposal.

F. Spin coherence time

The Spin Coherence Time (SCT), also known as in plane polarization (IPP) lifetime, is essential to achieve the desired sensitivity requirements \[^{37}\]. EDM search with a longitudinally polarized beam requires SCT of around $10^3$ s. It has been shown that long SCTs are correlated with zero chromaticity conditions \[^{58, 59}\]. Chromaticity is defined as,

$$\xi_{x,y} = \frac{\delta Q_{x,y}}{Q_{x,y}} \frac{\delta p}{p}.$$ 

Sextupoles can reduce chromaticity, and hence make it possible to achieve a long $\approx 10^3$ s SCT, as it has been experimentally shown at COSY \[^{60}\].

A long SCT could be achieved by using magnetic sextupoles. Magnetic sextupole fields are defined as,

$$B_x = 2k^m xy, \quad B_y = k^m (x^2 - y^2).$$

A magnetic sextupole pair $k^m_1, k^m_2$ overlaps with the magnetic quadrupoles (Figure 1) in order not to break the symmetry requirements of the lattice. Reference particle horizontal precession rate is significantly improved if the correct sextupole fields are used — Figure 11. The optimum sextupole pair strengths for the reference particle is found to be practically equivalent to the optimum for a bunch.

The sextupoles could also be electric instead,

$$E_y = -2k^e xy, \quad E_x = k^e (x^2 - y^2).$$

A similar spin precession behavior is seen— Figure 12.

However, the optimal pair (electric or magnetic) of sextupole strengths $k^m,e_1, k^m,e_2$ (Figures 11 and 12) is not symmetric with respect to CR beams. It first seems that SCT can be improved for one beam direction only. It is an acceptable solution if we allow the beams to be injected separately while adjusting the sextupole strengths accordingly for each of the beam directions.

Alternatively, by incorporating magnetic and electric sextupoles at the same time, SCT could be improved for both CR beams. The symmetry of the problem (Figures 11 and 12) shows that CR beams experience the same effect from magnetic and electric sextupoles in case,

$$k^m = k^m_1 = -k^m_2,$$

$$k^e = k^e_1 = k^e_2.$$ (10)

Hence, having both magnetic and electric sextupoles that follow Equation (10) will lead to a better SCT for both CR beams — Figure 13. By incorporating the best pair $k^m$ and $k^e$, the SCT improves vastly for both of the CR beams at the same time — Figure 14. Additional details about finding the optimum sextupole strengths are given in Appendix E.

G. Polimeter systematic issues

Measurement of the proton beam polarization will most likely involve the observation of the asymmetry in the elastic scattering of protons from a light-mass target such as carbon. The differential cross section for protons is given by

$$\sigma(\theta)_{pol} = \sigma(\theta)_{UNP} [1 + p A(\theta) \sin \beta \cos \phi].$$

where $\theta$ is the polar scattering angle for the detected protons, and $\beta$ and $\phi$ are the polar and azimuthal angles for the proton polarization direction (\( \phi \) measured from the perpendicular to the scattering plane). $A$ is the analyzing power, which describes the degree of sensitivity of the scattering to polarization acting through the spin-orbit interaction between the proton and the nucleus. $p$ is the beam polarization. At the energies expected for the EDM search, the small-angle cross section and analyzing power are both large (Figure 15).

The EDM signal arises from beam polarizations ($p$) that are perpendicular to the ring plane. These may be detected by comparing the elastic scattering rates on opposite sides of the beam in the ring plane. The cos $\phi$ azimuthal dependence produces opposite scattering rate changes in these two detectors. If the scattering rates are designated by L and R for the two sides of the beam and measurements are made with both + and − states of the beam polarization, then the vertical component may be determined from

$$\rho = \frac{1 - r}{A + r} \quad r^2 = \frac{L_+ R_- - L_- R_+}{L_+ R_+}$$

The combination of simultaneous left- and right-side detection with data using opposite polarization states cancels many first-order errors in this analysis.

Accurately measuring small polarization rotations at the level of $\mu$rad means being able to handle errors beyond the first order. To do this, we must create a model of the terms driving these errors provided a means of making corrections for them in real time if possible. Such a model was created for the original polarimeter used in beam studies at COSY \[^{61}\]. There must also be parameters that scale the corrections that are themselves
sensitive in first order to the driving terms. One such choice is,

\[ \phi = \frac{s-1}{s+1} \quad s^2 = \frac{L_+ L_-}{R_+ R_-} \]

which is sensitive to geometric errors in first order but not to the polarization and

\[ W = \frac{dL_+}{dt} + \frac{dR_+}{dt} + \frac{dR_-}{dt} + \frac{dL_-}{dt} \]

which is sensitive to the sum of the detector count rates for correcting rate-dependent errors. Next a calibration must be performed of the sensitivity of the polarimeter to various orders of angle/position errors as a function of these two driving terms. Once in place, monitoring the magnitude of these two terms allows a correction to be made to any polarization observable in real time. This was tested at COSY and proved correct to a level of \(10^{-5}\) (limited by statistics) with no suggestion that the method was encountering a limit.

There are a number of systematic effects that rely on the comparison of asymmetries measured with CR beams. Most likely, this will mean two sets of forward detectors mounted on either side of a single target that is shared by the two beams. For elastic scattering from carbon, backscattering from the target is usually less than \(10^{-7}\) of the forward scattering rate and should not be an issue. But the two polarimeters will be separate instruments, and the calibration of their response to polarization must be precise enough that the difference of the asymmetries they yield is meaningful at the level of \(10^{-6}\), what is needed for the EDM search.

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

A. Simulation with realistic conditions

We further demonstrate the feasibility of the experiment, by including multiple lattice imperfections, such as both horizontal and vertical quadrupole misalignments and deflector tilts. All in all, CR beams are required to vertically overlap within \(\pm 5\mu m\) with \(\pm 50\mu m\) overall vertical closed orbit planarity. With such conditions, we first numerically verify that the established realistic conditions are met – Figure 16. Then, vertical magnetic field \(B_z\) and RF cavity frequency is adjusted until no discernible (less than \(\sim 1\) prad/s) radial spin precession is present. Lastly, we run with both normal and reversed magnetic quadrupole polarities and look at the total EDM signal which is calculated as in Equation (B2).

Upon examining the result – Figure 17, it is clear that the unwanted background residual EDM-like signal is below target experimental sensitivity; hence, the systematic error sources with such lattice alignment requirements are low enough to allow the measurement of the proton EDM to \(d < 10^{-26}\) e.cm.

B. \(B\)-field measurement

Presented solutions to systematic errors require sub-nT level B-field experienced by the beam. This will be achieved by several techniques. The ring will be surrounded by sets of fluxgate magnetometers and Helmholtz coils to eliminate the external field by active cancellation. The number of sets determines the azimuthal B-field harmonics to be cancelled. Following this reduction, the magnetic focusing also cancels out the average B-field experienced by the beam.

As mentioned above, some systematic errors require a vertical beam split of CR beams no larger than \(\pm 5\mu m\) (Figure 16). The split can be measured by means of magnetic pick-ups. A \(\mu m\) level vertical split induces roughly \(pT\) level radial magnetic field at a few cm distance from the beam. In order to increase the SNR, the quadrupole fields will be modulated at \(1 - 10\) kHz by \(1\%\), which is coined as K-modulation [62]. The measurement can be easily accomplished with commercial fluxgate magnetometers (with a few \(pT/\sqrt{Hz}\) sensitivity), while there are a variety of other commercial options as well. A recently developed SQUID-based BPM has a potential to measure the split with \(nm/\sqrt{Hz}\) sensitivity [63].

C. Experimental knobs

In this section, a brief summary of the available experimental knobs that reduce the effects of systematic error sources is listed. Methods unused in this study are marked and will require additional detailed studies.

- **CR beam storage.** Simultaneous CR beam storage eliminates a whole class of systematic error sources, including the dipole (and higher odd multipoles of) \(E\)-field, the Earth’s gravitation field and some additional Geometrical phases (Appendix D).

- **Quadrupole polarity switching.** As mentioned in Appendix B, flipping the polarity of the magnetic quadrupoles effectively phase shifts the beta functions. Therefore, a significant amount of systematic error sources that depend on local values of the beta function are suppressed.

- **Beam splitting (chicane).** Applying a radial magnetic field \(B_x\) to split the CR beams enhances the effect of local quadrupole \(E\) fields (Section III C and fig. 9). Splitting the CR beams increases local beam offsets that will greatly amplify effects of quadrupole and higher order \(E\) fields. With such amplification, it is possible to measure and control high order \(E\) fields via SBA.

- **Positive and negative helicities.** In addition to CR beam storage, bunches with opposite helicities are present too, but the use is currently reserved for polarimeter related systematics.
Radially polarized bunches. Radially polarized bunches are the most sensitive to Vertical Velocity effect (Section 11.1A), and also to additional geometrical phases (Appendix D). Radially polarized bunches are needed for SBA and also used for the data combination (Appendix B).

Vertically polarized bunches. Currently, only radially and longitudinally polarized beams were considered. Utilizing spin precession data of vertically polarized beams could be used to further mitigate systematic error sources. Vertically polarized bunches are sensitive to different $\Omega_2$ components which could be used to isolate the EDM component even better (unused in this study).

Quadrupole strength variation. Has been proposed first in [33], varying the quadrupole strengths lets us extrapolate the effective vertical spin precession rate at an infinite quadrupole strength by subsequently increasing the focusing gradient $k$, where the beam split is minimal (unused in this study).

Spin Rotation. Every few seconds the spin direction will be rotated around the vertical axis in one direction and immediately in the opposite one, in order to have an accurate measurement of the beam polarization value as well as of the vertical spin component as a function of time. This technique is implicitly assumed in this work.

D. Conclusion

The most important systematic error sources in the storage ring proton EDM experiment are covered. Overall, we have shown that for the specified ring alignment requirements, the most significant systematic error sources are below the target EDM sensitivity. This paper has introduced novel methods of improving the sensitivity of the experiment such as Symmetric Ring design, hybrid sextupoles for increased SCT, and Spin-based alignment. Combined with [31, 33, 37] this work aims to be the constitutive basis for the technical design report and subsequent commissioning.
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### Table III. Properties of a single electrode plate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>104 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrode Height</td>
<td>20.0 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Width</td>
<td>4.0 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bending Field</td>
<td>4.391 MV/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Field</td>
<td>To be modelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltage per Plate</td>
<td>±87.82 kV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bending Radius</td>
<td>95.49 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIG. 14. Magnitude of the polarization vector vs. time simulation with a realistic bunch structure given as, $\Delta x/x = \pm 4$ mm, $\Delta y/y = \pm 3$ mm. The polarization retains a high value with hybrid (magnetic and electric) sextupoles for both CW (blue) and CCW (orange) bunches compared to the nominal case without sextupoles (green). The simulation is sub-second long, with the polarization at $t \gg 1$ s estimated by measuring precession rate for each particle, then extrapolated with corresponding error propagation.

Appendix A: Electrode Material and Design

The ring design imposes strict requirements on the choice of the electrode material. The electrodes must be compatible with bake-out at 200°C (due to required vacuum of $10^{-10}$ Torr) and nonmagnetic since the background magnetic field must be very small ($\lesssim 1$ nT). Other requirements relate to having an electrode made of a material that is easy to machine and polish. The electrode must also be made to very good tolerances to meet the required alignment and be from a light weight material. From the many choices considered [65, 66]: stainless steel 316L, niobium, molybdenum, titanium and TiN-coated aluminum, TiN-coated aluminum shows great promise.

The studies done on TiN-coated small electrodes [66] where the aluminum electrodes were manufactured from Al6061 alloy, required only hours of mechanical polishing using silicon carbide paper. The coating was about 2.5 µm thick and the electrodes were baked at 200°C for 30 hours and achieved $10^{-11}$ Torr. However, these were small electrodes and coating large pieces will be a challenge. Although the tested small pieces did not show field emission up to 14 MV/m, it is known that large pieces will not perform as well as small pieces.

Table III shows the properties of a single electrode plate. The ring will use 1152 such plates. The transverse edges of these plates can be shaped with Rogowski edge profile and electrostatic modelled to find the maximum field strength. The model will also speak to field strength everywhere inside the vacuum pipe and not just between the plates. To bias plates and support them inside the vacuum pipe, one can use inverted insulators. R24 insulators should work as they are relatively compact, about 10 cm long, and rated to nearly 200 kV. Each plate will be supported by two insulators. Luckily, since these insulators are sold to medical x-ray community, they should be relatively inexpensive. There are industry standard cables with R24 connectors. Small alumina insulator spacers can be used to hold the plates apart, and pro-

FIG. 15. Angular distributions for elastic proton-carbon scattering at 250 MeV [64] showing the differential cross section, analyzing power, and figure of merit. The figure of merit (FOM) indicates the statistical significance of utilizing parts of the angular distribution in a polarimeter; angles between $4^\circ$ and $16^\circ$ are optimal.

FIG. 16. Single particle position averaged over $5 \times 10^5$ turns at split onto 48 bins. (a) Horizontal position throughout the ring azimuth. (b) Vertical position throughout the ring azimuth. Fill color shows standard deviations at the bins, roughly giving the idea about the spread.
Appendix B: Data combination

Out-of-plane precession direction due to a genuine EDM signal would be opposite for positive helicity CR beams in the same storage ring. Namely,\(^5\)

\[
\left( \frac{dS_y}{dt} \right)_{\text{EDM}} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{dS_y}{dt} \right)_{\text{CW}} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{dS_y}{dt} \right)_{\text{CCW}} \tag{B1}
\]

vertical spin precession due to the EDM is the difference of vertical precessions of CW and CCW beams, with a factor of 1/2 to compensate for the doubling of the true EDM signal.

Complementing the simultaneous storage of CR beams, we can have another symmetrical flip — Polarity switch. It is the act of switching the direction of the currents in the magnetic quadrupoles. Quadrupoles being maximally current dominated makes it possible to phase shift the lattice beta functions by reversing direction of the currents in all the magnetic quadrupoles. Then, the EDM signal is given as,

\[
\left( \frac{dS_y}{dt} \right)_{\text{EDM}} = \left[ \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{dS_y}{dt} \right)_{\text{CW}} - \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{dS_y}{dt} \right)_{\text{CCW}} \right]_{\text{Polarity 1}} + \left[ \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{dS_y}{dt} \right)_{\text{CW}} - \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{dS_y}{dt} \right)_{\text{CCW}} \right]_{\text{Polarity 2}} \tag{B2}
\]

Additionally to the polarity switch of the quadrupoles, one can choose to continuously change the quadrupole gradient — \( k \) to extract \( dS_y/dt \propto 1/k \) in the asymptotic limit of \( 1/k \to 0 \) as has been first suggested in \([33]\).

In addition to the vertical spin precession, the spin would also (inevitably) precess into radial direction, assuming the lattice conditions listed in Section \( \text{IV.A} \). Radial spin precession would effectively create vertical precession due to the growing radial spin component (Section \( \text{III.A} \)).

We can model this case analytically and compensate for such radial spin precession. We denote the vertical spin precession rate as the combined effect from both radial and longitudinal polarizations,

\[
\frac{dS_y}{dt} = \eta' S_x + \delta' S_z.
\]

\( \eta' \) indicates EDM-like precession that only happens due to a longitudinal spin component \( S_x \) and \( \delta' \) indicates dark

\(^5\) \( y \) is vertical in lab frame
matter-like precession that happens due to a radial spin component $S_x$. $\eta'$ and $\delta'$ show only the combined background effect. For example, $\delta'$ directly contains vertical velocity and other systematics that only happen when the spin is radial.

Assuming that initially longitudinally polarized bunch precesses into radial direction linearly with time,

$$\frac{dS_x}{dt} = GS_y,$$

where $G$ stands for $(g - 2)$—like in-plane spin precession. Then, it could be described by coupled differential equations,

$$\frac{dS_y}{dt} = \eta' S_s + \delta' S_x$$ \hspace{1cm} (B3)

$$\frac{dS_x}{dt} = GS_s,$$ \hspace{1cm} (B4)

if the radial and vertical spin precession rates are small, i.e. $1 \approx S_s \gg S_x, S_y$ at all times. The solution is,

$$S_s \eta' = \frac{d}{dt} \left(S_y - \delta' G t^2 S_s / 2 \right).$$ \hspace{1cm} (B5)

The quadratic in time behavior caused by the drift into radial spin direction is confirmed — Figure 18.

First, $\delta'$ and $G$ are estimated from spin precession data — Figure 19. After redefining the effective $\frac{dS_y}{dt}$ as,

$$\frac{dS_y}{dt} \leftarrow \frac{d}{dt} \left(S_y - \delta' G t^2 S_s / 2 \right)$$

$\eta'$ can now be correctly estimated with Equations (B2) and (B5). The total combination result is given on Figure 17, from which it is clear that $\eta' < 1 \text{ nanorad/s}$.

FIG. 18. Effective vertical spin component precession data of CW-CCW and both quadrupole polarities calculated from Equation (B2). The quadratic behavior of this curve is explained by Equation (B5).

FIG. 19. (a): Vertical spin precession of a radially polarized beam all for beam directions and polarities (subscripts). Main contribution of the spin growth originates from Vertical Velocity effect Section III A. (b): Radial spin precession of a longitudinally polarized beam for all beam directions and polarities (subscripts). The spin precesses into radial direction due to RF frequency mismatch and non-zero average $B_y$ present in the storage ring due the misalignment of magnetic quadrupoles.

Appendix C: High precision tracking

Lorentz equation governs dynamics of a particle in EM fields,

$$\frac{d\vec{\beta}}{dt} = \frac{q}{m \gamma c} \left[ \vec{E} + c \vec{B} \times \vec{\beta} - \vec{\beta} \cdot \vec{E} \right].$$

However, its perturbative expansion in particle optical coordinates is more practical for storage rings and accelerators, as we are using natural variables of interest.

$$x' = a(1 + hx) \frac{p_0}{p_s}$$

$$\alpha' = (1 + hx) \left[ \gamma \frac{E_x p_0}{\gamma_0 \chi_{e0} p_s} + b \frac{B_s p_0}{\chi_{m0} p_s} - \frac{B_y p_0}{\chi_{m0} p_s} \right] + h \frac{p_s}{p_0}$$

$$y' = b(1 + hx) \frac{p_0}{p_s}$$

$$\beta' = (1 + hx) \left[ \gamma \frac{E_y p_0}{\gamma_0 \chi_{e0} p_s} + \beta_x \right] - h \frac{B_y p_0}{\chi_{m0} p_s} \right],$$

where prime indicates differentiation with respect to $s$ beamline travel distance, subscript 0 is the quantity with respect to the reference particle. In this curvilinear (Frenet–Serret) coordinate system, $x$ indicates radial deviation from the reference orbit, $y$ indicates vertical deviation, and $s$ points along the direction of motion of the reference particle. Hence, the momentum in this coordinate system is measured in $\vec{p}/p_0 = (a, b, \alpha, \beta)$. Other variables, $h = 1/R_0$ indicates curvature for the reference orbit, $\chi_{e0}, \chi_{m0} = p_0 v / Ze, p_0 / Ze$ electric and magnetic rigidities.

The spin vector should then be integrated with T-BMT equation [69][70], given in Cartesian coordinates as follows,

$$\frac{d\vec{S}}{dt} = \vec{\Omega} \times \vec{S}.$$
\[
\frac{d\vec{S}}{dt} = \frac{q}{m} \vec{S} \times \left[ \left( a + \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) \vec{B} - \frac{a\gamma}{\gamma + 1} \vec{\beta} \cdot \vec{B} \right] \nonumber \\
\quad - \left( a + \frac{1}{\gamma + 1} \right) \frac{\vec{\beta} \times \vec{E}}{c} \right) + \frac{\eta}{2} \left( \vec{E} - \frac{\gamma}{\gamma + 1} \frac{\vec{\beta} \cdot \vec{E}}{c} + \vec{\beta} \times \vec{B} \right). \tag{C1}
\]

However, as we would like the normalized to unity spin vector measured in terms of \( S = (S_x, S_y, S_z) \) — radial, vertical, and longitudinal spin components, the original T-BMT equation (Equation (C1)) needs to be modified as,

\[
\vec{S}' = \left( \vec{\Omega} t' - \frac{\vec{y}}{\hbar} \right) \times \vec{S},
\]

in order to compensate for the rotation of the coordinate system itself, and take into account that we want the derivative w.r.t. \( s \) integration variable.

Each of the storage ring elements have been tracked separately in order to avoid discontinuities in EM fields that directly lead to unstable numerical integration. Electric bending plates were hard-edge approximated. The fields inside cylindrical deflectors with a focusing index \( n = m + 1 \) are given as \( E_{1,2} \),

\[
E_x = -E_0 \left( 1 - \frac{n x}{R_0} + \frac{n (n+1)x^2}{2R_0^2} \right)
\]

\[
E_y = -E_0 \left( \frac{(n-1)y}{R_0} \right).
\]

It is important to note that in order to meet the precision requirements, second order terms \( (x^2) \) must be considered to have precise spin integration.

### Appendix D: Detailed analysis of the Geometrical Phases

In the hybrid ring design, the terms in the T-BMT equation proportional to \( E \) field are the main mechanism for systematical error sources, as \( B \) fields are naturally shielded by the quadrupoles. In addition to the dipole \( E \) field, vertical velocity, and quadrupole \( E \) field (Sections III B and III C) there exist additional ways of creating background vertical spin precession.

The list of the possible terms from Equation (C1) is given below (in the order of importance attributed by authors),

1. \( dS_y/dt \propto S_x \cdot \beta_y \cdot E_x \), discussed in Section III A, also recognized as “twist” distortion.

2. \( dS_y/dt \propto S_x \cdot \beta_y \cdot E_y \), discussed in Section III B

3. \( dS_y/dt \propto S_y \cdot \beta_y \cdot E_x \), will receive additional treatment in this section.

4. \( dS_y/dt \propto S_x \cdot \beta_x \cdot E_y \), will receive additional treatment in this section.

\( dS_y/dt \propto S_x \cdot \beta_y \cdot E_x \) term directly couples to the longitudinal polarization (EDM search), thus circumventing its effect via SBA is not trivial. As it has been argued in Section III A the average effect of the \( S_x \cdot \beta_y \cdot E_x \) term would not be zero. Nevertheless, from a energy conservation standpoint, \( \int E_x ds = 0 \) per each deflector. A static electric field cannot induce a net acceleration (or deceleration) on a passing particle. Hence, the effect of this term effectively applies to non-stationary longitudinal electric fields. High-precision numerical spin tracking has shown that even in case \( \int E_x ds \neq 0 \), for example, due a changing in time magnetic flux through the storage ring plane, the resulting false EDM signal is below 1 nrad/s for fields \( E_x < 5 \text{ V/m} \) normally distributed along the ring azimuth.

\( dS_y/dt \propto S_x \cdot \beta_x \cdot E_y \) term couples to the radial polarization, hence the effect is suppressed via SBA (Section III C). Isolation of this effect is challenging, as its contribution is orders of magnitude below vertical velocity effect. Vertical velocity is inadvertently created when probing for the \( S_x \cdot \beta_y \cdot E_x \) effect, as \( E_y \neq 0 \) fields create \( \beta_y \neq 0 \). Thus, this effect is negligible for the current sensitivity goals and could be ignored for the practical purposes.

### Appendix E: Optimum sextupole strength search

In Figures 11 to 13 the optimal sextupole strengths pair is obtained by a rough 2-dimensional parameter sweep, followed by numerical optimization to find the finer minimum. It is worthwhile to show that finding optimal pairs for magnetic and electric sextupoles separately is sufficient to infer the value for the optimum strength needed for hybrid sextupoles.

Let us suppose that \( k_1^m = \alpha_1, k_2^m = -\beta_1 \) is the optimal pair for magnetic sextupoles for CW beam, with \( k_1^n = \beta_1, k_2^n = -\alpha_1 \) for the CCW case. Similarly, \( k_1^e = -\alpha_2, k_2^e = \beta_2 \) and \( k_1^e = \beta_2, k_2^e = -\alpha_2 \) for CW and CCW directions respectively with electric sextupoles.

By observing the symmetry in Figures 11 and 12 we can infer that,

\[
k_1^m = -\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2} \times k_1^e \quad k_2^m = -\frac{\beta_1}{\beta_2} \times k_2^e \quad \text{for CW} \tag{E1}
\]

\[
k_1^n = \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_2} \times k_1^e \quad k_2^n = \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2} \times k_2^e \quad \text{for CCW} \tag{E2}
\]

i.e. only a sign change is required for transition from electric to magnetic or vice versa. We can also infer the conversion factor from electric to magnetic sextupoles. Following the lines of the symmetry, we can find the optimal pair for hybrid sextupoles case in magnetic units,

\[
M_1 + E_1 = \alpha_1 \quad -M_1 + E_1 = -\beta_1 \tag{E3}
\]

solving for each \( M_1 = (\alpha_1 + \beta_1)/2 \) and \( E_1 = \alpha_2/\alpha_1 \times (\alpha_1 - \beta_1)/2 \) we get the optimal pair for each case in.
proper units. Figures [11 to 13] verify these analytical estimations to 1% accuracy.
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