

1  
2  
3

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION


AECD-3373

THE ISOTRON

By  
R. R. Wilson

May 19, 1952  
[Date Declassified]

Radiation Laboratory  
University of California



Technical Information Service, Oak Ridge, Tennessee

## INSTRUMENTATION

In the interest of economy, this report has been reproduced direct from copy as submitted to the Technical Information Service.

PRINTED IN USA  
PRICE 35 CENTS  
Available from the  
Office of Technical Services  
Department of Commerce  
Washington 25, D. C.

Other issues of this report may bear the number UCRL-833.

## Chapter 9

### THE ISOTRON

By R. R. Wilson

#### 1. HISTORICAL NOTE

The isotron was invented in December 1941 by R. R. Wilson. It was developed at Princeton University under NDRC and OSRD contracts which ran from January 1942 until February 1943 under the direction of H. D. Smyth. The development was a cooperative enterprise which was only made possible by the enthusiastic support of those who participated in it. Because of the highly cooperative nature of the work, it is almost impossible to give individual credit for the many inventions and developments made in the course of the project. From the list of authors of reports given at the end of the chapter, some idea of the contributors to the project is obtained. However, in those reports as here, the authors were reporting the work of several people.

The project was organized by groups. One group, under the leadership of J. L. Fowler, worked on a small experimental isotron. They investigated the characteristics of this isotron at low current densities. Another group working under the leadership of L. G. Smith constructed a larger isotron which was predominantly used to study operation at high current densities. J. E. Mack led a group which investigated and developed metal types of ion sources. R. W. Thompson was in charge of a group which concentrated on the chloride type of ion source. R. Cornog was in charge of engineering and procurement, and W. A. Han was in charge of the electronic laboratory.

The project was a happy one; an attempt was made to give all participants some voice in the determination of its policies and program. The large number of experiments that were finished in the short lifetime of the project attests to their cooperation. When it became necessary to close the project down because other methods had proved more successful, almost all the workers left for the project at Los Alamos.

. M., where they contributed significantly to the scientific work that led to the actual assembly of the first fast-neutron chain reaction.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

Most methods of separating isotopes depend on the use of a large magnetic field. The isotron is an electromagnetic device for separating isotopes, but it effects the separation by the use of radiofrequency (r-f) voltages instead of magnetic fields. It has the advantage that plane sources of large area can be used instead of the slit sources to which most magnetic methods are limited. Before entering into any discussion of the details, a simplified description of the principles of the method is given.

Ions from a plane source extended in two dimensions are first accelerated by a constant high-intensity electric field and are then further accelerated by a low-intensity electric field varying at r-f and in a "sawtooth" manner. The effect of the constant electric field is to project a strong beam of ions straight down a tube with uniform kinetic energy and therefore with velocities inversely proportional to the square root of the masses of the ions. The varying electric field introduces small periodic variations in velocity, having the effect of causing the ions to form plane bunches at a certain distance down the tube. Thus bunches of ions of different mass travel with different velocities and therefore become separated. The intensities of the fields are adjusted so that the ions become most completely bunched at the position of maximum separation. At this position an analyzer applies a transverse focusing electric field together with an r-f component synchronized with the travel of the bunches. The synchronization is such that the varying component of the transverse field strength is zero when the bunch of ions of the desired isotope comes through and is maximum when the bunch of ions of the undesired isotope comes through. In this manner the ions of the desired isotope will be focused to collector pockets supported at the end of the tube opposite the ion source, whereas the ions of the undesired isotope will be deflected away from the collector pockets.

This can be rephrased in mathematical terms. Assuming that the r-f bunching field is a sawtooth wave with period  $T$  and range of voltage  $\Delta V$ , small compared to the accelerating voltage  $V$ , it is found that bunching will occur at a distance down the tube

$$l = 2Tv \frac{V}{\Delta V} \quad (1)$$

This can be derived by the following considerations: First the ions are accelerated by a constant voltage  $V$ ; hence they travel with a velocity  $v = \sqrt{2Ve/m}$ . They are then subjected to the r-f sawtooth field, the effect of which is to increase the energy of the ions linearly with time from  $V$  to  $V + \Delta V$  for each period of oscillation,  $T$ . Since the r-f voltage  $\Delta V$  is small compared to  $V$ , the velocity of the ions will also be increased linearly and by an amount  $\Delta v = (v/2)(\Delta V/V)$ . Assume a movement down the tube with ions at velocity  $v$ . An ion which received the full bunching voltage  $\Delta V$  at the end of one period of oscillation will be observed to move with a relative velocity  $\Delta v$  toward the ion that came through at the beginning of the period. It will be noticed that the successive bunches are separated by the bunch distance  $\Delta l = vT$ . Hence, when the ions accelerated at the end of the period have moved a relative distance  $\Delta l$ , the bunching will be perfect. This will occur after time  $\Delta l/\Delta v$  or at a distance down the tube  $l = (\Delta l/\Delta v)v$ ; this can be written  $l = 2Tv (V/\Delta V)$ .

Consider next ions differing in mass by the small amount  $\Delta m$ . They will bunch at a slightly different position,  $l' = 2Tv'(V/\Delta V)$ , or at a distance  $\Delta l' = \frac{1}{2}\Delta m/m$  from the other ions. For ions of one mass to bunch together just halfway between the bunches of mass  $\Delta m$  greater, it is necessary that  $\Delta l' = \Delta l/2$ , which gives the relation

$$\frac{\Delta V}{V} = 2 \frac{\Delta m}{m} \quad (2)$$

so that Eq. 1 can be rewritten

$$l = Tv \frac{m}{\Delta m} \quad (3)$$

Typical values of the above quantities for the isotopes  $U^{235}$  and  $U^{238}$  are  $V = 40$  kv,  $\Delta V = 1$  kv, frequency  $1/T = 17.9$  Mc,  $l = 80$  cm, and bunch distance  $\Delta l = 1$  cm. [More convenient formulas for uranium ions are, approximately,  $\Delta V = \frac{1}{40}V$ ,  $\Delta l = \frac{1}{40}l$ ,  $2V = (f\Delta l)^2$ , where  $V$  is in kilovolts and  $f$  is the frequency in megacycles.]

The development of the isotron splits rather naturally into the following major parts:

1. Development of ion sources
2. Acceleration of large beams of ions
3. Bunching the ion beams
4. Analyzing the bunched ion beam
5. Collection of separated isotopes
6. Extending the method to large-scale production

Work was actually carried out simultaneously on nearly all phases of the project. However, for simplicity, an attempt is made to discuss the experiments in roughly the above order. No attempt is made to discuss everything that was done, but, in order to keep this report to a reasonable length, only that which seemed to be most successful and most pertinent is presented. It should be remembered that the project lasted for just one year; hence many experiments were not completed. Nearly all the work has been described in detail in a series of about 40 Princeton University OSRD Project SSRC-5 reports which are listed as references at the end of this chapter.

### 3. ION SOURCES

The current density and area of the beam should be as large as possible for efficient large-scale operation of an isotron. A final unit with an ion-beam area of about 1 sq m passing a total current of the order of amperes was envisaged. Later it will be seen that space charge limits the method to current densities of less than a few hundred microamperes per square centimeter when practical dimensions and voltages are used. Thus a source is required which will provide uniform current density of the order of 100  $\mu\text{A}/\text{cm}^2$  over 1 sq m of area. An additional desideratum is that predominantly  $\text{U}^+$  ions are yielded. It is explained later that doubly and triply charged ions can also be bunched simultaneously with the singly charged ions.

From the beginning of the project about 50 per cent of the endeavor went into ion-source research. Although many attempts at novel methods of producing ions were investigated, the bulk of the work soon focused on two types of sources which seemed most promising: electron-controlled arcs using pure metal vapor and electron-controlled arcs using uranium chloride vapor.

The uranium chloride sources had the advantages of being easy to make and run, and much of the experience accumulated at Berkeley could be directly applied to them. Many different kinds of such sources were built and tried. However, they had the following serious disadvantages: (1) Severe vacuum problems were raised by the resultant vapors and hygroscopic properties of the chloride and (2) it was found extremely difficult to produce ion beams which were free from uranium chloride ions, which of course were not easily separated.

Sources that used uranium metal were considerably more applicable to the isotron method. The original approach to the use of uranium metal was to try to find a refractory substance in which to heat the metal to a temperature high enough so that a hot-cathode arc would run in its vapor. Innumerable materials were tried, but in every case

the uranium destroyed or corroded its container. Another approach<sup>11</sup> was to strike a cold-cathode arc in vacuum between two electrodes, one of which was made of uranium. In general, it was found that such arcs were very unstable and difficult to keep in place; hence work on cold-cathode arcs was abandoned.

Although tungsten was not found satisfactory as a containing vessel for molten uranium because of the rapid alloying of the two, nevertheless it was soon found that tungsten could be used as a sponge for uranium.<sup>12</sup> Thus, if not too much uranium is added to a piece of hot tungsten, the tungsten maintains its shape and the uranium simply evaporates out.

This proved to be the key to the construction of a successful metal arc source, namely, a hot-cathode arc to a hot anode consisting of a large rod of tungsten to which small amounts of uranium could be added from time to time. As typical of the many forms which were constructed, consider one of the simplest, shown in Fig. 9.1. A d-c potential of about 1000 volts is applied between the filament a and the tungsten rod b. As the filament is heated, a few amperes of electron arc are emitted which strike the tungsten anode with 1000 ev energy. Although the tungsten is water-cooled at its base, enough heat is developed to heat the free end white hot. The uranium wire c, about  $\frac{1}{16}$  in. in diameter, is then shoved against the tungsten until a gram or two melt. This immediately alloys and flows uniformly over and through the tungsten. Some of it evaporates, and a sufficient vapor pressure is built up so that an arc is struck between filament and anode. A constant-current network in the primary of the rectifier keeps the current at about 50 amp, while the arc voltage runs from about 10 to 30 volts. (At high voltage the network saturates and passes only a few amperes.) As the uranium evaporates out, the vapor pressure becomes less and the arc voltage is observed to rise. Eventually this trips a relay which causes the uranium wire to be pushed against the tungsten anode until enough uranium has melted to bring the arc voltage down to a chosen operating potential, 20 volts, for example. A shield d was found useful in keeping the arc away from the insulators of the filament leads.

It was found that amperes of positive ions could be drawn from the plasma surrounding such an arc. In the case described here these arcs were mounted several inches behind a plane fine-mesh tungsten screen to which the ions were allowed to diffuse. The ions were then accelerated by a high voltage, 20 to 50 kv, between this and another screen to give a beam of high-energy ions. The ion density across the screen was approximately uniform over an area, the dimensions of which were comparable to the distance from source to screen. In

fact, for a given uniformity the distance from source to screen is easily calculable, since the ion density was found to fall off accurately as the inverse square of the distance from the source. Mass-spectrographic analyses of the ions from such sources indicated predominantly  $U^+$  and  $U^{++}$  ions, depending on running conditions. Typical current ratios were  $U^+ : U^{++} : U^{+3} = 70 : 20 : 10$ .

The development of such sources was not complete. In general, their life was only a few hours, after which time a filament would burn out or the anode would disintegrate. The short life of the filament was due apparently to the presence of the uranium vapor. The solution to this difficulty would be to use indirectly heated cathodes. The anode life could be extended by using larger rotating anodes and controlling the feeding of uranium to it more closely. Source lifetimes of days or weeks might be feasible.

Another metal source which seemed promising was one in which cold uranium was the receptacle of the molten uranium. This was done by running an intense hot-cathode arc to the center of the top of a cylinder of uranium of a few inches in diameter, the periphery of which was cooled. Enough energy was dissipated at the center of the block to maintain a sufficient temperature gradient between the center and periphery to vaporize the molten metal. This source was difficult to start and was developed too late in the life of the project to be applied to an isotron.

Many other types of sources were tried, and the workers in the ion-source group, which was under the direction of Julian Mack, have written a complete description of sources and their properties.<sup>39</sup>

Tests showed that the metal sources of all types tried were amazingly efficient. If enough current was put into the arcs (about 50 amp), 90 to 100 per cent of the uranium vapor was ionized.

For production from a 1-sq m source, about four metal arcs located symmetrically about 50 cm behind a 1-sq m plane screen, from which point the ions would be accelerated, were visualized. The efficiency could be increased by using more and smaller arcs closer to the screen and by placing a second screen on the opposite side of the arcs to catch those ions going in that direction. This would require two isotron units working back to back on one source. Such a source did not get beyond the design stage. L. G. Smith pointed out some desirable features of using one arc surrounded by an isotron of circular symmetry.

#### 4. PRODUCTION OF LARGE ION BEAMS

After producing a source which provides uranium ions uniformly over a large area, it was next necessary to accelerate these ions into

a high-energy parallel beam. The parallelism of the ion paths had to be such that ions did not get out of phase with their bunches by having to travel obliquely and hence through longer paths from source to analyzer. A difference of path length of 10 per cent of the distance between two successive bunches was tolerable; this required that the ion paths could not have a total angular spread of more than about 6 deg.

The geometry of a typical isotron is shown schematically in Fig. 9.2. The source (not shown) was contained in the insulated cavity S. Ions from it drifted to a transparent plane tungsten screen a, which is shown in greater detail in Fig. 9.3. They were then accelerated in the gaps between screen a and transparent grid b, consisting of a number of closely spaced thin graphite strips at ground potential. A side view of this electrode is shown in Fig. 9.4. Typical accelerating-gap distances varied from  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 in. After acceleration the ions traveled through the buncher c and down the tube e to the analyzer f. The buncher consisted of two more grids of parallel wires aligned accurately behind the graphite strips as shown in Fig. 9.4, but more is said about it later.

The first remarkable fact observed was that it was possible, with the correct geometry of the accelerating gaps, to obtain a nearly straight high-current-density beam of uranium ions. Theoretical calculations<sup>2,7,25,36</sup> had shown that space-charge repulsion should cause such beams to diverge widely; since they did not, it was concluded that the positive-ion space charge of the ion beams was neutralized by electrons or negative ions of some sort. This conclusion was confirmed by measurements of space-charge potentials by the heated-filament method. In fact, no space-charge divergence of the beam was observed even at the highest current densities achieved, which were of the order of 0.1 amp/cm<sup>2</sup>.

An extensive set of experiments was carried out to determine the angular divergence of the beam.<sup>37</sup> On the basis of those experiments and of theory,<sup>17</sup> the following picture of the process of obtaining the beam of positive ions in an isotron can be formulated. Before any voltage is applied to the acceleration gap, the ion plasma from the source will extend throughout the whole isotron tube. If a small positive voltage is applied to the source screen and arc, the electrons in the plasma will no longer be able to pass through the gap, and a plasma boundary will develop.<sup>38</sup> The position of the plasma surface obeys Childs's law, which for  $U^+$  ions is

where  $j$  is the current density in microamperes per square centimeter,  $V$  is the accelerated voltage in kilovolts, and  $d$  is the distance in centimeters from the plasma boundary to the nearest negative electrode, which is the graphite grid in this case. As  $V$  is increased the plasma is pushed back toward the source screen which, at a high enough voltage, it eventually reaches. Since the field is very weak behind this screen, the plasma stops there.

Since the edges of the screen are farther from the ion source than the center of the screen, the current density will be smaller at the edges than at the center, and hence the plasma boundary will reach the edges first. At this stage the plasma boundary may have a nearly spherical shape, and, as the lines of force will diverge normally from this, the beam will be seriously defocused until the voltage is high enough to push the plasma boundary back to the screen at its center.

Assume that the plasma boundary is now pushed back to the source screen and is a perfect plane surface. It may be asked what fields defocus the ions. First there is the irregularity due to finite spacing of the buncher grid  $b$ . Feynman<sup>17</sup> calculated that this irregularity in the accelerating field would lead to an angle of divergence of  $2a/3G$ , where  $a$  is the spacing of the buncher grids and  $G$  is the accelerating-gap distance. (If the currents were not space charge limited, the formula would be  $a/2G$ .) A typical value of  $a/G$  was 0.1, leading to an angular divergence of about 3 deg. Feynman estimated that the source screen should have an effect of the order of magnitude of  $\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\alpha/G}$ , where  $\alpha$  is the mesh distance. The effect of lateral wires is ignored, hence the above is certainly an overestimate. For a 30-mesh tungsten screen it would give about 5 deg.

A third effect could come from the random velocities of the ions as they leave the plasma. The average energy is about 30 ev; hence for an accelerating voltage of 30 kv the maximum angle of divergence would be  $\sqrt{1/1000}$  or about 2 deg.

These theoretical estimates are very useful for guiding the design. They seem to be overestimated, for under the above conditions the total divergence of the ion beam was experimentally determined to be about 2 deg.<sup>23</sup> The scattering of the ions due to collisions with the gas was only appreciable at relatively poor vacuums ( $10^{-3}$  mm Hg).

Summarizing, ion beams can be and have been obtained having large cross sections, current densities of 200 to 300  $\mu\text{a}/\text{cm}^2$ , small divergence, and reasonable homogeneity of energy. It has been found possible to produce ion beams 10 times as intense as the above, but the angular divergence and the homogeneity of the energy of such intense beams have never been investigated.

Something should be said here about sputtering by the high-energy uranium ion beams. One of the first experiments was to expose a grid made up of various materials to the beam. The sputtering effect was very pronounced and was most serious for aluminum. It decreased for copper, tungsten, iron, and graphite in the order given. Graphite is by far the most resistant material to sputtering; graphite grids have been used for many hours in large beams, and they then showed almost no sputtering effect.

## 5. THE ANALYZER

It has been shown that it is possible to produce a two-dimensional ion beam traveling down a tube. The ions are made to bunch after traveling some distance, and at the point of bunching some sort of analyzer must be placed to separate the desired from the undesired isotope. There are many possibilities here, but only one device is described, the one on which all work at Princeton was done.

The analyzer consisted of a set of parallel ribbonlike electrodes shown schematically in Fig. 9.2 at  $f$  and in more detail in Fig. 9.5. The principle of operation of the analyzer was to place d-c voltages between the electrodes such that the beams coming through each pair of plates were brought together or, more accurately, to a line focus.

In order to separate the bunched ions with high-frequency fields at the analyzer, it was necessary to confine these fields to a region somewhat smaller than the bunch distance. This was done by superimposing a high-frequency voltage on the d-c voltages of the plates such that every other plate was grounded with respect to the high-frequency fields. The high-frequency voltage was applied to alternate plates through mica condensers, the r-f being kept from the d-c voltage supply by suitable chokes. When the r-f voltage was applied, the beam was split into two components since in half the gaps the field was in a direction opposite to what it was in the other half. Analysis was made by applying the alternating voltage at half the buncher frequency such that at the times of zero voltage the  $\text{U}^{235}$  ions came through to the center where the collector cup was placed and at times of maximum (plus or minus) voltage the  $\text{U}^{238}$  ions were thrown up and down.

In practice, the analyzer was from 10 to 15 cm wide, consisting of about 20 tantalum or graphite plates supported on insulated springs as seen in Fig. 9.5. The plates were about 1 cm wide and as long as the beam was wide. They were spaced about  $\frac{1}{2}$  cm apart. If the fields existed only between the plates, the voltage on each plate would increase as the square of the number of plates from the center. Owing

dates should be  $\delta/8$ . Actually, two harmonics are usually adequate for good bunching, so that the above dimension can be increased by a factor of 2 if it is desirable.

## 7. BUNCHING IONS

**7.1 Low Current Density.** In the simplified description of the principle of the isotron, a perfect sawtooth waveform was assumed for the velocity modulation. It has been shown in the preceding section how such a waveform was approximated by adding harmonics. Consider next how these approximations affect the separation and efficiency of an isotron.

Feynman<sup>4</sup> finds theoretically that it is possible to get complete separation even without a sawtooth waveform if ions accelerated in part of the cycle are thrown away. In general, it is necessary to choose between efficiency and degree of separation. If the separation factor is defined as the factor by which the ratio of heavy to light isotope is decreased and the efficiency  $\eta$  as the fraction of one cycle that is used, he finds that even for pure sine waves typical values of  $\sigma = 16$ ,  $\eta = 60$  per cent or  $\sigma = 10$ ,  $\eta = 70$  per cent can be obtained. For a waveform made up of four harmonics he finds  $\sigma = 44$  at  $\eta = 84$  per cent. If higher harmonics are used,  $\sigma = 17N$  and  $\eta = 2N/(2N + 1)$ , where  $N$  is the number of harmonics used. Most ion sources produce ions of different charges. In particular, it has been seen that the metal source usually made  $U^+$ ,  $U^{++}$ , and  $U^{+++}$  ions in the ratio 70:20:10. Fortunately, it is possible to bunch and separate all three of these ions simultaneously.

First consider only the two ions  $U^+$  and  $U^{++}$ . The  $U^{++}$  is accelerated to twice the energy and hence  $\sqrt{2}$  times the velocity of the  $U^+$ . Now the ratio of the energy received by the ion to the voltage put on the buncher<sup>17</sup> depends on the velocity of the ion through the buncher and on the geometry of the buncher. It was found possible to design the buncher in such a way that both the  $U^+$  and the  $U^{++}$  received the proper bunching voltage to give them both the minimum width at the analyzer. The difficulty then was that, although both ions bunched at the analyzer, they traveled with different velocities, and so in general they did not arrive at the analyzer at the same time. However, for a suitable choice of tube dimensions, it was possible to arrange it so that the  $U^+$  ions and the  $U^{++}$  ions arrived at the analyzer in coincidence for several unique values of the accelerating voltage. It is clear that this could be done by allowing the  $U^+$  ion bunch to lag behind the  $U^{++}$  ion bunch by an integral number of bunch distances. Paul Olum<sup>26</sup> has worked out the complete theory of this process and has extended it to the case of three types of ions.

Two groups working on two separate experimental isotrons did many experiments on bunching at low current density, about  $1 \mu\text{a}/\text{cm}^2$ . First, a group under the leadership of J. L. Fowler constructed a  $4\frac{1}{2}$ -in.-diameter isotron tube<sup>19</sup> which was later rebuilt as an 8-in.-diameter tube.<sup>24</sup> On the basis of results from the small isotron, another group under the leadership of L. G. Smith constructed a 12-in.-diameter isotron; the principal purpose of this group was to study bunching at high current density. However, this necessitated considerable work at low current density.<sup>22</sup>

Consider next the experimental procedure used in examining the bunching in an isotron. The ion source was turned on, and the accelerating voltage (about 10 to 40 kv, controlled electronically to within a few volts) was applied. This produced a straight beam of ions down the tube. Next the analyzer d-c voltage was turned on and adjusted so that most of the beam was focused into a narrow collector cup  $g$ , located some distance behind the analyzer as shown in Fig. 9.2. Then the r-f analyzer voltage was turned on. This caused the line focus to be spread out in a perpendicular direction about five or ten times the width of the collector cup. This of course caused a decrease in the current measured in the cup. The crucial point came as the buncher voltage was applied and the phase between buncher and analyzer was changed or when small changes were made in the accelerating voltage. If there was any bunching, it would show up as an increase or decrease in the current to the cup, depending on whether the bunch arrived at the analyzer at zero voltage or not. It was thus easy to see that the separation factor obtainable was just the ratio of the maximum current to the minimum current. The procedure then was to maximize the bunching or  $\sigma$  by making changes in the variables at will.

An experimental study was made of the dependence of  $\sigma$  on the following variables: acceleration voltage, distance between buncher and analyzer, arc conditions, gas pressure, beam size, beam current, frequency, and analyzer voltages, as well as number, size, and phase of harmonic buncher voltages.

In most of the experiments the separation was not measured in the simple way described above, but a mechanical scanner was used. This was located at the position of the collector cup and consisted of a slit which was moved recurrently at high speed in front of an ion-collector electrode. The direction of motion of the slit was perpendicular to the beam direction and perpendicular to the line focus. The ions coming through the slit produced a voltage on the electrode which was impressed on the vertical plates of an oscillograph, the sweep of which was synchronized to the recurrent motion of the slit.

to fringing fields, however, this relation was not fulfilled, so that the voltages had to be determined empirically to give a line focus. This was not found difficult, and in general it was easy to bring the beam to a line focus not much wider than the distance between successive strips. A grounded wire was placed on the beam side of each plate so that the d-c fields would not penetrate far into the beam region and slow up the ions in such a way that there would be an appreciable variation across the beam of the time that ions would reach the analyzer.

In the final unit of 1-sq m cross section, it was proposed to place eight or ten units of analyzers, as described above, side by side to cover the large area rather than to use one big analyzer which would require much too large d-c and r-f voltages.

The r-f voltage for the analyzer and the buncher were both obtained from a crystal oscillator from which appropriate multiples of the frequency were made. A phase changer permitted adjustment of the phase of the r-f analyzer voltage such that the  $U^{235}$  ions would come through the analyzer as the r-f voltage on it was zero. Of course this phase could also be adjusted by making small changes in the accelerator voltage.

## 6. THE BUNCHER

The purpose of the buncher is to modulate the velocity of the ions in such time that the ions form into separated bunches as they reach the analyzer. Ideally this could be accomplished by simply adding an r-f voltage to the accelerating voltage. This would mean applying the voltages either to the source or to the tube, both of which have considerable capacity. It was found more convenient to utilize the three grids b, c, and d, shown schematically in Fig. 9.2 and in more detail in Fig. 9.4.

To apply the voltage to the ions, the principle of the r-f linear accelerator was used. This takes advantage of the time of flight of the ion through the gaps between grids. The r-f buncher voltage is applied to the central grid c, the other two grids remaining at ground potential. The ion may be accelerated as it passes from the first grid to the second and then may also be accelerated as it passes from the second to the third grid, for the voltage has had time to reverse because of the time of flight of the ion.

The first grid, as has been seen, was also the ground electrode of the accelerating gap. It was possible to obtain the same results by using only two grids. In this case the r-f voltage was placed on the first grid while grid e was grounded and grid d was eliminated. The

source screen then was grounded for r-f, and it played the same role that grid b played before. In practice, the three grid bunches were always used so as not to introduce complications in the experimental work.

It has already been seen that the ions sputter most materials except graphite rather seriously. It was for this reason that the first buncher grid b was made of graphite strips. The other grids were sometimes made of tungsten wires, but these were carefully aligned behind the graphite strip so that no beam struck them (see Fig. 9.4). In later designs all the grids were made of graphite strips. It was not difficult to machine the graphite into strips 10 mils thick by  $\frac{1}{16}$  in. wide by 1 m long. Their positions were determined by grooves cut in a supporting bar, and they were kept under tension by individual springs g as shown in Fig. 9.4.

The best bunching resulted when the velocities of the ions were modulated in a sawtooth manner. This was approximated by synthesizing such a wave from harmonics. It is obvious that, to approximate a sawtooth modulation of velocity, a sawtooth voltage need not be applied to the central electrode of the buncher shown in Fig. 9.4. The actual contribution of any harmonic would depend on the geometry of the buncher grids and the velocity of the ions. In practice it was possible to apply four harmonics separately to the buncher electrode, the amplitude and phase of each harmonic being separately variable. First the fundamental was applied, and its effect on the production of bunches, observed on an oscillograph by using an electronic device, was maximized by varying the phase and amplitude. Then a second harmonic was added, and its effect on the bunching was also maximized by varying its phase and amplitude, as well as by readjusting the phase and amplitude of the fundamental or first harmonic. In the same way the other harmonics were added, and all phases and harmonics were finally trimmed for best bunching. A feeling for making this adjustment was readily acquired.

Feynman has worked out the theory of the design of bunchers.<sup>17</sup> This theory gives the dimensions of the buncher grids as well as the amplitudes and phases of the harmonic voltages. It is obvious that the dimensions between grids and between strips of a given grid must be of the order of the distance an ion travels during a period of the highest harmonic. The theory recommends for four harmonics a buncher consisting of two electrodes of grounded graphite strips of length approximately  $\delta/8$  ( $\delta$  is the bunch distance), with the r-f applied to a set of wires midway between the plates and on a line with them. The center of the plate electrodes should be a distance  $\frac{3}{8}\delta$  apart so that the wire is about  $\delta/8$  away from the edge of the plates. The spacing of adjacent



This produced a picture on the oscillograph of the distribution of the ions in a plane at the focus of the analyzer. With all analyzer voltage off, a uniform distribution across the tube could be seen. Turning the d-c analyzer voltage on caused this to form into a single peak at the center. The r-f analyzer voltage then spread this peak out into the familiar pattern obtained by projecting a circle onto a line, i.e., low at the center and with two peaks at both extreme sides. Turning the buncher voltage on caused the distribution to change so that a peak appeared in the center again or so that all the current went to the sides, depending on the phase between buncher and analyzer. The separation factor was determined by measuring the maximum height at the center, when the peak appeared there, to the minimum height at the center, when the peaks were made to appear at the sides. The motion of the slits was obtained by rotating a large drum in the vacuum through a sliding seal.

The results of a typical experiment performed in the 8-in.-diameter isotron are given below.<sup>31</sup> The buncher fundamental frequency was 6.5 Mc, the analyzer frequency was 3.25 Mc, and its voltage was 1200 volts rms. The accelerating voltage was about 20 kv, so that the distance between successive bunches was about 2 cm. To bring the centers of gravity of the  $U^+$  and the  $U^{++}$  bunches together at the analyzer and to place the  $U^{235}$  bunch midway between the two  $U^{238}$  bunches required 31.8 bunch distances between buncher and analyzer, or a distance of 160 cm. Other coincidences of  $U^+$  and  $U^{++}$  bunches were predicted at 21.7 and 18.4 kv for this frequency. The vacuum was about  $10^{-5}$  mm Hg pressure.

The best bunching was obtained as follows: one harmonic,  $\sigma = 6.8$ , bunch voltage  $E_B = 145$  volts rms; two harmonics,  $\sigma = 14.5$ ,  $E_{B_1} = 115$  volts rms,  $E_{B_2} = 17$  volts rms; and three harmonics,  $\sigma = 25$ ,  $E_{B_1} = 130$  volts rms,  $E_{B_2} = 31$  volts rms,  $E_{B_3} = 20$  volts rms. No definite increase in  $\sigma$  was obtained by adding the fourth harmonic, although the pattern on the scanner sometimes seemed slightly improved.

Figure 9.6 shows the result of an experiment to determine the effect of the accelerating voltage on the separation factor. The maximum which occurs at 19.6 kv is probably the coincidence of  $U^+$  and  $U^{++}$  which was predicted to be 20 kv. The voltmeter read 3 per cent too low at 3 kv, so the agreement was rather good. The difference in accelerating voltage between this maximum and the next was 1.7 kv, compared to the 1.6 kv predicted by theory.

Measurements of  $\sigma$  as a function of r-f analyzer voltage showed that the separation factors could have perhaps been doubled by increasing the analyzer voltage to about 2500 volts rms.

By allowing air to flow into the system at various rates with an adjustable leak, the curve of Fig. 9.7 was obtained. The pressures were read on a Western Electric D-79510 ion gauge using an emission current of 10 ma. Hence each microampere of the abscissa corresponds to about  $10^{-6}$  mm Hg. The theoretical curve was obtained from calculations by Feynman on the basis of collisions of the  $U^+$  ions with the atoms of the gas.<sup>32</sup> In order to fit the theoretical curve to the data it was necessary to guess the best value of  $\rho$ , the pressure at which  $1/e$  of the ions suffered collisions in traveling to the analyzer. A value of  $\rho = 8.3 \mu\text{a}$  fitted the data best.

Figure 9.8 shows the result of an experiment made on the 12-in.-diameter tube, the purpose of which was to determine the effect of buncher voltage (fundamental only) on the separation factor. The frequency was 7.5 Mc/sec, the accelerating voltage was 21.4 kv, and the distance from buncher to analyzer was 160 cm. The current density in the run was  $30 \mu\text{a}/\text{cm}^2$ . The curve of  $\sigma$  vs.  $E_B$  (the buncher voltage) showed four maxima at  $E_B = 120, 370, 570,$  and  $800$  volts; the corresponding values of  $\sigma$  were 4.8, 2.2, 1.85, and 1.45. The phase of the buncher voltage was the same for alternate peaks but differed by 180 deg from one peak to the next. These results were beautifully verified by the calculation of Feynman<sup>35</sup> on "high-order" bunching. His calculated curve is almost identical to the experimental one.

**7.2 High Current Density.** Originally it had been hoped that the space charge in the buncher would be neutralized in the same manner in which, as has been seen, the space charge of the beam itself was neutralized. Unfortunately such was not the case; in fact, it was never possible to observe any indication of even partial neutralization of the debunching space charge. Apparently this was because the electrons or, more plausibly, the negative ions that provide steady space-charge neutralization were unable to follow the r-f changes in the electric field produced in the bunches.

This fact, which was learned the hard way, caused a reorientation in thinking. This meant a revision downward from the condition of isotrons of 1 sq m area working at low V on beams of hundreds of amperes to the condition, mentioned earlier in this chapter, where debunching space-charge effects were not important, i.e., about 1 ar per square meter or per tube and high V. The original confusion came about because higher values of  $\sigma$  than seemed possible were observed at the large currents. These values of  $\sigma$  were not very large ( $\sim 2$  or  $3$ ), and, because at that time it was not possible to produce straight beams of ions in the isotrons, the low  $\sigma$  values were ascribed to geometrical effects. Later, when these were corrected and low values of  $\sigma$  were still obtained, a series of experiments<sup>32</sup> soon led to

the conclusion that space charge was responsible for the inability to obtain larger separation factors at high current densities.

Calculations by Feynman<sup>2</sup> and Olum<sup>30</sup> showed that, if there were no space-charge neutralization, the current density would be limited to values below a critical current density given by the formula

$$j = \frac{1250V^{3/2}}{L^2} \alpha \quad (4)$$

where  $\alpha$  is the ratio of  $c/m$  of the ion to that of the  $U^+$  ion. They further showed that if several ions were present in the beam they would act independently of one another.<sup>29</sup> Thus, for nearly equal currents of  $U^+$  and  $U^{++}$  ions, the limiting value of the current density would be given by

$$j_1 = 3000 \frac{V^{3/2}}{L^2} \quad (5)$$

The results of the experiment carried out on the 12-in. isotron to determine the effects current density has on the separation factor are shown in Figs. 9.9 and 9.10. For Fig. 9.9 the distance  $L$  was 160 cm, the accelerating voltage was 20.9 kv, and the buncher frequency was 7.5 Mc. The calculated limiting current density was about  $13 \mu a/cm^2$ , and it is seen that this is in good agreement with the experimental values shown in Fig. 9.9. In the case of Fig. 9.10,  $L$  was decreased to 99 cm, but the frequency was still 7.5 Mc. The value of the limiting current density given by theory was then  $40 \mu a/cm^2$ , which is also in good agreement with the data exhibited in Fig. 9.10. The two curves of  $\sigma$  against  $j$  corroborate the evidence given by Figs. 9.9 and 9.10; for example,<sup>32</sup> when  $L$  was shortened to 80 cm,  $V$  was 20.9 kv, and the frequency was raised to 15 Mc,  $\sigma$  was constant up to about  $65 \mu a/cm^2$ , above which it dropped. The theoretical  $j_1$  from Eq. 5 is about  $50 \mu a/cm^2$ . The largest current density about which experimental information is known was that used in the 8-in. isotron where  $L$  was 54 cm,  $V$  was 31.6 kv, and the frequency was 16 Mc. The theoretical<sup>31</sup>  $j_1$  was about  $200 \mu a/cm^2$ . High values of  $\sigma$  (5 or 6) were obtained for currents up to this order of magnitude.

It is clear from the above that, if isotrons are to be used at high current densities, i.e., about  $200 \mu a/cm^2$ , the accelerating voltage and frequency must be quite high and the distance between buncher and analyzer must be quite short. Under these conditions the isotron will separate large quantities of isotopes.

Theoretical considerations by Olum<sup>30</sup> indicate that space-charge neutralization may occur if isotrons are designed for use with high enough accelerating voltages.

## B. COLLECTION

In the first attempt to collect separated isotopes, the high-energy beam was simply allowed to impinge on a metal plate. It was not particularly surprising that the ion beam sputtered away any of the ions that came to rest on the plate. In the next attempt to collect, ions were decelerated so that they nearly came to rest as they came to the collector plate. If the energy of the ions was less than a few kilovolts, the sputtering was not serious, and it was possible to make successful collections. The decelerating potential was an additional complication, however, and it was not used in most of the collections. Instead, the high-energy beam was allowed to enter a deep cup and strike the back end of it. Platinum foils were placed around the sides of the cup. Almost all the material that was sputtered away from the back of the cup was then recovered from the sides of the cup, which were not exposed to the direct high-energy beam. In some of the collection runs, in order not to collect neutral atoms which might come directly from the source, the beam was deflected transversely into a pocket in which the collection was made in the manner just described. Both methods seemed to be successful.

The first collection runs were made early in the project to check the feasibility of collection and, more important, to see whether the electric methods of observing separation factor were as sound as they appeared. The small-current  $4\frac{1}{2}$ -in.-diameter isotron was used, and the samples obtained during the runs weighed from 50 to 100  $\mu g$ . The electric observations indicated a maximum separation factor of between 5 and 6 during the runs. Analyses made by Dunning and co-workers using an  $\alpha$ -particle and fission-counting technique gave 2.7, 3.2, and 3.9 for the three samples tested. Considering the fluctuations in the operation of the unit at that time, it was felt that the agreement was satisfactory.

A number of collections were made using the 12-in.-diameter tube in which considerably larger samples ( $\sim 10$  mg) were obtained. However, these collections were made using very low separation factors, and the results are included to show the effect of space charge on separation. The operating characteristics of the isotron for each run are shown in Table 9.1 together with the separation values obtained. In the early runs, there was little agreement between the electrically measured values of  $\sigma$  and those given by analysis. This was due partly

to the technique of measuring  $\sigma$  electrically and to the possibility of the beam sputtering unseparated uranium into the collector cups. Improvement in the collection technique and the methods of electrically measuring  $\sigma$  was indicated in the last run, where considerable precautions were taken. An attempt was made to make a collection using the high current density obtained when the tube was shortened and the voltage was increased to 32 kv. The attempt was abandoned, however, because of trouble with sparking and because the project was terminated at that time. The most successful run was made using the 8-in.-diameter isotron. Here a measured separation factor of 3 was obtained at a current density of  $200 \mu\text{a}/\text{cm}^2$ . The other characteristics of the run are shown in Table 9.1.

In general, it was felt that the problem of ion collection presented no insurmountable difficulties; in fact, the techniques developed at Berkeley for the calutron method at about the same time could have been applied directly to the isotron.

## 9. LARGE-SCALE OPERATION

It has by now become fairly clear just what an isotron can or cannot do. If an accelerating voltage of about 30 kv and a buncher frequency of about 16 Mc were used, it would be possible to produce, accelerate, bunch, and separate ion beams with current densities of about  $0.2 \text{ ma}/\text{cm}^2$ . The separation factor expected for such beams would probably be below 10 and above 3. Two harmonics would be adequate on the buncher, and the distance from buncher to analyzer would be about 50 cm. The  $U^{235}$  bunch would fall not midway between two  $U^{238}$  bunches but at about one-quarter of the bunch distance from one of the bunches. In doing this, the separation factor would be sacrificed for beam intensity since this would allow the beam to be made four times as large as if the bunches had been allowed to travel 100 cm—the position of maximum separation between  $U^{235}$  and  $U^{238}$  bunches. Similarly, twice as much buncher voltage would have to be applied. Actually, run No. 5 of Table 9.1 was made in this way.

On the basis of the above a production unit was designed. It consisted of a cylindrical vessel about 100 cm in diameter and about 150 cm long. The buncher was to have an area of 4 sq ft (24 by 24 in.), which was also the area of the analyzer and hence of the ion beam. By the time the project was terminated, the tube was constructed and evacuated to a low pressure, and the high-voltage supply was finished. The buncher and analyzer were nearly constructed as was the r-f equipment. On the other hand, there was no final design of the ion

source or collection system. A multiple-metal ion source was envisaged, and some work had been done on proposed units.

From this point on, this chapter takes on a considerably more conjectural tone. In fact, the following words are added only to complete an otherwise unfinished picture.

Assume that the unit will work at  $0.2 \text{ ma}/\text{cm}^2$ . It will then pass an ion current of 0.75 amp into the collector cups when no analyzer r-f voltage is turned on. Also assume that there is a separation factor of 5 and that 30 per cent of the current is wasted in the separation process. Suppose that the over-all efficiency is 3 per cent; i.e., 3 per cent of the  $U^{235}$  fed into the source, mixed of course, finds its way into the  $U^{235}$  collector pocket. (The above is particularly conjectural since the highest experimental value was a few hundredths of 1 per cent, although admittedly in units not designed for high efficiency.)

The question now is how such a unit can be used for the mass separation of  $U^{235}$  to high purity. Feynman has considered this problem carefully.<sup>20,29</sup> He finds, surprisingly enough, that in general it is better to use units of high current capacity and low separation factor than it is to use units of low current capacity and high  $\sigma$ . However, to get pure  $U^{235}$  with units of low  $\sigma$ , it is necessary to utilize the units in a cascade system. Thus Feynman visualizes the over-all separation as being accomplished in a series of successive stages, each stage effecting a separation factor of  $\sigma$ . Because of the increasing enrichment of  $U^{235}$  the later stages will have fewer units. Thus, if a  $\sigma$  of 5 is established, each successive stage will have one-fifth of the number of units of the preceding stage.

The operation of a typical intermediate stage is shown in Figs. 9.11 and 9.12. [This discussion on the cascade use of the isotron is taken nearly verbatim from reference 20, a report by R. P. Feynman.] For every unit of material which is put into the source, the fraction  $f$  goes to the walls as evaporating atoms from the source or is not otherwise collected as useful current. The useful current down the tube,  $1-f$ , is collected in two samples, one, called the "accept," in which the  $U^{235}$  is enriched, and the other, called the "reject," in which it is impoverished. The ratio of  $U^{235}$  to  $U^{238}$  in the accept is  $\sigma$  times as much as it is in the input material. Make the additional simplifying assumptions that the  $U^{235}/U^{238}$  ratio in the reject is just  $1/\sigma$  times that in the input and that the remaining uncollected material has the same concentration as the input. In this way the rejected material can be put into the preceding stage along with the input to this stage without having to mix substances of differing concentrations. The accept is of course sent on to the next stage.

The material which is scraped from the walls, as well as the material accepted from the preceding stage and that rejected from the next, will need to be chemically and mechanically processed and purified before it is in a form suitable to be put into the sources of the isotrons. Assume that for every gram of material handled by the processing equipment (including the removal of the material from the tube) a fraction  $\lambda$  is irrecoverably lost, leaving, for example, as fumes in the air. This loss  $\lambda$  may be expected to be a very small fraction, but the actual over-all efficiency (total output of stage/total input to stage) of a single stage, called  $\epsilon$ , may be further from 100 per cent than  $1 - \lambda$  if a large fraction  $f$  of the material put into the source is found on the walls and must be reworked. In this case the material must go through the chemical process many times before it finally makes its way into the accept or reject collection cups. The over-all efficiency  $\epsilon$  is given in terms of  $\lambda$  and  $f$  by the relation

$$1 - \epsilon = \frac{\lambda}{1 - f + \lambda f} \quad (6)$$

As a working basis, it has been assumed that the total separation factor accomplished by a plant of identical machines is 10,000, so that the original concentration ratio, 1 to 140, of  $U^{235}/U^{238}$  becomes 70 to 1. (The final results are quite insensitive to this particular choice provided it is somewhere in this same range.) The total output capacity  $M$  of all of the machines (isotrons) in the plant (per unit output of plant) has been computed as a function of  $\sigma$  and  $\epsilon$ , the results appearing in Fig. 9.12. (It should be noted that by the current of the machine is meant simply the total current collected by both the accept and reject cups. This is expected to be between 70 and 90 per cent of the total current in the beam arriving at the analyzer.)

The total material which goes through the chemical processes per day may also be obtained from Fig. 9.12, since it is  $M/[(1-f)(1-\lambda)]$  times the output of the plant. This is not accurate because it incorrectly includes the processing of the original raw material, but this is such a small fraction of the total material processed that little error is made in this way (if  $f$  is fairly large).

These curves may be used in the following way: Suppose that there are no losses of material ( $\epsilon = 1$ ). Suppose also that the separation factor of the machine is 10,000, so that only one stage is necessary. Then a number of machines capable of handling 140 units of output current for each unit of  $U^{235}$  produced would be needed. Suppose, however, that 10 times as much current could be put through the tube and

that the separation factor would thereby be decreased to only 2. Would it be worth while? It is seen from the curves that, at a factor of 2, about 860 times as much capacity as plant output is required, or only about six times what the capacity would be if the separation were perfect. Thus fewer machines (six-tenths as many) would be needed with the factor 2, and only 60 per cent as much material would have to be processed (albeit with more nuisance and care to keep partially separated fractions separately processed). If it can be assumed that other costs are reduced in the same ratio (the volume of raw material required is, however, increased), it can be concluded that it is worth while to work with the tubes with higher current but poor separation factor. This example serves to emphasize the rather unexpectedly good showing of machines of low separation factor when compared with devices of much higher factor.

What happens when the efficiencies are not perfect? If the over-all efficiency is 95 per cent, it can be seen that the machine with a factor 2 is quite impractical, whereas one whose factor is 2.78 is not. At 90 per cent efficiency efforts should be made to obtain a factor of 4 at least. Increases of separation factor beyond this yield less and less return as far as reducing the required number of machines is concerned.

Assume this particular case: Suppose that one machine carries a total current of 0.75 amp to the analyzer, of which only 70 per cent is collected in the accept and reject cups, or that the machine delivers 0.5 amp of useful current at a separation factor of, for example, 4.64. This is a capacity of 105 g per 24 hr of operation. Suppose that, of the material which is fed into the source, 97 per cent is found on the walls and only about one-thirtieth contributes to the useful current, so that  $f = 97$  per cent. Suppose also (at present no information is available on this point) that, of each kilogram handled in the chemical processing, 1 g is lost, so that  $\lambda = 0.001$ . Thus it is found from Eq. 6, with  $f = 0.97$  and  $\lambda = 0.001$ , that  $\epsilon$  is about 97 per cent. Looking at Fig. 9.12, with  $\sigma = 4.64$ ,  $M = 300$  is found.

This means that if it is desired to build a plant which will produce 1 kg of 70 to 1 pure  $U^{235}$  per day with such machines, their total output capacity must be 300 times 1000 g or 300 kg. Since each machine's capacity is about 100 g, about 3000 such machines will be needed. (If the separation were perfect in each machine, 1400 machines would be required.)

The total material processed, since  $1/[(1-f)(1-d)]$  is about 30, will be 30 times 300 kg or 9000 kg. (About two-thirds of this processing is of the wall scrapings in the first stage where the material processed has not yet been enriched. A high chemical efficiency is

not required here since the losses can be compensated by using more raw material.) The total raw material required under the original circumstances ( $\lambda = 0.001$ ), it turns out, contains only 40 per cent more  $U^{235}$  than is found in the product of the plant. That is to say, for a 100-g yield of  $U^{235}$ , 20 kg of raw material with  $U^{235}$  at one part in 140 would be required.

Feynman has given in his report<sup>20</sup> the curves showing the required raw material and other factors such as the time the material stands in the machine and the time for the machine to start turning out enriched material.

Table 9.1 — Operating Characteristics of the Isotron and the Separation Values Obtained<sup>21</sup>

Run No.	Date	Beam size, in.	L, cm	f, Mc	V, kv	M, g	j, $\mu\text{a}/\text{cm}^2$	i <sub>1</sub> , mg	i <sub>2</sub> , ma	m <sub>1</sub> , $\mu\text{g}$	m <sub>2</sub> , $\mu\text{g}$	Electrical analysis			
												$\sigma_1$	$\sigma_2$	$\sigma_1$	$\sigma_2$
12-in.-isotron collector															
1	11/16/42	6 by 4½	160	7.5	21.4		150	5.0		11	3	1.8		1.22	1.12
														±0.04	±0.05
2	11/1/42	6 by 4½	160	7.5	21.4	152	130	5.6	3.5	15.5	6.9	1.8	1.9	1.24	1.21
														±0.04	±0.04
3	12/30/42	7½ by 5½	160	7.5	21.4	272	19	0.45	0.38	10.8	8.0	4.7	5.86	2.56	2.29†
4	1/9/43	7½ by 5½	99	7.5	22.6	192	50	1.5	1.5	11.9	11.7	2.8	2.7	2.14	2.37
8-in.-isotron collector															
5†	2/4/43	?	54.7	16.0	33.7		208			7.0		2.7		2.95	

\*Definition of symbols:

L = Distance from buncher to analyzer

f = r-f frequency on buncher

V = d-c accelerating voltage

j = current density in vicinity of analyzer

M = mass of uranium used in run

i<sub>1</sub> = d-c current to collector cup 1

i<sub>2</sub> = d-c current to collector cup 2

m<sub>1</sub> = mass of separated sample collected in cup 1

m<sub>2</sub> = mass of separated sample collected in cup 2

$\sigma_1$  = separation factor for cup 1

$\sigma_2$  = separation factor for cup 2

†The material collected in the cups was converted to hexafluoride and analyzed in a mass spectroscopie by R. H. Crist of Columbia University

‡Analyzed by D. E. Hull of Columbia University by  $\alpha$ -particle and fission counting, using the small isotron (8 in. O.D.).




Fig. 9.1 — A typical metal arc source.




Fig. 9.2 — Schematic representation of typical isotron geometry.




Fig. 9.3 — A detailed view of a tungsten screen.




Fig. 9.4—Side view of transparent buncher grid b of Fig. 9.2.




Fig. 9.5—A detailed view of analyzer f of Fig. 9.2.




Fig. 9.6 — Effect of accelerating voltage on separation factor.




Fig. 9.7 — Effect of pressure on separation factor.  $\circ$ , experimental. —, theoretical.






Fig. 9.8 — Effect of buncher voltage (fundamental only) on separation factor.  $\circ$ , left side of tube.  $\times$ , right side of tube.




Fig. 9.9 — Effect of current density on separation factor. I.  $\circ$ , left cup.




Fig. 9.10 — Effect of current density on separation factor. II.  $\circ$ , top cup.  $\times$ , bottom cup.




Fig. 9.11 — Typical stage of unit output capacity (type I).




Fig. 9.12 — Number of machines and total material processed: over-all separation factor = 10,000 (type I stages).  $\sigma$  = separation factor per stage.  $n$  = number of stages =  $4/\log \sigma$ .  $f$  = fraction of source input found on walls.  $\lambda$  = losses of chemical and mechanical processing.  $\epsilon = 1 - (\lambda/1 - \epsilon + \lambda)$  = effective over-all efficiency. Number of machines required =  $M$  [output of plant (235)/output of one machine (235 + 238)]. Output (235) of machine in tonnes = output of machine in grams per work day. Total material chemically processed =  $M/(1 - 0.01 - \lambda)$  [plant output (approximate) for range  $f(1 - \epsilon) > 50$  per cent].

## REFERENCES

1. R. R. Wilson, Isotope Separator: General Description, Dec. 15, 1941.
2. R. P. Feynman, Effects of Space Charge; Use of Sine Waves, Jan. 5, 1942.
3. R. W. Thompson, Mass Spectrographic Analysis of Electron-controlled Arc Source, Jan. 6, 1942.
4. R. P. Feynman, Kinematics of the Separator, Apr. 25, 1942.
5. R. R. Wilson, Isotope Separator: General Progress Report, Mar. 3, 1942.
6. R. B. Sutton and R. W. Thompson, Preliminary Study of the Relative Abundance of the Ions  $Tu^+$ ,  $TuCl^+$ ,  $TuCl_2^+$ ,  $TuCl_3^+$ , and  $TuCl_4^+$  in a Discharge of  $TuCl_4$  Vapor, Apr. 1, 1942.
7. R. P. Feynman, The Formation of Bunches under the Influence of Space Charge, Apr. 14, 1942.
8. J. E. White, Corrosion of Materials in Tuballoy Chloride Ion Sources; Some Properties of the Tetrachloride and Tetrabromide, Apr. 24, 1942.
9. R. W. Thompson, Tuballoy Oxide Ions in a Metallic Tuballoy Discharge, Apr. 22, 1942.
10. P. Olum, Sputtering, Apr. 22, 1942.
11. R. W. Thompson and A. D. Schelberg, Vapor Pressures of  $TuCl_4$  and  $TuBr_4$ , May 4, 1942.
12. W. M. Woodward, Metallic Sources, May 15, 1942.
13. H. D. Smyth and R. R. Wilson, General Report, May 15, 1942.
14. R. W. Thompson and J. E. White, Mass Spectrometer Investigation of Vibrator Ion Source, June 21, 1942.
15. B. McDuffie, A. D. Schelberg, R. W. Thompson, and J. E. White, Memorandum on Preparation of  $TuI_4$ , July 14, 1942.
16. B. McDuffie, Possibility of Using Liquid Ammonia as Solvent in the Preparation of Tubaceous Salts, July 29, 1942.
17. R. P. Feynman, The Design of the Buncher and Analyzer, Aug. 26, 1942.
18. H. D. Smyth and R. R. Wilson, General Report, Aug. 20, 1942.
19. J. L. Fowler, The 4½-in. Isotron, July 1, 1942.
20. R. P. Feynman, A Note on the Cascade Operation of Isotrons, Sept. 8, 1942.
21. B. McDuffie, Attempted Preparation of Tuballoy Hexacarbonyl, Oct. 5, 1942.
22. L. G. Smith, Summary of Work on the 12-in. Isotron, Oct. 1, 1942.
23. R. B. Sutton, Progress on the 4½-in. Isotron Tube, July 30, 1942.
24. A. D. Schelberg and R. W. Thompson, Saturated Vapor Pressures of  $TuCl_4$ ,  $TuBr_4$ , and  $TuI_4$ , Oct. 10, 1942.
25. R. W. Thompson, The Production of Tuballoy Metal for an Isotron Plant I, Oct. 10, 1942.
26. L. G. Smith, Report of Work on the 12-in. Isotron (December 10-19, 1942), Dec. 31, 1942.
27. M. B. Sampson, Report of Work on the 12-in. Tube (December 19-26, 1942), Jan. 3, 1943.
28. P. Olum, The Simultaneous Use of Several Different Kinds of Ion, Jan. 26, 1943.
29. R. P. Feynman, The Operation of Isotrons in Cascade, Jan. 27, 1943.
30. E. W. Heller, Design of Sandwich Source, Feb. 5, 1943.
31. E. W. Heller, Estimated Costs of Buncher and Analyzer for 36-in. Isotron, Feb. 9, 1943.
32. L. G. Smith, Summary of Work on the 12-in. Isotron (Continued), Feb. 11, 1943.
33. R. W. Wilkins, Collimation of the Ion Beam in the 8-in. Isotron, Feb. 17, 1943.
34. J. W. DeWise, Bunching at Low Current Densities, Feb. 22, 1943.
35. R. P. Feynman, Factors Which Influence the Separation, Feb. 22, 1943.

36. A. D. Schelberg, R. W. Thompson, and J. E. White, The Characteristics of an Arc in Tuballoy Tetrachloride Vapor, Nov. 1, 1942.
37. W. A. Haas, R. F. Equipment for Isotrons, Feb. 25, 1943.
38. P. Olum, An Evaluation of the Influence of Space Charge on the Operation of the Isotron, Mar. 4, 1943.
39. E. E. Anderson, R. L. Kamm, E. D. Klema, J. E. Mack, T. M. Snyder, W. H. Surber, and C. M. Turner, Ion Sources, Mar. 15, 1943.
40. J. J. Gilvarry, R. Perry, E. H. Porter, A. D. Schelberg, and R. W. Thompson, An Extended Two Dimensional Ion Source Using an Arc in  $TuBr_4$  Vapor, Jan. 15, 1943.
41. H. S. Bridge, Experimental Work on Space Charge Debunching of Ions, Mar. 15, 1943.
42. L. S. Lavatchi, Metal Sources of the 8-in. Isotron, Mar. 17, 1943.
43. H. D. Smyth, Final Report, Oct. 15, 1943.