

COHERENT OPTICAL SIGNATURES OF ELECTRON MICROBUNCHING IN LASER-DRIVEN PLASMA ACCELERATORS

A. H. Lumpkin¹, M. LaBerge², D. W. Rule³, R. Zgadzaj², A. Hannasch², O. Zarini^{4,5}, B. Bowers²,
A. Irman⁴, J. P. Couperus Cabadag⁴, A. Debus⁴, A. Köhler^{4,5}, U. Schramm^{4,5}, M. C. Downer^{*2}

¹Accelerator Division, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, IL 60510 USA

²Physics Department, Univ. of Texas-Austin, Austin, TX 78712 USA

³Silver Spring, Maryland 20904 USA

⁴Institute of Radiation Physics, Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf, 01328 Dresden, Germany

⁵Technische Universität Dresden, 01062 Dresden, Germany

ABSTRACT

We report observations of coherent optical transition radiation interferometry (COTRI) patterns generated by microbunched ~ 200 -MeV electrons as they emerge from a laser-plasma accelerator. The divergence of the microbunched portion of electrons, deduced by comparison to a COTRI model, is $\sim 9\times$ smaller than the ~ 3 mrad ensemble beam divergence, while the radius of the microbunched beam, obtained from COTR images on the same shot, is < 3 microns. The combined results show that the microbunched distribution has estimated transverse normalized emittance ~ 0.4 mm mrad.

Key words: laser-plasma accelerator, coherent optical transition radiation, emittance

Index: 41.60

*downer@physics.utexas.edu

Periodic longitudinal density modulation of relativistic electron beams (*e*-beams) at optical wavelengths (microbunching) gives rise to coherent light emission in such forms as synchrotron radiation, including the free-electron laser (FEL) [1,2], and optical transition radiation (OTR) in its coherent form (COTR). The latter has been observed from FELs [3,4] and laser-driven plasma accelerators (LPAs) [5-7]. The FEL mechanism depends fundamentally on growth of microbunching at the resonant wavelength and its harmonics [8]. In both FELs and LPAs, COTR can characterize microbunched portions of electrons [3-7]. Microbunching in an FEL oscillator was observed indirectly via buildup of FEL output power to saturation [2]. The first direct time-resolved observation of microbunching in an FEL oscillator [9] used an off-phase final rf accelerator stage to streak a beam modulated at 60 μm wavelength, thereby mapping microbunch arrival time onto energy, measured in an electron spectrometer. With the advent of self-amplified spontaneous emission (SASE) FELs with a single-pass through a long amplifier chain, FEL light and the *e*-beam became accessible after each undulator, enabling tracking of FEL power and microbunching. The first measurements of microbunching evolution at visible wavelengths [3, 4] used COTR interferometry (COTRI) [10] to track microbunched features through exponential gain, saturation, and post-saturation [4]. An analytic model of COTRI fringe patterns showed growth of a microbunched transverse core in the exponential gain regime, and its subsequent reduction after saturation [4, 11]. Subsequently, such experiments were extended to vacuum ultraviolet wavelengths, further benchmarking this model [12, 13]. These experiments foreshadowed today's x-ray SASE-FELs [2, 14-18] by benchmarking the GENESIS simulation code [19] used in their prediction and development [20].

Here, we apply COTRI for the first time to LPAs [21], a class of compact accelerators that has been in scientific literature for 40 years [22], with compact LPA-driven FELs [23] now prominent amongst a growing list of their potential applications. Particle-in-cell simulations have predicted microbunching in LPAs [24, 25], which might be used to seed an FEL. Indeed faster start-up of a SASE-FEL from a microbunched input beam than from noise has been reported [26]. Our measurements yield the first evaluation of beam emittance of the microbunched subset of LPA electrons with COTR techniques. Microbunching in LPAs is not accessible with betatron x-ray spectroscopy [27], pepper-pot measurements [28], scintillator-based methods [29], or other LPA *e*-beam diagnostics [30]. Detailed understanding of microbunching is critical to developing LPAs and LPA-driven FELs. Past experiments used

COTR to deduce the presence of sub-bunches located in adjacent LPA buckets [5] or of an intrabunch slice of sub-per cent energy spread [7]. Here we use interference of COTR from 2 tandem foils downstream of the LPA to deduce the presence of visible-wavelength microbunching within the dominant quasi-monoenergetic component of an electron bunch that was ionization-injected [31, 32] into, and accelerated to ~ 200 MeV within, the leading plasma bubble of a strongly nonlinear LPA. Our results show that COTR gain relative to incoherent OTR rivals that obtained previously in a saturated SASE-FEL. As a result, COTR is intense enough to distribute to multiple cameras with different frequency filters or imaging modalities on each shot, enabling thorough characterization. One group of cameras detects COTR imaged from the surface of the first foil [hereafter “near-field” (NF) images], which when analyzed using a coherent point-spread function determine beam-size at the LPA exit. Other cameras record COTR in the focal plane of a collecting lens [hereafter “far-field” (FF) patterns], thereby measuring its angular distribution. Fringes in FF data, which are consistent with Wartski two-foil COTRI [10], fall outside of the $1/\gamma$ emission cone angle of single-foil COTR. Here, γ is the relativistic Lorentz factor of the electrons. High fringe visibility indicates microbunched electrons diverge significantly less than the e -beam-ensemble. A COTRI model [4, 11] of FF data quantifies this divergence. Combined frequency-filtered beam-size and divergence data yield single-shot, transverse emittance estimates of the microbunched electrons.

Our experiments used pulses from the DRACO laser (central wavelength 800 nm, energy up to 4 J on target, pulse length 27 fs FWHM) [32, 33] at Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf. These were focused to ~ 20 μm (FWHM) at the center of a 3-mm-long He gas jet (with 3% Nitrogen and ~ 0.5 -mm-long entrance and exit ramps) to drive LPAs in a self-truncated ionization-injection regime [31] in plasma of density $n_e \sim 3 \times 10^{18} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ [32]. Electron bunches with 225 ± 25 pC charge in a 200 MeV ($\gamma = 400$) quasi-monoenergetic peak ($\sigma_E = 0.042$ rms, or 10% FWHM, ensemble energy spread) and $\sigma_\theta = 3$ mrad rms ensemble divergence, plus a weak poly-energetic background [see Fig. S.7b in Supplementary Material] emerged from the LPA. A 75- μm -thick Al laser foil 700 μm from the jet exit, tilted $\sim 3^\circ$ off normal (Fig. 1a), blocked the drive laser pulse. An aluminized Kapton foil 1 mm downstream blocked $\mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B}$ electrons of low energy and associated COTR from the back of the blocking foil [34] (Fig. 1b). Indeed, direct laser excitation of the blocking foil with the gas jet turned off yielded no detectable OTR.




FIG. 1: Color online. **(a)** Schematic setup showing path of LPA drive laser pulse (red), gas jet, OTR foil, Si mirror, and OTR imaging-detection configuration. **(b)** Detail of gas jet exit, showing e -bunch, drive laser path, blocking foil and aluminized Kapton OTR foil. **(c)** NF data at 600 nm, imaged from Kapton foil to CCD through linear polarizer, showing two point-spread function lobes. **(d)** FF data at 633 nm for same shot, recorded with compound lens (microscope objective + single-element lens) and no polarization analyzer, showing interference fringes. Angular resolution: 0.35 ± 0.05 mrad/pixel, or ~ 6 pixels/fringe at eighth fringe. Color legend applies to (c) and (d).

With the gas jet turned on, LPA electrons generated forward OTR/COTR from the aluminized back surface of the Kapton foil. Several dozen foil pairs were mounted on a 15-cm diameter wheel, which rotated a fresh pair into position for each shot. A 200-μm-thick polished, non-aluminized Si wafer oriented at 45° degrees to the e -beam at distance $L = 18.5$ mm downstream of the Kapton foil redirected the foil's OTR/COTR to a 4-cm focal length microscope objective with collection angle 0.14 rad, which relayed it to one group of charge-coupled device (CCD) cameras (12-bit, 3.75-μm square pixels) via beam splitters (Fig. 1a) to record NF images (Fig. 1c). Additionally, the electron bunch generated reflected COTR from the Si surface (Fig. 1a). COTR from these two surfaces, which the microscope objective and an additional 15-cm focal-length lens (see Fig. 1a) relayed to another CCD, formed interference fringes in FF images (Fig. 1d). For results reported here, two CCDs recorded NF images through orthogonal linear polarization analyzers parallel (x) and perpendicular (y) to the drive laser polarization at $\lambda = 600 \pm 5$ nm. These were indistinguishable from 633 nm NF images. Generally, for a given shot, NF images differed significantly only when recorded at central wavelengths separated by $> \sim 50$ nm. Another CCD recorded un-polarized FF images at observation wavelength $\lambda = 633 \pm 5$ nm. Here polarizers proved unnecessary because the ratio of

y - to x -polarized intensity along θ_x (or x - to y -pol along θ_y) was ≤ 0.025 for all interference peaks (see Sec. 2e of Supplementary Material for details).

When the laser focus in the gas jet was adjusted to positions that yielded poly-energetic electron distributions similar to the background in the present LPA output, but with no quasi-monoenergetic peak, OTR signals weakened $\sim 10\times$. Thus, the quasi-monoenergetic peak is the dominant source of reported COTR signals in the ionization-injected regime. These signals were intense enough to necessitate neutral density filters to prevent camera saturation. When we operated the accelerator in different regimes --- e.g. by removing the nitrogen dopant and relying on self-injection, or by introducing a shock front near the gas jet entrance to create a local density down-ramp [35] --- we observed strongly correlated variations in COTR signal strength normalized to accelerated charge. Sec. 4 of Supplementary Material summarizes our preliminary observations of these correlations. Since foil and laser parameters were unchanged, these variations suggested that the LPA process -- not interaction of electrons with foils or reflected laser fields --- created microbunching responsible for observed COTR. Beam scattering by a foil can *reduce* coherent emission from microbunching when the projected multiple scattering angle exceeds the OTR opening angle $1/\gamma$ [36]. The latter is 2.3 mrad, while the Bethe-Ashkin formula [37] yields a lower value (1.1 mrad) of the former for the Al foil, a higher value (2.6 mrad) for the 45° Si mirror. To corroborate this conclusion, we measured space/angle-integrated forward COTR spectra in a downstream IR-to-UV spectrometer [38]. With the Si wafer temporarily removed, we observed strong IR and visible light down to $\lambda \sim 300$ nm. When we re-inserted the Si wafer and placed a new thin OTR foil downstream of it, however, only IR light remained strong. This showed that microbunching responsible for visible COTR survived transit through ≤ 75 μm Al, but not ≥ 200 $\mu\text{m}/\cos 45^\circ$ Si foils. We will present space/angle-integrated COTR spectra over a 5-octave spectral range in a planned forthcoming paper. Since FF images involve interference between COTR from 2 foils separated by ~ 2 cm, normalized emittance ε_n and/or microbunching properties could change as a bunch with finite σ_E propagates between them [39]. Explicit calculations, however, show that ε_n grows by $< 1\%$ for our conditions (see Sec. 2a of Supplementary Material for details). Moreover, we observed near-constant single-foil integrated COTR intensity for Al foil positions over a ~ 3 cm range from the LPA exit, consistent with findings of Lin et al. [7], suggesting that microbunching is stable within the COTRI apparatus.

Currents induced when a charged particle beam enters and exits a foil generate, respectively, backward and forward OTR in cones of half-angle $1/\gamma$ around the specular reflection or beam direction [40-42]. Thus, the configuration in Fig. 1a generates OTR at 90° to the beam direction, enabling minimally invasive OTR characterization. The number W_I of OTR photons that a single electron generates per unit frequency ω per unit solid angle Ω in a single foil is

$$\frac{d^2 W_I}{d\omega d\Omega} = \frac{e^2}{\hbar c} \frac{1}{\pi^2 \omega} \frac{(\theta_x^2 + \theta_y^2)}{(\gamma^{-2} + \theta_x^2 + \theta_y^2)^2} \quad (1)$$

where $\hbar$ is Planck's constant/ 2π , e is electron charge, c is the speed of light, and θ_x and θ_y are radiation angles [11]. The solid black curve in Fig. 2a shows the angular distribution of OTR at $\lambda = 633 \pm 5$ nm that a 200 MeV, N -electron bunch with divergence $\sigma_{x'} = \sigma_{y'} = s_q = 0.2$ mrad generates in one foil. There is one peak at $\theta_x = \theta_y = 1/\gamma \sim 2.3$ mrad. When N_B of the N particles are microbunched, a coherence function $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{k})$ becomes involved, and for two foils an interference function $\mathbf{I}(\mathbf{k})$. The spectral angular distribution function then becomes

$$\frac{d^2 W}{d\omega d\Omega} = |r_{\parallel, \perp}|^2 \frac{d^2 W_I}{d\omega d\Omega} [N \mathbf{I}(\mathbf{k}) + N_B(N_B - 1) \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{k})] \quad (2)$$

where $|r_{\parallel, \perp}|^2$ is reflectance of the second (Si) foil for parallel, perpendicular polarization components, respectively. The reflectance reduces intensity of OTR from the first foil (via reflection from Si) and OTR generated at the Si wafer (via Eq. 2) equivalently. $\mathbf{I}(\mathbf{k})$ is [10]

$$\mathbf{I}(\mathbf{k}) = 4 \sin^2 \left[\frac{kL}{4} (\gamma^{-2} + \theta_x^2 + \theta_y^2) \right] \quad (3)$$

where $k = |\mathbf{k}| = 2\pi/\lambda$, using a small-angle approximation. Peaks of $\mathbf{I}(\mathbf{k})$ occur at angles $\theta_x^2 + \theta_y^2 = (2\lambda/L)(p - p_0)$, where $p = 1/2, 3/2, \dots$, and $p_0 = L/(2\lambda\gamma^2)$. Adjacent peaks are separated by $\Delta(\theta_x^2 + \theta_y^2) = 2\lambda/L$. Choosing $L = 18.5$ mm provided good fringe contrast, while enabling near-field optics to focus on the first foil. The dashed red curve in Fig. 2a shows the two-foil OTR angular distribution for $L = 18.5$ mm, with λ , γ and s_q as for the black curve. Now there are multiple fringes. At this γ , tilt of the 2nd foil introduces negligible intensity asymmetry, as is evident also from Eq. 1 of ref. [41]. The coherence function can be defined as

$$\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{k}) = [H_1(\mathbf{k}) - H_2(\mathbf{k})]^2 + H_1(\mathbf{k})H_2(\mathbf{k})\mathbf{I}(\mathbf{k}) \quad (4)$$

where $H_j(\mathbf{k}) = r_j(\mathbf{k})/Q = g_j(k_x)g_j(k_y)F(k_z)$ for an e -bunch of charge distribution $\rho_j(\mathbf{x})$ and total charge Q , with $j = 1, 2$. Here we have introduced two microbunch form factors, H_1 and H_2 , to

account for the increase in bunch radius from the first to the second interferometer foil due to beam divergence. Each $H_j(\mathbf{k})$ is a product of Fourier transforms $g_j(k_i) = \exp(-\sigma_i^2 k_i^2/2)$ of transverse ($i=x,y$) charge form factors (with $k_i \approx k\theta_i$), and of longitudinal form factor $F_z(k_z) = \exp(-\sigma_z^2 k_z^2/2)$, with $k_z \sim k$ and $\theta \ll 1$, assuming the Fourier transform $\rho_j(\mathbf{k})$ of $\rho_j(\mathbf{x})$ is separable. If $J(\mathbf{k}) \ll 1$ or $N_B \rightarrow 0$, only the incoherent OTR term ($\sim N$) remains in Eq. (2).




FIG. 2. Color online. **(a)** Analytical calculations of angular distributions of OTR at $\lambda = 633 \pm 5$ nm generated by 200 MeV electron bunch with divergence $\sigma_\theta = 0.2$ mrad: in one foil (solid black curve) and in a two-foil interferometer with $L = 18.5$ mm and beam radius $s_r^{(1)} = s_r^{(2)} = 2 \mu\text{m}$ at both foils 1 and 2 (dashed red). **(b)** Calculated dependence of COTRI fringe visibility on σ_θ and σ_r . $\theta < 0$: beam-divergence effect for $\sigma_\theta = 0.5$ mrad (solid blue curve) and 1.0 mrad (dashed black) for $s_r^{(1)} = s_r^{(2)} = 2 \mu\text{m}$. $\theta > 0$: effect of expanding $s_r^{(2)}$ for fixed $s_r^{(1)} = 2 \mu\text{m}$, $\sigma_\theta = 0.5$ -mrad, with curves labeled $s_r^{(1)} + s_r^{(2)} \mu\text{m}$ in legend.

Figure 2b illustrates how transverse charge form factors determine COTR gain vs. θ , for azimuthally symmetric ($\sigma_r = \sigma_x = \sigma_y$) beams of microbunched fraction $f_B = N_B/N = 0.01$. The left side ($\theta < 0$) shows effects of varying microbunched beam divergence ($s_q = 0.5, 1.0$ mrad) alone, with σ_r held fixed at $2 \mu\text{m}$ at both foils; the right side ($\theta > 0$) shows the additional unavoidable effect of increased beam radius at foil 2 ($s_r^{(2)} = 2, 5, 10 \mu\text{m}$) for fixed $s_q = 0.5$ mrad and $s_r^{(1)} = 2 \mu\text{m}$. As an example, for $s_r^{(2)} = 5\text{-}\mu\text{m}$, $s_q = 0.5$ -mrad, 8-9 fringes are enhanced out to $\theta > 20$ mrad. In contrast, past COTRI studies of SASE-FELs involved beam radii $25 \mu\text{m} < \sigma_{x,y} < 200 \mu\text{m}$, and yielded at most 3-4 fringes out to only $\theta \sim 5$ mrad [4, 11]. LPA beams are often an order of magnitude smaller, so coherent enhancements can be proportionately larger and can

extend to $\theta > 30$ mrad. Generally, optical detection bandwidth $\Delta\lambda$, electron energy bandwidth $\Delta\gamma$, s_q and σ_r , can all affect fringe visibility in a FF angular distribution pattern. Our chosen bandwidth filter ($\Delta\lambda = 10$ nm), however, minimizes the bandwidth effect, while for our chosen L , the angles $\theta_{x,y}$ at which $I(k)$ peaks are, according to Eq. (3), nearly γ -independent for $300 < \gamma < 500$ (see Sec. 2d of Supplementary Material for details). Thus we can relate observed fringe number directly to σ_θ and σ_r of the contributing portion of the beam and observed COTR intensity directly to f_B . Consequently, observation of ≥ 3 fringes implies sub-mrad divergence and few- μm beam radius. Simultaneously, by calibrating integrated signal on the FF camera, we determine $J(k)$, and thus COTR gain ($\sim N_B^2/N$ for $N_B \gg 1$) and f_B . We find $N = 1.47 \times 10^9$ electrons in the quasi-monoenergetic peak (i.e. $eN = 235$ pC) and $N_B = 1.8 \times 10^7$ (i.e. $eN_B \approx 3$ pC), implying $f_B \approx 0.013$ and $N_B^2/N \approx 240,000$. These results took into account single-electron, single-foil OTR source energy [43] and charge in the quasi-monoenergetic peak determined from a calibrated LANEX screen [44] in the spectrometer on the same shot (see Sec. 1 of Supplementary Material). Thus coherent enhancements dominate over incoherent OTR.




FIG. 3: Color online. **(a)** Azimuthally averaged COTRI fringes vs. θ from Fig. 1d (solid black curve). See Supplementary Material for description of averaging procedure. Inset: outermost fringes magnified. Dotted red curve: analytical COTRI model using $s_q = 0.33$ mrad, and $\sigma_x = 2.75$ μm and 6.6 μm at foils 1 and 2, respectively. **(b)** x -projection of NF image in Fig. 1c from same shot (solid black curve), with COTR model using $\sigma_x = 2.75$ - μm (dotted red curve).

The FF image in Fig. 1d has 8 to 9 visible fringes. Azimuthally asymmetric fringes indicate a non-Gaussian angular distribution of the COTR source. Here, to simplify analysis, we averaged this data azimuthally (Sec. 2b of Supplementary Material describes the averaging procedure). Fig. 3a compares the resulting fringe pattern (black curve) to analytical results. Since outer

fringes (Fig. 3a, inset) are more sensitive to s_q than inner fringes, whereas amplitudes of the latter are more sensitive to neglected non-Gaussian features of the beam angular distribution, we analyzed s_q by fitting COTRI model calculations for various s_q to the 4th thru 9th fringes. Beam radii $s_r^{(1)}$ and $s_r^{(2)}$ also enter these calculations (see Fig. 2b). We determined $s_r^{(1)}$ independently by analyzing NF image Fig. 1c for the same shot. Fig. 3b compares y -averaged, x -polarized NF data (black curve) to a COTR calculation for $s_x^{(1)} = 2.75 \mu\text{m}$ (red-dotted). Here, calculated curves take into account the optical collection angle via Eq. 26 of Ref. [45]. Left-right asymmetry of NF data probably results from distortions of $\rho(x)$ from a Gaussian shape, which we introduced into the model with an empirical skew parameter. Full analysis yields $s_x^{(1)} = 2.75^{+0.45}_{-0.30} \mu\text{m}$. We generated statistics underlying the stated uncertainty by comparing single-shot data to an ensemble of single-parameter model curves (see Sec. 3 of Supplementary Material for details). We then calculated $s_r^{(2)}$ by adding $s_x^{(1)}$ and $s_q L$ in quadrature. Finally, we fit the black curve in Fig. 3a to an ensemble of model curves, with s_q as the sole free parameter and minimized χ^2 . The dotted red curve in Fig. 3a shows the best-fit COTRI curve. Full analysis (see Sec. 2f of Supplementary Material), yields $s_q = 0.33^{+0.12}_{-0.05} \text{ mrad}$, 9 $\times$ smaller than the ensemble-divergence [32]. Only sub-mrad s_q can explain 8 to 9 visible fringes. When combined with $s_x^{(1)}$, we estimate normalized emittance $\epsilon_{\text{nx}} = 0.36^{+0.19}_{-0.09} \text{ mm mrad (rms)}$ for the microbunched beam portion at foil 1. y -polarized NF data yielded similar values. Significant position-momentum correlation, if present, would reduce this emittance value [46].

To illustrate more complex beam structure, and wider COTRI diagnostic possibilities, Fig. 4a shows FF data for a different shot. Here, a dark node runs vertically through the interference pattern, a feature not seen in Fig. 1d, nor in most shots. The corresponding NF image (Fig. 4b) shows two pairs of point-spread-function lobes separated by $\sim 6 \mu\text{m}$ along x , instead of one pair as in Fig. 1c, suggesting that two beamlets emerged side-by-side from the LPA, as seen in some simulations of bubble-regime LPAs [47]. Fig. 4c shows a reconstruction of the main qualitative features of Fig. 4a by modeling two beamlets, each with $\sigma_\theta = 0.6 \text{ mrad}$, with phase and angular trajectories differing by 0.75π and 2 mrad , respectively. This example illustrates that FF COTRI patterns contain signatures of the phase and trajectory of multiple microbunched beamlets, when present. Such bunch pairs, if controllable, could open new LPA applications -- e.g. pump-probe

experiments or two-color FELs. Single-shot diagnosis demonstrated here could help develop control methods for generating bunch pairs reliably.




FIG. 4: Color online. (a) COTR angular distribution pattern for shot with vertical dark band due to interference of two beamlets. (b) y-polarized NF image on same shot, showing two double-lobed patterns. (c) COTRI image reconstructed from two-beamlet model. Color legend applies to all panels.

In summary, we identified microbunched *e*-beamlets from LPAs, which generate visible COTR $>10^5$ times stronger than incoherent OTR. We discovered and modeled COTRI fringes, and applied COTRI, along with COTR imaging and calibrated COTR energy measurements, for the first time to LPAs. This coordinated triad of COTR measurements revealed divergences and emittances of microbunched beamlets that are less than those of the electron ensemble, which motivates SASE-FEL startup experiments. Although single-wavelength COTR measurements alone do not distinguish periodic longitudinal density modulation from sharp density spikes, time-domain reconstructions from space/angle-integrated COTR spectra [38] and simulations of ionization-injected LPAs [24] indicate that micro-bunched beamlets studied here were longitudinally modulated. Future directions include understanding correlations among COTR intensity, LPA operating regime, and microbunching mechanisms, and developing strategies for diagnosing, tuning and optimizing microbunching over a wide range of wavelengths.

A.H.L. acknowledges discussions with K.-J. Kim (ANL) on microbunching in FELs and R. Thurman-Keup (FNAL) on COTRI, and support from Fermi Research Alliance, LLC under DoE Contract DE-AC02-07CH11359. U. Texas authors acknowledge support from DoE grant DE-SC0011617, and M.C.D. from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation with sponsorship from R. Sauerbrey. Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf authors acknowledge support from the Helmholtz Association under program Matter and Technology, topic Accelerator R&D.

References

- [1] J. M. J. Madey, *J. Appl. Phys.* **42**, 1906 (1971).
- [2] Kwang-Je Kim, Zhirong Huang, and Ryan Lindberg, *Synchrotron Radiation and Free-Electron Lasers: Principles of Coherent X-ray Generation* (Cambridge University Press, 2017).
- [3] A.H. Lumpkin, R. Dejus, W.J. Berg, M. Borland, Y.C. Chae, E. Moog, N.S. Sereno, and B.X. Yang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 79 (2001).
- [4] A. H. Lumpkin *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 234801 (2002).
- [5] Y. Glinec, J. Faure, A. Norlin, A. Pukhov, and V. Malka, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 194801 (2007).
- [6] O. Lundh *et al.*, *Nat. Phys.* **7**, 219 (2011).
- [7] C. Lin *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 094801 (2012).
- [8] Kwang-Je Kim, *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. Phys. Res. A* **250**, 396 (1986).
- [9] Kenneth N. Ricci and Todd I. Smith, *Phys. Rev. ST-Accel. and Beams* **3**, 032801 (2000).
- [10] L. Wartski, S. Roland, J. Lasalle, M. Bolore, and G. Fillippi, *J. Appl. Phys.* **46**, 3644 (1975).
- [11] D.W. Rule and A.H. Lumpkin, in *Proceedings of the 2001 Particle Accelerator Conference*, vol. 2. (IEEE, Piscataway, NJ, 2001), pp. 1288-1290.
- [12] A.H. Lumpkin, R.J. Dejus and D.W. Rule, in *Proceedings, 26th International Conference, Free Electron Laser 2004* (Comitato Conferenze Elettra, Trieste, Italy, 2004), pp. 519-522.
- [13] A.H. Lumpkin, Y.-C. Chae, R.J. Dejus, M. Erdmann, J.W. Lewellen, and Y. Li, in *Proceedings, 26th International Conference, Free Electron Laser 2004* (Comitato Conferenze Elettra, Trieste, Italy, 2004), pp. 523-526.
- [14] J. Arthur *et al.*, “Linac Coherent Light Source (LCLS) Conceptual Design Report”, SLAC Report SLAC-R-593 (2002).
- [15] JADRI/Spring-8 and Harima RIKEN, “SPring-8 Compact SASE Source Conceptual Design Report,” eds. T. Tanake and T. Shintake (2005).
- [16] H.-S. Kang, K.-W. Kim, and I.-S. Ko, “Current Status of the PAL-XFEL Project” in *Proceedings, International Particle Accelerator Conference 2014*, (JACoW Publishing, Dresden, Germany, 2014), pp. 2897-2899.
- [17] R. Brinkman, B. Faatz, K. Flöttmann, J. Rossbach, J.R. Schneider, H. Schult-Schrepping, D. Trines, T. Tschentscher, and H. Weise, “TESLA XFEL: First stage of the X-ray Laser Laboratory”, DESY, Report TESLA FEL2002-09 (2002).
- [18] Paul Scherrer Institute (PSI), “Swiss FEL Conceptual Design Report”, ed. R. Ganter (2010).
- [19] S. Reiche, *Nucl. Instr. Meth. Phys. Res. A* **429**, 243 (1999).
- [20] S.V. Milton *et al.*, *Science* **292**, 2037 (2002).
- [21] S. M. Hooker, *Nat. Photonics* **7**, 775 (2013).
- [22] T. Tajima and J.M. Dawson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43**, 267 (1979).
- [23] F. Gruener *et al.*, *Appl. Phys. B* **86**, 431 (2007); K. Nakajima, *Nat. Phys.* **4**, 92 (2008); T. André *et al.*, *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 1334 (2018).
- [24] X. L. Xu *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 034801 (2016).
- [25] K. Németh, B. Shen, Y. Li, H. Shang, R. Crowell, K.C. Harkay, and J.R. Cary, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 095002 (2008).
- [26] A. H. Lumpkin, R. J. Dejus and N. S. Sereno, *Phys. Rev. ST Accel. Beams* **12**, 040704 (2009).
- [27] G.R. Plateau *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 064802 (2012).
- [28] E. Brunetti *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 215007 (2010); A. Cianchi *et al.*, *Nucl. Instr. Meth. Phys. Res. A* **720**, 153 (2013).

- [29] S. K. Barber *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 104801 (2017).
- [30] M. C. Downer, R. Zgadzaj, A. Debus, U. Schramm, and M.C. Kaluza, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 035002 (2018).
- [31] M. Mirzaie *et al.*, *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 14659 (2015).
- [32] J. Couperus *et al.*, *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 487 (2017); A. Irman, J. P. Couperus, A. Debus, A. Köhler, J. M. Krämer, R. Pausch, O. Zarini, and U. Schramm, *Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion* **60**, 044015 (2018).
- [33] U. Schramm *et al.*, in *Proceedings, International Particle Accelerator Conference 2017* (IOP Publishing, Copenhagen, Denmark, 2017), IOP Conf. Series: *Journal of Physics: Conf. Series* **874**, 012028.
- [34] H. Popescu, D.D. Batton, and F. Amiranoff, *Phys. Plasmas* **12**, 063106 (2005).
- [35] K. Schmid, A. Buck, C. M. S. Sears, J. M. Mikhailova, R. Tautz, D. Hermann, M. Geissler, F. Krausz and L. Veisz, *Phys. Rev. ST Accel. Beams* **13**, 091301 (2010).
- [36] A. Murokh, E. Hemsing, and J. Rosenzweig, in *Proceedings, Particle Accelerator Conference 2009*, (JACoW Publishing, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 2009), TH6REP021.
- [37] E. Segrè *et al.*, *Experimental Nuclear Physics, Vol. I* (John Wiley and Sons, NY, 1953), p.285.
- [38] O. Zarini *et al.*, in *Proceedings, Advanced Accelerator Concepts Workshop 2018*, (IEEE, Breckenridge, CO, USA, 2018).
- [39] M. Miglioratti, A. Bacci, C. Benedetti, E. Chiadroni, M. Ferrario, A. Mostacci, L. Palumbo, A. R. Rossi, L. Serafini and P. Antici, *Phys. Rev. ST Accel. Beams* **16**, 011302 (2013).
- [40] V. L. Ginzburg and I. M. Frank, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **16**, 15 (1946).
- [41] D. W. Rule, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. Phys. Res. B* **24/25**, 901-904 (1987).
- [42] A. H. Lumpkin, in *Proceedings, Accelerator Instrumentation Workshop 1990*, (Batavia, IL, 1991) *AIP Conf. Proceedings* **229**, pp. 151-179.
- [43] C.B. Schroeder, E. Esarey, J. van Tilborg, and W.P. Leemans, *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 016501 (2004).
- [44] T. Kurz *et al.*, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **89**, 093303 (2018).
- [45] M. Castellano and V. A. Verzilov, *Phys. Rev. ST-Accel. Beams* **1**, 062801 (1998).
- [46] A. Curcio *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Accel. Beams* **20**, 012801 (2017).
- [47] A. H. Lumpkin, R. Crowell, Y. Li, and K. Nemeth, “A Compact Electron Spectrometer for an LWFA,” in *Proceedings, 29th International Conference, Free Electron Laser 2007*, (Novosibirsk, Russia, www.JACoW.org), WEAAU05.