

**COMPARISON OF THE CONSTANT GRADIENT  
AND  
UNIFORM ACCELERATOR STRUCTURES**

By  
**R. B. Neal**

**Technical Report  
A.E.C. Contract AT(04-3)-363  
M Report No. 259  
March 1961**



**W. W. HANSEN LABORATORIES OF PHYSICS  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA**

Proprietary data of Stanford University and/or U. S. Atomic Energy Commission. Recipient hereby agrees not to publish the within information without specific permission of Stanford University.

Nothing in this permission shall be construed as a warranty or representation by or on behalf of Stanford University and/or the United States Government that exercise of the permission or rights herein granted will not infringe patent, copyright, trademark or other rights of third parties nor shall Stanford University and/or the Government bear any liability or responsibility for any such infringement.

No licenses or other rights under patents or with respect to trademarks or trade names are herein granted by implication, estoppel or otherwise and no licenses or other rights respecting trade secrets, unpatented processes, ideas or devices or to use any copyrighted material are herein granted by implication, estoppel or otherwise except to the extent revealed by the technical data and information, the subject of the permission herein granted.

COMPARISON OF THE CONSTANT GRADIENT  
AND  
UNIFORM ACCELERATOR STRUCTURES

By

R. B. Neal

Technical Report  
A.E.C. Contract AT(04-3)-363  
M Report No. 259  
March 1961

W. W. Hansen Laboratories of Physics  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction . . . . .	1
II. Ratio of peak to average electric field . . . . .	1
III. RF power dissipation per unit length . . . . .	3
IV. Electron energy and beam loading derivative, $dV/di$ . . . . .	5
V. Maximum conversion efficiency . . . . .	5
VI. Electron energy in terms of $i_{\eta_{\max}}$ . . . . .	9
VII. Group velocity and filling time . . . . .	9
VIII. Stored energy . . . . .	11
IX. Frequency sensitivity . . . . .	12
X. Examples . . . . .	14
XI. Conclusions . . . . .	17

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Ratios of peak to average axial electric field strengths in uniform and constant gradient accelerator structures vs $\tau$ . . . . .	2
2. Ratio of power losses at input and output ends of accelerator section for uniform and constant gradient structures vs $\tau$ . . . . .	4
3. Unloaded beam energies for uniform and constant gradient accelerator structures vs $\tau$ . . . . .	6
4. Beam loading derivatives for uniform and constant gradient accelerator structures vs $\tau$ . . . . .	7
5. Maximum beam conversion efficiencies and corresponding values of peak beam current for uniform and constant gradient accelerators vs $\tau$ . . . . .	10
6. Frequency sensitivities of uniform and constant gradient vs $\tau$ . . . . .	15

## I. INTRODUCTION

The constant gradient and the uniform accelerator structure have previously been compared<sup>1,2</sup> from several points of view. In this report, the earlier results will be summarized and the structures will be further compared on the basis of frequency sensitivity and beam loading derivative ( $dV/di$ ). The general case resulting in constant gradient at any electron beam current was considered in reference 2. In this report, we will confine attention to the particular case where the constant gradient condition is obtained when  $i = 0$ . This is probably the most useful case in practice.

## II. RATIO OF PEAK TO AVERAGE ELECTRIC FIELDS

The ratio of peak to average axial electric field strength is unity in the c.g.<sup>3</sup> accelerator while it may be as high as 1.76<sup>(4)</sup> in the uniform accelerator. Thus, it is clear that the c.g. accelerator can produce electron energies up to 1.76 times as high as an optimized uniform structure when both are operating at the breakdown limit of electric field strength. The relative advantage of the c.g. accelerator in achieving high average gradients without breakdown depends upon the value of the attenuation parameter,<sup>5</sup>  $\tau = (\omega t_F/2Q)$ . This is shown in Fig. 1 where the ratio of peak to average electric fields =  $E_0 \ell / V_0$  is plotted versus  $\tau$ . The equations of these curves are:

- 
1. R. B. Neal, M.L. Report No. 185, Appendix A, February 1953.
  2. R. B. Neal, M.L. Report No. 513, May 1958.
  3. The abbreviation "c.g." will be used for "constant gradient" in the remainder of this report. The sub-script "U" is used in those equations pertaining to the uniform structure.
  4. This magnitude corresponds to a value of the rf attenuation constant  $\tau = 1.26$  nepers which gives maximum no-load energy in the uniform accelerator structure.
  5. This parameter has been called  $I\ell$  in several previous reports, where  $I$  is the rf attenuation in nepers per unit length and  $\ell$  is the length of the accelerator section. The dependence of  $\tau$  upon filling time  $t_p$  is emphasized in this report and in ref. 2 to call attention to the importance of comparing the c.g. and uniform structures at the same value of  $\tau$  for each. For equal  $\tau$ , the two structures will have the same filling times, the same stored energies, and the same ratios of input to output rf powers.




FIG. 1--Ratios of peak to average axial electric field strengths in uniform and constant gradient accelerator structures vs  $\tau$ .

$$\left. \frac{E_0 \ell}{V_0} \right|_U = \frac{\tau}{1 - e^{-\tau}} \quad (1)$$

$$\left. \frac{E_0 \ell}{V_0} \right|_{c.g.} = 1 \quad (2)$$

### III. RF POWER DISSIPATION PER UNIT LENGTH

The rf power dissipated per unit length in the walls of the uniform structure is given by:<sup>6</sup>

$$\left. \frac{dP}{dz} \right|_U = -\frac{2\tau P_0}{\ell} e^{-2\tau z/\ell} \quad (3)$$

so that the ratio of power loss at the input end to that at the output end of an accelerator section is given by

$$\frac{\left. \frac{dP}{dz} \right|_{z=0}}{\left. \frac{dP}{dz} \right|_{z=\ell}} = e^{2\tau} \quad (4)$$

Thus, this ratio may be as high<sup>4</sup> as 12.4. On the other hand, the power dissipated per unit length in the c.g. accelerator is constant over the entire length of the structure.<sup>2</sup> This means that the temperature rise in c.g. structure can be perfectly compensated by a simple frequency adjustment of the rf power source, thus preventing phase shift between the electrons and the wave. Such an adjustment will usually be imperfect in the uniform structure case leading to phase shift and loss of beam energy. The power loss ratios for the two structures are shown in Fig. 2 vs  $\tau$ .

---

6. This is derived in a number of reports. See, for example, R. B. Neal, J. Appl. Phys. 29, 1019 (1958).




FIG. 2--Ratio of power losses at input and output ends of accelerator section for uniform and constant gradient structures vs  $\tau$ .



#### IV. ELECTRON ENERGY AND BEAM LOADING DERIVATIVE, $dV/di$

For the uniform accelerator structure, the electron energy is given by<sup>6</sup>

$$V_U = \left(2\tau\right)^{1/2} \frac{1 - e^{-\tau}}{\tau} \left(P_0 \ell r\right)^{1/2} - ir\ell \left(1 - \frac{1 - e^{-\tau}}{\tau}\right). \quad (5)$$

Thus, the beam loading derivative is

$$\left.\frac{dV}{di}\right|_U = -r\ell \left(1 - \frac{1 - e^{-\tau}}{\tau}\right). \quad (6)$$

Similarly, the electron energy for the constant gradient structure is given by<sup>2</sup>

$$V_{c.g.} = \left(1 - e^{-2\tau}\right)^{1/2} \left(P_0 \ell r\right)^{1/2} - \frac{ir\ell}{2} \left(1 - \frac{2\tau e^{-2\tau}}{1 - e^{-2\tau}}\right) \quad (7)$$

so that the beam loading derivative is

$$\left.\frac{dV}{di}\right|_{c.g.} = -\frac{r\ell}{2} \left(1 - \frac{2\tau e^{-2\tau}}{1 - e^{-2\tau}}\right). \quad (8)$$

The no-load energies,  $V_0$ , for the two structures are plotted versus  $\tau$  in Fig. 3. The beam loading derivatives are shown in Fig. 4. For a given value of  $\tau$ , the constant gradient structure has a higher no-load energy and a lower beam loading derivative than the uniform structure. Thus, the c.g. structure has greater relative energy advantage in the loaded case than in the unloaded case.

#### V. MAXIMUM CONVERSION EFFICIENCY

The conversion efficiency  $\eta$  is defined as the ratio of power in the electron beam to the input rf power. Thus,

$$\eta = \frac{V_i}{P_0} \quad (9)$$




FIG. 3--Unloaded beam energies for uniform and constant gradient accelerator structures vs  $\tau$  .




FIG. 4--Beam loading derivatives for uniform and constant gradient accelerator structures vs  $\tau$ .

For the uniform accelerator the conversion efficiency is given by<sup>6</sup>

$$\eta_U = \tau \left( \frac{2r\ell}{\tau P_0} \right)^{1/2} i \left[ \frac{1 - e^{-\tau}}{\tau} - \frac{i}{2} \left( \frac{2r\ell}{\tau P_0} \right)^{1/2} \left( 1 - \frac{1 - e^{-\tau}}{\tau} \right) \right] . \quad (10)$$

Differentiating Eq. (10) with respect to  $i$ , we find the current  $i$  which gives maximum  $\eta$  to be

$$i_{\eta_{\max}(U)} = \left( \frac{\tau P_0}{2r\ell} \right)^{1/2} \frac{1 - e^{-\tau}}{\tau - (1 - e^{-\tau})} . \quad (11)$$

Inserting the value of  $i$  from Eq. (11) into Eq. (10) we obtain for the maximum conversion efficiency:

$$\eta_{\max}(U) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(1 - e^{-\tau})^2}{\tau - (1 - e^{-\tau})} . \quad (12)$$

Similarly, the conversion efficiency for the c.g. accelerator is given by<sup>2</sup>

$$\eta_{c.g.} = \left( \frac{r\ell}{P_0} \right)^{1/2} \left( 1 - e^{-2\tau} \right)^{1/2} i \left[ 1 - \frac{i}{2} \left( \frac{r\ell}{P_0} \right)^{1/2} \frac{(1 - e^{-2\tau}) - 2\tau e^{-2\tau}}{(1 - e^{-2\tau})^{3/2}} \right] . \quad (13)$$

This is maximum when  $i$  is given by

$$i_{\eta_{\max}(c.g.)} = \left( \frac{P_0}{r\ell} \right)^{1/2} \frac{(1 - e^{-2\tau})^{3/2}}{(1 - e^{-2\tau}) - 2\tau e^{-2\tau}} . \quad (14)$$

Inserting Eq. (14) in Eq. (13) we obtain for the maximum conversion efficiency

$$\eta_{\max}(c.g.) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(1 - e^{-2\tau})^2}{(1 - e^{-2\tau}) - 2\tau e^{-2\tau}} . \quad (15)$$

The maximum conversion efficiencies for the two structures and the corresponding values of  $i_{\eta_{\max}}$  are shown in Fig. 5 vs  $\tau$ .

#### VI. ELECTRON ENERGY IN TERMS OF $i_{\eta_{\max}}$

From Eqs. (5) and (11) and Eqs. (7) and (14) we find that the electron energies from both the uniform and the c.g. accelerators can be written

$$V = V_0 \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{i}{i_{\eta_{\max}}} \right) \quad (16)$$

where  $V_0$  is the no-load energy given by the first term on the right in Eq. (5) for the uniform accelerator, and the first term in the right in Eq. (7) for the c.g. accelerator and  $i_{\eta_{\max}}$  is given by Eqs. (11) and (14) for the uniform and c.g. structures, respectively.

From Eq. (16) it is clear that in each of the two structures, when the beam loading is sufficient to result in maximum conversion efficiency, the electron energy is reduced to one-half of the no-load energy.

#### VII. GROUP VELOCITY AND FILLING TIME

The group velocity  $v_g$  is a constant over the entire length of the uniform accelerator structure. Thus, the filling time  $t_F$  is given by

$$t_F (U) = \frac{\ell}{v_g} = \frac{20}{\omega} \tau \quad (17)$$

where  $\ell$  is the length of the accelerator section.  $\tau$  is the rf attenuation over the length of the section and is therefore equal to

$$\tau_U = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left( \frac{P_0}{P_\ell} \right) \quad (18)$$

so that the filling time may also be written




FIG. 5--Maximum beam conversion efficiencies and corresponding values of peak beam current for uniform and constant gradient accelerators vs  $\tau$ .

$$t_{F(U)} = \frac{Q}{\omega} \ln \left( \frac{P_0}{P_\ell} \right) . \quad (19)$$

In the c.g. accelerator, the group velocity varies linearly over the accelerator length and is given by<sup>2</sup>

$$v_{g(\text{c.g.})} = \frac{\omega \ell}{Q} \frac{1 - \frac{z}{\ell} (1 - e^{-2\tau})}{(1 - e^{-2\tau})} . \quad (20)$$

The incremental time  $dt$  required for the rf wave to move through the distance  $dz$  is given by

$$dt = \frac{dz}{v_g} . \quad (21)$$

Inserting the value of  $v_g$  from Eq. (20) into Eq. (21) and integrating from  $z = 0$  to  $z = \ell$ , we obtain for the filling time

$$t_{F(\text{c.g.})} = \frac{2Q}{\omega} \tau = \frac{Q}{\omega} \ln \left( \frac{P_0}{P_\ell} \right) . \quad (22)$$

Thus, the uniform structure and the c.g. structure having the same values of  $\tau$  have equal filling times.

#### VIII. STORED ENERGY

The stored energy per unit length in the uniform structure is given by

$$u(U) = \frac{P}{v_g} = \frac{P_0 e^{-2\tau z/\ell}}{v_g} . \quad (23)$$

Integrating over the accelerator length  $\ell$ , the total stored energy is

$$U(U) = P_0 t_F \left( \frac{1 - e^{-2\tau}}{2\tau} \right) . \quad (24)$$

In the c.g. structure, the stored energy per unit length is

$$u_{(c.g.)} = \frac{P}{v_g} = \frac{P_0 \left[ 1 - \frac{z}{l} \left( 1 - e^{-2\tau} \right) \right]}{\omega l \frac{z}{l} \left( 1 - e^{-2\tau} \right)} = \frac{P_0 Q}{\omega l} \left( 1 - e^{-2\tau} \right) . \quad (25)$$

The stored energy per unit length in the c.g. accelerator is seen in Eq. (25) to be constant over the entire length. Thus, the total stored energy is

$$U_{c.g.} = \frac{P_0 Q}{\omega} \left( 1 - e^{-2\tau} \right) = P_0 t_F \left( \frac{1 - e^{-2\tau}}{2\tau} \right) , \quad (26)$$

which is observed to be identical to the stored energy in the uniform structure with the same value of  $\tau$ .

#### IX. FREQUENCY SENSITIVITY

By frequency sensitivity, we refer to the fractional loss of electron energy  $\delta V_0/V_0$  caused by a fractional change in frequency  $\delta f/f$  of the input radiofrequency power from the frequency giving phase synchronism of the rf wave and the electron beam.

The frequency sensitivity of the uniform structure has been previously calculated<sup>7</sup> and is given by:

$$\left. \frac{\delta V_0}{V_0} \right|_U \cong \left( Q \frac{\delta f}{f} \right)^2 \left[ \frac{2\tau (\tau + 2)}{e^\tau - 1} - 4 \right] . \quad (27)$$

The frequency sensitivity of the c.g. structure will now be determined using the results of reference 2. The electron energy in the negligible beam loading case is given by:

---

7. R. B. Neal, M.L. Report No. 185, pp. 55-57, February 1953.



$$V_{0(\text{c.g.})} = \left(1 - e^{-2\tau}\right)^{1/2} \left(P_0 \ell r\right)^{1/2}, \quad (28)$$

where  $\tau = \omega t_F / 2Q$  as before,  $t_F$  is the filling time of the structure,  $P_0$  is the input rf power,  $\ell$  is the length of the section, and  $r$  is the shunt impedance per unit length. The incremental phase shift between the electrons and the wave is given by<sup>7</sup>

$$d\Delta = \frac{2\pi}{\beta_e} \left( \beta_w \frac{c}{v_g} - 1 \right) \frac{\delta f}{f} \frac{dz}{\lambda}. \quad (29)$$

Inserting the value of  $c/v_g$  given in references 1 and 2

$$\frac{c}{v_g} = \frac{Q\lambda}{2\pi\ell} \frac{1 - e^{-2\tau}}{1 - \frac{z}{\ell} \left(1 - e^{-2\tau}\right)}, \quad (30)$$

into Eq. (29) and integrating between the limits of 0 and  $z$  we obtain for the total phase shift (when  $\beta_w = \beta_e = 1$  and  $c/v_g \gg 1$ )

$$\Delta_{\text{c.g.}} \cong Q \frac{\delta f}{f} \ln \left[ 1 - \frac{z}{\ell} \left(1 - e^{-2\tau}\right) \right]. \quad (31)$$

The electron energy when there is no phase shift in the structure can be written:

$$V_{\text{c.g.}} = \int_0^{\ell} E dz = E\ell. \quad (32)$$

Similarly, when there is phase shift, the energy is given by

$$V'_{\text{c.g.}} = \int_0^{\ell} E \cos \Delta dz, \quad (33)$$

---

7. R. B. Neal, M.L. Report No. 185, pp. 55-57, February 1953.

which, when  $\Delta$  remains sufficiently small, is closely equal to

$$V'_{c.g.} = E \int_0^{\ell} \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta^2}{2} \right) dz \quad . \quad (34)$$

Thus, from Eqs. (32) and (34) we may write

$$\left. \frac{\delta V_0}{V_0} \right)_{c.g.} = - \frac{1}{2\ell} \int_0^{\ell} \Delta^2 dz \quad . \quad (35)$$

Inserting the value of  $\Delta$  from Eqs. (31) into (35) and integrating, we obtain

$$\left. \frac{\delta V_0}{V_0} \right)_{c.g.} = \left( Q \frac{\delta f}{f} \right)^2 \left[ \frac{2\tau e^{-2\tau} (\tau + 1)}{1 - e^{-2\tau}} - 1 \right] \quad . \quad (36)$$

For purposes of comparison, the quantities

$$\left. \frac{\delta V_0}{V_0} \right)_{U} \quad \text{and} \quad \left. \frac{\delta V_0}{V_0} \right)_{c.g.}$$

are plotted in Fig. 6. We note that the constant gradient structure has less frequency sensitivity than the uniform structure over the entire range of  $\tau$ .

## X. EXAMPLES

To illustrate the topics discussed in this report, we have considered specific examples of the two structures whose parameters are quite close to those of the proposed Stanford Project M accelerator (Stage I). A comparison of the various derived characteristics is shown in Table I.




FIG. 6--Frequency sensitivities of uniform and constant gradient vs  $\tau$ .

TABLE I. <sup>1/</sup> Comparison of constant gradient and uniform accelerator structures at  $\tau = 0.6$

Characteristic	Const. Grad.	Uniform	Ratio (c.g./U)
$\frac{E_0 \ell}{V_0} \left( \frac{\text{Peak Elec. Field}}{\text{Aver. "}} \right)$	1.0000	1.3298	0.752
$\left. \frac{dP}{dz} \right _{z=0} / \left. \frac{dP}{dz} \right _{z=\ell}$	1.0000	3.3201	0.301
$V_0$ (no-load energy)	11.772 Bev	11.600 Bev	1.015
$- \frac{dV}{di}$	33.242 $\frac{\text{Bev}}{\text{amp.}}$	34.155 $\frac{\text{Bev}}{\text{Amp.}}$	0.973
$V$ (at $i = 50$ ma.)	10.110 Bev	9.892 Bev	1.022
$\eta_{\text{max}}$ (Max. Beam Conversion Efficiency)	0.724	0.684	1.058
$i \eta_{\text{max}}$	177.1 ma	169.8 ma	1.043
$v \left/ \begin{array}{l} g \\ c \end{array} \right. \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{Normalized} \\ \text{Group Velocity} \end{array} \right)$	.0201 $\rightarrow$ .0061	0.0117	1.718 $\rightarrow$ 0.521
$t_F$ (Filling Time)	0.872 $\mu\text{sec}$	0.872 $\mu\text{sec}$	1.000
$U$ (Stored Energy)	731.2 joules	731.2 joules	1.000
$\Delta_{z=\ell}$ (For $\delta f = 0.1$ Mc/sec.)	0.546 rad.	0.546 rad.	1.000
$\delta V_0 / V_0$ (For $\delta f = 0.1$ Mc/sec.)	0.0357	0.0424	0.842

<sup>1/</sup> Assumed Parameters:

No. of sections = 960

$\tau = 0.6$

Length per section:

$L = 9600$  ft (293,000 cm.)

$\ell = 10$  ft (305 cm.)

$P_{\text{ot}} = 1440$  Mw

$r = 0.47 \times 10^6$  ohms/cm.

$i = 50$  milliamperes

$Q = 13,000$

$\omega = 1.79 \times 10^{10}$  rad./sec.

## XI. CONCLUSIONS

The constant gradient accelerator is equal to or superior to the uniform accelerator in all the characteristics considered in this report. Its relative superiority depends upon the value of  $\tau$  (the normalized filling time parameter), increasing as  $\tau$  increases.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

cc	Addressee	cc	Addressee
10	U.S. Atomic Energy Commission San Francisco Operations Office 2111 Bancroft Way Berkeley 4, California	1	Mr. Tore Wessel-Berg Norwegian Defense Research Establishment Radar Division Bergen, Norway
3	U.S. Atomic Energy Commission Office of Technical Information Ext. Post Office Box 62 Oak Ridge, Tennessee	1	Dr. Craig Nunan Varian Associates 611 Hansen Way Palo Alto, California
2	Chief of Naval Research Department of the Navy Washington 25, D.C. Attention: Code 422	1	Dr. Jacques Ovadia Tumor Clinic, Michael Reese Hospital 29th Street and Ellis Avenue Chicago 16, Illinois
2	Director, Office of Naval Research San Francisco Branch Office 1000 Geary Street San Francisco 9, California	1	Brookhaven National Laboratory Associated Universities, Inc. Upton, L.I., New York Attention: Mrs. Sheila Hulse, Bldg. 911
1	CERN, Scientific Information Service Geneva 23, Switzerland Attention: Mrs. L. Goldschmidt- Clermont	1	Dr. Lester S. Skaggs Argonne Memorial Hospital University of Chicago Chicago 37, Illinois
1	Dr. H. W. Koch, Chief High Energy Radiation Section National Bureau of Standards Washington 25, D.C.	1	Dr. John S. Foster, Director Radiation Laboratory McGill University Montreal, Quebec, Canada
1	Dr. M. J. Moore Nuclear Physics Research University of Liverpool Mount Pleasant Liverpool, England	1	Ramo-Wooldridge, a Division of Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc. 8433 Fallbrook Avenue Post Office Box 1006 Canoga Park, California
1	High Voltage Engineering Corporation Burlington, Massachusetts Attention: Librarian	1	Mr. Kjell Johnsen Norwegian Institute of Technology Trondheim, Norway
1	Mr. T. Roumbanis Sylvania Microwave Tube Laboratory Mountain View, California	1	Dr. G. K. Green Brookhaven National Laboratory Upton, Long Island, New York
1	Massachusetts Institute of Technology Laboratory for Nuclear Science Cambridge 39, Massachusetts Attention: Dr. P.T. Demos, Assoc. Director	1	Mr. Georges Mourier C.S.F. <u>Corbeville</u> (Seine-et-Oise) France
1	Professor Samuel Devons The Physical Laboratories The University Manchester 13, England	1	Applied Radiation Corporation 2404 West Main Street Walnut Creek, California Attention: Mr. N. Norris

cc	Addressee	cc	Addressee
1	Dr. J. T. Senise Instituto Tecnológico de Aeronáutica São José dos Campos São Paulo, Brazil	1	Sperry Gyroscope Company Electronic Tube Division Great Neck, Long Island, New York Attention: T. Sege
1	General Electric Company Power Tube Department Electronic Components Division Bldg. 269, Room 205, One River Road Schenectady 5, New York	1	The Science Library Science Museum South Kensington London, S.W. 7, England Attention: Keeper of the Library
1	Dr. Ivan Neilsen Physics Department Pacific Union College Angwin, California	1	Mr. H. F. Onusseit Sylvania Electric Company 100 First Avenue Waltham 54, Massachusetts
1	The University of British Columbia Department of Electrical Engineering Microwave Laboratory Vancouver 8, B.C., Canada Attention: G. B. Walker	1	Mr. R. W. Hodgers, Jr. Manager-Engineering X-Ray Dept. General Electric Company 4855 Electric Avenue Milwaukee 1, Wisconsin
1	Laboratoire des Hautes Energies Service de l'Accelérateur Lineaire Boite Postale No. 2 <u>Orsay</u> (Seine-et-Oise), France	1	Mr. Maurice G. Kelliher Vickers Research Ltd. Sunninghill Ascot Berkshire, England
1	Mr. C. T. Zavales FXR, Incorporated 26-12 Borough Place Woodside 77, New York	1	Instituto de Fisica de S. C. de Bariloche Universidad de Cuyo San Carlos de Bariloche Rio Negro, Argentina
1	L. F. Broadway, Head. Research Laboratory Electric and Musical Industries Ltd. Blyth Road, Hayes, Middlesex England	1	Dr. John Romaine High Power Klystron Dept. G.38 Sperry Gyroscope Company Great Neck, Long Island, New York
1	Research Laboratory of Electronics Chalmers Institute of Technology Gothenburg, Sweden	1	Hughes Aircraft Company Culver City, California Attention: Technical Documents Center
1	Margaret L. Pflueger Chief Information Section Reference and Analysis Branch Office Technical Information Ext. U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Oak Ridge, Tennessee	1	Mr. Kenneth T. Casey Defense Industrial Sales Heavy Military Electrical Dept. General Electric Company Court Street, Syracuse, New York
1	Advanced Engineering Super-Power Microwave Tubes Radio Corporation of American Lancaster, Pennsylvania Attention: Mr. A. C. Grimm	40	Microwave Laboratory Stanford University Stanford, California