

Pulsed RF Knock-Out Extraction: A Potential Enabler for FLASH Hadrontherapy in the Bragg Peak

Simon Waid¹, Andreas Gsponer^{1,2}, Claus Schmitzer³, Florian K hteubl², Elisabeth Renner², Clara Becker², J rgen Burin¹, Philipp Gaggl¹, Dale Prokopovich³, Thomas Bergauer¹

¹ Austrian Academy of Sciences, Institute for High Energy Physics, Vienna, Austria

² Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria

³ MedAustron GmbH, Wiener Neustadt, Austria

November 2023

Abstract. FLASH radiotherapy using proton beams is currently commonly performed in transmission mode. This mitigates the main advantage of proton radiotherapy: large energy deposition in the Bragg peak located in the tumor and low energy deposition in the entrance channel. One challenge on the path to treating using the Bragg peak and pencil-beam scanning are the extremely high dose-rates required for FLASH combined with the required accurate dose-control. We propose the use of pulsed RFKO extraction as a way to control the dose delivered per Voxel. In a first feasibility test dose-rates in pulses of up to 600 Gy s^{-1} were observed, while the granularity at which the dose was delivered is expected to be well below 0.5 Gy .

1. Introduction

The FLASH effect was first described in the 1960s and 1970s [1, 2]. However, it did not find clinical application up until recently when it was re-discovered and put into practical use during the last decade [3, 4]. Since then, FLASH radiotherapy has seen increased research interest. Initial research focused on electron and photon radiotherapy. Later, the existence of the FLASH effect was also confirmed for proton radiotherapy [5, 6]. Currently, a first study on humans using proton radiotherapy is ongoing [7, 8]. The use of other ion species such as carbon is currently under investigation [9].

Attaining FLASH conditions while using the Bragg peak for treatment has proven difficult. As a consequence, researchers often resort to irradiation in transmission mode, positioning the Bragg peak outside of the target. The transmission mode has been applied to the vast majority of in-vivo and in-vitro studies on FLASH radiotherapy using protons so far [5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11].

Positioning the Bragg peak outside the tumor volume mitigates one of the main advantages of proton radiotherapy: The larger dose deposition and larger radiobiological

effectiveness in the Bragg peak compared to the entrance channel [12]. When moving FLASH radiotherapy from research to the clinic, weighting the benefits of the FLASH-effect against the benefits of using the Bragg peak will become a difficult endeavour. Combining the two effects would be highly desirable.

The difficulties encountered when targeting FLASH conditions while using the Bragg peak for treatment are mainly related to the required modification of the beam energy to position the Bragg peak in the tumor volume: (i) dilated treatment times due to switching times between energy layers and (ii) the limited beam flux at low beam energies in cyclotrons. Both issues have been addressed for cyclotrons using a combination of universal range-shifters and field-specific range compensators [13, 14, 15]. Thus, for cyclotrons, FLASH beams using the Bragg peak can be deemed feasible even if further development might be needed prior to clinical application.

For synchrotron accelerators, irradiation using the Bragg peak at FLASH dose rates has been demonstrated for shallow tumors in mice [16]. Similar to cyclotrons, the use of range compensators can be expected to enable a spread out Bragg peak. One issue still existing with synchrotron accelerators is online dosimetry and beam control due to the highly fluctuating beam intensity. In particular, for synchrotron accelerators it is challenging to keep the dose delivered under fault conditions within acceptable limits.

In this work we propose an extraction scheme to deliver FLASH dose-rates in synchrotrons while complying with safety regulations: a pulsed radio-frequency knockout-driven (RF KO) extraction, in which the excitation pulses are synchronized to online dosimetry.

2. Extraction and dosimetry concept

Safety concepts for synchrotron accelerators typically rely on monitoring the beam parameters and interrupting or terminating irradiation if the parameters are out of specifications. Detection of deviations and termination has to happen before an intolerable dose is delivered to the patient. The relevant tolerable dose for each detection and termination is 0.25 Gy (IEC 60601-2-64, 2014, clause 201.10.2.101.3.1.6). When driving extraction at the maximum available extraction speed, one can assume the dose is proportional to the extraction time. If the dose delivered within a single short, FLASH-compatible high-dose pulse is below this limit, it becomes acceptable to have no means of termination during this pulse. Still, after such a pulse and prior to any subsequent pulse, an evaluation of the delivered dose and beam parameters needs to be carried out. This verification may then lead to a termination of irradiation.

We can now alter extraction and beam parameter verification as shown in fig. 1, whereby extraction is performed in short pulses instead of continuously. The beam parameters of each pulse still need to be monitored. This monitoring can be carried out in two phases: A measurement and a verification phase. The measurement phase needs to be carried out during the delivery of a pulse. The verification can be carried out after the pulse has been delivered. E.g. the online dosimeter may integrate the readings from

a detector during a pulse in a fast, analog memory. In a short pause between pulses, the values can be digitized and verified. Delivery of the next pulse is only permitted in case the verification shows the pulse was within limits. This can help to optimally utilize the bandwidth of the beam monitors. An exemplary synchronization scheme is depicted in in fig. 1. Each pulse only needs to be covered by a single measurement of the beam parameters.

The described approach poses challenges to both the extraction method and the employed dosimeter. Regarding the extraction mechanism, different slow extraction techniques are being investigated concerning their suitability to provide such a pulsed, high-dose rate extraction. A key aspect in this context is a short response time of the extracted beam to accelerator setting variations. However, another factor not to be underestimated is a simple and flexible integration into the facility, which allows the ion therapy centre to combine FLASH treatments with nominal irradiation.

A promising technique fulfilling both requirements is radio frequency knock out (RFKO) extraction [17], which is already applied in several ion therapy synchrotrons for nominal operation [18, 19, 20] and explored as alternative extraction mechanism at MedAustron [21]. This slow extraction method applies a horizontal electric RF field to increase the amplitude of the horizontal particle oscillation around the reference orbit until they reach the unstable region around the resonance and get extracted.




Figure 1: Synchronization between extraction and dosimetry. While the beam is being extracted with FLASH-compatible dose rates, the dosimetry system integrates the charge from the detector. During the verification of the beam parameters, no beam is extracted. If the beam parameters are out of limits, the subsequent extraction pulse is inhibited and irradiation is terminated.

In regards to online dosimetry, traditional ionisation chambers will saturate when confronted with dose rates of kGy s^{-1} [11]. Further, depending on the type of ionization chamber, drift times can cause readout delays up to hundreds of μs [22]. Given the need for a fast repetition rate of pulses to attain flash rates not only within pulses,

but on average, this is unacceptable. Semiconductor detectors respond faster than ionization chambers and are thus a potential replacement candidates. Silicon detectors are wide spread. However, their increase in their dark current when exposed to radiation is problematic as it prevents DC current measurements and thus absolute flux measurements. In contrast, silicon carbide (SiC) shows a negligible increase in dark current when exposed to ionizing radiation [23]. Further, in contrast to diamond detectors, the fabrication of large area SiC detectors for future clinical use is realistic due to the commercial availability of wafers with 6 inch in diameter. Consequently, we chose to employ a SiC detector as dosimeter.

3. Material and Methods

The presented measurements were performed at the synchrotron of the MedAustron facility located in Wiener Neustadt, Austria. The accelerator is based on a proton-ion medical machine study (PIMMS) design [24] and enables proton energies from 62.4 MeV to 800 MeV, whereby energies up to 252.7 MeV are employed clinically. When configured for clinical operation, the accelerator extracts the beam using a Betatron core. However, for experiments, the accelerator can be configured to extract the beam using alternative extraction methods such as constant optics slow extraction (COSE) [25, 26] or RFKO [17]. The RFKO set-up at MedAustron [27] was still under development during the presented proof-of-concept RFKO FLASH extraction tests and the applied machine settings therefore preliminary (tab. 1). For our experiment we chose an unbunched (coasting) proton beam with a constant beam energy of 252.7 MeV and a ring filling of $0.9 \cdot 10^{10}$ to $1.3 \cdot 10^{10}$ protons after acceleration.

The RFKO signal was generated using an Ettus USRP X310 software defined radio (SDR) and amplified using a custom built 1 kW amplifier. The transversal excitation of the beam was achieved by feeding the amplified signal via a custom built BalUn to the plates of the Schottky beam monitor. The SDR was configured to emit periodic pulses at a rate of 100 Hz with 50% duty cycle. The excitation signal was set to a base of 3.9644 MHz modulated by a sawtooth signal providing a frequency deviation up to $\Delta f \approx 800$ Hz. Note, that in this set-up the RF KO frequency was offset by $\Delta f_{\text{offset}} \approx -17$ kHz compared to the average horizontal oscillation frequency of the particles, which was ≈ 3.9825 MHz.

The excitation amplitude was modulated by changing the output level on the SDR between 0.04375 and 0.7 relative to the maximum permitted by the SDR. The maximum amplification of 0.7 was chosen to not exceed the maximum allowed voltage on the Schottky monitor.

Dosimetry was carried out using a combination of the current transformer in the synchrotron and EBT3 films and 4H-SiC detectors in the irradiation room. EBT3 films and the current transformers were used for absolute dosimetry by measuring the dose and intensity, respectively. The 4H-SiC detector measured the time structure of the dose-rate. At the beginning of the experiment a reference measurement was performed

Parameter	Unit	Value
Nominal $Q_{x,0}$	-	1.666
Horizontal chromaticity Q'_x	-	-4
Relative momentum offset and resulting Q_x	- / -	-0.0025 and 1.676
RF settings, longitudinal distribution	-	Coasting (unbunched)
Resonant sextupole strength k_2L	m^{-2}	2.2
Intensity before extraction	protons	$0.9-1.3 \times 10^{10}$
Relative momentum spread (FWHM)	-	8×10^{-4}
Normalized horizontal rms emittance $\epsilon_{n, rms,x}$	mm mrad	0.5
Normalized vertical rms emittance $\epsilon_{n, rms,y}$	mm mrad	0.5
Revolution time of synchronous particle	μs	0.4209

Table 1: Machine settings at extraction during the presented RFKO FLASH tests.

using one EBT3 film. This measurement was employed to link the change in current in the ring during extraction and the integrated detector current to a delivered dose. The EBT3 film was scanned prior to exposure and positioned in the iso-center for exposure as shown in fig. 2. Post-exposure, the film was aged for 48 h and scanned again. A Co-60 derived calibration curve was employed to convert the darkening of the film to an integral dose. The time structure of the dose-rate during each extraction was computed by normalizing the current from the 4H-SiC detector to the dose determined via the corresponding current measurement in the ring.

4H-SiC detectors were provided by Centro Nacional de Microelectrónica (CNM), Barcelona, Spain. The detectors were fabricated on a 4H-SiC substrate with a 50 μm thick epitaxially grown, n-doped active layer and had an active area of 3x3 mm^2 . More details on the employed detectors are given in [28, 23, 29]. A Keithley 2470 SMU was employed to bias the detector and measure the current through the detector. The sampling rate of the SMU was configured to the maximum available frequency of 2.8 kHz.

In addition to the SMU, the current through the detector was also measured using a custom made transimpedance amplifier (TIA). The TIA consisted of an Analog Devices LTC6268-10 operational amplifier with a single feedback resistor as well as a compensation capacitor. The TIA had a transmittance of 46 dB Ω and a bandwidth of 20 MHz. The output of the TIA was digitized using a Rohde & Schwarz RTP164 oscilloscope configured in HD mode to attain an ADC resolution of 16 bit. The sampling rate of the oscilloscope was between 100 MHz and 200 MHz. The entire 10 s chopper opening time were recorded and stored in the oscilloscope memory.




Figure 2: Measurement setup with mounted EBT3 film as it was employed to measure the absolute dose. The film was glued to a metal frame surrounding the SiC detector using double-sided tape.

4. Results and Discussion

The measurement result for a 5 ms pulse with a SDR gain factor of 0.175 is displayed in fig. 3. The areas coloured in gray indicate the time intervals during which the beam gets excited by the RFKO signal. Since the detector bandwidth exceeds the synchrotron frequency, dose-rates were fluctuating substantially. For better clarity, the plot shows the average (blue) and the peak dose-rate (orange) calculated as the moving average dose-rate over 100 samples, corresponding to averaging time of 1 μs .

The measured dose-rate profile is shown in fig. 3. After the RFKO signal is enabled, the dose-rate rises to a maximum, which is reached after 260 μs . However, after reaching the maximum, the dose-rate falls rapidly and reaches a steady state which is 20 to 30 times lower than the peak dose-rate even though the RFKO extraction signal is still being applied.

Dose-rates over time for different gain settings are shown in fig. 4. Peaks in the average dose-rates of up to 900 Gy s^{-1} can be observed, while the dose-rate dropped substantially after an initial peak. Assuming a pulse duration of 0.5 ms this corresponds to a dose-rate of 600 Gy s^{-1} at our detector.

We reproduced the measurements using Xsuite [30] simulations. The simulated extraction rate evolution for our setup is given in fig. 5. Analysis of the simulation results revealed, that the initial peak in each pulse can be attributed to a subset of particles, which occupy a region in 4D phase space $(x, x', z, \Delta E)$ that allows them to be




Figure 3: Dose rate over time for a RFKO extraction at a gain factor of 0.175. The gray area between vertical black lines denote the time when the RFKO signal was enabled. The average and maximum were calculated over a sliding window of 100 samples. The moving average shows a distinct initial extraction peak at high dose-rate, followed by a 20 to 30 times lower dose-rate.




Figure 4: Average dose-rate over time for different gains. The duration of the FLASH pulse stays almost constant, while the height of the pulse scales with the applied gain.

extracted within a few hundred turns once the RFKO is turned on: they have to feature 1) large horizontal actions, i.e. particles close to the separatrix and 2) a beneficial combination of horizontal and longitudinal phase space coordinates, which causes them to be in phase with the RFKO signal. After this initial pulse, the now depleted 4D phase space region is refilled, leading to another intensity peak when turning the RFKO signal on again.

In our case the excitation frequency features a narrow bandwidth and a slight offset $\Delta f_{\text{offset}} \approx -17$ kHz compared to the mean horizontal oscillation frequency of the particles, which enhances the described effect. Particles, which occupy said beneficial 4D phase space region are less sensitive to such a configured frequency mismatch. As they are extracted between tens to hundreds of turns, no significant phase error between horizontal particle oscillation and RFKO frequency is accumulating during this period of time.




Figure 5: Xsuite simulations of the extracted particle rate averaged over 1000 turns. The initial intensity peak each time the RFKO signal is enabled is clearly visible.

We further analyzed the dose in the initial dose-rate spike for each peak. The resulting dose per peak is shown in fig. 6. The first extraction pulse shows a significantly larger extracted dose than the subsequent pulses. After this first pulse, the dose per pulse drops significantly and is almost constant before it falls after approximately 15 peaks. We attribute the drop in the dose per pulse to the chosen machine parameters, for example the frequency offset of the applied RFKO signal. Optimizing these parameters as well as modulating the gain pulse-to-pulse is expected to help harmonizing the delivered dose rate between pulses.

To support our hypothesis that the dose extracted in each pulse is limited by 4D phase space replenishment, we tried to predict the extracted dose in each pulse from




Figure 6: Measured dose in each peak over time.

the replenishment rate. The 4D phase space replenishment rate is expected to correlate to the steady state extraction rate after extracting the initial peak, i.e. the extraction rate in the tail of the pulse. Assuming our replenishment is far from complete, we make the ansatz that the replenished dose and hence the dose of the subsequent pulse corresponds approximately to the flat dose rate multiplied by the time between pulses. Fig. 7 compares this dose calculated from the replenishment rate of the n -th pulse with the dose measured in the peak of the $(n + 1)$ -st pulse, showing a linear correlation. Interestingly, the dose measured in the $(n + 1)$ -st peak is almost twice as large as the dose predicted from the steady state of the n -th pulse.

The observed effect is beneficial for reaching our goal of dose-limited extraction pulses. In contrast to limiting the extracted dose via the RFKO on-time, the observed 4D phase space depletion further adds a layer of safety, as this process is self limiting. If the RFKO signal is applied for too long, the dose-rate will still drop giving safety systems time to react and terminate irradiation. In case of the MedAustron accelerator termination of a treatment at the MedAustron facility is primarily attained via the chopper system [31]. For protons, the system has a maximum response time of 150 μ s. In addition to the chopper closing time, we assess there will be the need to process the measurement data from the extraction pulse. We assess, this processing will take less than 20 μ s. Thus, to calculate the expected termination dose, we can calculate the dose delivered during the 170 μ s after switching off the RFKO signal. The result of this calculation is given in fig. 8 as a function of the average dose-rate during the flat part of the extraction pulse. Due to the low dose-rates during this time-frame, the data is noisy and the calculation yields even nonphysical negative doses. The data shows that the dose is below 3 mGy in all cases.




Figure 7: Relationship between the dose in the initial peak of a pulse and the dose expected when integrating the average dose-rate in the flat part of the previous pulse over the pause between RFKO extraction pulses. The line indicates a linear relationship and helps to guide the eye. The measured dose in the peak is approximately twice the with said ansatz computed dose.




Figure 8: Computed dose delivered during termination. The plot shows the dose delivered within 170 μ s after the RFKO signal was switched off as a function of the dose-rate during the flat part of the extraction. The data is dominated by noise. The dose is below 1.1 mGy in all cases.

Fig. 6 also shows that for a gain of 0.35 and 0.7 the dose extracted per peak is almost independent from the applied gain factor. This might be due to reaching the power limit of the employed RF-amplifier. For lower gains this is not the case. Fig. 9 compares the averaged dose-rates within the first pulse normalized to the maximum for the highest and lowest gain. The figure shows that for the highest gain the dose is concentrated in the initial peak, while the steady-state becomes flatter. Conversely for the lowest gain, after an initial peak dose is still delivered over several peaks before reaching a steady state. We attribute this behaviour to instabilities in the magnetic field in the ring. This fluctuations move the beam closer and further away from the resonance, leading to more or less favourable extraction conditions. The effect has more impact on the extraction when the RFKO excitation signal is weaker. With a stronger excitation signal (gain 0.35 and 0.7), the excited momentum space is depleted earlier leading to less impact of the field instabilities. In contrast, for lower gain, the extraction is slower and the field instabilities have a larger impact.




Figure 9: Comparison of relative dose-rates for the lowest and highest gain investigated. The dose rates have been normalized to the initial peak of the dose-rate.

5. Conclusion and Outlook

We have shown that pulsed RFKO extraction can be used to attain extraction pulses with large instantaneous dose-rates. This can be utilized to optimize the available monitoring bandwidth of online-dosimetry systems by synchronizing the online dosimetry to the RFKO excitation. In our experiments, we recorded dose rates of 600 Gys^{-1} , assuming a pulse duration of 0.5 ms. We observed that after turning on the RFKO signal for extremely large extraction rates, the measured dose-rate drops by

a factor of 20 to 30 after an initial peak. We attribute this drop after the switch-on of an RFKO pulse to a fast depletion of the excited region in 4D phase space, which comprises particles with large horizontal action that are in phase with the RFKO signal. This self-limiting effect is beneficial when operating the accelerator with pulsed RFKO extraction as the dose in each pulse is limited. We believe that the presented extraction and online-dosimetry approach can be attractive for the delivery of scanned FLASH beams using synchrotron accelerators.

6. Acknowledgement

This project has received funding from the Austrian Research Promotion Agency FFG, grant number 883652. Production and development of the 4H-SiC detector was supported by the Spanish State Research Agency (AEI) and the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), ref. RTC-2017-6369-3.

7. Bibliography

- [1] R. J. Berry, “EFFECTS OF RADIATION DOSE-RATE: From Protracted, Continuous Irradiation to Ultra-High Dose-Rates from Pulsed Accelerators,” *British Medical Bulletin*, vol. 29, pp. 44–47, Jan. 1973.
- [2] S. Hornsey and T. Alper, “Unexpected Dose-rate Effect in the Killing of Mice by Radiation,” *Nature*, vol. 210, pp. 212–213, Apr. 1966.
- [3] J. R. Hughes and J. L. Parsons, “FLASH Radiotherapy: Current Knowledge and Future Insights Using Proton-Beam Therapy,” *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, vol. 21, p. 6492, Jan. 2020.
- [4] V. Favaudon, L. Caplier, V. Monceau, F. Pouzoulet, M. Sayarath, C. Fouillade, M.-F. Poupon, I. Brito, P. Hupé, J. Bourhis, J. Hall, J.-J. Fontaine, and M.-C. Vozenin, “Ultrahigh dose-rate FLASH irradiation increases the differential response between normal and tumor tissue in mice,” *Science Translational Medicine*, vol. 6, July 2014.
- [5] M. R. Ashraf, M. Rahman, R. Zhang, B. B. Williams, D. J. Gladstone, B. W. Pogue, and P. Bruza, “Dosimetry for FLASH Radiotherapy: A Review of Tools and the Role of Radioluminescence and Cherenkov Emission,” *Frontiers in Physics*, vol. 8, 2020.
- [6] A. Velalopoulou, I. V. Karagounis, G. M. Cramer, M. M. Kim, G. Skoufos, D. Goia, S. Hagan, I. I. Verginadis, K. Shoniyozov, J. Chiango, M. Cerullo, K. Varner, L. Yao, L. Qin, A. G. Hatzigeorgiou, A. J. Minn, M. Putt, M. Lanza, C.-A. Assenmacher, E. Radaelli, J. Huck, E. Diffenderfer, L. Dong, J. Metz, C. Koumenis, K. A. Cengel, A. Maity, and T. M. Busch, “FLASH Proton Radiotherapy Spares Normal Epithelial and Mesenchymal Tissues While Preserving Sarcoma Response,” *Cancer Research*, vol. 81, pp. 4808–4821, Sept. 2021.
- [7] T. Tedeschi, “FLASH radiation therapy shows promise in first-in-human trial.” <https://www.uc.edu/news/articles/2022/10/flash-radiation-therapy-shows-promise-in-first-in-human-trial.html>, Oct. 2022.
- [8] R. Chow, M. Kang, S. Wei, J. I. Choi, R. H. Press, S. Hasan, A. M. Chhabra, K. A. Cengel, and H. Lin, “FLASH Radiation Therapy: Review of the Literature and Considerations for Future Research and Proton Therapy FLASH Trials,” *Applied Radiation Oncology*, no. June, pp. 16–21, 2021.
- [9] U. A. Weber, E. Scifoni, and M. Durante, “FLASH radiotherapy with carbon ion beams,” *Medical Physics*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 1974–1992, 2022.

- [10] S. Wei, H. Lin, J. I. Choi, R. H. Press, S. Lazarev, R. Kabarriti, C. Hajj, S. Hasan, A. M. Chhabra, C. B. Simone, and M. Kang, “FLASH Radiotherapy Using Single-Energy Proton PBS Transmission Beams for Hypofractionation Liver Cancer: Dose and Dose Rate Quantification,” *Frontiers in Oncology*, vol. 11, 2022.
- [11] E. S. Diffenderfer, B. S. Sørensen, A. Mazal, and D. J. Carlson, “The current status of preclinical proton FLASH radiation and future directions,” *Medical Physics*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 2039–2054, 2022.
- [12] R. Mohan, “A review of proton therapy – Current status and future directions,” *Precision Radiation Oncology*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 164–176, 2022.
- [13] M. Kang, S. Wei, J. I. Choi, H. Lin, and C. B. Simone, “A Universal Range Shifter and Range Compensator Can Enable Proton Pencil Beam Scanning Single-Energy Bragg Peak FLASH-RT Treatment Using Current Commercially Available Proton Systems,” *International Journal of Radiation Oncology*Biophysics*, vol. 113, pp. 203–213, May 2022.
- [14] S. Wei, H. Lin, J. I. Choi, C. B. Simone, and M. Kang, “A Novel Proton Pencil Beam Scanning FLASH RT Delivery Method Enables Optimal OAR Sparing and Ultra-High Dose Rate Delivery: A Comprehensive Dosimetry Study for Lung Tumors,” *Cancers*, vol. 13, p. 5790, Jan. 2021.
- [15] S. Wei, H. Lin, J. Isabelle Choi, C. Shi, C. B. Simone, and M. Kang, “Advanced pencil beam scanning Bragg peak FLASH-RT delivery technique can enhance lung cancer planning treatment outcomes compared to conventional multiple-energy proton PBS techniques,” *Radiotherapy and Oncology*, vol. 175, pp. 238–247, Oct. 2022.
- [16] I. Dokic, S. Meister, J. Bojcevski, T. Tessonier, D. Walsh, M. Knoll, S. Mein, Z. Tang, L. Vogelbacher, C. Rittmueller, M. Moustafa, D. Krunic, S. Brons, T. Haberer, J. Debus, A. Mairani, and A. Abdollahi, “Neuroprotective Effects of Ultra-High Dose Rate FLASH Bragg Peak Proton Irradiation,” *International Journal of Radiation Oncology*Biophysics*, vol. 113, pp. 614–623, July 2022.
- [17] S. van der Meer, “Stochastic extraction, a low-ripple version of resonant extraction,” 1978.
- [18] S. Savazzi, E. Bressi, G. Debernardi, L. Falbo, V. Lante, P. Meliga, C. Priano, M. Pullia, and G. Russo, “Implementation of RF-KO Extraction at CNAO,” *Proceedings of the 10th Int. Particle Accelerator Conf.*, vol. IPAC2019, pp. 3 pages, 0.638 MB, 2019.
- [19] C. Krantz, R. Cee, F. Faber, E. Feldmeier, T. Fischer, M. Galonska, T. Haberer, B. Kroeck, A. Peters, U. Scheeler, S. Scheloske, C. Schömers, A. Weber, and M. Witt, “Slow Extraction Techniques at the Marburg Ion-Beam Therapy Centre,” in *9th Int. Particle Accelerator Conf. (IPAC’18), Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 29-May 4, 2018*, pp. 1084–1086, JACOW Publishing, Geneva, Switzerland, June 2018.
- [20] E. Feldmeier, R. Cee, E. C. Cortés García, M. Galonska, T. Haberer, M. Hun, A. Peters, S. Scheloske, and C. Schömers, “Upgrade of the Slow Extraction System of the Heidelberg Ion-Beam Therapy Centre’s Synchrotron,” in *13th International Particle Accelerator Conference (IPAC’22), Bangkok, Thailand, 12-17 June 2022*, pp. 2509–2512, JACOW Publishing, Geneva, Switzerland, July 2022.
- [21] Florian Kühleubl, “Design Study of Radio Frequency Knockout Slow Extraction for the MedAustron Synchrotron,” Sept. 2020.
- [22] O. Müller, J. Stötzel, D. Lützenkirchen-Hecht, and R. Frahm, “Gridded Ionization Chambers for Time Resolved X-Ray Absorption Spectroscopy,” *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, vol. 425, p. 092010, Mar. 2013.
- [23] P. Gaggl, T. Bergauer, M. Göbel, R. Thalmeier, M. Villa, and S. Waid, “Charge collection efficiency study on neutron-irradiated planar silicon carbide diodes via UV-TCT,” *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment*, vol. 1040, p. 167218, Oct. 2022.
- [24] P. J. Bryant, L. Badano, M. Benedikt, P. J. Bryant, M. Crescent, P. Holy, A. Maier, M. Pullia, S. Rossi, and P. Knaus, “Progress of the Proton-Ion Medical Machine Study (PIMMS),” *Strahlentherapie und Onkologie*, vol. 175, pp. 1–4, June 1999.

- [25] V. Kain, F. M. Velotti, M. A. Fraser, B. Goddard, J. Prieto, L. S. Stoel, and M. Pari, “Resonant slow extraction with constant optics for improved separatrix control at the extraction septum,” *Physical Review Accelerators and Beams*, vol. 22, p. 101001, Oct. 2019.
- [26] P. A. Arrutia Sota, P. Burrows, A. De Franco, M. Fraser, B. Goddard, V. Kain, F. Kuehteubl, M. Pivi, D. Prokopovich, and F. Velotti, “Implementation of a Tune Sweep Slow Extraction with Constant Optics at MedAustron,” *Proceedings of the 13th International Particle Accelerator Conference*, vol. IPAC2022, pp. 3 pages, 0.468 MB, 2022.
- [27] Wastl,Alexander, Fraser,Matthew, Kuehteubl,Florian, Kurfuerst,Christoph, Prokopovich,Dale, Renner,Elisabeth, Holzfeind,Katrin, Fischl,Lorenz, Pivi,Mauro, Strasik,Ivan, Rizzoglio,Valeria, Maderböck,Clemens, Adler,Laurids, German,Xavier, Schmitzer,Claus, Plassard,Fabien, Guidoboni,Greta, and Arrutia Sota,Pablo Andreas, “Investigating alternative extraction methods at MedAustron,” pp. 2419–2422 pages, 1.4 MB, Sept. 23.
- [28] M. Christanell, M. Tomaschek, and T. Bergauer, “4H-silicon carbide as particle detector for high-intensity ion beams,” *Journal of Instrumentation*, vol. 17, p. C01060, Jan. 2022.
- [29] P. Gaggl, A. Gsponer, R. Thalmeier, S. Waid, G. Pellegrini, P. Godignon, J. M. Rafi, and T. Bergauer, “Performance of neutron-irradiated 4H-Silicon Carbide diodes subjected to Alpha radiation,” Oct. 2022.
- [30] G. Iadarola, R. De Maria, S. Lopaciuk, A. Abramov, X. Buffat, D. Demetriadou, L. Deniau, P. Hermes, P. Kicsiny, P. Kruyt, A. Latina, L. Mether, K. Paraschou, Sterbini, F. Van Der Veken, P. Belanger, P. Niedermayer, D. Di Croce, T. Pieloni, and L. Van Riesen-Haupt, “Xsuite: An integrated beam physics simulation framework,” Sept. 2023.
- [31] M. G. Pullia, E. Bressi, L. Falbo, C. Priano, S. Rossi, C. Viviani, and CNAO. Foundation, “Betatron Core Driven Slow Extraction at CNAO and MedAustron,” *Proceedings of IPAC2016*, pp. 1330–1333, 2016.