Lumi Testbeam results and Shower Max Detector

Dustin McNulty Idaho State University *mcnulty@jlab.org*

Thanks to: Carlos Bula, Brady Lowe, Kevin Rhine, and Max Surgeon

Aug 13, 2015

 $\overline{1}$

Lumi Testbeam results and Shower Max Detector

Outline

- New Hall A downstream Lumi –Design
	- –Monte Carlo
	- –Test beam studies and results
- New Shower-max baseline design
	- –Design
	- –Monte Carlo
	- –Baseline performance (MC)
- Optimizing Designs and Prototyping
- Summary

- Detect charged particle flux at extreme forward angles
- Important diagnostic of target density fluctuations and overall noise floor
- In theory, should have very low/no PV asymmetry and can serve as null asymmetry monitor
- Can use upcoming PREX as a learning opportunity for MOLLER Lumi development

- Conceptual Design 2002 Riad Suleiman
- 8 quartz Cherenkov detectors with air-core light guides placed symmetrically around beam line 7.5m downstream of pivot
- Used $6.0 \times 2.0 \times 1.0$ cm³ quartz placed 4.5 cm from beam center \Rightarrow 0.3 - 0.8 deg polar angle acceptance

New Hall A Luminosity Monitor

- Incorporate Qweak's downstream Lumi experience:
	- –Use pre-radiator and "unity gain" PMT
	- –Use radially smaller, but thicker quartz
	- –May achieve desired linearity at anticipated photocathode currents
- Work within constraints of existing beampipe insertion tubes

- Constraints of existing beam pipe insertion tubes...light guide is long and narrow
- Optimized? one-bounce design

✬ **New Hall A Luminosity Monitor (Simulations)** Photo-Electron Distribution - Lumi Detector (1GeV Electrons) 40000
Element
145000 photo electrons photo electrons tungsten tickness no tungsten 5mm tungsten Entries 249994 **Entries** 249419 10mm tungsten 6.546 Mean 18.78 Mean 13.4mm tungsten 15mm tungsten **RMS** 2.676 **RMS** 9.779 20mm tungsten 30000 photo electrons photo electrons **Entries** 249533 **Entries** 248398 25000 $R = 0.408832$ Mean 17.4 Mean 15.56 **RMS RMS** 9.384 9.416 = 0.514802 20000 photo electrons photo electrons 249088 **Entries** 249708 **Entries** 0.539309 15000 12.53 Mean 20.15 Mean 8.135 **RMS** 10.37 **RMS** 10000 5000 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 Photo-electrons • G4 optical simulations: $-lumi$ v1: $3.0 \times 2.0 \times 1.0$ cm³, 41cm one-bounce lightguide (air) $-$ Used 1GeV electrons, centered on quartz with 90° incidence

–Varied tungsten thickness from 0 to 20mm

New Hall A Luminosity Monitor (Prototype)

- Using 2" Hamamatsu $R375 + E1435-02MOD$ unity gain base
- PMT and base fully housed in mu-metal shield
- Anolux Miro-Silver light guide; dry N₂ purge/flush
- Spectrosil 2000 quartz: $3.0 \times 2.0 \times 1.0$ cm³ (prototype)
- Tungsten: $2.0 \times 2.0 \times 1.0 / 1.5$ cm³; Aluminum and Delrin frame

MAMI Testbeam (Lumi Tests)

- Recent testbeam: May 29 June 1, 2015: MOLLER, PREX/CREX
- Half a shift for Lumi prototype tests: –Different tungsten thicknesses: 0, 10, and 15 mm –Different lightguide lengths: 41 and 35 cm $-With$ and without N_2 purge

Prelim. Lumi Testbeam Results

- For no tungsten, adding N_2 (compare runs 652 and 712) increases PEs from 1.3 to 2.0 (+50%)
- For no tungsten, shrink LG by 6cm (compare runs 712 and 716) increases PEs from 2.0 to 2.2 $(+10\%)$
- For 10mm tungsten, shrink LG by 6cm (compare runs 643 and 713) increases PEs from 8.0 to 13 $(+60\%)$
- For 41cm LG, increase tungsten from 10mm to 15mm (compare runs 643 and 706) increases PEs from 8.0 to 9.8 (+23%)

✬

Lumi R&D Summary

- Results are preliminary; analysis and simulation work ongoing
- Narrow beampipe insertion tubes significantly restrict light collection at PMT
- Qualitative agreement between initial simulations and test beam data. But why peak PE values have ∼large disagreement? $-$ Incident MAMI beam angle was 86° , not 90° –LG reflectivity coeffs. in MC need verification/improvement –Bending LG into proper shape is not trivial...
- Can use this data (combined with other prototype detector tests) to help benchmark optical MC
- Pre-radiator significantly increases PE yield by factor of 5 or 6
- Flushing with dry N_2 increased signal size by 50% (whoa!)
- Sum of quartz and tungsten thicknesses must be ≤ 2.3 cm so if quartz is 1cm, then W can be upto 1.3cm...What is best configuration?

Showermax Detector (10 piece stack)

- 10 pieces quartz (each 5.0mm thick): 0.41 X_0
- 10 pieces tungsten (each 2.4mm thick): 6.8 X_0
- 25 cm Miro-silver LG; 3" PMT. *Note:Uniform sampling, trapez. Q*

✬

- 6 pieces quartz (each 8.33mm thick): 0.41 X₀
- 6 pieces tungsten (each 4mm thick): 6.8 X_0
- 25 cm Miro-silver LG; 3" PMT. *Note: center sampling, new QE*

- 4 pieces quartz (each 12.5mm thick): 0.41 X₀
- 4 pieces tungsten (each 6mm thick): 6.8 X_0
- 25 cm Miro-silver LG; 3" PMT. *Note: center sampling, new QE*

Summary and Future Work

- Optical MC framework for showermax R&D established –Will use simpler, single quartz detector prototype testbeam data to benchmark MC
- New baseline MOLLER showermax detector design (4 piece) stack):
	- –Gives strong energy dependent light yields with ∼ 25% relative width
	- –Much cheaper than 10 piece stack with no loss in performance
- Will continue studying and optimizing baseline design
- Build prototype and test with beam