# 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





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  $6.0 \times 2.0 \times 1.0$  cm<sup>3</sup> quartz placed 4.5 cm from beam center  $\Rightarrow 0.3$  - 0.8 deg polar angle acceptance









- 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 (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  $N_2$  purge/flush
- Spectrosil 2000 quartz:  $3.0 \times 2.0 \times 1.0 \text{ cm}^3$  (prototype)
- Tungsten:  $2.0 \times 2.0 \times 1.0/1.5$  cm<sup>3</sup>; Aluminum and Delrin frame





## MAMI Testbeam (Lumi Tests)



- Recent test<br/>beam: 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<sub>2</sub> purge











![](_page_12_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_3.jpeg)

Prelim. Lumi Testbeam Results					
Run #	LG	Tungsten	with $N_2$	peak PEs (gain)	peak PEs (sim)
652	41cm	0mm	No	1.3	5
643	41cm	$10 \mathrm{mm}$	No	8.0	15
706	41cm	$15 \mathrm{mm}$	No	9.8	13
712	41cm	$0 \mathrm{mm}$	Yes	2.0	not gen.
716	$35 \mathrm{cm}$	$0 \mathrm{mm}$	Yes	2.2	not gen.
713	35cm	10mm	No	13	20

- 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%)

![](_page_13_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_2.jpeg)

### 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 ≤ 2.3cm so if quartz is 1cm, then W can be upto 1.3cm...What is best configuration?

![](_page_14_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### Showermax Detector (10 piece stack)

![](_page_16_Figure_4.jpeg)

- 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

![](_page_17_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_4.jpeg)

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

![](_page_18_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### Showermax Detector (4 piece stack) Photo-Electron Distribution - Shower-Max Detector (4 pieces) te 250 RMS/Mean = 0.211586 **RMS/Mean = 0.189937** RMS/Mean = 0.189268 200 photo electrons photo electrons 25000 Entries Entries 25000 211.2 Mean 727.1 Mean 150 44.68 RMS RMS 137.6 photo electrons Entries 25000 100 484.4 Mean RMS 92.01 50

4 pieces quartz (each 12.5mm thick):  $0.41 X_0$ 

800

600

400

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

1000

200

1200

Photo-electrons

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_2.jpeg)

### 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  $\sim 25\%$  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